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<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVII</td>
<td>Kālāṭjar Stone Inscription of Paramaridēva (Vikrama) Year 1258</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXVIII</td>
<td>Garrā Copper-Plate Inscription of Trailōkyavarman (Vikrama) Year 1261</td>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXIX</td>
<td>Sāgar Copper-Plate Inscription of Trailōkyavarman (Vikrama) Year 1264</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXX</td>
<td>Dhurē Copper-Plate Inscription of the Time of Trailōkyavalla (Kalachuri) Year 968</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXI</td>
<td>Chākhār Copper-Plate Inscription of Vīravarman (Vikrama) Year 1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXII</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Vīravarman (Vikrama) Year 1317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Vīravarman (Vikrama) Year 1325</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIV</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Rock Inscription of the Time of Vīravarman (Vikrama) Year 1337</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXV</td>
<td>Kālāṭjar Stone Inscription of Vīravarman (Fragmentary)</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVI</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Bhūja vārman (Vikrama) Year 1345</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVII</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Stone Inscription of the Time of Bhūja vārman (Undated)</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXVIII</td>
<td>Chākhār Copper-Plate Inscription of Hannāṭavarman (Vikrama) Year 1346</td>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Facing page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIX</td>
<td>Bambhû Sati Stone Inscription : (Vikrama) Year 1365</td>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXX</td>
<td>Ajayagadh Sati Stone Inscription of the Time of Hammiravarman : (Vikrama) Year 1368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXI</td>
<td>Dubkuud Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasinha : (Vikrama) Year 1345</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXII</td>
<td>Gwalior Stone Inscription of Mahipala : (Vikrama) Year 1150</td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
<td>Gwalior Stone Inscription of the Time of Mahipala : (Vikrama) Year 1161</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXXXIV</td>
<td>Narwar Copper-Plate Inscription of Virasinhadèva : (Vikrama) Year 1177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Inscription of the Dynasty of Vijayapâla**

| CXXXV | Inghûdâ Stone Inscription of Vijayapâladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1190                                                                                                                                       | 560         |

**Inscriptions of the Yajapâlas of Narwar**

| CXXXVI | Bhumípur Stone Inscription of the Time of Asalladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1319                                                                                                                            | 566         |
| CXXXVII | Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Asalladèva : (Fragmentary, Undated)                                                                                                                            | 571         |
| CXXXVIII | Badôdi Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopaladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1336                                                                                                                             | 576         |
| CXXXIX | Bangâ Stone Pillar Inscriptions of the Time of Gopaladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1337                                                                                                                          | 581         |
| CL | Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopaladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1359                                                                                                                                | 582 & 583   |
| CLI | Survââ Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopaladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1241                                                                                                                               | 594         |
| CLII | Sewâ Pillar Inscription of the Time of Gopaladèva : (Vikrama) Year 1341                                                                                                                               | 595         |
| CLIII | Survââ Stone Inscription of the Time of Ganapati : (Vikrama) Year 1350                                                                                                                                | 598         |
| CLIV | Narwar Stone Inscription of the Time of Ganapatidèva : (Vikrama) Year 1355                                                                                                                             | 603         |

**Supplementary-Inscriptions**

| CLV | Halâvudhâ-Sûtra in the Amârâsvâra Temple at Mândhûlâ : (Vikrama) Year 1120                                                                                                                             | 608         |
| CLVI | Udaipur Stone Inscription of the Time of Udvâditya : (Undated)                                                                                                                                           | 612         |
| CLVII | Dabhûkâ Stone Inscription of the Time of Naravarman : (Undated)                                                                                                                                              | 613         |
| CLVIII | Hosangâbâd Stone Inscription of Mahâkumâra Harîschandra : (Vikrama) Year 1243                                                                                                                            | 615         |
| CLIX | A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Ujjain : (Date Lost?)                                                                                                                                                  | 616         |
| CLX | A Fragmentary Inscription From Mându : B (Date Probably Lost)                                                                                                                                              | 618         |
| CLXI | A Fragmentary Stone Inscription From Mându : A (Date Lost ?)                                                                                                                                               |             |
| CLXII | Udaipur Stone Inscription of Jayasimha IV : (Vikrama) Year 1366                                                                                                                                           | 623         |
LIST OF PLATES

CLXIII Girvaṇ Stone Inscription : (Vikrama) Year 1181 Facing page 623
CLXIV A Paramāra Stone Inscription From Chittī : (Vikrama) Year 1314 " " 625
CLXV Varmān Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasihna : (Vikrama) Year 1356 " " 626
CLXVI Dhūbelī Museum Stone Inscription of the Time of Madanavarmān : (Vikrama) Year 1203 —
CLXVII Ajayagadhi Stone Inscription of the Time of Trailokyavarman : (Vikrama) Year 1269 —
CLXVIII Ajayagadhi Stone Inscription of the Time of Vīravarman : (Vikrama) Year 1335 Facing page 632
CLXIX Ajayagadhi Rock Inscription (of the Time of Bhōjavarmān) : (Vikrama) Year 1344 " " 632
CLXX Pannā Stone Pedestal Inscription : (Vikrama) Year 1366 " " 635
CLXXI Ajayagadhi Rock Inscription (of the Time of Bhōjavarmān) : (Vikrama) Year 1347 " " 637
CLXXII Rāsin Stone Inscription of the Time of Paramadhin : (Vikrama) Year 1466 " " 638
CLXXIII Makāval Stone Inscription of the Time of Dharavartsha : (Vikrama) Year 1276 " " 639
CLXXIV Rājpur Copper-Plate Charter of the Paramāra Ranadhavala : (Vikrama) Years 1148 and 1127 Between pages 644 & 645
CLXXV Eulogy of Sun-God From Udaipur : (Incompleted and Undated) — Facing page 648
CLXXVI Sāvargāon Stone Inscription of the Time of Jagaddēva : (Undated) — CLXXVII Kundēvāra Copper-Plate Inscription of the Time of Vidyādharaḥēva : (Vikrama) Year 1060 — Facing page 655
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The stone bearing this inscription appears to have been found near the temple of Vāmana at the village of Khajurāhā in the Chatarapur District of the Vindhya Division of Madhya Prades. Alexander Cunningham, who discovered it in 1883-84, noticed the inscription in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-1885), p. 65, with a small-scale lithograph (Plate xvi-B); and the record was subsequently edited by F. Kielhorn in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I (1892), pp. 121 ff., without a facsimile and with a transcript of the text prepared by him from an impression supplied to him by Dr. Burgess, the editor of the Journal. From Kielhorn's writings we know that the stone existed in "the mausoleum near the temple" till the time when he wrote. The present situation of it, however, is unknown; and, as a fresh impression of it is not now forthcoming, I edit the inscription from the lithograph published by Cunningham.

It is only a fragment of an apparently very large inscription, and contains thirteen imperfect lines. Its shape is irregular, roughly appearing as triangular. The total height of it, as stated by Kielhorn, is equal to 40-64 cms., and the length, beginning with 17-78 cms. in the first line, gradually increases to 58-10 cms. in l. 8, and decreases again to 15-24 cms. in l. 13. The size of the letters is 2-22 cms. and the photograph shows the writing fairly well preserved.

The inscription is very neatly engraved in the Nāgari alphabet, showing a close resemblance to that of the inscription of Yasōvarman, edited immediately after this. With reference to the formation of the individual letters, we notice that the vowel ś, which occurs only once in āstānā, l. 9, is engraved so as to resemble mrah; the letter k in kṣhiti, l. 10, loses its loop as a superscript; ch, dh and v are often almost alike throughout, e.g., in chatur-avidham, l. 4; bh is formed as h; cf. prabhā, l. 4; and finally, the slightly different forms of the dental s can be seen in asmāt and sakha, respectively, in l. 2, where it appears as a combination of the palatal and the dental sibilants, and also in l. 5. The paleography shows that the inscription is of about the same time as of Yasōvarman referred to below, or slightly earlier than that.

The language is Sanskrit; and the fragment now available is all in verse. The orthography does not call for any special remark except that (1) the consonant that precedes and follows r is, as a rule, doubled, e.g., in pātra, l. 2, and kṛtti, occurring three times in lls. 5, 6 and 11, respectively; and (2) the medial diphthongs are shown by prāṣṭha-mātrās.

Neither the object nor the date of the inscription is to be found in the existing fragment; but from the way of writing, it appears to be a praśasti of a Chandellā king who had Khajurāhā included in his kingdom, as we know from the names occurring therein.

To note briefly the contents of the inscription, we find the word namah in the first line thereof, showing that the verse containing this word must have been devoted to pay obeisance to some deity; and lls. 2-4 where words like kālpa, vākun and bhūta-vikāra occur, tend to show that they contained an account of the creation of the universe, as we find in the following two of the records of the house. The next line mentions Jējākā and Vījākā, two rulers as born from a king (tasmāt) whose name is lost, but taking these two names denoting respectively the well-known ancestors of the house of the Chandellā rulers and the first of them as giving his own name to Jējākahhukti, which is now known as Bundelkhand, we may take the lost name as of

---
1 This place with its antiquities is described by Cunningham in his A.S.I.R., Vol. II, p. 412; Vol. X, p. 16, and Vol. XXI, p. 55. In the last of these Vols. it is stated that the fragment may have belonged to the temple of Vāmana, from which it was found not far off (p. 65).
2 For the sake of convenience, the lines of the extant portion are numbered here from one.
3 See Nos. 98 and 114, below.
Vâkapati who was his father. The name of Râhila, the son of Vijayaâshtâi is again lost in ll. 6-7, which describe him as "vanquishing the haughty enemies by the prowess of his arms." Râhila's son was Harshâdeva, whose name appears in l. 7; and the description of him in ll. 8-9, which obviously refers to his fame and valour as conquering the earth up to the ocean, is all conventional.

The next line, which preserves only a foot of a verse which is otherwise completely lost, informs us that "he (a ruler whose name is not preserved) again (punâr =) placed Kshitiâpalâdevâ on the throne". The latter of these rulers has of course been unanimously taken to be the imperial Pratihâra monarch, Mahâpâla, and as for the former, Kiellhorn has shown good grounds to identify him with the Chandellâ king Harshâdeva and not his son Yaâovarman, as was conjectured by Hoernle.1 R. S. Tripâthi has also given cogent reasons for taking this ruler to be Harshâdeva.2 Thus the incident appears to have an obvious reference to the long-drawn hostility between the two great powers of the North and the South India, viz., the Pratihâras and the Râshtrakutas, culminating in the sensational achievement of Indra III (914-927 A.C.) in capturing Kanauj,3 some time between 915 and 918 A.C., and the subsequent recovery of the throne by Mahâpâla, soon after the retreat of the enemical forces whose main interest was in the south.4

On the other hand, however, there is a set of scholars who urge that the incident when Harsha rendered help to Mahâpâla has a reference not to the latter's restoration after the field was left by the Râshtrakutas but to his very accession by defeating his rival and half-brother, Bhöja II, who, after the death of his father, Mahâendrapâla, succeeded in obtaining the throne with the help of the Kalachuri king Kõkâlla I.5 R. S. Tripâthi, who belongs to this set, goes so far as to suggest that the word "punâr" of the verse under reference should be taken not to mean "again" but in the sense of "introducing further details about the achievements of the Chandella ruler."6 But this suggestion, though ingenious, is not corroborated by any other source, and there is no positive evidence to establish that there was actually a war between the two brothers.

Whatever may have been the fact, it is doubtful that the help rendered by the Chandella king to his Imperial overlord speaks highly of a valorous feat which increased the prestige of the latter's house.

What remains of the inscription makes it fairly clear that it was a very important record throwing light on the Chandella ruling house, and its loss is indeed greatly felt.

No geographical name occurs in the portion now available.

TEXT*

1  
[महाजयाचिने नम्]7 जलस्व[म्]  
यं पात्रं किम्रास्तरं8 एवं यो व-

---

1 The words kshiti and mahâ are synonymous. Cunningham was disposed to regard Kshitiâpalâdeva as a son of Harshâdeva and thus an elder brother of Yaâovarman, but as pointed out by Kiellhorn, there is nothing in support of this view in the fragment. His conjecture, however, that Harshâdeva first defeated and subsequently re-instated Kshitiâpâla in the government of his dominions (op. cit., p. 122) is baseless.


3 H. K., p. 237, n. 1. Some hold this view doubtful, for which, see C. J. I., Vol. IV, p. lxxv.

4 A. J. K., p. 13; R. T. T., p. 102.

5 A. J. K., pp. 35 f.

6 See R. T. T., p. 101; H. K., pp. 235 ff; R. D. Banerji, Haukayas of Tripuri, etc., p. 4. This theory is based on the mention of the doubtful name Bhöja, without any details, in a Kalachuri grant (C. J. I., Vol. IV, No. 48, v. 7). According to Tripâthi and others, he was Bhöja II of the Pratihâra dynasty. But if we take him to have been the first ruler of the name, the whole theory falls flat on the ground.

7 See n. 3, above.

8 From plate XVI-B in Cunningham's A. S. I. R., Vol. XXI.

9 Metre: Âmukâra. Kiellhorn read the last of the bracketed akâharas as âvarî, but the plate does not show the consonant of the letter as doubled.

10 Metre: Sûrâlakrûpti. For the sake of the metre, the letter rauh has to be read as separate from the following one.
KHAJURAHO STONE INSCRIPTION OF HARSHADEVA (FRAGMENTARY)

From Facsimile
KHAJURĀHŌ STONE INSCRIPTION OF YĀṢŌVARMAN.

[Vikrama] Year 1011

THE stone which bears this inscription is said to have been discovered, some time after 1843, amongst the ruins at the base of a temple known as the temple of Lakshmanaj at Khajuraho in the Chatarpur District of the Vindhyā region of Madhya Pradesh, and is now built into the wall inside the entrance porch of the temple. The inscription was briefly noticed by General Alexander Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. II, (1862-1863), pp. 425 f, and again in ibid., Vol. XXI (1883-1885), pp. 65 and 84, where a small photograph of it was also published on Plate xvii.B. The record was first edited by F.

1. Metre: ārdhānavākṣṭha. Kiethorn read the first letter in this line as ṛ, but the vertical stroke that distinguishes it from ṛ is clear. It may also be noted that the last letter in this line is totally lost and has been adopted from Kiethorn's reading.

2. Metre: Upāṣṭī. Kiethorn's reading of the last two aksaras is ṛṣṇa, but on the plate the first is a clear ha with the mātrā very distinct.

3. Metre: Sadābhara, or Mandākranta, the last cātra of both of which is identical in syllables.

4. Metre: Anuṣṭūbha. Kiethorn read the first letter of the line as ṛṣṇa but the initial loop of the letter in only ornamental.

5. Metre: Sadābhara, or Mandākranta.


7. Metre: Aṣṭā or its variant, i.e., Gīt or Upāṣṭī.


10. Metre, as above. The last two aksaras in this line are as suggested by Kiethorn.


12. Metre: Aṣṭā or its variant.

13. Metre: Rathaḍāhāta or Śāgarā, both of which are distinguished only from the interchange of the mātrās of the 9th and the 10th aksaras in each of its feet.

14. Kajrow of the Indian Atlas, sheet No. 70. Situated at N. Lat. 24° 51' and E. Long 80°, this place is 43 km. east of Chatarpur and 55 km. south of Mahbāla, and is now connected with a metalised road with each of these places. The antiquities of this place are described by Cunningham in his A.S.I.R., Vol. II, pp. 412 ff. ibid., Vol. X. pp. 16 ff. and again in ibid., Vol. XXI, pp. 75 ff.

15. Cunningham found the slab placed 'doping against the wall' of the temple, and he also remarked that it was not seen by Buri in 1889, but was obtained in course of repairs carried on to this temple by the Chatarpur Rajā some time after 1848. In Buri's time the temple was known as of Chaturbhuja.
KIENHORN IN THE EPIGRAPHICA INDICA, Vol. I (1888-1892), pp. 129 ff., with text in the Nāgari, from impressions supplied to him by Burgess, with a translation (pp. 130 ff.) and a photolithograph facing p. 216; and some of its historical importance was later on discussed by scholars from time to time. It is edited here from an excellent inked impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.1

As stated above, the record is engraved on a large slab. The inscribed surface measures 1.72 metres broad by 0.74 metres high and consists of twenty-eight lines of writing. The stone has suffered considerably about the middle of lines 17-21, and in the latter half of the last lines and some others akṣharas here and there have been damaged or rendered illegible by the effects of weather; moreover, a few of the akṣharas which were wholly or partially visible in Kielhorn’s time have now been completely broken away. However, in most of the cases the missing akṣharas can be supplied by conjecture, in view of the context and occasionally from the lithograph published in the Epigraphica Indica, referred to above, from which too I have compared my reading of the text. The letters are well formed and carefully engraved. Their size varies from 1.9 to 2.2 cms.

The characters are of the Nāgari alphabet. To make some general observations, we find that the top-strokes are occasionally angular, e.g., of dānavā, l. 1, the vertical strokes of the letters generally end in a curve and the daṇḍas are often marked as the modern Nāgari ra. The initial a and the consonants t, n, r and s show transitional forms; see, e.g., a in ṭaṅkapā, l. 3, and ṭaṅkāna, l. 28; t in -niṇu and viṅkaṇta-, both in l. 1; n in dānavā, l. 1; and -ajani, l. 3, and s in yasya- and śānu-, both in l. 8. The initial ṝ, which appears in ll. 4 and 26, is formed of two dots horizontally placed and subscribed by a loop ending in a tail; and the initial ī, e.g., in īkā-āvī, l. 20, has its left curve joined directly to the right vertical, which has a tail below. The loop of k as the first member of a conjunct consonant or in letters like ku and kṛ̥̃ gives place to a stroke or is joined to the vertical not directly but by a stroke; cf., e.g., khasyā, kriyā and krīdā, all in l. 6, kuṣṭa- in l. 12, and chukrē and krīti, both in l. 26. The letter ū has not developed the dot, e.g., in saṅga, l. 2; the lingual u is laid flat when a subscript; see niśāpa, l. 2; the rare ḷh appears twice, in mirijharā and ṭaṅkāra, both in l. 8; and ṣh in phala- in l. 6. Dh is in a transitional stage, showing its left limb resembling u in most cases, but occasionally this limb appears developed and is very rarely horned, though this horn is not joined to the lower part or the vertical; cf. respectively, dhātrī, dhīr- and -mudha-, all in l. 8. R which has assumed the modern form as in tārā, l. 2, is sometimes engraved in a slightly varying way, e.g., in krīḍa, rumya and vārī, all in l. 8. The subscript form of this letter is denoted by a serif attached to the lowest extremity of the vertical, as in prāsava-, l. 3. This form is occasionally indistinguishable from the curved end of the verticals which appear throughout the inscription, as stated above, or from the stroke for the medial short u, which sometimes shows this form; see, e.g., asura-, vara- and tīrōṇ, all in l. 1.

In spite of the carefulness devoted to the record by the mason in its technical execution, we observe that in some cases it is difficult to distinguish between ɻ and u, as in tānu-, l. 1, between ɻ and y as in ātavu and puyā, both in l. 2, and between bh and ɻ, as in ḹhrītī and bhīmā in ll. 2 and 10, respectively. As for the mātras, a peculiar example of the medial ā is to be seen crescent-shaped in khaṇḍa-čekhātā- in l. 2, and a rare instance of the medial o is in tirīkha-, l. 1, where the prīṣṭhā-mātrā assumes the form of a dot attached to the left of the top-stroke of ɻ. The secondary short o appears both in its ordinary form as in avatu, l. 1, and as a serif as of the subscript o, as in bhūvana- in the same line. And finally, the formation of the last akṣhara te is noteworthy.

The language is Sanskrit, generally correct; and with the exception of a short sentence paying obeisance to Vāsudeva in the beginning and the date and some other particulars in the last line, the record is all metrically composed. The style is ornate and the composition abounds in figures of speech like amūtī-citra, uṇātī, vātīca, ṭaṅkāra and the rare parisāṅkhāya (v. 25). The language is fluent; but one of the verses (No. 4) does not admit of proper construction, as shown in a note appended to the text. The total number of verses is forty-nine; they are not numbered.

As regards orthography we notice that (1) the sign for v is everywhere employed to denote b; see śrāma, l. 2; (2) the dental sibilant is occasionally written for the palatal as in Kāśī, l. 13, while the reverse is also found e.g., in Kālīśa in l. 24; but such cases are very few; (3) the

1 For example, in Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. XXV, p. 213 and in ibid., Vol. XXX, pp. 189 ff.
2 Hs. No. B-246 (1999-00).
class-consonant following \( r \) is sometimes doubled and sometimes not; examples of the first are afforded by \( nimirrata \), and \( karita \), both in I. 20, and of the second, by \( nirmātā \), I. 4 and \( karnavī \), I. 9. In the word \( vārṣiga \) occurring twice in the record, the \( akṣhara \, \dot{g} \) is doubled in I. 25 but not in I. 7. \( T \) before \( r \) is also often doubled, e.g. \( tatara \), I. 6.1; (4) the \( visarjita \) after \( vaksha \) in I. 2 is dropped in accordance with \( pārtika \) on Pāṇini, VIII, 3, 36, and besides this we have four other cases of this type, in II. 4, 6, 19 and 20; but in two examples, viz. \( \dot{a}-\dot{p}rāpta=\dot{k}hajyāya \), I. 6, and \( dharmānā=\dot{p}rīśe \), I. 28, the \( visarjita \) is wrongly dropped; (5) one of the two similar consonants forming a conjunct is dropped by syncope in some instances like \( ujāśa \), in II. 3, 5 and 11; \( sator \), I. 1, \( ajñātā\) and \( prādyayālā \), both in I. 16, and \( rāgī=\dot{d}riśi\), in I. 24; (6) the anuvāra is often used for the nasals \( n \) and \( m \) and the final \( m \) is also incorrectly changed at the end of a stich; on the other hand, it wrongly takes the place of a nasal in words like \( vānśa \), I. 5, and \( samāvāra \) and \( samāvāt \), both in I. 28; (7) the dental \( n \) stands for the lingual in \( nishān\), I. 8, and a superfluous \( n \) is inserted after \( m \) in words like \( namśiti \), I. 14 and \( namśita \), I. 26; and finally, (8) the vowel \( i \) is used for \( ri \) in \( trīśi \), I. 24.

The inscription belongs to the reign of Dhaṅgaṅḍeṅa of the Chandrātrēya (Chandella) family. It is a \( prākśiti \), a laudatory account, as stated twice in its vv. 47 and 48, and was composed by the poet Mādhava, whose father was Dēḍda, a grammarian whose fame as a poet was celebrated in tales by wise men with repute (vv. 46-47). That this fame was well deserved is indicated by the style of composition. The inscription was written on stone, in 'pleasing letters', by the karānaka Jaddha, the Gauda, who was a son of Jayaṅguṇa (7), the writer of the legal documents (karānaka). The name of the engraver who was an artisan (\( vāpēkā\)) is lost in I. 28.

The immediate object of the inscription is to record the construction of a temple of the enemy of the Dāityas, i.e., Vishnu, by the illustrious Yaśōvarman (also called Lakshavarman) in vv. 37 and 39 of the Chandrātrēya ruling house and setting up in the same an image of the god under the name Vaiṅkūṭhpa (vv. 42-43). The record is dated, in I. 28, in words as well as in numerical figures, in the year 1011, without any specification of the month, fortnight, \( tīti \) or week-day; and the year which is evidently to be referred to the Vikrama era, is equivalent to 954 A.C., taking it as expired of the Chaṭrāḍi year.

The inscription may be divided into two parts. The first part, which traces the genealogy of the ruling house, ends with verse 41; and the second part, which speaks of the temple and the image, and also gives some other particulars, comprises the remaining portion.

After three \( mīnāγa\,\dot{a}\,\dot{d}kā \) in praise of Vishnu respectively under the names of the boar and man-lion incarnations, Vaiṅkūṭha and Lakshmi's husband, the record introduces the name of Yaśōvarman, referring to his personal qualities and valour (v. 4). In the following five verses that are devoted to describe the origin of the world and springing of the early sages of holy conduct, Maṛichi and others from the mind of Brahma, it tells us that Atri, one of them, begat the sage Chandrātrēya and from him proceeded the family known after him. In that family was born the illustrious prince Nānnuka, 'a touch-stone to test the worth of the gold of the regal order', whose fame spread far and wide and who conquered hosts of enemies (vv. 10-11). Nānnuka's son was Vākpati, whose fame was sung by Kṛśna women in the Vindhyā mountain (vv. 12-13). He had two sons, Jayaṅsakti and Vījayaṅsakti (vv. 14-15). The latter's son was Rāhila who destroyed his adversaries (vv. 16-17), and his son again was Harsha, who was endowed with the excellencies like heroism, vigour and self-confidence. Harsha's wife was Kaśčukṣa, who sprang from the Chāhamāna tribe, and she bore to him a son, named Yaśōvarman, (vv. 18-22).

Of all these names, those of Jayaṅsakti and Vījayaṅsakti are the same as jējāka and Vījāka of the preceding inscription which also mentions the name of Harṣadēva. It must however be stated here that much of the description in the present inscription is entirely conventional and altogether devoid of any historical interest. Yaśōvarman is further eulogised in as many as nineteen verses (23-41), most of which too are equally poetic and only mean to say that he was a great warrior destroying his antagonists, possessed wide fame which spread in all quarters and

---

1. In all such cases I find that the oblique strokes are three and therefore I have read this \( akṣhara \) as \( trīśi \) and not \( trīśi \) as read by Khilnani.
2. For an analogous instance of describing the reigning king in the beginning of a record, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVI, p. 324, and n. 1.
that he equalled Karpa in munificence. Yudhishthira in truthfulness and Arjuna in heroism. Verse 30 states that 'in his victorious march his armies reached up to the Himalayas'. The only historically important verses of this portion are 28, 28 and 31, the first of which mentions the exploits of this ruler, stating that he was "a sword to (cut down) the Gaudas as if they were pleasure-creeper, equalled the forces of the Khasas and carried off the treasures of the Kosalas; before him perished the Kāśmīri warriors; he weakened the Mithilas, (and) was, as it were, a god of death to the Mālavas, who brought distress on the shameful Chēdis and was to the Kurus what a storm is to trees, (and) a scorching fire to the Gūjaras".

Nothing is known about Yaśovarman's expedition against Gauda of Bengal, his contemporaries then ruling over the region were the Pāla kings Rāja-prāpāla (c. 908-40) and the latter's successor Gopa-la II (c. 940-80 A.C.). Both of them were admittedly weak rulers and the Chandella king may have taken an opportunity to invade their dominions, probably to make them still weaker and not with the objective of any territorial gain. It also seems possible that in course of this expedition Yaśovarman may also have come into conflict with the people of Mithilā, i.e., North Bihār. We may also note here that the separate mention of Mithilā in this verse clearly indicates that this kingdom was a separate political unit and not under the Pālaś, as held by some scholars. 1 So far as Mālava is concerned, Yaśovarman's contemporary on the throne was Sīyaka ādīla Harshadēva, who was then busy extending his conquests particularly in the north, as we have seen while editing his Harṣālā grants of V.S. 1005 or 949 A.C.; and it is reasonable to presume that his further extension of the territories in that direction may have been frustrated by the menacing potentiality of Yaśovarman who was equally keen to extend his conquests towards the south and southwest, as we also learn from verse 45 of the present record, which reports that his son Dhaṅgadēva had under him some region around Bihāla. As we shall presently see, Yaśovarman snatched the fort of Kāla-hīrā from the Rāshi-trākaṭas, on behalf of the contemporary Prathihāra king; and in view of this, he may be taken to be naturally hostile to the Paramāra king who was deeply attached to the Rāshi-trākaṭa power.

Yaśovarman's kingdom was conterminous with that of the Kalachūris on its south and the struggle of this ambitious prince with them too was inevitable. His contemporary on the Kalachi oral throne was Yuvārjadēva I (915-945 A.C.), who appears to have suffered a defeat at his hands, as the present inscription informs us. That Yaśovarman had a more-than-usual grudge against the Kalachūris is indicated by the repeated mention of his victory over them. Verse 28 of the present inscription also tells us that "the fearless Yaśovarman vanquished a Chēdi prince with his countless forces, who was being protected by a furious multitude of invincible bowmen riding elephants in rut presenting a scene of a lofty mountain of collyrium and who had planted his lotus-foot on toes of diadem of famous kings". 2

The adjective śāhodāna, meaning shameful, applied to the Chēdis in the aforementioned verse of the inscription has been taken to explain that the Chandellas had some special reason for being provoked against the royal house of the Kalachūris. We know that these kings were attached to the Rāshi-trākaṭas who were southerners and were carrying on constant raids in North India; and besides this, Dr. S. K. Mitra has also drawn our attention to the series of political marriages between the Rāshi-trākaṭas and the Kalachūris, particularly pointing out cases in each of which the bride came from the Kalachūri family; and this was sufficient to provoke the Chandellas whose interests were linked up with the politics of North India. 3

The verse under reference also mentions Yaśovarman's invasion of the Kōsalas. Kōsala here obviously appears to designate Dakṣiṇa Kōsala, i.e., the region of the upper Mahānadi

---

1 See F. R. K., pp. 48-49. On p. 51 of ibid. Dr. S. K. Mitra suggests that this show of allegiance in official documents was nothing but a mere formality; but it is rather strange that this show of allegiance and the open declaration of his hostility should find place in the same record.

2 Dr. V. V. Mirashi has shown that since the Kalachūri prince was a senior contemporary of Yaśovarman, and moreover that he courted the defeat after vanquishing a number of kings, the struggle between the two has to be dated towards the close of his reign. And this is exactly the time of Yaśovarman's military expedition. For Mirashi's view, see C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. 334v, which is followed here. But according to R. S. Tripathi, the Chēdi ruler was Kōkalla I, and according to S. K. Mitra, he was most probably Bāhāhara, the elder brother of Yuvarjadēva. For the respective views, see H. K., p. 256, and F. R. K., p. 42.

3 See Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. XXX, pp. 189 ff. Krishna II, his son Jagatnāgīna and the latter's son Intra III had all their wives from the Kalachūri family.
valley where the Sōmayānaśa were ruling; and Yaśāvarman's contemporary ruler Śivagupta (c. 950 A.C.) carried on congenial relations with the Kalachuris after his defeat by the Kalachuri king Lakshmanaṇarāja II (945-970 A.C.). And this may have enraged Yaśāvarman to invade this region. It must be admitted, however, that there is no evidence in support of this view.

The statement of the pradakṣiṇa crediting Yaśāvarman to be 'a scouring fire to the Gurjaras' would naturally suggest his enemies to have been the imperial Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kanajat, as is generally held;1 but this statement would be nothing less than directly challenging the overlordship of his master Vināyakaṗāla whose name is mentioned below in the same record with all due honour. I am therefore inclined to agree with Dr. D.C. Sircar who takes these Gurjaras of the present inscription to be identical with the Pratihāra dynasty represented by Harirāja who was then ruling over the Jhānsi-Gunā area and who too, like Yaśāvarman and some others, originally owed his allegiance to the imperial Gurjara-Pratihāra power. Editing the Bhārata-Kalā-Brāhman copper-plate inscription of Harirāja, Dr. Sircar has suggested that it is this house of the Gurjaras which is alluded to in the expression occurring in our inscription and that Harirāja claims for himself the title of Adhirāja in I. 2 and Mahārājaḥdhirāja in I. 6 of the record goes to indicate that he openly declared independence when the imperial power was hard pressed by the Rāṣṭrakūtas.2

With reference to the other countries and people which are alluded to in the verse under reference, it appears to be practically impossible that Yaśāvarman actually invaded Kashmir and the kingdom of the Kūrus or the Khasas which were far distant from his region.3 Equally conventional is another statement which is made in v. 30 of the record that he led his conquests up to the Himalayas in the north. The expression digēya used in this verse and again in verse 59 below only reminds us of the description of conquests of kings of the ancient times. Verse 36 tells us that this king was also known as Lakṣhavaṇarman.

Verse 31 of the record under study states that Yaśāvarman easily conquered the Kālaṇjara mountain, the dwelling place of the Jata. The name of the enemy from whom he captured this mountain is not mentioned; and prima facie this enemy of the Chandella king would appear to be either the Rāṣṭrakūta king Kṛśna III (939-967 A.C.), whose predecessor Intra III may have occupied it in one of his northern campaigns, or the imperial Pratihāra ruler. The first of these suggestions is obviously untenable, since we do not find the name of any Rāṣṭrakūta ruler in the long list of Yaśāvarman's adversaries as given in v. 23 of the record. Similarly the second view also cannot be upheld in view of the fact that not only Yaśāvarman but his son Dhanga also acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Vināyakaṗāla in this very record. Bringing to our notice all these difficulties, Dr. D.C. Sircar, while editing the Bhārata Kalā Bhāvan grant of Harirāja Pratihāra of V.S. 1040, suggested that the Chandella ruler seems to have captured the fort from any of the ancestors of the Pratihāra ruler Harirāja, who, as a feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kanajat and perhaps as belonging to the imperial family, was holding the Jhānsi-Gunā area under him, with Kālaṇjar included in it.4 We have no hesitation in accept-

---

1 See E.R.K., p. 51.
3 The Mārak. Purāṇa (p. 346, n.) places the Khasas in Nepal, whereas according to some, they were masters of the Lōhara country on the borders of the Kashmir State (E.R.K., p. 50). Dr. R. C. Majumdar observed that the appropriate sense of the expression ātula-khaṇ-mahā of the verse under reference is that Yaśāvarman treated these people with contempt, and Kielhorn's translation thereof as 'equalled in strength' does not therefore appear to be correct. In support of this view the scholar drew attention to some us of the participle ātula in some Sanskrit texts (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. XXV, p. 213). Pointing out, however, that the sense taken by Majumdar would be hardly applicable in v. 52 of an inscription of Dhaṅga reissued by Jayavarman (No. 114, below), we may also quote here a verse from Halāyudha's Kavi-rāhava, describing his hero the Rāṣṭrakūta king Kṛṣṇaṇarāja:

केलवतस्नासा कण्ठम दी भारे भक्तमनुसरः ।
वस्त नूतनिः ध्रुवम । रसदुःस्तरमन्तः ॥

(Cited in E.H.D., p. 133, n.)

Instances may be multiplied by the well-known expressions like ātula-dhīnya-bhīṣa (C.I.I., Vol. IV, p. 282, v. 10); and two of the instances mentioned above clearly show that Kielhorn's translation of the expression used in the present inscription is absolutely correct and also that all the instances enumerated by Dr. Majumdar denote only the secondary sense.

ing Sircar's suggestion, but the difficulty of how and from whom Haritāja obtained the fort remains unexplained, besides the fact that it is doubtful whether a feudatory ruler in the Jhāst-Gunā region could have extended his sway in the east so far as Kālaṇjar which is not less than 150 miles (about 240 kms.) from Chandelli, which is said to have been his capital, after crossing two big rivers (the Dhasan and the ken) and the region around khajurāhō which was then held by the Chandellas.

The second part of the inscription which commences with verse 42, says that Yaśōvarman erected the lofty and splendid shrine of Vishnu (enemies of the Daitīyas), which is described in the usual poetic style. In the next verse we are told how this ruler obtained the image which he set up in the temple, viz., that originally the lord of Bhūta obtained it from Kailasa, from him, Śahi, the king of Kīra, from him, Herambapāla, and finally, Yaśōvarman received it from Dēva-pāla, the lord of horses and the son of Herambapāla.1

The next three verses introduce Yaśōvarman's son Dhanga, describing him as a source of joy to his subjects. This king, who was endowed with valour and fame, as we are further told, ruled the earth, 'as far as Kālaṇjar and as far as Bhāsvar situated on the banks of the river Kālindī, and from there to the frontiers of the Chēdi country and even as far as the marvellous mountain called Gopa. Dhaṅga is also described here as a brave, intelligent and righteous ruler causing the belief that 'the Kali age had, out of season, come to an end'.

Then we have the mention of the poet and the writer (vv. 46-48): and the next verse expresses the hope that the king may protect the earth, may the laws of the three Vēdas prosper and may the cows and the twice-born (divīja) obtain happiness. This account is followed by the particulars of the date and the name of the engraver, as seen above; and the inscription comes to an end with the name of Vināyakapālalādeva who had annihilated the enemies,2 and finally, with a salutation to the glorious Vāsudeva and the Sun.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the present inscription, Kālaṇjarī (vv. 31 and 45) is the well-known fort of that name in the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh and situated about 15 kms. west-southwest of Allahabad. Mālavanādi, on the bank of which Bhāsvar, i.e., Bhūta (now known as Vīdisha) is situated (v. 45), is the river Bētā; and Gopa-giri (v. 45) is of course Gwālīor, the Chief city of the district of that name in Madhya Pradesh. The other places mentioned in the record in v. 45 have already been identified above.

TEXT1

[Metres: Verses 1-56 and 24. Siṭhārāṃi; vv. 24, 7-8, 10-11, 17, 19, 25, 28, 30, 32, 35, 38-40, and 44-45; Sārdāla-puṣṭi[v]; vv. 9 and 29; Mandanāra; vv. 12 and 15; Pāji; vv. 13, 18, 22, 33, 37, 41 and 46-47; Parantālādā; vv. 14, 48 and 54; Āryā; vv. 16, 21, 34 and 49; Anuśūthā; vv. 20, 23, 28-27, 31, 36, and 42-43; Sraṇdharā].]

1 जीै नमो भक्ते वामेवाम ॥ द्वादशस्मा ये विदुर्मित्वातिहासिक-खरोहकोलास नृसुर-भुवनकरात ॥ जेय वेतमहानव(व)वर्ग विदुर्मित्वातिहासिक-खरोहकोलास नृसुर-भुवनकरात ॥[11] पापमुहेः(व)विदुर्मित्वातिहासिक-खरोहकोलास नृसुर-भुवनकरात ॥

1 Herambapāla alias Vinayakapāla mentioned below in l. 28 was the Imperial Prathīhāra ruler of Kanauj, for whose grant of 951 A.C., see Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 158. By some scholars he is presumed to be identical with Mahāpāla alias Kshetrapāla as shown in detail in A.I.K., p. 34, while others are of the view that he was quite a distinct person. See C.I.L., IV, p. lxxiv, n. 2. Also see H.K., pp. 275-74. and Ind. Ant., Vol. LVII, p. 292.

2 From an impression supplied by the Chief Epigraphist (His No. B-256/1959-60).

3 Denoted by a symbol.
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From Facsimile
2 हृदे। यदै ब्रह्मसिद्धिमर्मसदिलोकं पाबर्मकविवृत्तं गर्वराजविन्दुव् अगस्त् \nचक्रमकः पूर्वं स मुखर्यं 
हर्ष [II.31] सूक्ष्म स एव; प्रकारप्रृवति विद्यमानी विद्यमानी 
दिविकादसः सम्बन्धी । तत्सिद्धामर्ममहत्त्वमलिपुरः रस स्वभम्ब । गणेण 
त्यस्य तथा त्रिभुजस्वस्मालस्मालस्मालस्मालस्मालस्मालस्मालस्मालस्माल 
कालस्माल 

gांगीरें।

3 स्मृतं: शाश्वामर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्म 
शाश्वामर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्ममर्म 

tतत्स्मालभग: सत्त्वम्। 

4 महाभार 

5 नमः। 

6 रघु न व वत्ससिद्धिः। 

7 अमायाद: [II.31] त्रि:नाथायप्रभुपद्मादि: महाबलसिद्धिः। 

8 उद्विद्ध: \n
9 धिनिकर्ममहाराजसिद्धिः। 

10 And not वा as read by Kielhorn. The middle curvilinear stroke is clear though smaller. In all the instances below, where the stroke is clear, I have taken the ओक्ष्या as या. 

11 As already suggested by Kielhorn, read नामः। Probably the preceding word is intended to be दार्शनिकः। 

12 The viśarga is dropped in accordance with the vārttika on Pāṇini VIII. 8. 36. 

13 The oṣṭhaḥ न, which was originally omitted, is written above the line. Kielhorn also observed that the first half of this verse does not admit of a proper construction but he has not proposed any emendation, which I propose as नाश्त्रीयमःवाचयतवा। केवल दार्शनिकाय पत्तकालात्। Kielhorn translates the first phrase of the second quarter of this verse as ‘firm like the Creatore’: but I think that what is intended here is दिति, the Earth, as often found in Sanskrit literature. For similarity of construction in the last foot of this verse, see G. J. J., Vol. IV, p. 413, v. 22. 

14 Originally वः, with the sign of अंुपन्धा later on scratched off. The idea in this verse is taken from the Śūkṣmya system of Philosophy. 

15 The two oṣṭhaḥ गुष्म were at first omitted and subsequently written above the line. 

16 See n. 3, above. 

17 The other sages created by Brahman are named in the Mā. P., Canto L. One of them was Atri who begot the Moon. 

18 Read चृः। The दास्क त has follows is superfluous. 

19 For dropping the viśarga, see n. 5, above.
9 तान्त्रिकसचिवाणि स विद्या [११६.१२४] तस्मादिष्ठमवधानं श्रीरो(र)कं(क्ष)कुक्रोक्तस्मभष्यत ।
वृत्तात्मालयुक्तो अवकाशिकविवशस्यनिर्देश [११६.१२४] नयोऽऽर्थोऽर्थपूर्वविद्वानवा|विद्वानवादधिकारिणी | कर्मणि रोहाक्षुपुष्टि समेता समृद्धकामं ॥१॥ सुभवित ॥११६.१२५॥ तत्तावधानम नवमं राहस्याऴ्वनावजनाभि || ।

10 दिक्तः वादनतयां निधिः दिहय: [११६.१२५] भोमभायभविताः किव अवकृष्णसप्तादितावर्तकम्
वायुनिनियोऽवर्तकम् कर्मरथविवशस्यनिर्देश [११६.१२५] नयोऽऽर्थोऽर्थपूर्वविद्वानवा|विद्वानवादधिकारिणी | कर्मणि रोहाक्षुपुष्टि समेता समृद्धकामं ॥१॥ सुभवित ॥११६.१२५॥ तत्तावधानम नवमं राहस्याऴ्वनावजनाभि || ।

11 लस्यः [४] अधिपिय यस्य सुविधायपि युक्तम् युक्तिसारसो सरोऽसर0
16  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

17  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

18  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

19  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

20  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

21  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्

22  दक्षेश्वरकल्याणभुविन्यासविनिवेदनार्थोऽविनेद्रःसाधनायमहोक्ष्यादत्तत्
व्यासःवायतिनयःसातोऽविनेद्रः व्यासः काल्याणःतद्
राजेः महोक्ष्यादत्तत्
And giving the name of the Mahārāja-guru Vāsavadatta and recording the month and date at the end, the inscription comes to a close.

To study the names of the gardens mentioned here, it is tentative to suggest that the first of these is obviously named after the donor himself, i.e., Pāhilla; Nos. 2 and 3, after the Chandrātrya, i.e., Chandella house, and No. 7, after the name of king Dhaṅga. I am, however, unable to explain the origin of the fifth of these gardens, viz., Pañcālāla-pratikā. It may be that what was really intended is Pañcāla-pratikā and the third and the fifth letters of this name are wrongly engraved as some others in the inscription. If so, the five sour fruits (amālaru), as enumerated in the following verse of the Śabda-chandrikā, are really meant:

Kūta-dāṣīma-vaṭkalūmāila = amla-vaṭkas-saṁyutuḥ
Chatuṭalām cha pañcālāmā mārulīga-saṁvyutuḥ

However, it is only a suggestion.

The record is dated, at the end, on Monday, the seventh tithi of the bright half of Vaiśākha in the year which, due to the mason's error, can be read either as 1011 or 1111, the second figure being compounded of zero and one. Noticing this error, Cunningham preferred to take the latter of these years as true, in view of his calculation of the tithi falling on Monday, the 18th April, 1954 A.C. But his calculation of the date has shown to be wrong by Kielhorn, according to whom the said tithi in reality fell on Sunday, a day before. Besides Kielhorn's observation, we have also to note that the record was put up in the reign of Dhaṅga who was on the throne in the latter half of the tenth and not of the eleventh century A.C., unless we presume the existence of a successor of his who bore the same name. While editing the inscription, Kielhorn has also shown that taking the figure 1011 to denote the Southern Vikrama year 1011, expired, the corresponding day works out to be 2nd April, 955 A.C., which was a Monday, as actually mentioned, and thus the date works out satisfactorily for the year. But as the characters of the inscription are definitely not earlier than the thirteenth century A.C., I agree with him in observing that the inscription, as we now have it, appears to have been engraved from a more ancient copy.

TEXT

[Metres: Verse 1, Madini; v. 2, Amathubh.]

1 तिर्या "ह्य" संवत् १०११ समये II निजमलेखस्ते8 विः-
2 व्यवसितैः स्वतीतैः[२] सं(द)दयमुक्तारुः[२] सर्वः-
3 सल्व(स)कुलक्षणैः[४] त्यजनांसन्तोषोः सौ(स)प्रारम्भनैः
4 नायीः[२] प्रणमण्डाययोः भवयाधि-१०
5 नाया इ(१)र। II पाहिललवाटिका १ चतुरावाटिका २१२
6 लघुचुतवालिका २ सं(व)कुतवालिका ४ पंचावालि-}
NANYAURĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTIONS OF DHAŃGADĒVA

No. 100; Plate XCV-B

NANYAURĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF DHAŃGADĒVA

[Vikrama] Year 1055

The plate bearing this inscription was found in 1872, along with another which is edited below (No. 107), by a peasant in the process of ploughing his field at the village of Nanyourā, or Nāyayourā, in the Jaipur-Panwāri tahsil of the Hamirpur District in Uttar Pradesh. The plate was acquired by W. Martin, B.C.S., who presented it to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta; and six years subsequently (in 1878) the inscription was published by V. A. Smith, with a translation of the text prepared by Pt. Prāṇāṭh but without a facsimile, in the Journal of the same Society, Vol. XLVII, Pt. I, pp. 80 ff., which also included a note by the Pandit himself. Subsequently, the record was edited by F. Kielhorn, with a facsimile, in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI (1887), pp. 201 ff., with his own reading of the text from an impression made and supplied to him by J. F. Fleet, with a fresh translation and facsimile, and also with the remark that his reading of the text 'would be found to differ considerably from that of his predecessors'. The plate is stated to have been made over some time subsequently, to the Indian Museum by the Asiatic Society to which it had been presented by Martin, as stated above; and it is regretted that all my efforts failed to know anything about its present whereabouts. And, as no impression of the inscription could now be available, it is edited here from the photo-lithograph accompanying Kielhorn's article in the Volume of the Ind. Ant., referred to above.

It is a single copper-plate, incised on one side only, and measures about 14½" (36-20 cms.) by 7½" (19.7 cms.). Kielhorn described the plate in the following words: "The edges of it were turned up, so as to form a high raised rim all round, which was fastened, by fusing, at two of the corners, but not at the other two. The plate is rather thin; and the letters, being fairly deep, show through very plainly on the back of it. The engraving is good; but, as usual, the interiors of most of the letters show marks of the working of the engraver's tool. — There is no ring-hole in the plate, for a ring with a seal attached to it; and no indications of a seal having ever been soldered on to it."

The writing covers the upper three-fourth of the surface, which measures about 32.5 cms. broad, at 12.5 cms. high, and consists of fourteen lines, the last of which extending slightly more than half of the others. Below it and on the proper left side of the plate is engraved the sign-manual Sri Dhaṅgada, in characters which are almost of the double size of the others and followed by two vertical strokes, but it does not show the representation of the royal emblem. On the right

---

1 Better read पालिकाप्रेमी त्रिः श्रीमद्वरि यो द्वकिष्ठ्रि नविष्ठ्रि.
2 Better read श्रीपादी.
3 Read dattā. In the sense of 'a gift'. See C. I. I., Vol. IV, p. 617, n. What appears as an amasāra over da is a fault of the stone.
4 Read Vaiśēkha.
6 From personal correspondence with both these institutes I can only conclude that this plate, along with some others which are recorded to have been handed over to the Indian Museum by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, is not now forthcoming.
side, again, the lines leave an open space which increases almost uniformly in each of the subsequent lines and thus the alignment of the record is not exactly vertical but slightly slanting inwards. The average height of the letters ranges between 5 and 7 cms.

The characters of the inscription are Nāgarī of the tenth century, to which the record belongs. To note the peculiarities of the formation of some of the letters, we find that g as a subscript is engraved as n, cf. svarga, l. 13; t continuos to be devoid of its dot, as in bhāṅga- and kalabha, both in l. 5; and dh and v are often alike; see dhava-, l. 3 and chandra-, l. 5; occasionally the first of these letters, i.e. ch, resembles v; see chatul-, l. 10; and in a few instances dh shows the beginning of a horn on its fore-limb, as in vasudhā, l. 12, where the verticals of dhā are also joined. The letters t, n and ū appear in their antique form; see nayan-anuyāsśi- and śchandra-, both in l. 1. P is often engraved as y; cf. parama-, l. 6; and y is generally found with the curve bent upwards so as to serve the purpose of the vertical; see yasya, l. 12. R, which is generally marked as a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to the middle of its left, often resembles v, as in kairava-, l. 5, and is sometimes also like g, as in ravas, l. 8; this letter in its subscript form is shown by a serif; cf. pragny-, l. 1. The signs for n and v are not frequently distinguished; cf. vṛddhā- and tmanā-, both in l. 11, and also the signs for ch and v; see chatul- and nāma-, both in l. 10. The medial shorter n is a slanting stroke attached to the middle of the vertical and bent to the right; see aśra, l. 4; and the sign for the medial nasal ū is shown by a loop turned upwards and then suddenly bent down; cf. bhūmi-, l. 12. A curious form of ph appears in phalaṃ, l. 12.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and it is written in an admixture of prose and poetry. In all there are thirteen verses which are not numbered. With reference to orthography, we may note (1) the use of the sign for v to denote b as well, as in vahṣāhi-, l. 12; (2) the general use of the prishṭha-mātrā with a few exceptions; (3) the reduplication of a class-consonant following r as in svaraṇa-, l. 13, and frequently of a class-consonant preceding r, as in mitra-, l. 1; (4) the correct use of all the bilabials and class-nasals; and finally, (5) no change of m to an anusvāra in samayatara-, l. 7, and samvat, l. 8; and the use of the dental nasal in pratigriñāti, l. 12.

The inscription is one of Dhaṅgaḍēva of the Chandella Dynasty. Its object is to record the bestowal, by Dhaṅga himself, of the village Chulli (or Yulli) connected with Usharavāha, to Yaśōdhara bhāṭṭa, son of the bhāṭṭa Jayakumāra of the Bhāradvāja gota, with the three pravaṇas uṣīr, Bhāradvāja, Anērāsa and Bārhaspatya, of the Vajasaneya jākhā, who had migrated from Tankhākā. Yaśōdhara was the grand-father of the donor of the Nandava grant of Dēva-varman, as will be discussed below while editing that grant. The present grant was made by the king for the increase of the religious merit and fame of his parents and himself, from Kāśikā, i.e., Vāraṇaśi, on Sunday, the lunar-eclipse day in the month of Kārttiaka in the (Vikrama) Year 1055, as expressed both in words and numerical figures. The corresponding Christian date is Sunday, the 6th of November, 998 A.C., when there was a lunar eclipse visible in India.3

The inscription opens with the symbol for Siddham, followed by seven stanzas giving the genealogy. The first two of these stanzas introduce Harṣadēva, mentioning him to be valorous and fierce like the scorching Sun of summer and also endowed with some other qualities. Stanzas 3 and 4 mention his son Yaśōvarman, who earned fame 'by clearing the temples of opponents' elephants; and the following three stanzas describe Yaśōvarman's son, Dhaṅgaḍēva, stating that he was victorious in countless battles, righteous and just. All this description is merely poetic, the verses being good examples of the classical style of composition, containing figures of speech like upamā, rūpaḥa and parasanbhāya. Historically they are of no value, as all the three kings who are mentioned here with their mutual relationship are already known from the other records of the house. All these three names are repeated in the prose passage that follows and

---

1 See text, n. on the name, below.
2 He also appears to be the royal priest mentioned in No. 114, v. 56.
3 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, p. 261 and ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 23, No. 5. In the former of these references Kielhorn also says that calculated by General Cunningham's Tables, the result would be the following day, Monday, the 7th November. But considering the Tables and Kielhorn's calculations to be correct, it is possible to hold that Sunday was the day of the eclipse and the grant was made actually on Monday when the period of the eclipse was over.
each of them is mentioned here with the usual title of Paramabhaṭṭajī, Mahārājādhirāja and Paramēkṣvara, with an additional epithet of Kālañjīrīdhīpata attached to the name of Dhaṅgadēva. Then comes the formal portion, followed by the date, which we have seen above; and with the five oft-quoted imprecatory verses, the document comes to a close. In the end there is the sign-manual of the king.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the record, Kālañjara (l. 7) is the well-known fort; and Kāśikā (l. 8) is the renowned Vārānasī, as we have seen above. I am unable to identify Dūravahara, the habitation of the donee, and the grant village Chulli or Yulli (ll. 9-10). The maps at my disposal show a place Dēvrāo, which is roughly about 80 kms. south-east of Jhansi; but besides some similarity in the names and the situation of the latter in the region of Bundelkhand, we have nothing to establish its identity with Dūravahara. Or it may be identical with Dīrurwā, c. 55 kms. west of Jaitpur. The grant village is described as Āśaravāśa-pratiśuddha; this expression, as far as I think, is not a place-name but an adjective of the word grāma, in the sense of 'connected with or bounded by a barren spot', and along with it, we may take the other expression sarīrāśaravā; i. e., fertile and saline soil. Lastly, Tarkārikā, the original home of the donee (l. 9), seems to be the same as mentioned variously as Tarkārikā, Ķakārikā, Ķakārī or Ķakārī in epigraphic records as the original home of Brāhmaṇa donees as well as of the Vāstavya family of the Kāyasthas. Our attention has been drawn by Dr. V. V. Mirashi to the fact that there were more than one place of this name; some of these were situated in Malwa, as we have seen while editing the Māndhata grants of Dēvapāla and Jayavarman, while some others in Uttar Pradesh; and though nothing can definitely be said about the location of this place, the Tarkārikā of the present record appears to be the same as situated about 25 kms. north-west of Gayā in Bihar, as pointed out by Mirashi. It is easy to understand a man from Gayā going to Vārānasī to receive the donation made by Dhaṅgadēva, who ruled at Khajurrāh.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1 and 7: Sārdūlanāhīdāna, vv. 2, 46 and 8-14 Anushṭubh; v. 8 Āryā].

1 सिद्धम्[१] स्वसित। आसीलक्ष्मते: प्रविलितः बालस्वर्गः सतात संत्राणं नदयस्मृतं परव(अ)क्ष्यो ल।[१]तकेपु: पर। सेवतः सुकुलहाथे-स्वस्वरस्त्रलोकमभास्करान्यःशर्मत्वः।

2 नूनस्वरहः केले श्रीलंधि देवो तुष।॥[१] प्रवक्ष्यस्यमोलेश्च सरस्यमज्ञवस्तु॥। निधारामसक्कर्ष्येक्ष्य प्रशानो यथा शुष्क।॥[२]॥ अर्थितिमर्निकलानि। परः॥

3 फिकुदप्रति॥[३] दक्कोकस।॥ वस्मोदाला-भान्तिममतो चक्षुस्मां॥[३]॥ यस्तेनकुस्तुङ्कुरेण यथस भवतीहः॥। कुर्कुलमूर्तः॥ सेवतः जाता: किलिकंकविता:॥

[6] The anusvara on अ is redundant. — Before अ two aṣhāras are omitted in the text, as is evident from the metre. Kielhorn’s guess that they may stand in the margin just above where there appears to be some writing, seems to be correct. He proposes to read something like suṣhīt here, but suḥā or suṭi appears to me to be more appropriate.
[7] The aṣhāra in the brackets are not distinct in the facsimile and are adopted here from Kielhorn’s reading.
[8] Kielhorn read the bracketed letter as अ and corrected it to आ. But the slanting stroke before it with its extremity joined to the preceding aṣhāra appears to be the sign of the prashṭha-mūtra.
[9] One of the seven principal mountains of the continent. Kinnara is a mythical being with a human figure and the head of a horse.
4 म॥[४] तत्य श्रीश्चरूक्षेदेयमुकुट: पाण्य अवभिगः। अस्वप्पवश्यविविषालात: बुधवाराप्राधाम्॥[५] विने 
वर्तनायोऽण्यु विस्तारात्। अस्वमनुपूर्वीविषयमः।

5 नौष पन्नाः॥[६] भज्यो।पुन्यकलेक्सु मुखाम्बु: केनाः। 
कार्त्तिक कुक्ष्यः[४४०४] कुक्ष्यता 
वधृः कल्याणेः॥[७] सच्चिदार्जान(का)विवाहिता। किन्नर्म निम्नदेवः

6 हृदिता शिशुमदासकल्पस्ति कदिनकालायाः पितारासा॥[८] परमेश्वरःकालहाराजासिद्धापवलोकितस्ते 

gीतिहासिक्ष्यात्रास्मातित्वम्॥[९] शिशुमदासकल्पस्तिकथा।

7 जानिराज्यरस्वस्तिकोदशूलिजस्त्रापतारस्मातित्वम्वहारीधराजासिद्धापवलोकितकालविशिष्टस्ते 

gीतिहासिक्ष्यात्रास्मातित्वम्॥[१०] सामव(संग)सरस्वत्तमः पत्रवासः।

8 वद्विन्दके कार्त्तिकायोनमास्त्य रहितेन एवं समव(संग)स्तु १०४५ क(क)रत्नकुष्यः १५ रौ(र) अस्तः॥[११] 

9 निदित्यः॥[१२] ह्रासाः राजनीतिः॥[१३] भाराराजसंगोत्तम निर्मक्षार सायनापिलस्तो वर्षकल्याणं 

tदर्शत्वनिराशरायातिनव(व)ः मनोयथेत सन्निमोलित साप्रामोक 

10 मायाितिहासिक्ष्यात्रास्मातित्वम्॥[१४] श्रीमदासकालस्ते गुलांगः कर्मानुसार अक्ष्यातिनव(व)ः 

11 श्रीमदासकालस्ते॥[१५] बुधवाराप्राधाम्॥[१६] 

12 द्वारा॥[१७] वस्मारायाम्॥[१८] उदारम्बकीः। न(व)हरिचन्द्रेऽशुः भूताराजसिद्धारस्मातित्वम्।

13 ति चर्चा भूमि प्रवक्तः। उर सो पुक्तक्षणां निधति सायनापिलिन्व॥[१९] श्रीमान्ताणुणेनकालस्ते।

14 हृदश्रीमदासकालशास्त्र शास्त्रादिकालस्ते॥[२०] प्रत्यापिलितात्मनकल्याणं कामविलित॥[२१] श्रीमदास॥[२२]

---

* As n. 7 above. This verse has the figure of speech known as pariśākhāya, instances of which are found in the Kādambari and some other works of the type. It means to say that bhanga (break and curls of hair), kela-graha (seizure by the hair), hardiness, crookedness, stain, self-willfulness, aversion and superficiality—all these are to be found only in what is mentioned with each of these and not in his kingdom. There is a play on the word mira, meaning (1) the Sun and (2) a friend.

* By a wrong stroke of the chisel the bracketed letter appears as hū.

* The danda is redundant.

* Originally श्रीमदास. But what one naturally expects is श्रीभक्तिवृत्तृत्तम्.

* This verse and No. 11 that follows are introduced in the middle of a prose portion, as in a Champā-kārya and the word pravakṣa is used for, as Kielhorn has already observed, pravakṣa or pravakṣita. It means to say that when the orb of the 'deer-marked' (moon), the root (source) of joy to the heart of Rohini, had been devoted by the son of Śiṅhikā (Rāhu), i.e., when there was a lunar eclipse.

* Read श्रीभक्तिवृत्तृत्तम्.

* The danda is superfluous.

* The consonant of the first akṣara of the name might also be read as ch; cf. ch in chārya—appearing just before in the same line. The village is described as 'appertaining to Īśārayā, with its water and (dry) land, with its low and high (land), with its mango and madhūka (madhuca indica) trees and with its fertile and saline soil!.

* I am very doubtful about the reading of this akṣara, though I have adopted it as read by Kielhorn.

* What looks like इ in the beginning may have been a wrongly cut loop of ṁ.

* Some word like )!= has to be supplied after this verse.

* Here, the word suvarṇa is used in the sense of a gold coin. For the sake of metrical euphony, read सुवर्णी सवर्णी.

* Kielhorn takes krama in the sense of vidhiyāt; but comparing the use of this word in some other records, I feel that it has the sense of krama-digata, i.e., 'obtained by succession'. See C. I. I., Vol. IV, p. 999, n. 1.

* Here we have the use of uṣṇāda, unlike in all the other instances in the record where we have the nasal.
THE six inscriptions which are edited here were first brought to notice by Sir A. Cunningham, who published transcripts of them, accompanied by phototintographs of five, in his *Archaeological Survey of India Reports*, Volume X (for 1874-75 & 1876-77), pp. 94-95, and Plate xxxii, 1-2 and 4-6. Subsequently they were edited by F. Kiellhorn in the *Indian Antiquary*, Volume XVIII (for 1889), pp. 236 ff., from rubbings taken by Cunningham and supplied to him by Fleet. But Kiellhorn's article is not illustrated. The inscriptions are edited here from impressions kindly supplied to me by the Chief Epigraphist, and in my readings thereof I have also taken into account the plate illustrating Cunningham's writings.

All these inscriptions were discovered by Cunningham, as stated above, in a shrine dedicated to Brahmana and standing on a ridge to the east of Dudahi¹, a petty hamlet in the Lalitpur subdivision of the Jhansi District of Uttar Pradesh, situated about 29 kilometres to the south of Lalitpur and about 19 kilometres south-east of Deogad, the well-known place of antiquity. They are said to have been carved on parts of the temple, though neither Cunningham nor Kiellhorn gives a clue as to their exact location. As stated above, they are six in all, and all are short, ranging from one to eleven lines. In his *Report*, Cunningham, while describing them, uses figures (1 to 6), whereas Kiellhorn uses alphabetical figures from A to F, to denote them, and for facility's sake, he also makes alterations in their order fixed by the former scholar. In the subjoined transcripts thereof, I have followed the order given to them by Kiellhorn, and in brackets I have also given the respective numbers in which they are treated by Cunningham.

The following table is intended to show the number of lines of the respective records, along with their dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8:25</td>
<td>25:4</td>
<td>1:27 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>21:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15:25</td>
<td>12:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15:3</td>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>1:5 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15:37</td>
<td>0:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>2:0</td>
<td>2:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the inscriptions are fairly legible and are engraved, as stated above, on parts of the temple so as to suit the space available. For example, A and B are arranged in short lines, each of which consists of about 5 or 6 letters, while C and D are in longer lines, the first of these two showing about ten and the second about twelve letters in each of the lines.

The characters of all these records are Nāgari of the eleventh century A.C. Attention may be drawn to the general tendency that the letters have their curves sharp and some of the

¹ Doothai, N.L. 24°28'; E.L. 78°27' (Ind. Atlas, Sheet No. 70 N.W.); Cunningham describes the antiquities of this place in his *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. X, pp. 90-95. For the description of the temple, see *ibid.*, p. 94, where he observes that the inscription of this temple to the Gonds, as stated in the *Gazetteer of the N. W. Provinces* (now U.P.) Dist. Lalitpur, should evidently be taken as pertaining to later times. A parallel example of an earlier temple captured later on by the Gonds is shown by the temple of Boramdeo at Chhipari near Kawardhā in the Chhattegadh Division of Madhya Pradesh (See *C.I.I.*, Vol. IV, p. 581).

This inscription is not noted by Cunningham; and instead of it, he gives transcript of another (his No. 3); but it is not illustrated by him.
top-strokes are triangular: \( J, n, s \) and \( t \) are engraved in their antique forms; \( ch \) shows its loop triangular, and the formation of \( dh \) is like that of \( v \). The subscript \( r \) resembles \( l \), and \( r \) is in a transitional stage, showing both its forms—with and without the loop.

The language is Sanskrit and all the inscriptions are in prose. Orthographically, there is nothing worth noting except that the medial \( d \) is denoted both by the \( prth\) and \( u\) and the consonant following \( r \) is generally doubled.

The object of all these inscriptions is to record that the temple \( kirttana \), evidently the one where they were found, was erected by \( \text{Dēvaladbhi} \) of the Chandellā family, who was a son of \( \text{Krishnappa} \) and lady \( \text{Āśarvā} \), and a grandson of the \( \text{Mahārājādhirāja} \), the illustrious \( \text{Yaśovarman} \). The first three of the inscriptions (A-C) give this information completely: D states the same but omits the name of the grandfather Yaśovarman with his epithets; and E and F, both of which consist of one line each, mention only the name Dēvaladbhi, the former of these adding that it is his (built by him) temple.

Yaśovarman, the grandfather of Dēvaladbhi, as we are informed here, was undoubtedly the Chandellā king of the same name, whose long inscription of V.S. 1011, i.e., 954 A.C. has been edited above. We have seen that his son Dhaṅga had succeeded to the Chandellā throne shortly before this date; and from the present records we know that Dēvaladbhi, who was Krishnappa’s son and thus a nephew of Dhaṅga, was in those days guarding the western frontiers of the Chandellā dominions, as his subordinate, when the boundaries of his kingdom are known to have extended up to the Bētwa river in the west. The necessity of appointing an officer in that region may have been particularly felt in apprehension of an attack by an enemical power from the west.

Krishnappa of the present records is no doubt the same as Kanhaṇa, mentioned in II. 8-10 of a fragmentary stone inscription found at Jhānī and now preserved in the Provincial Museum at Lucknow (E. 24 of the Museum Catalogue). This record is not included here as it is in a very bad state of preservation and nothing but mere names of some of the rulers can be read in some of the lines. But what is absolutely certain is that it refers to Kanhaṇa as a \( ñ\) like the present inscription; and from what is stated in this connection, he seems also to have founded a city which was his capital (\( rājadhrāni)\). Whether he actually ruled cannot be said with certainty, since the use of the word \( ñ\) can be justified even by concluding that he held a command under his father or his brother, who were Yaśovarman and Dhaṅga, respectively. Here it is noteworthy that he is called a ñ in another fragmentary inscription also, which was found by Hall at Vīdīśhā (Bhīlsī) in the last century.

Since Duddhā, the find-spot of the present inscription is only about 120 kms. north by east of Vīdīśhā, the situation of both these places in the same region corroborates the statement of Yaśovarman’s inscription of V. 1011, etc., that the Chandellā kingdom in those days extended in the west so far as Vētravātī which flows by the town.

While editing these inscriptions in the \textit{Indian Antiquary}, Kiellhorn has observed that they furnish an older form of the name of the royal family, i.e., Chandellā, instead of the later Chandellā. The former of these names he takes to be a derivative, by means of the Prakrit suffix \( illa \), from \( chander \), ‘the moon’, formed like Bhaillā from \( bh\). But the subjoined transcripts clearly indicate that the word is spelt in all of them without the subscript \( r \), excepting in only one (B), where too the reading is doubtful. Thus this slender evidence precludes the possibility of drawing any conclusion with reference to the older form of the name, as done by Kiellhorn, particularly bearing in mind that the inscriptions were engraved by different hands, as is clear from a look at the plate.

---

1 No. 98. Another Yaśovarman is mentioned in the Baṭēwarā stone inscription of Paramardin of the Vikrama year 1252, as the latter’s father. But his name figures in no other record of the house, and whether he actually ruled is doubtful, as we shall see below, while editing that inscription. The palaeographic evidence too points to an earlier ruler.
4 No. 98, v. 45.
6 See \textit{n.} on this word occurring in the text below.
DUDÁHI STONE INSCRIPTIONS OF DeVALABDHí (UNDATED)

From Facsimile
DUDHAI STONE INSCRIPTIONS OF DEVALABDHI (UNDATED)

Scale: Actual size

Scale: Actual size
DUDĀHI STONE INSCRIPTIONS OF DEVALABDHI (UNDATED)

Scale: Actual size
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 101: A (C 2)</th>
<th>No. 102: B (C 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 महाराजाधिकरण-</td>
<td>1 चंद्रेशाल्मव-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 राजशीर्षक-</td>
<td>2 महाराजाधिकरण-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 वर्मनंकथा श्री-</td>
<td>3 राजवीरति-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 कृष्णसुल्तन</td>
<td>4 वर्मनंकथा[दुर्भीर]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 मातृशीर्षक-</td>
<td>5 कृष्णसुल्तन-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 श्रीविजयरङ्गन</td>
<td>6 श्रीविजयरङ्गन-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 चंद्रेशाल्मव-</td>
<td>7 दोरोजात्मक-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 वीदेवकथिक (विन)</td>
<td>8 वल्लभभ्रोक य - कर-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ना कीर्तिमिदं</td>
<td>9 श्रीटंसिद सर्व-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द वर्ष[११] कारिः</td>
<td>10 म[व] [II]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 103: C (C 1)

| 1 महाराजाधिराजसम्यक- |
| 2 वर्मनंकथा[दुर्भीर] |
| 3 मातृशीर्षकविजयरङ्गन- |
| 4 श्रीकृष्णसुल्तनसागरमकर (श्री) यः |
| 5 सर्वकीर्तिमिदं [II] |

No. 104: D (C 4)

| 1 श्रीकृष्णसुल्तनमातृशीर्षक- |
| 2 सर्वरा (वै) दोरोजात्मक (वल्लभसंग) [व] श्री- |
| 3 देवलक्षेत्रभ- (वै) सर्व कीर्तिमिदं (संस्कृत) [II] |

No. 105: E (C 5)

श्रीकृष्णसुल्तनमातृशीर्षक [II]'

No. 106: F (C 6)

श्रीदेवकथिक (विन) [II']

---

1 From impressions supplied by the Chief Epigraphist and also from photoprints (Plate xxxiii) in Cunningham's A.S.I., A.R. Vol. X. Cunningham's number of the inscriptions is given here in brackets, where the letter C denotes Cunningham.
2 Sanskrit is not observed here and below in similar cases.
3 Kielhorn read this letter as भ, but what he took to be the subscript च appears to me only a scratch, as can be seen also above this letter and below those that precede and follow it. This portion is damaged and we cannot be certain about the existence of the subscript.
4 What appears as an amaruha above य is only a defect in the stone.
5 The word श्री, 'belonging to' is used to express the meaning of the possessive case in contemporary inscriptions; but, as Kielhorn has rightly observed, it is redundant here since the name that precedes this word is already included in that case.
NANYAURĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF DĒVAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1107

The copper-plate which bears the subjoined inscription was found in 1872, along with the one issued by Dharigadēva and edited above (No. 100), by a farmer, in the process of ploughing his field at Nanyaurā, or Nānyaur, a village in the Panwār-Jaitpur tahsil of the Hamirpur District in Uttar Pradesh. The plate was acquired by W. Martin, B.C.S., who presented it to the Asiatic Society of Bengal; and six years subsequently the record was published by V. A. Smith, with an English translation, in the Journal of the Society, Vol. XLVII (1878), Pt. I, p. 81, without an illustration, though accompanied by a note by the local Pandit who prepared the transcript. The inscription was thereafter systematically edited by F. Kielhorn in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI (1887), pp. 201 ff., with his own reading of the text and a fresh translation, accompanied by a photo-lithograph, from an impression prepared by Fleet who was then one of the editors of the Journal. Some time subsequently, the plate is stated to have been made over to the Indian Museum, Calcutta, but in my attempt I failed to obtain a definite clue regarding its present whereabouts; and as neither the original nor any estampage of the inscription is now forthcoming, I edit the record from the facsimile accompanying Kielhorn’s article in the Volume of the Indian Antiquary, referred to above.

It is a single copper-plate, smooth and plain with its corners rounded off, and is inscribed on one side only. According to Kielhorn’s statement it measures about 10 inches by 10 inches, which are respectively equivalent to 25.7 and 25.7 cm. “The plate is not very thick but the letters are rather shallow and do not show through on the reverse side.” The inscribed portion covers a space about 56 cm. broad by about 25 cm. high; and the size of the letters varies from 5 to 8 cm. The central part of the first line of the plate shows a mark as for a ring, but no ring nor any seal was ever obtained. The photo-lithograph shows that a few of the akṣaras in the lower proper right corner have been slightly damaged by verdigris, but they are throughout legible; otherwise the plate was in a good state of preservation when Kielhorn wrote. There are also redundant marks of the engraver’s tool. The inscription consists of nineteen lines of writing.

The characters are Nāgārī of the eleventh century A.D. and are slightly developed than those employed in the plate-inscription of Dharigadēva, which was obtained along with it from the same place and under the same circumstances. The initial a generally begins with a curve and resembles the modern ṛ, as in Ābha, l. 11, but occasionally it has a more modified form, as in anyayu, l. 15. The form of the initial i which occurs in stham, l. 6, is represented by two hollow circles placed horizontally and subscribed by the sign for medial u. The loop of k, which is often formed with a sudden bend of the lower extremity of the vertical, as in Kālaḥāra, in l. 2, appears generally in its developed form, as in bhūdavāra in the same line; and in such akṣaras as krey and krey, or when the first member of a conjunct consonant, it shows an unlooped form; see, e.g., krimi, l. 18 and akshā, l. 4, but there are exceptions like ukṛṣṇa, l. 15, Kṣ is formed of two loops with a vertical stroke on each and joined by a horizontal bar at the top; see Udrākha, l. 7; but occasionally this letter appears in its modern form; cf. sākṛṣṇa, l. 11, showing it in a transitional stage. The akṣaras t and n which in rare instances have their antique form as in varja, l. 13 and snātā, l. 9, respectively, show the developed form as in hutta, l. 10 and purī, l. 9. N occasionally also shows its unlooped form, see bhūgōṇa, l. 15. In a few instances the upper loop of th is not developed; cf. pāñchita, l. 16; sometimes this letter is engraved as the modern Nāgārī gh, as in yathāvat, l. 10; and a totally different form of its subscript occurs in sthalo, l. 12 where it much resembles the modern dh. The letters dh, v, ch and r are occasionally confused; see, e.g., bhauvāla, l. 5, Pāchāpati, l. 5, and kara, l. 14. Ṛ shows its forms with and without the vertical bar, e.g. in gāthāhṛṣyaṇa and satvēṇa, both in l. 4; and in addition to some of its forms noted in the preceding inscriptions, ṛ has its form resembling ṇ in pravara and pava, as a result of the fresh attempt is explained by Kielhorn himself who says: “my own reading will be found to differ considerably from those of my predecessors.”
both in l. 11, and v, as in -purä, l. 7. S shows its antique form as in śubha, l. 6, and occasionally it is only a triangle surrounded by a hook; see kuśâl, l. 3; s which is in its older form occasionally appears as modern, e.g., in Sâchô, l. 4. And finally, h is occasionally without the tail; cf. mahârâjâ, l. 1. One akṣara each in lIl. 6 and 9 was originally omitted and is engraved above and below the line.

There are a few instances showing that some of the letters have totally different forms than in the rest of the record: e.g., ৎ in yâtô, l. 10, jña in dījñâ, l. 14, sva in lâyâ and ph in phalaṁ, both in l. 16. Mistakes of writing or engraving, e.g., vâh for kah in dārmânikâh, and guh for jûh in krîta-jûh, both in l. 5, and others are pointed out in the text that follows. There are a few grammatical errors, e.g., kriṣṭâyayati and the use of the wrong dvandvâ compound in kshtyudâdhir for — dhi (neuter), both in l. 15; they are also corrected in the text.

The language is Sanskrit; and except two stanzas devoted to the description of the donor Dévarman in lIl. 4-6 and five impercative verses in the concluding portion, the record is composed in prose. The verses are not numbered. A tendency of the writing, as to be seen in some other records also,1 is the use of a dânda to denote a comma as well, as in ll. 3 and 10-13; and another peculiarity is to introduce verses in the very middle of a prose portion (see ll. 1-2) as in a Châmpâ-kârâya.

In respect of orthography, we may note the following: (1) the general use of the sign for v to denote b as well, as in yâthâyati, l. 8; (2) occasionally putting the dental for the palatal sibilant, e.g., in Sâchô for Sâchî, l. 4 and sâlta for sâlta, l. 12; (3) the doubling of a class-consonant following r, as in hârmânâtu and scârgya, both in l. 17, with rare exceptions like -oorità, l. 13; (4) the sparing use of the prîshiva-mîrâ; (5) the wrong change of the final m to an anusvara at the end of a sentence in upanetavâyam and bhaṅgavâyam, respectively in lll. 14 and 15, and also at the end of a stich as in lIl. 18-19, and vice versa in sîmavatsarkâ, ll. 8-9; (6) the general use of an anusvara except in four instances, viz., jîtiendrîya, l. 5, dâmanda, l. 6, bhâgavatî, l. 9 and parvânta, l. 13, where the dental nasal is correctly used; and finally, (7) the wrong spellings of ardha as argha and dattâ as datâ, both in l. 9, and of punya as punya in l. 10.

It is a royal charter and its object is to record the grant of a village by king Dévarman, in honour of the first death-anniversary of his mother Bhuvanâdevî; and the day is recorded to be Monday falling on the third of the dark half of Vaiśâkha of the (Vikrama) year 1107. The details of the date are to be discussed below.

The inscription opens with the auspicious symbol for Siddham, followed by a prose passage naming the ancestors of Dévarman, introducing him as Parâma-bhāṭṭâraka, Mahârâjâdhîrâja Paramârâsura, and the supreme lord of Kâlahara, meditating on the feet of the P.M.P., the illustrious Vîjaya-pâlâdevâ who, in his turn, had meditated on the feet of P.M.P., the illustrious Vidyâdhârâdeva. The inscription does not name the family to which all these kings belonged; but from the occurrence of these names in succession and also from the use of the epithet Kâlaharādhâpita, they may safely be taken as belonging to the house of the Chandâlas holding their sway over the Vindhya region, particularly when Dévarman who issued this grant has given us another record in the very next year which is to be dealt with just below. Dévarman is further described as a great warrior (ll. 3-4); and in a stanza that follows, he is said to have surpassed Yudhishthira by his truthfulness, the ruler of Champa i.e., Karna, by his generosity, the ocean by his depth, the lord of Sachi (Indra) by his might, the mind-born (Kâradâva) by his handsomeness and Sûtra and Vâchaspâti (Guru) by his shrewdness. The next stanza describes him as endowed with many good qualities, stating that he was wise, righteous, valiant, truthful, subduing senses and grateful.

Then the record says that 'having realised that the world which is beautiful to look at is like the innermost part of a plantain tree and void of substance', on the day as stated above, after performing all the rites and in the presence of all the mahâtmas and the jina-pâdas (chief and other persons), the Brâhmaṇas and others dwelling at the village of Kâthâhâu which appertains to Rânamau in the Râjâpurâ avasthâ,2 the king Dévarman, from his camp at Suhâvâsa, donated the village, exclusive of what had already been given, the occasion being the death

---

1 As also in the Śrâva grant of Paramavind, below, No. 126.

2 This word seems to be connected with avanta or avântana, a dwelling place. Here it may be taken to denote a town or a territorial unit.
anniversary of his mother Bhuvanadevi (ll. 8-9). The purpose of the grant was also to increase the merit and fame of the king himself and his parents and the donor was the Brāhmaṇa Abhimanyu, the son of Bhaṭṭa Ėllī and grandson of Jasadhara (Yāsōdāhara), hailed from the Bhaṭṭa-grāma known as Takārī. His gōra was Bhāravadāja with the three prāvaras, viz., Ėṅgarasa, Bāhaspātya and Bhāradvāja, and he was a Vajurādīn, versed in all the Vēdas and the Vēdāṅgas,1 and was devoted to the six duties adjoined on Brāhmaṇa2 (ll. 10-13).

Lines 15-16 specify the details of the gift village and all express the full right of the donor and his successors over it. And with the usual beneficent and imprecatory stanzas (vv. 3-7), the document ends, desiring bliss and good fortune and with the sign-manual Śrīmad-Devavarman-madēvālī.

This is the earliest known record of the house to give us the names of the three kings who ruled at Kālaṇjīr, in close succession, viz., Vidyādharas, Vijayapālas and Dēvavarman. The Khaḷurāhō inscription of Dhanagadēva, V.S. 1011, supplies the names of Harshadeva, Yāsōvarman and Dhaṅga, in succession; and the names of two intermediate princes, viz., Dhaṅga’s son Gandaṅgēva, and the latter’s son Vidyādharas, are known from some later records of the house, e.g., the Mahōbā stone inscription of Kiritivarman and the Mau stone inscription of Madanavarman, both of which are fragmentary and bear no date. Thus all these records taken together enable us to establish a line of succession of the Chandella kings from Harsha to Dēvavarman. The present record also informs us that Vijayapāla’s queen was Bhuvanadevi.

The word vāhala (l. 12) is of lexicographical interest. While editing this inscription in the Ind. Ant., referred to above, Kielhorn translated it by the word ‘water-cour’ and quoted epigraphical references in support of his views. M. Williams, however, showed the meaning of this word to be ‘a stream’ and rightly remarked that ‘it has not yet been met with in any published text’. It appears to me to be a Prakrit or local word, from the root vahi, to flow, as we find two other words in their Prakrit form, viz., Ėllī and Jasadhara, respectively the father and grandfather of the donor, in this record.

The date of the document does not yield satisfactory equivalent for v. 1107 mentioned in it. Making calculations for four years, i.e., for 1105, 1106, 1107 and 1108, Kielhorn concluded that the only year in which the third day of the dark half of Vaiśīkhā, as mentioned in it, was associated with Monday, is V.S. 1105, and in the other three years the day differed.3 Elsewhere he observed that the details work out properly for the immediately following year which was V.S. 1108 or 1052 A.C.; and accordingly the day was Monday, 20th April.4 He rejects his calculation of the date which is equivalent to Monday, 1st April, 1051 A.C., probably because, as noted by himself, the desired tithi (tristāṇī) commenced 6 h. 4 m. after mean sunrise and also that either Monday was joined with the (third) tīthi, or the year 1107 has been put erroneously for 1108. But as far as I think, it is less likely to take the year wrong. It may also be remarked here that on Monday, 1st April, 1051, tristāṇī was current in the afternoon, which is preferred to the foregoing form performing a śrāddha. Thus this seems to be the desired day.

Of the localities mentioned in the inscription, Kālaṇjīr and Takārī have already been identified, respectively with the well-known fort and Tarkārīka of the Nānacūra grant of Dhaṅgadēva. Rājapurā suggests its identification with the modern Rājapur which is about 40 kms. west-north-west of Chhatarpur, the headquarters of a district of the same name in the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. This identification appears to be probable in view of another, viz. of Rāṇamaṇī with the modern Mhow, which is about 16 kms. north-west of Chhatarpur and about 32 kms. north-east of Rājapurā. Both these identifications are suggested in view of the fact that these places are situated in the same region as Jaitpur-Panwārī, the headquarters of the tāhālī in which the present plate was discovered. I am, however, unable to locate Kāṭhahān, the donated village, and Suhaka(v)āsā where the king was encamped when he issued the grant.

1 These are Sīkṣā, chhanda, nīrukta, vyākaraṇa, halpa and jñātiṣa.
2 See M. S., X, 75. The donor of the present grant was evidently the grandson of Yāsōdāhara, the donor of the Nānacūra grant of Dhanagadēva, in which the name figures in its Sanskrit form. For, besides the fact that the gōra and the prāvaras of both were the same, their families are also mentioned as hailing from the same place.
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, pp. 201-02.
4 Ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 564, No. 178. In his J. N. I., No. 129, D. R. Bhandarkar takes the English equivalents as 1st April, 1051 A.C.
NANYAURĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF DĒVAVARMAN

TEXT

[Metros: Verse 1 Sūrdālaukīrṣita : vv. 37 Anuṣṭubh].

1. सिद्धम् ज्ञासति। परम्पराधृतकमालाशास्त्रानि। सर्वसेवा। लोकप्रकाश्वववदायित्वानुपलब्ध्यापरमहादुर्गा। राजसेवकवीर्योक्तरसहायशास्त्रानि। सर्वमहाधमोक्तराजसेवकवीर्योनिः। जनालालायित्वानुपलब्ध्यापरमहादुर्गा। कुलदीपी। ॥ ॥

2. श्रीमान् तमस्तेत्वलिताविधिद्वारातः॥। संप्रायाप्रज्ञाविलासारतिनितिति

3. श्रायुः। (॥) यथा सालेन गुरुविधर्म विजयं वामेन चंपिक्षेपम्। (॥) गा भोजयेन महादेवं दृष्टया देवसंतोलक्ष्मणम्।।।

4. श्रेणायुः प्रमोदवं [॥] तु-।

5. या चुक्तं सर्वं [॥] यथा तत्त्वाद्येशत्रुद्राभमावलं। कर्म न निर्देशते। स्वादू गुणे। ॥। [॥] बुधं [॥] तिम्बं [॥] वहं गुणं [॥] तिम्बं [॥] कर्म निर्देशते॥।

6. नामाजनं [॥]। वर्षमेकं [॥] वर्षमेकं अनुपलववदायित्वानुपलब्ध्यापरमहादुर्गा।।।

7. संततु १९०७ वैलामासे च [लन [॥]]। गोवे तुतीयायां संरक्षितं दुधाससस्माहसे राजपुतराध्यायां

8. या च निवाससमाइनकपति। च [लन [॥]]।

9. लात्रे [॥]। जले [॥] विविधश्रेष्ठभावेन देवमुखुपवृत्तं। विनून वदर्शितोक्तवेन संसारं वर्षे [॥] देवा

10. [॥] ष्टत्त्वादू गुणूनि हुला च। (॥) मातानातिरत्न [॥] गुप्त [॥] गोवे [॥] (॥) नारायंभु-

11. श्रायुः (॥) हेमचन्द्रायाधिपतिरथम प्रियद्वानाधिपतिने च [लन [॥]]।

12. य दशकमहाभिवर्त्य वृद्धिवर्त्य। (॥) प्रामोदसमाधिकं।।।

11 स्मलयक्ष: सा [लन [॥]। का: (॥) मच्छव का: (॥) समरीयर- पाणि: (॥) साले (॥) लल्लयत।॥।।

1. From facsimile in Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI.
2. Denoted by a symbol.
3. Here and in some cases below, which are not separately noted, the sign of punctuation is redundant.
4. That is, Karna. The consonant of the preceding 丝毫 is not well formed.
5. The ахāra in the brackets was originally omitted and was later on written below the line with an arrow-mark to draw attention, but after the sign of visarga and not before where it is actually to be supplied. This was not noted by Kielhorn.
6. Better read — कारं सर्वादर्श —.
7. The reading of the consonant of this ахāra, as also noted by Kielhorn, is not certain. In युक्तां that precedes, the vertical showing the माधुर्य in the third ахāra is detached from it so as to look like a दान्त.
8. This ахāra, which was originally omitted, is written below the line but without an arrow-mark to draw attention to it as in n. 4, above.
9. Kielhorn read इति, but to me it appears to be as given here. What follows the point of ्त is a chisel-stroke and not the head.
10. The reading of the first ахāra of the name is not certain. Moreover, no संवाह is made here as also in गुप्त — that precedes. The Sanskrit form of the name that follows is गुप्त.
11. This ахāra is followed by two small dots vertically placed. It cannot be ascertained whether they form the sign of the visarga inserted subsequently or are merely strokes of the chisel.
12. This word is not known to dictionaries. The context, however, shows that सिन्ध, water-courses, is intended. See on this word in No. 4, l. 11, above. The word सिन्ध occurs also in No. 100, l. 10.
CHARKHÅRI COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF DEVAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1108

This plate, together with some others, is stated to have been in the possession of the ruling Chief of Charkhåri, formerly a State in Bundelkhand, Central India Agency, but now included in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh. Its original find-spot is unknown and there is no information as to how and under what circumstances it was obtained. The inscription on it was edited by R. B. Hiralal, with text in Någarî characters but without a lithograph, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XX (1929-30), pp. 125 ff. It is edited here from an inked etchment kindly furnished by the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

It is a large plate of copper, with its corners rounded off. Its dimensions, as recorded by Hiralal, are 18" by 12½" which are equivalent to 47-63 and 30-48 cms. respectively, and it is stated to weigh 360½ tolas, or 420 kgs. Hiralal described the plate as "surmounted by a copper-hook, 2½" (6-85 cms.) long, which is riveted to it and holds a ring 2½" (5-80 cms.) in diameter".

The plate is inscribed on one side only. The writing covers a space measuring 42 cms. broad by 28 cms. high and consists of 23 lines, the last of which is only 19½ cms. long. At the top of the plate is engraved a representation of the four-armed goddess Lakshmi, being sprinkled by an elephant holding a pot in its trunk raised up, on either side. The figure is seated

---

1 Kielhorn explained this as niyâl-añiyata, in the sense of 'fixed and not fixed'.
2 The first akhara in this line is damaged and Kielhorn doubtfully read it as. But the two verticals which are clear show it as taken here.
3 Read स्तवमही, so as to suit the metre.
4 The sign-manual and the preceding six akharas are separated by some space from the main body of the record.
5 Below, Nos. 132, 144 and 151.
6 From impressions sent to him by Hiramanda Sastri who was then the Government Epigraphist for India.
7 His No. A45 (56-57). The present whereabouts of the plate are unknown.
on a full-bloomed lotus and holds a lotus-bud in each of the upper hands which are raised. The whole design is included in an oval figure of beaded borders, 8 cms. in height and 10 cms. in breadth, and divides the first six lines of the writing into equal halves. Under the seat of the goddess is inscribed the sign-manual Śrīnātad-Dēvavarmadamādagub svas-hastakā, in two lines. The average height of the letters is about one cm., except for those of the second line of the sign-manual which are slightly smaller. The impression shows the plate to be in a perfect state of preservation.

The characters are Nāgarī. They share the characteristics of the script of those of the preceding charter which was issued only a year back; but they are somewhat irregularly formed and slovenly incised, evincing that some of the letters and signs of the original draft were misunderstood both by the writer and the engraver. The record also abounds in grammatical and other mistakes, as will be known from the notes appended to the text that follows.

Despite this, the points that call for notice regarding the palaeography of the letters employed in the present inscription are as follows. The initial ē which resembles a triangle with its vertical point below, in ēka, l. 5, appears as pa in ēkam, l. 13; Kh shows its older form in uṇākhyāna, l. 17, but its advanced form in sākhyāna, l. 16 and likhitām, l. 23; the conjunct consonant gg sometimes appears as ḡg in māṛgga, l. 4 but as gg, in some other cases as in vinirīn-gata, l. 16; ṇ has not developed its dot; cf. -anāṅgā, and -āṅgana, both in l. 7; the letters ch, dh, ṇ and occasionally r also are often confounded; e.g., ch appears as v in suchīra, l. 11, and cha, l. 15, and reverse is the case in gatāv, l. 21; r is cut as ch in rātāna, l. 15; dh is endowed with the top-stroke in bandhu, l. 7, but is devoid of it in dhārā, l. 5, where the verticals of dhā are also joined, as is often the case, with a horizontal stroke; ṇ occasionally appears as the modern r, e.g., in paṇḍita, l. 16; and finally, s in satah, l. 11 and 21, and -āṅkāya, l. 11, shows that this akṣara had then begun assuming the modern form.

The language is Sanskrit, often barbarous and incorrect; and in some places the case terminations are altogether omitted, whereas in others we have wrong cases, incorrect verbal derivations, false genders, incorrect numbers, and moreover, often, putting the visarga sign unnecessarily. The record is in prose, with the exception of a verse in ll. 11-13 and six imprecatory verses in ll. 18-23 in the end, which are not numbered. In the composition the writer has evinced his fondness for similes and we also find some portions of the composition reading as parts of verbs, e.g., in anushtūbig, manāṅkāntā, and mālinī, respectively in ll. 4, 7 and 8.

With reference to orthography, we may note (1) the general use of the sign for v to denote b also, as in evaṃvada, l. 10; (2) the doubling of a class-consonant following r, e.g., in varāga, l. 6; (3) putting the dental for the palatal sibilant in some cases, cf. sīsana, l. 5 and nāṣkotā, l. 13; (4) the wrong use of an anusvārā at the end of a stich: see ll. 12 and 18; (5) the use of a dental nasal for the lingual: cf. ṇisru, l. 6, ṇirvya, l. 18, -ṛīnīnī, l. 19 and -punya, l. 20; and finally, wrong spellings, e.g., of tris as trṣ, l. 16, ṇē as ye in v. 6 (l. 22) but not in v. 5, and jala in l. 10 spells as yālā, some of which evince the effects of the locality. The spelling Kāṭiṣṭa (in ll. 5 and 8) and not Kāṭiṣṭa, as it often appears, may also be noted with interest. In some cases the māṭrīs are detached from the letters to which they belong so as to make them appear as a deva, e.g., in parivaṇmāṇā, l. 14.

It is a royal charter referring itself to the reign of the king Dēvavarmā who belonged to the Chandella dynasty ruling at Kālaṇjara. The object of it is to record the grant of the village Bhūṭapallikā, situated on the bank of the Yamunā river in the vishaya of Navarāṣṭramāṇḍala, by the king Dēvavarmā. The donee was a Brāhmaṇa-Paṇḍita named Kīkkanā, the son of Paṇḍita Sōmeśvara and grandson of Paṇḍita Jayaśvāmin, whose ancestors had come from bhaja-grāma known as Kumbhāt. He belonged to the Krīṣhṇāya gōra with the pravara Atreyā, Archanānasa and Śyāvāsa and to the Baiḍvīchā lākhā, and expounded the Vēdās, the Vēḍbhāgas, Ithīsā, the Purāṇas and Mināṅsā, and was devoted to the six-fold duties (ṣat-karma-śhirāta) obviously enjoined on the Brāhmaṇas. 6

---

5 This is the first of the Chandella grant issued with the representation of a royal emblem.  
6 As we find the dental nasal often put for the lingual in the present inscription, it is not possible to know whether the last letter of the name was really ne or ma.  
7 See M.S., X, 75. Hiratā took these six duties to designate the practices of hāthayoga, given under shat-karma in Apte's Dictionary. But his statement cannot be upheld for want of evidence. It is also worth nothing here that the donee of the Nānyārā grant of the same king also was shat-karma-rātō.  
8
The day of the grant, as mentioned both in figures and words, was **Monday** the 15th day of the bright half of **Mārgaśīrṣha** of (the vikrama) **Ṣaṅvat 1108**, when there was a **lunar eclipse**. The details of the date do not work out satisfactorily. Calculating the date to be equivalent to 20th November of 1051 A.C., Hiralal observed that it fell on Wednesday and that there was no lunar eclipse on that date.¹ In a footnote to this sentence he also says that the date in V.S. 1109 would correspond to Tuesday, the 8th of December, 1152 A.C., when there was a lunar eclipse. And remarking that neither of these dates is associated with Monday he takes the date to be irregular. A solution of this difficulty, however, may be sought by suggesting that charitable deeds associated with an eclipse are generally performed only after the period of the eclipse is over; and taking the day of the eclipse to be Monday, as mentioned in the inscription, it would be **Tuesday** when the gift was actually made.² Thus, if what has been suggested here is all correct, the present grant appears to have been made about eight months later than the previous one which was issued by the same king on the occasion of the death-anniversary of his mother.

After a symbol of auspiciousness and a sentence in prose showing obeisance to Siva, the inscription gives the genealogy of the illustrious king Dēvavarman; and this portion is nothing but a mere repetition of what we find in the preceding grant. He is said to be the sole and supreme lord of Kālīṇāra; and in the portion that follows, a fulsome praise is lavished on him, comparing him with Vishnu, Bali, Karna and Vyūdhishtīra and also stating that he was as pious as a sage. The passage that follows says that Devavarman, having reflected that the world is unsteady like the interior of a plantain tree, that wealth is as momentary as the flash of lightning, that human life is transitory as water-bubbles and that youth is fickle, and also realising that righteousness alone is eternal, set his mind on giving alms and made the donation, as seen above. The purpose is stated to be the increase of his own merit and fame, as well as of his parents. Thereafter we have the conditions of the gift (l. 18); and with the customary imprecatory stanzas, the inscription comes to an end, stating that it was written by Yaśōbhāṭa, the akṣha-patālakha, i.e., the writer of legal procedure.³

As for the **geographical names** occurring in the inscription, Kālīṇa (l. 3) is the well-known fort, as we have often seen; and Kōṭīṭīrtha (l. 15) is obviously the celebrated place of pilgrimage within the fort. The river Yamunā (l. 14) needs no remark for its identification. The gift village Bhuṭapalikā, which is stated to have been situated on this river (l. 14) does not appear to have been far from Hamirpur, close to which the Bēṭwā joins it. I am, however, unable to locate the place definitely. Navarāṣṭra-mandala (l. 14) roughly corresponds to the region where all these places were situated and a part of which was watered by the Yamunā, north of the present Hamirpur District. We have no clue to identify the Bhuṭagrāma of the name of Kumbhāṭ (l. 15); it may, however, be pointed out that a place bearing the same name figures in the Mallār stone inscription of the Kalachurī Jājalladēva where it is stated to have been situated on the Ganges in Madhyadesa.⁴ It appears that the Kumbhāṭ of the present inscription is identical with this place in view of the fact that whereas the first is said to be a bhāṭa-grāma, the second is described as a 'habitation of the twice-born (dvija-varṇa-vāsāt)'.⁵ Thus this place has to be sought on the Ganges, somewhere to the north of Hamirpur, though I am unable to know its definite location.

---

² It has also to be observed here that the consonant of first akshara showing the day may really have been bh and a redundant vertical stroke above its tail would make it appear as s, as also in snabhāṣya towards the end of L. 7. This suggestion is made in view of the fact that the inscription teems with errors in engraving of this type. It may also be noted here that the thirteenth iṭīhi ended at 10 moment of the day, on Monday, and the next was a kakshya iṭīhi; and thus the fifteenth day, when there was an eclipse, actually commenced on Monday.
³ One of the meanings of akṣha is 'legal procedure' which gives us this word. But in epigraphy it is generally used to denote an officer in charge of records and documents. See L.E.G., p. 14.
⁵ It is interesting to note here that like the donor of the present grant, the one mentioned in the Mallār grant also hailed from Kumbhāṭ and belonged to the same gōra with the same pravarṇa.
This akshara has a redundant chisel stroke above and it is also separated from the following letter by some space showing another redundant chisel stroke. Similarly, there are some redundant strokes over some of the following aksharas.

The vertical strokes are redundant. A top-stroke representing the medial ज was originally incised above it and subsequently struck off, as unnecessary. This verse is from Bhartṛhari's Fairlygadata.

Hiralal put a query mark after these six aksharas; but to me they appear to be restored to ा, े, औ ते. The subscripts of both the bracketed letters that follow are formed alike, though they are different.

What is perhaps intended is शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः.

This akshara is incised as ँ and the same as ँ, that follows has an oblique stroke separated from its loop.

Read शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः or शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः. श appears somewhat like ष, as it was actually read by Hiralal.

Read शुभिक्षेपत्ति, शुभिक्षेपत्ति. ष is redundant here.

The name of the third pāramā can also be read in the original as शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः. But read the whole as शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः, following the Gūṭrēgavaramīvambhāhakāmba.

The last but one akshara has the sign of medial ा above it, which is superfluous.

Read शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः.

Read शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः.

The figure 7 is intended to show the repetition of the preceding word. Cf. above, No. 91. Text, 1. 3.

The đēṇḍa is superfluous.

Read the latter half of this verse as शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः े ा, ते ा, ते के ते.

The akshara in the brackets was originally engraved as ा and then altered to ा.

This form of the verb is singular whereas that of the subject is plural. Read in the first half: शुभिक्षुपरात्मनः ा.

These four aksharas are as actually engraved in the original. Restore: ाप्रकाशी.

The đēṇḍa is superfluous and the sandhi is not made mātrī causa.
DARBAT SÄNTINÄTHA IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF KIRTTIVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1132

This inscription, which is engraved on the pedestal of a statue, was discovered in the village of Darbat, near Mahōbā in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh, in 1935, and was presented to the State Museum, Lucknow, by the Commissioner of the Jhansi Division. It is No. G. 508 of the Acquisition Register of the Museum. The record was noticed by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti, then Government Epigraphist for India, who gave a brief description of it in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1936-7, p. 92. His description of the inscription runs in the following words:

"It is found on a marble frieze containing a sitting lion on each side. Apparently the statue once set up has now disappeared. The whole record is in three parts. The one to the left records that the image of Sāntinātha was caused to be made by the merchants Pāhila and Jijū, that in the middle mentions Pañcūṭāchārya Vāsavachandra and the inscription on the right says that the image was set up by Kiritidhara in Sañvat 1132 in the reign of the illustrious Vijayapāla. This ruler is most probably to be identified with the father of Vikramaśānta of the Dubunkid branch of the Kachchhapagāha family for whom we have a record of V. 1145. The Vijayādhirāja of the Bāyāna Jaina inscription of V. 1100 has been identified with this Vijayapāla. But if he is a prince of the Srasana family whose inscriptions have been found in Bharatpur State, as he seems to be, then the present inscription would be the only record so far known of the Kachchhapagāha Vijayapāla."

Dr. Chakravarti had also prepared impressions of this record in his visit to the Provincial Museum, Lucknow; and from a study of these impressions, lying in his office since then, Dr. D. C. Sircar, then Government Epigraphist for India, published a note in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Volume XXX, pp. 183-85, with a transcript and a photograph of the inscription. In this article he rightly observes that "Dr. Chakravarti does not appear to have taken note of the find-spot of the inscription." Sircar goes on to state that since in the eleventh century A.C. to which time the record belongs Mahōbā was one of the strongholds of the Chandella kings, it should be ascribed to this dynasty and not to that of the Kachchhapagāhas. More in this respect will be said in its proper place, after giving the preliminary details of the document.

As stated above, the inscription contains three sections: the portion on the left, middle, and right, called here Sections A, B, and C, each of which contains two lines of writing. The letters are not very carefully formed and a few of them are also damaged in Section C, but the text of the record can be completely restored. The writing belongs to the eleventh century A.C. Attention may here be drawn to the formation of v in pañcūṭa in B, l. 1, of which the lowest extremity is just a stroke, of t which is devoid of its tail of the left limb, as in preṇamati in B, l. 2, and of r which is denoted by a vertical with a horizontal or a slanting stroke attached to it on the left, as in rāpani and srevajasravani, both in A, l. 1. The cursive way of writing ktyā in A, l. 2, is noteworthy, and in pañcūṭāchārya in B, l. 1 ch appears as d.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and whereas Section B is wholly in prose, Sections A and C have one verse each in the Avasahṭubh metre, the latter also embodying the word Sañvat in the end, in prose. Orthographical peculiarities are the same as to be found in the inscriptions of the time, e.g., the use of the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in śrevajasravani and Śaṃṭēṣṭ, in A, l. 1, which also illustrate the use of an anuśāva for a class-nasal, and the reduplication of a consonant following r, as in Śaṃṭēṣṭ-व्रज्य for a Śaṃṭēṣṭ-व्रज्य in A, l. 1, but not in pañcūṭāchārya in B l. 1. A grammatical error occurs in the use of pratishṭāḥ for pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ in C, l. 2.

The inscription is sectarian; and its object is to record the setting up of an image — evidently the one which is now lost, of Śaṃṭi, i.e. the Jaina Tirthankara Sāntinātha, in V.S. 1132, corresponding to 1075 A.C. The details of the year are not recorded.

1 The exact location of the village is not recorded and I have no means to ascertain the same.
To note the contents of the inscription, it begins with an auspicious symbol for Siddham, and goes on to state that the image (vāpani) of Sañti, i.e., the Jaina Tirthankara Sañtinātha, which bestows on prosperity, was caused to be made with praise, i.e., out of devotion to the deity, by the Śrēṣṭhis Pāhila and Jiţi. Section B says that Vāsavendra of Section A, bows down to the Jina, i.e., to the Tirthankara (whose image was set up), and a verse in Anushṭubh in Section C records that the statue was set up in the kingdom (i.e., during the reign of) Kṛrttivarman, the son of Vijayapūla and during the administration of a group of his hereditary ministers. The concluding part of the inscription records the Sañvat, as we have seen above, and it is followed by what I take to be an auspicious symbol resembling chha. Vāsavendra or Vāsavachandra, as his name figures in Sections A and B, respectively, appears to have been the sage who influenced Pāhila and Jiţi to set up the image and not their preceptor, as remarked by Dr. Sircar in his paper in the Ind. Hist. Quarterly, referred to above. Similarly I do not see any reason to take Pāhila and Jiţi to be the ministers under Kṛrttivarman, as taken by Dr. Sircar. The reading tatukulāmātya-vṛptidesa in stanza 2, which is in a separate section C, can hardly be connected with the names of these two persons figuring in an altogether separate stanza in Section A. Again, of the two ministers under Kṛrttivarman, the first, that is Pāhila, is proposed to be identified, by Dr. Sircar, with Pāhila of the Grahaṇatī family, who was the son of Śrēṣṭhis Dēdu and who is known from the Kañjurañ Jaina image inscription of V.S. 1215 (1158 A.C.). The difference between the years of these two records is of 83 years; and Dr. Sircar’s suggestion can be accepted only if we presume that the Pāhila who caused to set up the present image when he was at least a young man could have enjoyed a life of more than hundred years. The name Pāhila also figures in another inscription at Kañjurañ, dated in V.S. 1011 (955 A.D.), showing that it was a very common name.

Since Kṛrttivarman is mentioned in the present record as the son of Vijayapūla, there is no difficulty in taking him to be the well-known Chandella monarch of that name. The earliest known date for this king is offered by the Kālañjara stone inscription, to be V.S. 1147 or 1090 A.C.; and the present inscription, which gives for this king a date 15 years earlier than that of the record from Kālañjara, is of inestimable value as it offers a clue to solve the problem of the Kañchuri-Chandella contest, as will be seen below while dealing with the following inscription.

TEXT

[Metre: Anushṭubh]

A

1  सिंहास ॥[1]॥ श(प)य श(स)स्कर शा(प)जेवासि स्तुति ॥।
2  श(स)स्कर कारिता सुवि ॥[11]॥

B

1  परिकावर शरीरसाध चः
2  चः: प्रणमित जिनम(गु) ॥

C

1  [मुनि]प्रकरणश्रय राजश्रीकृतिवर्ण:।
2  कलुमालय- ॥[11]॥ संक्त्र ११३२ ||०॥[11]

---

1 Dr. Sircar translates it as ‘or belonging to king’s kul-āmātya-vṛinda’.
2 It is taken to be an ornamentation by Dr. Sircar.
3 See below, No. 124.
4 From the facsimile in I. H. Q., Vol. XXX, between pp. 184 and 185.
5 Expressed by a symbol.
6 Sircar corrects this word to शुभे: and takes it as an adjective of शोभयं = मलिनशयं; but as an adjective of स्तुति, it requires no emendation.
7 By a break in the horizontal stroke the fourth letter appears as श, as in some other contemporary inscriptions.
8 The loop forming the lower portion of the preceding letter is broken; but to me it appears to be श and not  as read by Sircar.
9 In Sircar’s reading in I. H. Q. this appears to be a zero; but I take it to be the letter chha(च) as found to be the symbol of prosperity in some of the contemporary inscriptions.
HIS inscription was brought to notice, by N. P. Chakravarti, in the *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* for 1935-6, pp. 98 ff. It was edited by Dr. Sant Lal Katere in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXXI (1933-34), pp. 168 ff., with text in Nāgarī and a facsimile facing p. 165. From the same facsimile the inscription is edited here.

The record is engraved on a slab of stone affixed to a wall of the sanctum of the temple of Nilakantha on the well-known fort of Kālañjar in the Bandā District of Uttar Pradesh. It consists of twenty lines of writing which covers a space about 43 cms. broad by 64 cms. high. The last of the lines is about three-fourth of the others, in length. The size of the letters in the first seventeen lines is between 18 and 2 cms., whereas in the remaining lines, which show letters of a slightly bigger size, it is about the double of this size.

The inscription is very slovenly engraved and shows a number of cases of subsequent corrections and insertions. It has also suffered considerably from the peeling off of the surface of the stone on the proper right side which has wholly or partially broken away one or two aksaras in each of the lines from 6 to 16, the loss being greater in Il. 15-16. Even in the extant part of the inscription some of the letters here and there are mutilated or rubbed out and a long horizontal scratch running over about the three-fourth portion of line 5 makes it difficult to restore the text for a great part thereof.

Besides what is said above, the proper right side of the bottom of the slab contains four lines of writing which occupies a space about 10.5 cms. high by 9 cms. broad; and the letters in these lines, which are of about the same size as in the last three lines of the main inscription, range from three to five in each of the lines. This portion of the inscription is wholly corrupt and the reading of it is almost uncertain, as will be shown below.

The characters are Nāgarī of the eleventh century A.C., to which the record belongs. They lack in showing uniformity, and in this respect they share the same peculiarity as of the preceding inscription. However, to note the outstanding peculiarities of the letters, we find that k in kau, Il. 15, shows a sudden curve of the lower end of the vertical so as to form the loop and is altogether different from that employed all through the record. N has not developed the dot, as in Gaṅga, Il. 1; the lingual d is round-backed; e.g., in maṇḍapa, Il. 5; and the conjunct consonants gg and vu appear as gn and ln, respectively in varga, Il. 6 and -pūryā, Il. 12. Dh is without the horn on its left limb and thus it resembles ch; see: vidhatad = odhi-, Il. 4; r is generally represented by a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to its middle on the left; e.g., in rāchita, Il. 15, but its lowest extremity is occasionally curved to the right, showing it in a transitional stage, as in vāja, Il. 9. We have at least one clear instance to show that as the latter member of a conjunct consonant this letter appears complete with a slanting stroke attached to the lower end of a long vertical; see gra in Il. 19.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the introductory Oṁ namah Śivāya and the last five lines which are in prose, it is all in verse. The stanzas are not numbered, but each of them has the letter tha engraved at the end to show its completion. A mistake in versification occurs in the very first stanza, to which attention has been drawn in n. appended to the text below.

The orthography calls for only a few remarks, viz., (1) the use of the sign for v to denote b as well, as in -vāṭha in Il. 3; (2) the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sibilant; cf.

---

1 The place lies at 80°30' E. Long. and 22°58' N. Lat. and is about 30 kms. straight north-east of the fort of Ajaygarh and about 145 kms. due south-southwest of Allahabad. For the description of the Nilakantha temple and the other antiquities at the place, see Cunningham's *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 20 ff.

2 For the significance of this syllable, see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXX, p. 218, n. 2.
Siväya, l. 1 ; (3) showing the medial dipthongs more often by the mātrā at the back than above; and (4) the general use of anusvāra mostly to represent all the class-nasals except n and ṅ, as in Gaṅgā, l. 1 and kāyuṭa, l. 8, though exceptions are also to be found, e.g., the word maṇḍapa is written with the lingual nasal in l. 5 but with an anusvāra in l. 18; (5) occasionally it is difficult to distinguish between a redundant chisel stroke and a dāṇḍa which is, in some instances, put so close to a letter as to appear a mātrā attached to it, e.g., after thā in l. 2, and after the word sūtradhāra in l. 18; (6) a class-consonant after r is reduplicated as in pāruśa, l. 12; and finally, (7) yuga in l. 3 is spelt as jūga, betraying local influence.

The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a hall (maṇḍapa) for the temple of Nilakaṇtha by the guru (spiritual preceptor) of Kṛttivarman (II. 5-7), the latter of whom is mentioned here only as a king. The house to which this king belonged is not mentioned in the record, but from the time of the inscription and from the region where the inscribed slab was found, he appears to be evidently identical with the homonymous Chandaḷa ruler and the son of Vijayapāla, as known from the preceding inscription.

The inscription is dated in II. 16-17, in figures only, on the seventh day of the bright half of Māgha, of the year 1147, on Rāvati nakṣatra; and referring this date to the Chaitrādi Vikrama era taking the year as expired, it corresponds to Thursday, the tenth January, 1090 A.C. This date falls within the reign period of Kṛttivarman whose earliest and latest known years are furnished respectively to be V.S. 1132 (1075 A.C.) and V.S. 1134 (1098 A.C.) by the Darbārit and Dēgadī inscriptions. Thus the present date is not new; but the record reveals for the first time the name of Kṛttivarman’s guru and also his patronage to Śaivism.

Opening with the customary invocation of Śiva, the inscription has a maṇḍalāṭikā in praise of the same god, who is described as the basic pillar of the world and is evidently Nilakaṇtha himself in whose temple the inscribed slab was found. The second verse introduces the preceptor (guru) of Kṛttivarman as one who commanded mastery over the vast field of literature with its various pluses of subletties and who had attained enlightenment and high position by the favour of the three-eyed deity (Śiva). The expression śrīmārti used in this stanza may have been either his name or his title. Stanza 3-7 inform us that this person built a beautiful maṇḍapa adjoining to the temple of Nilakaṇtha, at Kāḷaṇjara, and now he requests (desires) the chief of the royal iṛkaraṇa (superintendent of the records department) and the other Saivais who were Pāṇḍaras and the vārikas and others to comply with the request of Vāsudeva, by which they would also earn a part of the merit. The next two verses (8-9) speak highly of pouring water on Siddhālīgas and also repeat the request of Vāsudeva. It may be noted here that it is not an official record, and hence the preceptor of Kṛttivarman, who enjoyed a high position (maṇḍapā, as used in l. 1), desires the iṛkaraṇādhipa to regularise the whole affair. Further we are told that the inscription was composed by the Kāvyastha, Thakura Dēvāpāla, son of Pāyā, and the maṇḍapa was built by the sūtradhāra Rāma.

Line 19 of the inscription is extremely mutilated but the reading is certain. It may be translated as follows: “When the sūtradhāra Rāma constructed the maṇḍapa, two kalas (of land) were obtained.” It appears possible that Rāma was the donee, but who donated the land cannot be made out from the context. Admitting this difficulty, Dr. Kataré who edited the

---

1 Kataré translated the compound word prabhūtha-mahima as ‘glory of knowledge’ (p. 163 of his article); I would, however, prefer to take here a doandava compound, taking the latter of these words in the sense of ‘power’ as the royal preceptor could naturally have commanded.

2 The way in which the word śrīmārti is put in this stanza is rather obscure, and Dr. Sircar who takes this to be rather an honorific expression than a personal name, observes that his real name was Vāsudeva, as quoted in his own speech in v. 5 (J.P. Ind., Vol. XXXI, p. 164, n. 1). But this would involve śrīmārti; and as the word śrīmārti is followed here by iti, I am inclined to take it the name of the royal preceptor, presumably so called after he had acquired attainment and prestige. If so, it is consistent with his birth-name Vāsudeva, as given in his own speech.

3 The reading of this name is uncertain. We cannot be definite about the reading of the consonant of the second akṣara.

4 The name Rāma figures also in another inscription found at the same place and of V.S. 1188 (No. 117), as the father of the mason Lāhaṇa; and Dr. Kataré identifies them both. This may be possible, but excepting only the similarity in name, we have no other evidence to hold this view definitely.
inscription, suggested that the donor may have been either the sāstradhāra Rāma himself, or, as also is not unlikely, Vāsudeva. On the other hand, while publishing Katare’s article in the Epigraphia Indica, referred to above, Dr. D. C. Sircar observed that “although the context appears to require a word like datram instead of labhānam, lines 17-20 mean to say that, on the completion of the construction by the mason Rāma, Kāyashtha Dēvapāla granted, on the occasion of its installation ceremony, two kala measures of land for its maintenance.” The argument advanced by Sircar appears to be very cogent, but in view of the word labhānam as we actually find in the record, and connecting it with Rāmēṇa in l. 18, it does not appear to be altogether improbable that the mason Rāma obtained the land by way of his wages for constructing the maṇḍapa, presumably from Vāsudeva, who, as the royal preceptor, could donate it on the occasion; and this is why he desires the royal superintendent (l. 9-10) to regularise the gift by obtaining the formal royal sanction for this donation also, as is implied by the expression anumānyantāṁ in l. 9 and again by pālaṁiyāṁ in l. 20, as in the case of the maṇḍapa.

Reference has also been made at the beginning of this article to four small lines incised on the proper lower right corner of the stone on which the present inscription is engraved. All the four lines contain about 14 or 15 aksharas which are extremely mutilated and nothing except the name Vāsudeva in the first of its lines is eligible. Dr. Katare is inclined to take this inscription as a ‘marginal note’ and he observed that “the scribe who appears to have omitted a portion of the text which he later on inscribed in the margin, has drawn the attention of the reader to it by adding a note at the end of the main record, saying that the wise will read the small inscription also.” But it is noteworthy here that in l. 20 the inscription uses the word eṇa and not api; that the word labhānam, as read by katara, is used without any case-ending and without any adjunct; and also that in the sense in which he took it, the use of sudhībhīṣa instead of sudhiyāṁ would have been not only grammatically correct but also more appropriate. It may also be observed here that should have been no necessity of forming letters of bigger size at the end of the record in the last three lines, particularly knowing when the writer or the engraver could at that stage have perceived that the record would thereby remain incomplete. Viewing all these points, I am inclined to hold with Dr. Sircar that the inscription seems to be complete in itself and what Katare takes to be a ‘marginal note’ may have formed part of an altogether different record which cannot be deciphered owing to its mutilated condition. The only geographical name figuring in the inscription is Kālaṇjara in l. 5. It is the well-known fort in the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh, as already seen above.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1, 3 and 4 Aryā; v. 5 Pasauṭāṭilakā; vv. 5-9 Anuśṭubh].

1 [हीर(हर)।] आँ। नमः: गः(हर)वाय। ग(हर)। यह पत्रका हैमकती सा(हर)।|[हर]। वधा। यह ||(1) |
2 यह(2) स्वतः प्रभा(हर)कोल्मुलग्लमन्य नमाभिः जाता।|[(1)]।\|(1)।| अग्नि विन्दुर(2)-

3 See n. 2, on the previous page.
4 Op. cit., p. 164. Also see my reading in the text, below, and n. on it.
5 Op. cit., p. 166, n. 1. Attention may also be drawn here to text, n. 15 on the next page.
6 From the facsimile in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXI, facing p. 164. After the text was finalised, an impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist was helpful to me in deciding the reading of a few disputable letters.
7 This syllable is preceded by traces as of र, probably showing that the letters श्र may have been engraved before it. Katare, who edited the inscription, took no notice of it.
8 Bha is engraved as ha, as also below.
9 Here two dari are the first engraved and the latter of them was subsequently scored off as unnecessary. It is also followed by what looks like a ṇaha-pAda symbol.
10 A slanting stroke on the top of the left limb of this letter has changed its form.
11 The fourth foot of this stanza, with its sixteen maṭrās, offends against the metre, Aryā. If we add r̥ in the end of it, as required by the use of r̥ in each of the other pāda, this quarter will have eighteen maṭrās, showing the verse in the Gītā metre. Secondly, the dari which was later on inserted at the close of the verse, has damaged the following letter ग, which looks like ग, as actually read by Katare. For the similar idea as found in this verse, see above, No. 94, v. 1.
3. पशुभु(गृ)गमनाद्रामलने(को)समहिता महती(नी)कोरिति। श्रीमु(म)सित-
4. रिविविलिवमत्तम(स्वर)सरासारप्रसादसिते यदि विविधविहित। इ इ(121)।
5. कार्यर पूजनाम: श्रीमति(ने) मुखरसिद्धेन येन। मंडलन[लिख]।
6. सुविचार देशानीसिद्धक्षण। य (131)। उदाहरणेण दृष्टिना रिपुरुचिमृ(12)
7. [लिखल] सुमित्रा। श्रीकीर्तिसुधृष्टमस्मु(मु)गुणेन तेनलये सु(सूर)मृगु।
8. [य इ] (141)। मुकुटदशनेन नीतिकलावय वल्लम। जेनेस समुदायों श्री-
9. [द]मुदुवा। सत्तमा(म)ता। य [151] जाति(द)दुमुक्ताना। जयवकशिया|16|
10. [शिखा]। श्रेयस्त। गा[शु]पतासा(सा)सारामार्कसुभावसे ये। य (161)। पाश्चादना ना
11. [सुधेराक्षा पाल्लिमा महासमभिः। ल(क)कासा पाल्लाना न(देवस) हुव(प)मपस(स)-
12. माह(म)ल। य [171]। पुष्किर(12)। मार्कसुभावसे। ततस्व- 
13. [रिलिख]। [स]मायेन-१। सिद्धांतोक्ष्यिता स्रुवमु। य [181]। आश्रममिसा चाकराव- 
14. श्रोतिविद च(च)स्मा॥ जात्वष वी(म)त्रां वाचयेन पूर्वात्ममिष्यम(सम)।10। 
15. [य इ] (191)। निर(विषय)समथम। विवाहस्वरोच्चित्वादेशोनिना कलिना। रिलिखे 
16. ————[य व इ] (191)। संस्थ 1147 माहासिमे स(शु)कस्तें स(सध)।12। 
17. रेव[ती]नकाल्॥ दार्शन्युथानी।[गा] दुर्गीदेशालेन।
18. सुकरमार्द(र)रामसं(श)भुवना[शै]। पटालिवर अर्किना[व] द्राश्चा।13।
19. रहस्य प्रदेशवकषासदि सुमसे हुव(प)ः।14।
20. ल[कर(कर)] एवं[व]संदेश्या करणी|र(सम)|।।।15॥ इ।16॥

1 A dot above the first of these aksobhās is probably due to a redundant stroke of the chisel, as some others in this inscription, or it may have been due to the fault in the stone. Taking the letter as with the anusūraṇa, the editor of the Ep. Indi, remarked that the intended reading seems to beṛṇa, i.e., handful; but according to M. Williams, it is for aksobhā or for rinsing the mouth. Moreover, the śāstras lay down that water is poured on an image by a pot (gadubha) and (not from the palm). Katuragrees with me in reading the word as I have done here.

2 This aksobhā is wrongly engraved as ṛṇa.

3 The letters lost here may have been ॥ नामा, as to be restored from the traces, as also read by Katuragre.

4 It is also possible that the intended reading here may have been = नामां = he, by name.

5 This and the following sibilant show a combination of the dental and the palatal sibilants. Dr. Sircar translated the expression as "the Śāivas headed by the Pāṇāpata aksobhās and vānās, i.e., temple superintendents like the Pāṇḍavās of today", for which see ep. cit., p. 16., n, 1. Our remark on the word vānā may be seen in No. 85 where too it occurs.

6 I take ṣenā as an example of ṣenā tristimś, and the correction in the brackets is as suggested by Dr. Sircar.

7 Both these letters are indistinct in the impression but the latter appears as a conjunct consonant.

8 The aksobhā in the brackets has altogether disappeared and the reading is only from the traces left.

9 Katuragreeds dhi but my reading of it is more suitable.

10 Read तराकार। The superscript is perhaps t, wrongly engraved.

11 The sign of anusūraṇa above ॥ which was wrongly engraved at first, appears to have been struck off subsequently.

12 Here the aksobhā appear to be as—[श्र]िनिलिं, but nothing can be made out of them. It is possible that a portion of the v, in l. 15, which could not be accommodated in this little space, is given below, which Katuragretook as a marginal note, though he has not pointed out its exact fitting. It is also possible that this half of the verse has to be completed by what is engraved in l. 17, after the portion containing the date, which, in this case, has to be taken as a parenthesis, and it would then give us the name of the engraver as दर्मिन. In fact, the whole of this portion is so carelessly engraved and is also damaged that nothing can be said with certainty, and the suggestions made here should all be taken as tentative.

13 Both these aksobhās are lost, leaving only traces.

14 In his notice of the inscription in A.S.T., A.R., 1935-36, p. 93, Chakravarti took two maṇḍopas constructed by Vāsudeva, but this sense does not fit in the record. He appears to have taken the word in neuter dual, but it is masculine. The use of sati also shows that it is one (not two) and the word is in the locative absolute. Also read त्वंदे।

15 The ṣaṃdopas are redundant.

16 Katuragread तुष्य ॥ शिष्याय ज्ञानी।, for which see my remarks in the article above.

17 This letter is again damaged and the reading is doubtful.
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No. 111; Plate CIII

DEOGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF KIRTTIVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1154

T

his inscription was found by Sir A. Cunningham who published a rough transcript of it, accompanied by a photozincograph, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. X (for 1874-75 & 1876-77), pp. 103 ff. and Plate xxxiii-3. Cunningham’s transcript was corrected by Hultzsch, who also translated the text into English in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, pp. 311 ff. Subsequently, the record was edited by Kiellhorn, showing some differences between his own and Hultzsch’s readings and also attempting a fresh translation, in the same Journal, Vol. XVIII, pp. 257 ff. but without a facsimile. The inscription is edited here from an excellent impression which I owe to the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The inscription is incised on a rock near the river gate of the fort of the town of Deogadh, situated at the western end of the Lalitpur range of hills immediately overhanging the river Bétwā in the Lalitpur division of the Jhāna District of Uttar Pradesh. The record contains eight lines of writing which cover a space about 66 cm. broad by 35 cm. high; and the letters are beautifully formed, showing angles at their bends and joints. The size of the individual letters is between 3 and 3.5 cm.; but in the first three lines they are slightly longer in size and are sparsely written. The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet of the eleventh century A.C. and they are peculiar in showing a crescent incised under the straight line forming the top-stroke. The inscription is in a good state of preservation.

As regards individual letters, attention may be drawn to the form of the initial ḍ with the tail of its left limb joined to the vertical on the right so as to bear resemblance to ṁ, as in ēṭ, l. 5 (for comparison, see prasanna which follows it immediately). N as the second member of a conjunct consonant appears as in, e.g., in Vishna, l. 5; the subscript ṭh is laid flat on its side; see -asthariya, l. 4; ḍh is devoid of the top-stroke and thus resembles v; cf. vidyādhara, l. 2; and the letter b, which appears in three certain instances in all, is put by its own sign, which resembles ṁ only with the difference that it is almost a rectangle with the horizontal stroke slightly less drawn; see babhūva in ll. 1 and 6 and abdiḥ, l. 4. Bh which is generally indicated by a wedge joined to a vertical by means of a horizontal or oblique stroke, as in babhūva, ll. 1 and 6, resembles the mūndi t in one case, viz., bhavat, l. 3; and r appears with a wedge loop as in nara, l. 2, but in one instance viz., rauna, l. 8, we see a sudden bend in its lowest extremity; the subscript r is shown by a serif attached to the lowest extremity of the vertical of the preceding consonant, as in prākara, l. 5; and the slightly varying form of this subscript can clearly be seen in sṛt- in ll. 4 and 6; and occasionally as in nipendra, l. 2 and lēn = ātra, l. 8, the serif assumes the form of a curved stroke.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the customary obeisance in the beginning and the portion containing the date in the end, it is metrically composed. It contains seven verses composed in the usual kāvya style, the first six of which are numbered. The language is correct. Metrical irregularity occurs in the last quarter of verse 5, which, though anushed, obstructs against the metre śūka. As regards orthography, we may note that (1) b is denoted by the sign for ṣ except in the three instances noted above; (2) a class-consonant following ṛ is usually doubled, as in drumasta, l. 2, of the exception of which we have probably only one instance in vimigata, ll. 5-6; Chaitra is spelt with the double ṛ in l. 8; (3) occasionally figures as s, e.g., in suḥrī, l. 3 but not in visāla in l. 1; (4) the medial ṝ and ṝ have both been denoted by the prakṛta-mātrā or the mātrā above, cf. for the latter, ēṭr, l. 5 and rājā, l. 4, respectively; in one case, in -sthariya, l. 4, we have both the mātrās above the letter; and finally, the word anighrī in l. 1 is spelt as anhṛ, probably because of the influence of the local pronunciation of the word.

1 Situated at Long. 78° 18' E. and Lat. 24° 52' N. The antiquities of this place are described by Cunningham in his A.S.I. R., Vol. X, pp. 100 ff.

2 Cunningham, and following him, Kiellhorn call the head-strokes s'aucus-shaped'.
The inscription refers itself to the reign of Kirttivarma of the Chandella ruling Dynasty (v. 2) and the object of it is to record the construction of a flight of steps (ghattā) by the king's Counsellor and Chief Minister Vatsarāja, who was the son of Mahādhara (v. 7). The inscription is dated at the end of l, 8, in figures only, on Sunday, the second of the bright half of Chaitra of the (Vikrama) era 1154. The day and the date regularly correspond to Sunday the 7th March, 1098 A.C., according to the Kārthiḍī Vikrama year 1154, expired, when the second tithi ended 22 h. 13 m., after mean sunrise.1

After the introductory Oṁ namāḥ Śivāya, the inscription introduces the name of Vidyādhara, "whose wide-spread fame was to the Chandella family what the moon is to the night-lotuses." From him was born the king Vijayapāla (v. 1). The next verse states that the latter's son was the illustrious Kirttivarma, whose fame spread far and wide. Verse 3 goes on to describe the same prince, saying that in withdrawing royal fortune (emotional) kings and making it firm, he appeared to be a new Vishnu who recovered Lakshmi from the sea and made her leave off her fickleness. This is evidently a reference to his conquest of the Kalachuri Karnā, alluded to in a number of inscriptions of the house and will be discussed at length below.2 The next verse informs us that Kirttivarma, among the other kings, resembled the moon moving in the midst of stars, and also that Yudhishṭhīra, Safasa and Rāma-chandra—all these three have entered his grace person which was endowed with all (lit. these and those) virtues.3 It may be noted here that these three in particular have probably been chosen by the poet with the intention of signifying the best specimens of satya, śiva and sundara, respectively.

The royal genealogy appearing in the present document is also known from some other inscriptions of the house, and in this respect it adds nothing new to our knowledge. Verse 5 introduces Kirttivarma's Counsellor and Chief Minister Vatsarāja who was the illustrious son of Mahādhara and a native of Ramanipura. We are informed in verse 6 that Vatsarāja wrested the surrounding region from the enemy and constructed the fort of Dēvagiri, which, from the use of the expression idam appears to be the fort of Dēvagiri itself where the inscribed slab was found. The enemy from whom Vatsarāja snatched the neighbouring region is not mentioned here, but he appears to have been Karnā or Lakshmi-Karna of the Kalachuri dynasty who is referred to above, though vaguely, in the description of Kirttivarma himself. As we shall see below, the credit of repelling Karnā from the Chandella territories is ascribed to Kirttivarma's Brāhmaṇa general Gōpāla; however, it is possible to hold in view of the information supplied by the present record, that Vatsarāja too may have had some significant share in that exploit.

It is stated in the last of the verses (v. 8) that Vatsarāja caused this flight of steps (ghattā) which was known after him. And with the date as seen above, the record comes to a close.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Kirttigiri appears, as stated above, to be the hill near its finds spot, probably named after Kirttivarma. I am unable to identify Ramanī-pū, i.e., Ramanipura, or -puri, the native place of Vatsarāja.

TEXT*

[Metres: Verses 1, 4 and 6, Vasumatiilaka; vv. 2-3, 5 and 7, Anushūkha.]

1 सिद्धि:1 [I'] आय नम: विश्व चंद्रवंशार्थुषु: विविधावल्केरीति: लक्ष्मी।
2 विनाशाएरे नरप्रति: कपोलाविनाशी जातस्तति विनाशालघ्निः सुमिष्ट: ||11||

1 As calculated by Kielland in Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 36, No. 61. Also see Ibbi, Vol. XI, p. 312, n. 2.
2 In No. 113.
3 Both Hultsch and Kielland have not in their translation fully brought out the sense of the expression yattadguru-, which I take to mean 'this and that ability'. Yattat- is a devarṇa, the first of which refers to his recovering the kingdom and the second to establishing the same in his family on firm grounds.
4 From an impression.
5 Denoted by a symbol. The next syllable is expressed as त्व with a dot over it, as is often the case. See Nos. 113, 183, 151, 187, etc.
AJAYAGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF KIRTTIVARMAN

(Undated)

This inscription was found by Alexander Cunningham in the touring season of 1883-84 and was noticed by him in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Volume XXI, p. 54 (PL), where he says that the inscription consists of four lines and contains the name of Kirttivarman in the last line. The record was again noticed by N. P. Chakravarti in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, for the year 1935-36, p. 92; and from an impression supplied by the Government Epigraphist for India, it was edited by Dr. Sant Lal Katare, in the Epigraphy Indica, Volume XXX, pp. 87 ff., with the text in Nāgarī and Plate (facing p. 90). From the same plate the subjoined transcript is prepared.

The inscription is engraved above a group of female images on a rock lying below the upper gate of the fort of Ajayagad, situated by the side of the chief town of a pargānā of the

---

Footnotes:
1. Originally inscribed as अ and later on the curve above the top-stroke was attempted to alter so as to form मात्र.
2. Kidhorn remarked that the superscript of ब्रह्म was omitted while engraving, but in the impression before me it is very clear. This verse has a pun on the word अगादा meaning (1) free from disease and (2) without the gātha, mare.
3. Kidhorn read the bracketed letter as ख and corrected it to ग.
4. Above this letter is a fault of the stone appearing as an anusvara sign.
5. Both the bracketed aksharas are rather peculiar; the fore-part of the first was probably formed as that of अ and subsequently corrected, and the second appearing as ग. In the following qualification न appears as ल.
6. The subscript of अ appears more like अ.
7. This akshara looks somewhat like अ but it is as I have taken it here.
8. The fourth pada of this verse obstructs against the metre śloka, though it is a different type of avasīrṇabh.
9. Kidhorn says that the subscript is formed as o but in the impression before me it is clearly the same as taken here.
10. This akshara is a combination of the palatal and the dental sibilants.
11. The vowel attached to the bracketed letter is clearly उ and the consonant of the following letter, though indistinct and cramped, is ə, making the whole akshara to be əउ and not əअ, as it was read by Hultzsch in Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, p. 311. And thus I agree with Kidhorn who observes that perhaps this letter (अ) was at first omitted and was inserted on revision and this is why it appears as a usarga in Cunningham’s phototypograph. In the impression the two circles, as of ə (and not ə) are clear.
12. The tail of अ is curved to the left.
same name in the Panna District of Madhya Pradesh. At this place a number of inscriptions of the time of the Chandelā kings have been discovered.

The writing, which is damaged in the initial portion and a letter or two here and there, as can be seen from the transcript, covers a space measuring 1·22 metres broad by 9 cms. high. It consists of four lines, as already stated above. The size of letters is about 1·2 cm. The characters are Nāgari of the eleventh century A.C. The initial ē shows its right limb as a vertical resembling that of p; see ekālapatrāni, l. 3, in which both these letters appear. The guttural nasal a figures twice in l. 4, in siddhāṅgāmā and kārān-grāmānā, where it is formed of straight strokes showing angles where they meet, and is also without the dot. Ch and v are almost alike; cf. vīmucya, l. 1. Dh shows a horn on the left limb; this horn is more often a slanting stroke, as in sātraḥ-kār, l. 1, but occasionally it is curved and separated from the lower limb, as in nāmadvēryō, l. 2. Th which occurs only once, in l. 4, is formed of two loops placed vertically before a vertical stroke; and almost so is the letter sh, which too occurs only once in mahakābhi, l. 2, with the distinction that its upper loop touches the top-stroke and the lower one is comparatively bigger in size. R which ends in a tail, e.g., in charaiti, l. 2, is sometimes engraved as v, cf. grāmā, l. 3. The sibilants ṣ and s present transitional forms. The former of these syllables sometimes appears in its old form beginning with a curve as in saīla, l. 1, but in some other instances it is without the bow in the middle of the left limb and shows a sudden bend to the right; cf. sālaś, l. 2: its developed form almost resembles the modern one, as in sāma, l. 2. Similarly the antique and the developed forms of s are to be seen side by side in vāsah śvegr-gaukasām, l. 1. The dots of the sign of the viṣārga are rectangular.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and excepting the initial sentence denoting obeisance to Chandikā, the record is metrically composed. In all there are eight verses; all of them are numbered. Orthographically, the following peculiarities may be noted: (1) the letter b is throughout denoted by the sign for v, e.g., in virodha for vibudhā, l. 1; (2) in two instances out of about a dozen, the dental sibilant is put for the palatal; they are visuddha, l. 2 and sātra, l. 3; and the palatal sibilant appears for the dental about half a dozen times out of 21; e.g., in sīmā for sīma, l. 3. The wrong use of both these sibilants occurs in sisana, l. 4, spelt as sālāma; (3) consonants following r are doubled, e.g., in āvirodhānta, l. 1, with a few exceptions like soṇīpadha, l. 4; (4) the final consonants t and n appear in their full forms in āvīr-āstī, l. 4 and dhīmān, l. 3; (5) the dipthongs are denoted by the pratiṣṭhā-vāt, an additional upward stroke being marked for at and au: but there are a few exceptions to this, like -śala, l. 1; -aśat- and kritiṇā, l. 2; (6) dṛi is spelt as dru in pātārī, l. 4: and (7) sanḍhi has wrongly been observed in sthitām-śāpi put as sthitāmśāpi in l. 2.

The object of the inscription is to record the grant of the village of Pīpālāhika and the sanction of the authority over the gates1 of the fort of Kālājāra in favour of one Mahēśvara, by the illustrious Kṛitīvarman. Nothing besides the name of the king is mentioned in the record, but from the statement that he donated a village to Mahēśvara on whom he also conferred the authority over the gates of the fort which was then included in the dominions of the Chandellā kings, he is none else than the king Kṛitīvarman of the Chandellā house, whose earlies and the latest dates are provided respectively by the Darbat inscription of 1075 A.C. and the Deogad inscription of 1098 A.C. (our Nos. 109 and 111). And the present inscription, which unfortunately bears no date, has to be placed during this period, as also indicated by its paleography.

After the auspicious symbol, the record contains a stanza in glorification of (the fort) of Kālājāra, stating that it is longed for their abode even by the inhabitants of the heaven, i.e., gods. The next verse describes Brahmap who created the three worlds, and in verse 3 is mentioned Brahmap's son āttājya Kaśyapa, a sage who gave his name to the earth (kaśyapi). The following two stanzas introduce a family sprung from Kaśyapa and known as Vāstavya, in which was born Jājūka, who crossed the ocean of (was dexterous in) knowledge consisting of kālā, purāṇa,

1 The place is situated at 24° 56' N. Lat. and 80° 29' E. Long. It is about 25 kms. due north-east of Panna and about 32 kms. south-west of Kālājāra. Its antiquities are described by Cunningham in his A.S.I.R., Vol. VII, p. 46; and Vol. XXI, pp. 46 ff.
2 The number at the end of the last verse is not visible.
3 See text, n., for the details.
The expression येन-अर्ज्जितान् बासानाम् = भोभालिः in v. 6, presents a difficulty of interpretation. Katarre explains it by saying that "the grant of the village was recorded on a copper-plate, which has not yet been discovered" (op. cit., p. 88). But in that case the use of भोभालिः would be redundant. The intended reading is possibly येन-अर्ज्जितान् बासानाम् to give the sense that he strengthened the government. Cf. स्री=नाजातार्य=नादीसपत्तप, v. 3 of the Devagadh inscription of the time of the same ruler.

Nos. 149 and 150. The latter of these inscriptions also mentions both Jājukka and Mahēśvara. Both these names are also found in an inscription from the same place, dated v. 1335 Chaitra-sa 15, Monday (27th March, 1278 A.C.). See A.S.L. A.R., 1925-26, p. 81. It is not included here; its contents are the same as of the present record. For the fanciful origin of the Kāyasthas, also see C.I.L. Vol. IV, p. 267; and Naishadhiya Charita, XIV, p. 66.

Pet hill of the map of former Orchha state, as suggested by Katarre.

2 From the facsimile facing p. 90 in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXX.
3 Expressed by a symbol.
4 All these letters are cramped and damaged. The last five of them appear to read सार्वसम. Is the intended reading सुर देश क्षत्रियलम्बवं: प्रारं विरिषाः सारस धर्म स बीकके? (?)
5 Originally some other letter engraved and later on corrected.
6 What is partly visible at the end of the line may have been a kāka-pada symbol, intended to indicate that the word is completed in the next line.
FRAGMENTARY MAHÔBĀ INSRIPTION ENDING WITH THE NAME OF KÎRTTVARMAN

(Date lost?)

This inscription was discovered by General Cunningham in 1865, at Mahôbā, the ancient Mahotsvaranagava and the chief town of a Parganā of the same name in the Hamīrpur District of Uttar Pradesh. The place lies 86 kilometres to the south of Hamīrpur and 55 kilometres to the north of Khajûrâbâh, and is connected with both these places by metalled roads and is also a railway station on the Jhânsi–Mânkâp branch of the Central Railway. Cunningham found the stone set into the wall of a Dargâh, known as of Pir Muhammad Shâh; but some time later it found its way to the Museum at Allahabad, where Cunningham saw it again in 1872, and from an impression thereof taken by him there, he published a short account of it in his Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India for 1883-1884, Volume XXI, p. 71, and facsimile (Plate xxix). In 1885 a transcript of the inscription with a short abstract thereof in German was published in Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgen. Ges., Volume XL, p. 47, by E. Hultsch, who also edited it almost about the same time in the Epigraphia Indica, Volume I (1888), pp. 217 ff. It is edited here from the original and a fresh impression kindly supplied by the Director of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, where the stone now exhibited.

1. This word is used as a name of any slanting or sloping surface.
2. The form is different from the present form of the name. This is used in the old written that was used in the inscription.
3. The form of a slanting line is different from the present form of the name. This is used in old written that was used in the inscription.
4. The reading is doubtful, as a horizontal stroke appears between the two limbs of this letter.
5. This means either (1) authority over the main gate of the fort (दरवार) or the supreme authority over (all the gates) (दरवारों) of the fort.
6. The reading is doubtful, as a horizontal stroke appears between the two limbs of this letter.
7. Mahôbā is one of the well-known strongholds of the Chandella rulers: it is situated in Long. 79°.59' E.; Lat. 25°.18' N. The place and its antiquities are described by Cunningham in A. S. I., A. R., Vol. XXI, pp. 71 ff. For the discovery of the inscription, see ibid., Vol. II, p. 447.
The inscription, which is incised on the sunken panel of a slab of black basalt, is fragmentary, containing seventeen imperfect lines, written in ornamental characters. The stone is broken on the proper left side and also at the bottom. The maximum height of the extant portion of writing is about 39 cms., while the length of the lines is irregular; it begins with 24 cms. in the first line, and gradually increasing to 50-5 cms. in line 14, with the exception of lines 11 and 12 in each of which some 2-3 letters are lost, and decreasing again from line 15, it is only 15 cms. in the last line where a major portion is again lost. It cannot be said how many more lines the inscription contained originally, but the length of the lines can be estimated by a calculation of space covered by the letters which are lost and comparing the same with those in the existing portion; for example, the complete length of writing in l. 14, which now contains 60 letters and 2 other symbols and has lost 43 letters, must have been approximately of about 102 cms.; and this may have been the length of the writing in the whole inscription. However, whatever remains is well preserved, though the stone has also suffered from a crack measuring about 12 cms. and developed in the proper left corner at the bottom. Fortunately no letter is lost in this crack, which appears to have developed some time after Cunningham saw the inscription, as he does not refer to it.

The writing is well executed. The size of the letters varies from 1 to 2 cms. in height, including the mātrās, subscripts and the ornamental flourishes appearing occasionally above the tops. The characters are Nāgārī closely resembling those used in the Ajayagad stone inscription of Kṛttivarmān which has been noticed just above. The tendency of attaching a slight vertical stroke to the left of the top-strokes of some of the letters is further developed here, using the stroke in the cases of all letters.

Worthy of note are the forms of the following letters:—the initial i is represented by two hollow circles below a horizontal top-stroke, as in ity-, l. 10, and the initial े resembles ॐ only with the difference that the vertical is not completely drawn, as in ेva, l. 16. K as a superscript has its loop joined to the vertical not directly but by a small horizontal stroke, for which see kṣhamā, l. 15; े is still devoid of its dot; cf. tvongat-tuṅge-taranga, l. 8; the initial horizontal stroke of ो is not drawn beyond its loop; see chakrā, l. 7; dbh begins with a curve but it is quite separate from the loop below; see -sudā- and -uddhata-, both in l. 15; b is represented by its own sign as in the Deogarh inscription of the time of Kṛttivarmān; see babhīva in ll. 6 and 8, but not in the same word in l. 14 and not also in -kunja-, l. 13; and bh often resembles t, as in lēbhē, l. 15. R has assumed the modern form but occasionally it is incised as a vertical stroke with a horizontal stroke or a wedge attached to its left; cf. -ruṇmaja- and -ruddha-, respectively in ll. 9 and 11; and lastly, े has its left limb often joined to the vertical by a stroke as of s, and the latter of these letters occasionally begins with a loop as े; cf. fasvant, l. 2 and tasmādā, l. 11 respectively. The tail of letters like s and h are occasionally not developed, as can be seen in sudā- and hari-, both in l. 15. The mātrās above are thin but ornamentally treated. The forms of the letters, however, indicate that the inscription belongs probably to the latter part of the eleventh century A.C., or to the early years of the twelfth.

The language is Sanskrit which is generally correct; and excepting a small sentence paying obeisance to Śiva in the beginning, the record is composed in verses full of ornate style which often remind the reader of the works of our classical poets. Orthographically, we may note that only on two occasions, viz., in āsuva and āsā, both in l. 1, we have the use of the dental sibilant for the palatal; a class consonant following r is often doubled, e.g., in kṛtivāya, l. 4; and particularly noteworthy is the use of b in babhīva, occurring twice in ll. 6 and 8, but not in other cases as already stated above. The use of anavādā and parasvarāyā may also be noted, e.g., in l. 8.

The inscription opens with the auspicious symbol for Siddham and, following the usual sentence paying obeisance to Śiva, Namāh Śivasya, it has two stanzas, the first of which invokes the blessings of Śiva, and the second, of the Moon-deity adorning his forehead. Stanzas 5-9, introducing the Chandrārāja Dynasty sprung from the moon, are partially preserved; and stanzas 6-9, which are all fragmentary, speak in glorification of the dynasty, probably also naming the earliest heroes thereof. The first of these heroes is explicitly stated to have been Nārāyaṇa, in stanza 8; possibly what the poet means is Nāmukka (?), the earliest of the known kings belonging to this house. The name of Yākpati, who was Nāmukka's son, as we know from other records of the house, appears to have been lost in stanza 9, of which only three
aksharas are preserved. Stanzas 10-11 mention the names of Jējā and Vījā, evidently the Prakrit forms of Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti, who were brothers.

The next name we have in the record is that of Dhaṅga, in stanza 17, and the names of three of his predecessors—Rāhilā, Harsha and Yaśōvarman may have figured in stanzas 12-16 which are only partially preserved, the extant portions describing them all to be valorous, in a poetic way. Dhaṅga, as we are told here, destroyed his adversaries, and, by the strength of his arms, equalled (lit. weighed) even the powerful Hanuṭra who was ‘a heavy burden for the earth’. The identification of Hanuṭra or Hāmmāra and Dhaṅga weighing him with his arms have been discussed above while dealing with the Khajarāḥ inscription of Yaśōvarman of V.S. 1011 (No. 98, above), where we have also seen that this powerful enemy was none else than Sabuktīga (977-997 A.C.), against whom the king of Kālāṇjara (who was no other than Dhaṅga himself) helped Jayapāla with troops and money, according to the report of Firishtha.

Stanza 18, which is again incomplete, appears to have a reference to Dhaṅga; and the following verse, of which the first half is fortunately complete, mentions his son Gāṇḍā, “an ornament of the earth and an unrivalled hero,” the ladies of whose enemies, as we are told in a poetic way of expression, “used to resort to the forest.” Referring to the description of Gāṇḍā, Hultsch accepted Cunningham’s identification of this ruler with Nandā, the king of Kālāṇjara, who, according to Firishtha, Nizamuddin, and others, was twice attacked by Mahāmūḍ in 1021 and 1023 A.C. But from Ibn Asīr, who mentions Mahāmūḍ’s enemy as Bīdā and adds that he was the greatest of the rulers of India in the territory around Khajarāḥ and had the largest army, it is now definitely known that the Sultān launched his campaign not against Gāṇḍā but his son Vidyādhara (Bīdā).

Stanza 21-22 state that from him, that is from Gāṇḍā, was born Vidyādhara, who snatched from his enemies the flower of fame and who brought about the destruction of the king of Kānyaḵubja; and who, a master of warfare, was worshipped by Bhojādeva, together with the moon of the kalachurī (kalachurī-chandra) who were full of fear, on his throne.3

The Bhojādeva referred to here is evidently the Paramāra Bhōja (c. 1000-1050 A.C.) and the Kalachurī king is either Kōkalla who ascended the throne some time before 998 A.C., or his son by whom he was followed some time before 1019 A.C.; Mm. V. V. Mirashi takes him to be the latter. All the three names have a reference to Vidyādhara’s assassination of the Pratihāra king Rājyapāla of Kanauja for the latter’s surrender to Sultan Mahāmūḍ of Ghaznī, as seen above. This chivalrous feat must naturally have made Vidyādhara a conspicuous figure among the contemporary kings, and it was natural for the Paramāra and the Kalachurī kings to hold him in high honour.

Stanza 23 mentions Vidyādhara’s successor Vijayapāla, “whose conquest of the quarters, as we are told in it, was checked (only) by the ocean;” and the following stanza states that “perceiving this terrible (adversary) before himself, (even) the lotus of the heart of Gāṇgyādeva closed its knot of pride in battle”. While editing the inscription, Hultsch thought that this expression means nothing more than that the two rulers were contemporaries, but we have now definite evidence to show that the eastern portion of the former kingdom of Kanauja, around Vārāṇaśi, which was included in the Chandella kingdom under Dhaṅga, as we know from his Nanyaurā grant, dated V.S. 1055, had been subsequently captured by Gāṇgyā, of course, definitely at the time when the present record was put to stone.

What is preserved of the last of the verses (stanzas 25) is only the name of Vijayapāla’s successor Kṛttivārman, who in the next verse is described “to have acquired (royal) fortune just as Puruṣabottama (Vishṇu) had obtained Lakṣmi by churning by his mountain-like strong arms the stormful ocean in the form of Lakshmi-karna, who had swallowed several kings (mountains)”. Lakshmi-karna is no doubt identical with the Kalachuri Karna (1041-1073 A.C.) who is known to have attained remarkable success in the east, south and west, and was thus

---

3 The expression talpahārjas, as rendered by Hultsch by ‘who was lying on a couch’ (E.I., I, p. 219) is not at all appropriate here.
5 For details, see C. I. I., Vol. IV, p. 221; H. K., p. 295.
6 The name of Devasvarman is omitted here because he was a collateral.
regarded to be the Indian Napoleon; and the defeat of such a powerful adversary was indeed a marvellous achievement. This event is also referred to in a general way in the Deogad inscription and is described at length in the Prabodhachandrodaya, a drama written by Krishna Mishra some time between 1050 and 1116 A.C. The work in its prologue states that Kiriti- varman's general Gopala vanquished Karna, the Lord of the Chedi country, and again placed his master over the throne. A lengthy Sanskrit passage of the drama again says that "Gopala, having crushed the ocean-like army of Karna, obtained the splendour of victory in battle, just as Madhumathana (Vishnu), having crushed the milky ocean obtained the goddess Lakshmi. The way of description is exactly similar to that of the present inscription which also uses the same simile, probably with the drama before its poet. It is therefore clearly visible that the same event is referred to in both the works, viz., the drama and the present inscription.

The expression pitadri-gatam used in v. 8 of the preceding inscription, which is undated but which also belongs to the reign of Kiritivarman, enables us to solve the problem, in view of the situation of this mountain in Bandelkhanda (in the present Tikamgarh District). In the Rewa stone inscription of 1060-1061 A.C. Karna's general Vappulla is reported to have vanquished one Trilochana, whose details are not mentioned in it, at the fort of the Yellow mountain (pita-paranta-tala); and the mention of this place where the encounter took place goes to suggest that in all probability it is the same Kalachuri-Chandella contest which is referred to in the Prabodhachandrodaya on the one hand and the present inscription on the other; and in view of this, Trilochana about whom nothing is known from the record and who is diversely identified by scholars, appears to have been a Chandella general (under Devavarman) who was overthrown by Vappulla some time before 1061-1062 A.C., which is the year of the aforementioned Rewa stone inscription. If this view is accepted, the date of the newly-discovered Darbat image inscription may further help us in ascertaining the time of the Chandella-Kalachuri contest. The latest known date of Devavarman is 1051 A.C. when he issued the Charkhâr grant; and he may have been exterminated between this year and that of the Rewa stone inscription, i.e., 1061-1062 A.C., and the kingdom, which had terribly suffered with his death, appears to have been recovered by his brother Kiritivarman some time before 1075 A.C., the year of the Darbat inscription which mentions him as the ruling prince.

Combining all these evidences we may also hold that though the main credit of exterminating the Kalachuri forces goes to Kiritivarman's Brahmana general Gopala, the valiant Chandella Chief Minister, Mahidhara, also appears to have participated in the general rising and wrested from the enemy the region around Rewa, and the Kasyatha Maheshvara also participated in this stupendous task, as applied by the Ajayagarth inscription, stating in v. 8 that he rendered help to Kiritivarman when the latter was in distress at Pitadri.

The next two verses (stanzas 27-28) of the inscription are again devoted to the exultation of Kiritivarman's bravery in the usual way and telling us that he was a brave and warlike prince. And after this, we have the expression āsit tadiya-taryo (his son was...). The remainder of the inscription is lost. This son of Kiritivarman, as we know from the inscriptions of the house, was Sallakshanaavarman.

Though it is a hazardous statement to make, it appears that the inscription probably included one or two names more; and the lost portion also contained the date and the purpose of the record.

No geographical name figures in our inscription.

---
1 Above, No. 7 vv. 3 and 6.
2 Calcutta edn., p. 5; also see ibid., pp. 5, 7 and 8. For the date of the drama, see Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, p. 204. As observed by Holtseh, the historical importance of this verse was first recognised by General Cunningham in his As. I. R., Vol. II, p. 453 and ibid., Vol. IX, p. 108.
5 R. D. Banerji took him to be a descendant of Barappas of the Chalukya dynasty, and V. V. Mirashi is inclined to hold that he was a Gurjara-Pratihara. For both the views see C. I. I., Vol. IV, pp. 280-81.
6 Above, No. 106.
7 The F. D. Ch. (Canto XVIII, v. 93) describes Karna as the death of the lord of Kalañjara, who thus appears to be Devavarman and not Kiritivarman as held by Smith in Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 127.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHANDELLAS OF JÉJAKABHUKTI

**TEXT**

Metres: Verses 1, 6 and 8 Anushtubh; vv. 2, 4, 7, 14, 18, 27 and 28 Sārūdāsākhyātita; v. 3 Indraśājī, Upapati or Pāramiśītaka (as shown by the first five letters only); v. 5 Mandhārənta; vv. 10, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25 and 29 Pāramiśītaka; v. 12 Pulipitāgā; v. 16 Sraghur; vv. 20 and 26 Harinī; vv. 22 and 24 Dālāmōtā; v. 23 Drutavāṣrayita; v. 9, 11 and 15 are totally lost.

1. दिष्टम्। अं नमः शिखान्। अनपायान्यानिनिमेण मित्रर।
2. तत्र सत्तो शस्त्र(श)सत्तरमंगलम् मूर्तिविशेषः शिखा। शाश्वो मयुः जालकुरः॥ ॥[१२] तर्क निवासः।
3. प्रतिकल नारायणरूपम्। तपस्यै: प्रतिपद्विररूपम्। आर्यावरोधायायायः।
4. विदतो बेदपापमपतितम् रजनीकल्पितम्। वातम्।
5. कुमाराेऽद्वारस्वरूपसिद्धरूपायोऽश्रवितं।
6. स्य लोकः। अष्टमः।
7. सुभवः।
8. रघुवरम्।
9. विदवायेत्तवोः।
10. ब्राह्मविदवायेत्तवोः।
11. कुमारविदवायेत्तवोः।
12. विदवायेत्तवोः।
13. विदवायेत्तवोः।
14. ब्राह्मविदवायेत्तवोः।
15. रघुवरम्।
16. रघुवरम्।
17. रघुवरम्।
18. रघुवरम्।

**Notes**

- From impressions and the original stone, which is No. E 23 of the Lucknow Museum Catalogue.
- Expressed by symbol. What immediately follows may have been a danda, with its lower end mixed with the curve of the following syllable, as already noted by Hultzsch.
- Read रघुवरम्।
- Here 21 syllables of v. 1 and 54 of v. 2 are lost. The number of lost syllables here and in the following notes are mentioned as already noted by Hultzsch.
- Here the remainder of v. 5 and 27 syllables of v. 4 are lost. As in this line, all the अर्धवसूरङ्गs throughout are beautifully engraved, but occasionally they are not deep and consequently have only faintly come out in the impressions.
- Here 18 syllables of v. 4 and 48 of v. 5 are lost.
- Here 20 syllables of v. 6 and 47 of v. 7 are lost.
- By an additional redundant stroke this letter appears as मयुः.
- Here 23 syllables of v. 8 and the commencement of v. 9 are lost.
- Here 20 syllables of v. 10 and the commencement of v. 11 are lost.
- Read बाल्यवरम्। The first of these अक्षरम् is lost in the preceding line.
- Here 7 syllables of v. 12, the whole of v. 13, and 6 syllables of v. 14 are lost.
- This syllable, which is mutilated, looks like मयुः, but the reading is certain.
- Here 18 syllables of v. 14 and 57 of v. 15 are lost.
- Here 46 syllables of v. 16 and 7 of v. 17 are lost.
- Here 19 syllables of v. 18 are lost. For the use of तुलितकृष्णकृष्ण, cf. तुलितकृष्णकृष्ण in No. 98 above.
- Here 21 syllables of v. 19 and 32 of v. 20 are lost.
- Pa, the first syllable of this word, is lost in the preceding line.
- Here 32 syllables of v. 21 and 18 of v. 22 are lost. Read ओदयो-ओदयाः in the end of the line.
FRAGMENTARY MAHÔBÂ INSCRIPTION ENDING WITH
THE NAME OF KÎRÎTTIVARMA N (DATE LOST)

Scale: Three-tenth
THE stone bearing this inscription is built into the wall on the right side of the entrance of the temple of Viśvanātha at Khajurāhō in the Chhatarpur District of the Vindhyā region of Madhya Pradesh. It is said to have been found in February 1888 at the temple at that place, by Captain T. S. Burt, of the Bengal Engineers, who first published the record, with an English translation by J. C. C. Sutherland, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VIII (1839) pp. 159-184. The contents of the inscription were next discussed by Alexander Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. II (1862-1865), p. 423, and again in ibid., Vol. XXI (1883-1884), p. 66, publishing a small-size photolithograph of it (Pl. xviii)2 and subsequently it was edited by F. Kielhorn in the Nachrichten d. Königl. Ges. d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1886, pp. 441-462, from a rubbing supplied to him by Fleet. But since the rubbing from which Kielhorn prepared his text was rather indifferent, as he himself remarked, he made another attempt to edit the record, with an improved version of the text prepared from two new impressions taken and supplied to him by Burgess. This article in which he also corrected Burt's errors was printed in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I (1888), pp. 147, without any lithograph or translation. The record is edited here from an excellent inked impression kindly placed at my disposal by the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.3

The record consists of thirty-four lines of writing and covers a space about 1.57 metres broad by 0.86 metres high. The last of the lines is about three-fourth of the rest in length.

---
1 Here 29 syllables of v. 23 and 19 of v. 24 are lost.
2 Here 37 syllables of v. 25 and 6 of v. 26 are lost.
3 Here 47 syllables of v. 27 are lost.
4 From this letter onwards the lower parts of the syllables are lost in the impressions, but they can be made out from what remains.
5 Here 47 syllables of v. 28 are lost.
6 The first syllable of the word mrigākha, 'the moon', is lost in the preceding line.
7 Here 46 syllables of v. 29, along with the remainder of the inscription, are lost. The expression tadiya-tamaṣaḥ in this line no doubt refers to Sallākhanavarman who is known from the other records of the house.
8 For the situation of this place, see above, Nos. 97-98. For the description of the temple, see A. S. I. R., Vol. II, p. 492. It is also known as of Pramathanātha, and Marakariśvara, as stated respectively, below, in II. 31 and 33.
9 As rightly observed by Kielhorn in Eps. Indi. Vol. I, p. 137 n., in the plate it is wrongly described as the 'Inscription of Ganda Diva', whereas the name Ganda occurs nowhere in this inscription.
10 Cunningham, who saw the stone standing loose in the temple of Viśvanātha, also remarked that the record required a careful revision as it abounds in mistakes.
11 It is his No. B-248 of 1959-60.
In 1888, when Kielhorn wrote, the stone had already suffered from a crack running through it from top to bottom and rendering one or two aksharas illegible, but it has since developed another crack in the middle which cuts the stone transversally, from l. 1 to 21 on the right. Except these two cracks which have rendered a few aksharas illegible, the writing is well preserved throughout. The size of the letters varies from about 2 to 2½ cms. Lack of uniformity in their size is occasionally noticeable and some of them are closely packed up. Slovenliness on the part of the writer as well as of the engraver is also apparent from subsequent corrections by over-writing or chiselling parts of letters and also making insertions, which are all noticeable here and there.

The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet and resemble those of the Kālājñāra inscription of the time of Kṛṣṇavarman which was incised only about twenty-five years earlier in V.S. 1147. Owing to the slovenliness in writing, as already remarked, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the forms of some of the letters; nevertheless, the present inscription evinces some palaeographical peculiarities showing a number of letters both in their older as well as in advanced form, indicating that they were in a transitional stage in the region during this period.

As regards the formation of the individual letters, the initial i appearing e.g., in itv = ālāpa-, l. 24, consists of two loops, the first of which shows a fine tail below and the second a hook above; k which is written in its modern Nāgarī form is occasionally inscribed in ligature, e.g., in kālēna-, l. 8; and as the first member of a conjunct consonant or with a mātrā below, this letter either loses its loop or the same is joined to its vertical not directly but with a horizontal stroke; see Sakuni, l. 19, and kṛta- and kṣhavana, both in l. 29, but with a few exceptions like kṛita- in l. 18, where we find the loop of ḷ; ṣṭä appears as ni, as in karīra, l. 19; the upper loop of th is closed as found in modern Nāgarī; see padārtha, l. 3; dh is written both in its older form without a horn on its left limb, as in vyaṭhatā, l. 20, and also in its advanced form where the horn appears, as in sudhra in the same line; in udhi-, l. 2, this letter has a top-stroke; in abāra- in the same line the top-stroke resembles a crescent, and in abhara, l. 29, the horn assumes the form of a loop and is separated from any other limb; the slightly varying forms of this letter are to be seen in expression abhara-abhāra-abhāra-abhāra, l. 28, where we also find the verticals of dhā joined by a horizontal stroke in the middle. N in many cases is formed as l; cf. rājak- and tēna-, both in l. 18; p is occasionally marked as y; see sīlpi, l. 27; and the latter of these letters is frequently written as s; see yāvat, l. 32; bh is incised as a dot, a wedge, or a vertical joined to the right limb by means of a horizontal stroke as in bhūrī-bhatangā-bhūmānana, l. 13; the letter r is incised in at least five slightly different ways: e.g., its ch-like form can be seen in hāra-, l. 15; the wedged form in savīgara, l. 33; its form as a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to its middle in -citra, l. 1; as a vertical with a triangular loop in rīpā, l. 3; and the developed modern form as in āvārī, l. 2. As a subscript, this letter appears in its complete form with the superscript half drawn, as in chakra, l. 27, and occasionally the subscript form also is shown by a serif, e.g., in ṛvāra, l. 12. Both the sibilants s and s are written in their older forms, e.g., in śīvaya, l. 1 and subhrī, l. 12, and also in their modern form, as in śivīya, l. 2 and tasaṃrīt, l. 12, respectively. The peculiar form of the ligature i is also to be seen in some examples in śrīvama- and pratiṣṭiḥ, both in l. 30; and occasionally the former of these sibilants has also the horizontal stroke as in s; cf. dṛṣṭiḥ, in the same line. In some cases s and kh have not developed the tail of the left limb; cf. both the letters in sakti-, in l. 10; and finally, in a few examples the tail of h is either undeveloped or is altogether missing; see varhā-, l. 2 and mukha-, l. 3 respectively. As regards the mātrās, in a very few examples the mediāl ā is denoted by a curve above the letter, e.g., in tasyā, l. 23; and the mediāl short ā is in rare instances shown by a curve turned downwards and attached to the middle of the vertical stroke, as in -achyuta-, l. 13.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for the opening obeisance to Śiva, the two dates, one each at the end of l. 32 and 34, and a sentence at the beginning of l. 33, the whole record is metrically composed in an artistic kāvyā style abounding in figures and hyperbolic expressions. In all there are sixty-four verses, four of which are composed in the Ratḥōdhada and one the Hariṇī metre which are rather rare. The verses are not marked by numbers, and one of them (No. 12) offends against the metre.

As regards orthography, we may note that (1) b is throughout denoted by the sign for v as in -Vrahma, l. 4; (2) the class-consonant following r is generally doubled; see nisaggī, l. 6; and the consonant preceding r is also doubled in some instances, e.g., in -karītra but not in
sūtra—both in I. 31: (3) the dental sibilant is often used for the palatal even in ordinary words like sukkha, I. 5, sickha, I. 11, svagha, II. 20 and 26 and sūdha, I. 27, and vice versa is the case in a few examples like yaṣā, I. 18 and yaṛāma- and pṛāśā, both in I. 31: and lastly, the anusvāra does the duty of the final m, even wrongly at the end of a stich except in a few instances in vv. 25, 27 and 35 and some others. Anusvāra is generally put for all the nasals except n which is used indiscriminately.

The record contains some grammatical errors as in prāṇikhat, I. 54, niḥkriyāya, I. 1 and jyōthi-pataka, I. 5. Rules of sandhi are violated in a few instances, e.g., in rīpaḥ chhēti, I. 22, bahīḥ-kṛtā, I. 14, and smṛchhhah cha, I. 16; instances of wrong spellings are to be seen, e.g., in nētra for nētra, I. 5, atithā, II. 10 and 30; and the dental nasal for the lingual is wrongly used in hirarnaya, I. 4 and khumma, I. 20. And finally, one of the two similar consonants forming a conjunct is dropped by syncopation in ujjvala in I. 5, 10, 15, 24 and 51. The mātrās above the letters in the first line are ornamentally treated.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Jayavarmadēva of the Chandrātrēya (Chandella) Dynasty. The object of it is to record the renewal, in clear letters, of a prasūti which had been originally put in the temple of the glorious and illustrious Marakatēvāra (the emerald lord) at Kharjūravāhaka, by his honoured predecessor Dhaṅgadēva in (Vikrama) Siṃhati 1059 or 1001 A.C. and which had become damaged or illegible (I. 38). The inscription is dated, at the end, in the year 1173 (expressed in numerical figures only), the third of the bright half of Vaiśākha when it was a Friday. The date does not work out satisfactorily, but discussing all the possible alternatives, Kiellhorn concluded that "Friday, April 6, 1117 A.D. is really the day intended by the inscription, although according to the civil reckoning that day was the 2nd of the bright half of Vaiśākha." The year is thus to be taken as the kārttikādī Vikrama expired. The prasūti was rewritten by the Kāyastha Jayapāla of the Gauḍa country.

The record opens with a short sentence paying homage to Śiva, and it is followed by four maṅgala-śaktas in honour of the same deity under the names Rudra, Śiva and Śambhu and then of Nāgavakra (Gaṇapati). After two more verses, — one of them eulogising Bhrurat (the goddess of speech) and the other expressing the poet’s devotion to good people (old poets), the inscription says how the mundane egg came into existence, how from its two halves Brahmā made heaven and earth and also that the same god created the sages Marichi with others (v. 8). The most eminent among these sages was Atri, from whose eye sprang the moon and the latter’s son was the pious sage Chandrātrēya (v. 9). He was the progenitor of the renowned race which is called after him and which would (in the form of a prophesy) rule the earth as long as the moon shines (vv. 10-12). The poet then pays regard to the former great kings who were born in this illustrious race and ruled gloriously.

Verse 14 begins the genealogy of the Chandrātrēya (Chandella) house; and the first king mentioned here is Namukka, whose valour in the battle-field reminded the gods, of Arjuna (vv. 14-15). His son was Vākpati who resembled Vākpati (i.e., Brāhmaṇpati, the preceptor of the gods) and excelled the mythic kings Pṛithu and Kukśu (vv. 16-17). Vākpati’s son was Viśaya, who is called Vijayaśakti in the other records of the house and whose fame was sung by semi-divine beings. He, subdued the adjacent regions and led an expedition, “in the interest of his friend,” to the south as far as the seacoast, as Rāma had done (v. 20). This statement is no doubt hyperbolical but may contain some historical truth, viz., that this prince may have helped

---

1 Kiellhorn has noted that in this inscription the dental sibilant is 48 times put for the palatal and the palatal 12 times for the dental; but this number has to be taken approximate and not exact, as there are a few cases where both these sibilants cannot be distinguished from one another as I found in preparing my transcript of the record.
2 Op. cit., p. 139. Also see Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 362, No. 171. Here the day (Friday) appears to have been joined with the tithi which commenced on it, 2 h.16 m., after mean sunrise, probably in view of the fact that the third day of the bright half of Vaiśākha (aṅkha-tīṇī) is a holy day generally favoured for undertaking any auspicious work.
3 It is significant to note that Yaśovarman’s inscription of V.S. 1011 also begins the account from the creation of the earth, though in a somewhat different way.
4 This simile is obviously borrowed from our No. 98, the inscription referred to above. In fact, from the account given in the present inscription it appears almost certain that the poet of this record had before him the same inscription, i.e., of Yaśovarman.
his overlord the Gurjara-Pratihāra king, in the latter's expedition over a region which adjoined to the south of his kingdom.

The name of Jayaśakti, who was the elder brother of Vijayaśakti, is omitted in the present record probably for the simple reason that it deals with the line of succession from the latter. We are further told that Vijaya's son was Rāhila (vv. 21-23) and the latter's son was Śrīharsa whose description is merely poetical, as of some of his predecessors (vv. 24-25). Harsha's wife was Kañcikē (vv. 29-30) who bore him a son of the name of Yaśovarman, who was devoted to Brāhmaṇas, excelled Śiva in liberality, powerful, far-famed and highly meritorious (vv. 31-37). We are further told that Yaśovarman caused to be dug a large tank which was known as Bāhu-tālāga, and also constructed a magnificent temple dedicated to Vaikuṇṭha (Vishaṇu) (vv. 38-39), which is evidently the same shrine as referred to in v. 42 in his inscription of V.S. 1011. His wife was Puppā (Pushpā) who bore him a son named Dhaṅga (vv. 40-42). The following five verses describe Dhaṅga in a poetic way and are devoid of any historical interest, though indicating the poet's skill in composing highly ornamental verses. In these verses Dhaṅga is compared with deities like Kiṃśu and Nṛśīhā, telling us that he exercised his complete control over the kings of Kōśala, Kraṭha, Śiṅhala and Kuntala and had put in prison the queens of the lords of Kāśi, Andhra, Rāṭhā and Āṅga. This claim cannot be justified from any of the available evidences.

The formal part of the original record commences with verse 48 and states that Dhaṅga constructed a magnificent temple and installed in it a lofty liṅga of emerald, also telling us that it was originally worshipped by Yuḍhishṭhīra on the earth, where it was brought by Arjuna through the favour of Idrā who used to pay homage to it (v. 48). It is interesting to note that the way of devising an exceedingly sacred origin and antiquity of the liṅga is much similar to the case of the image of Vaikuṇṭha described in Yaśovarman's inscription of V.S. 1011. In the same shrine Dhaṅga also installed another liṅga which was of stone (vv. 49-51); he also distributed a large mass of gold (v. 52) and established there pious Brāhmaṇas, honouring them by gifts of wealth, grain, cows and land (vv. 53-54).

The next verse of the inscription tells us that Dhaṅga, after he had ruled the whole earth (i.e., his kingdom), and lived upwards of hundred years of age, abandoned his body in the waters (confluence) of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, closing his eyes in meditating upon Rudra and muttering holy prayers and thus obtained liberation. This statement makes it evident, as Kiernan has pointed out, that the death of Dhaṅga must have taken place before V.S. 1059 which is the date of the original inscription and after V.S. 1055 when his Nāyavāra copper-plate was issued.

Verse fifty-six of the inscription tells us that this kīrti of the lord was accomplished when Yaśōdhara, the illustrious priest of the royal house was administering justice. The word kīrti (temple) is probably used here with a double entendre, as we so often find in inscriptions; and it also signifies all the charitable deeds of Dhaṅga which are mentioned here.

The praśasti was composed by the illustrious Rāma who was clever in composing pleasing expressions and also was an ocean of knowledge. He was the son of Balabhadrā and grandson of Nandana who was the foremost among the poets (kavi-chakravarti) and belonged to the Sabara (or Sābara) family of Tārākīka (vv. 57-58). It was written (on the stone) by the Kāyaśtha Yaśāhpāla, who was dexterous in padavedyā (grammar), and was engraved by Śiṅhala who had mastered the art of writing (vv. 59 and 62 respectively). Verse 60 of the record says that the temple of Pramanātha, i.e., Śiva (where it was engraved) was built by Chhīchhā, who was an expert architect.

Here ends the original praśasti adding a sentence in prose, as seen above; and the remaining two verses are devoted to express that it was got re-written, in clear letters, by the

---

1 We have no clear indication that Vijayaśakti was a feudatory of any Pratihāra (i.e., Gurjara-Pratihāra) king nor do we know any Pratihāra king leading any expedition to the extreme south. For a different view and its contradiction, see E.R.K., p. 51, which also denies the suggestion of R. C. Majumdar, viz., that Vijayaśakti may have helped the Pāla king Dēvapāla in his campaign in the south (H. B., Vol. I, p. 119, n. 4).

2 See No. 100, above. Also see kielhorn, op. cit., p. 139.

3 He is apparently the same person as the donor of the Nāyavāra grant of Dhaṅgadeva and mentioned in it with the title bhūja.
king Jayavarmadēva who had spread his fame in all the directions. The inscription is concluded by expressing the name of the writer and the date which we have seen above. It is strange that the record contains no allusion to the successors of Dhaṅga nor anything else about Jayavarman besides his name. From the other records of the house, however, we know him to be the sixth descendant of Dhaṅga, as we shall see in their proper context.

Of the two place-names mentioned in the inscription, Kharjūravāhaka (II. 32, 83) is the modern Khajuraho in the Chhatarpur District of Madhya Pradesh, as already seen above; and Tarkārikā from where the poet originally hailed (v. 57) and which is also the original home of the donor of the Nāyāvarā grant of Dhaṅga-deva, has already been shown to be existing in Bihar. The other names like Kāṅchi, Andhra, Rādhā and Āṅga do not figure in the main text and they are all well known to need identification.

TEXT

[ Metres : Verses 4, 6, 16, 21, 36, 42, 51-52 and 60 Aryā; vv. 2, 8, 7, 10-11, 15, 18, 25, 29, 34, 37-38, 43, 47, 50, 53, 55, 59, 68 and 63-64 Sārdhālakriśṇī; vv. 5 and 20 Mālinī; vv. 6 and 59 Sīkharā; vv. 8, 12, 14, 22, 28, 31, 33, 40, 43-44, 48, 54 and 62 Anushījubh; vv. 9, 28, 31 and 46 Māndavaśā; vv. 15, 19, 23 and 32 Rathōdiṇhā; vv. 17, 35 and 36-37 Vasantaśilākā; vv. 21, 39 and 64 Śrīgūḍhā; vv. 27 and 41 Vanaśakīvatsa; v. 48 Hariś.]
6. सर्खाबिग्नितमयां शवं न्यायिणेऽस्य नातिकृतं:। कार्योपयुक्तानां तदुपरिणामं।
   गुणम्।।(v) प्रारंभम्।।(vi) वर्णम्।।(vii) देवतागम्यं।।(viii) ज्ञानम्।।(ix) देवराजम्।।
7. यहसुः।।(x) आचार्यं।।(xi) चंद्रमक्ष्यम्।।(xii) विनियोजः।।(xiii) भूतावादं।।(xiv) क्रीड़ाम्यं।।(xv) विद्यकयां।।
8. कार्तेश्वरहं बन्धुप्रेरणा:। अन्यथां:।।(xvi) नृत्यम्।।(xvii) अभिलक्षितम्।।(xviii) गुणाक्षयम्।।
9. ति:।।(xix) अनेत्राः।।(xx) सत्यम्।।(xxi) विद्यकयां।।(xxii) अन्यथाः।।(xxiii) अप्राणम्।।
10. महामायेऽनेन भाएऽस्मिन्म्।।(xxiv) नृत्यम्।।(xxv) अभिलक्षितम्।।(xxvi) अनेत्राः।।
11. यद्रोऽस्मिन्म्।।(xxvii) नृत्यम्।।(xxviii) अभिलक्षितम्।।(xxix) अनेत्राः।।(xxx) अप्राणम्।।
12. तत्स्मि।।(xxxI) विद्यकयां।।(xxxii) अनेत्राः।।(xxxiii) अप्राणम्।।(xxxiv) अभिलक्षितम्।।

1. Reading conjectural and as required by the context. In the original, these two aṣṭhānas look like ṇ, or गृहा. The sense is redundant.
2. Probably some other letter was originally cut and it was later on altered to ṇ.
3. Noting that this aṣṭhana looks like श or श Kielhorn proposed to correct it to श to suit to the sense, but the anunātra on the third letter, which appears as a in its ṛ-like form, as at many places in the inscription, tempts me to take the whole word as श, with the second of the aṣṭhanas misformed. The reading proposed by me would also be suitable to the sense.
4. By play on words, the expressions used in this verse are applicable to vādcita, meaning (1) family and (2) bamboo.
5. This hemistich is metrically faulty. It may be restored as क्रिमादिकृतम्।।(xxxv) नृत्यम्।।(xxxvi) अभिलक्षितम्।।
6. The punctuation mark, as some others below, is superfluous: and not noting them separately in each case, I have put them in brackets. Kielhorn read the two of the preceding aṣṭhāna as sṛṣga and noted that the second of these letters is rather rṁma than ṣṛṣga. I think that rṁma is really intended here in the sense of ‘having happiness by righteous conduct’.
7. श, which was originally omitted, was added subsequently in a smaller form below the line and the dots of the visarga that follows is combined with the dāya.
8. Originally two dots, later on changed to the curve of the medial i. Here we can have the pāda-sēchchheḍa as kṛmāta or akrāmāti, walking (proceeding), or attacking.
9. The concomitant of this aṣṭhana looks like ॠ, and the forelimb of the preceding aṣṭhana looks somewhat like ṇ, because of a redundant stød stroke.
10. The concomitant of the first letter of the name is ṇ, and of the bhāya that follows appears a ṇ probably with a medial u. ṇaḥ is here in the sense of ‘conowned’.
11. These aṣṭhanas are misformed and in the impression they look like औत्तमामन्त्रम्।।(xxvii) अप्राणम्।।(xxviii) अभिलक्षितम्।।
12. The seventh aṣṭhana of this verse is engraved as ṛḥā and Kielhorn corrected it to ṇ, giving the word vāreyōḥśhīm. He also translated the verse, for which see the text, fn. 32.
KHAJURĀHO STONE INSCRIPTION OF DHAṆGADEVĀ, VIKRAMA 1059 RENEWED BY JAYAVRAMADEVĀ, VIKRAMA 1175
Some other letters originally cut in place of mmā and dru, which were subsequently corrected.

The abhāra in the brackets was lost in Kielhorn’s time also, and the reading adopted here is as proposed by him.

Read व्याजस्. The consonant of the second of these abhāras is damaged.

The bracketed abhāra is entirely lost.

Kielhorn read ऋन and corrected the first of these letters to आ, to give the sense of ऋत. But my impression shows a rāpha attached to आ and thus I take the letter as dru.

The preceding letter was originally cut as र and later on altered to य. This sense contains a play on vṛttā meaning (1) round and (2) conduct, and on gūna meaning (1) thread and (2) merit.

The saṃgī is omitted here not wrongly, as Kielhorn has observed, but in accordance with the Pārtīkā on Pāṇini, VIII, 3, 56.

This refers to the legend according to which Bīśhma was born from the Ganges (Trīdaśaśīri) by Sāntanu. See Mbh., I, 99, 37; Mādhyamā, 118, 81 (Gāgāyīya Bāl Pūrāṇa Bīśhma).

The bracketed abhāra appears to have been changed to sa, which suits the sense.

There is a pun here on the word pala, meaning (1) flesh and (2) a weight (and thus a coin of that weight). Śīvī is the well-known mythical king.

Kielhorn read this aksara as ti and corrected it to tī, but I do not think that the emendation proposed by him is necessary. Rāṭaś is in the loc. absolute; the verb is tathāyapati.

Read māyakāsā. The latter ha, which was repeated by mistake, has been scored off; but I fail to find the two signs of the annāvara also struck off, as Kielhorn observed.

The prīthvhamāṇi of य is very thin and the consonant of य in युष्म appears to have been corrected. The letter य is damaged by the crack.
20 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

21 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

22 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

23 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

24 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

---

1 Kielhorn read correctly the first letters of sect 3 and 4 as \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} respectively, but finding them indistinct in the impression before him, he suggested \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} instead, without any cogent justification. He also translated the verse accordingly, for which see \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, Vol. I, p. 144, n. 54. But I prefer to retain both these letters (\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}), which are quite clear in my impression. The former of these would mean 'the celebrated (Yudhishthira) on the one side, and 'the recognised (canons of dharma) on the other. Kielhorn's translation 'that Dhrifatindra did not oppose Yudhishthira' would also factually go against the statement of the \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} viz. that he actually did so 'when he saw his own race being destroyed', though not after his family was decimated. Thus the figure of speech applied here is what is technically called \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} as taken by Kielhorn. The reading \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} also brings out the significance of the use of the word \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} with more force, while its emendation to \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} as suggested by Kielhorn, misses the point almost completely.

2 Originally \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, later on changed to \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

3 Some letter was first cut before \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and subsequently was struck off as redundant.

4 Here the reference is to the mythical story of Sugara's sixty thousand sons digging down towards the Pārāsī in search of the sacrificial horse and thus extending the boundaries of the ocean. \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, XIII, v. 3. The name \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} seems to suggest that the tank was excavated in a spot containing numerous \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} trees sacred to Siva to whom this temple was dedicated.

5 Originally \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, with the \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} erased later on.

6 Kielhorn observed that this \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} is probably engraved below the line, but I do not find it in my impression. His restoration of the following \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} is not necessary since the reading here gives the sense of 'turning away (from the main path)'. The temple referred to in this verse is obviously the same as described in \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, No. 98, v. 42.

7 Both the letters of the name \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} are partly abraded but the reading is certain. Kielhorn stated that they are quite distinct in the best of the impressions; and, following him, I take it to be the name of the queen. It may also be observed here that generally a lady is compared to Lakshmi; but the comparison of this queen with Narmadā may go to suggest that she came from the region where this river was flowing.

8 Kielhorn has noted that the letter in the brackets is rather \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} but the present inscription has a number of instances, e.g., in \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, where the \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} can distinctly be read as \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

9 \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} By \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} this verse is applicable to both Dhāraṇa and \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

10 The reading of the first \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} of this verse, from my impression, is exactly as given here, of course with the exception that the second of these may also be read as \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and also that the third and the fifth appear to be altered. \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}

11 Kielhorn read the bracketed \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} as \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} and restored it to \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}, but the \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} is marked above the letter, a small trace of which can be seen in the photograph.

12 The \\textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}} is incised above the letter, resembling a \textit{\textbf{Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuti.}}.
KĀLAGAR PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

[Vikrama Year 1186]

T HIS inscription was found on a pillar in the temple of Nilakantha inside the fort of Kālāgara, in the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh. It was noticed by General Alexander Cunningham who transcribed and translated it in his Archaeological Survey Reports, Vol. XXI (for 1883-84 & 1884-85), p. 54 and Plate x-A. It is edited here from an inked impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India. The record, which consists of five lines, is incised on a shaft, rounded at the top, and below another record separated from it by a space of about 2 cms. It covers a space 28 cms.

1. Kielhorn read the first akhara of this word as ṛ, but the mātrā is marked as a horn above.
2. Above ṛ, and also above the preceding ṇa, the sign for the medial ṛ was first cut and then struck off as unnecessary.
3. Kielhorn doubtfully read the third akhara as ni and remarked that it might also be read as ni or ti. But I see a curve representing the medial i which appears to have been either struck off in the original or blanched.
4. The thousand-figure, though damaged, is quite clear.
5. The sign for ṛ (not i) before ha was originally marked and later on struck off as unnecessary. Kielhorn also remarked the same in his time can now be recognized only in traces.
6. Read ṛ. The akhara ṛ so far as I can make out, had a sign d attached at its top, but it has disappeared now, leaving only traces above. The following akhara, as many others in this inscription, has ṛ for its consonant.
7. Kielhorn read this akhara as ṛ and corrected it to ṣ. But the loop at the top shows it definitely as taken here, and the tail is mixed with the horizontal stroke. — The vertical stroke that follows is redundant.
8. For the metre, mætrā can be. To suit the metre it may be restored to gātāṃ.
9. The second akhara of this word is engraved as Ṛ with a small curve representing the supercript of the following letter.
10. From ṛr, up to the end the letters are slightly bigger in form.
11. For the situation and archæological importance of Kālāgara, see No. 110, above.
12. The inscription above consists of two and a quarter of lines and ends with the usual expression paying obeisance to Nilakantha (nirvam pranamati). The letters in it are smaller and the palaeography shows them to belong to a slightly earlier time. The technical execution too is crude. For all these reasons I hesitate to agree with Cunningham who took both the records as one.
KĀLANJAR PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

Vikrama Year 1187

This inscription was brought to notice by General Alexander Cunningham, who published his transcript thereof, in Roman characters, with an English translation and a small-scale lithograph in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-1885), p. 54 and Plate X-B. The inscription is edited here from the same plate.

1 From an impression which I owe to the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 This is a contraction of मेवत्त.
4 Read either राक्षी or राजस्वि देवस्व, dropping the दानदास.
5 A colloquial word in the sense of 'dancer'.
The record is inscribed on a piece of a broken stone pillar which Cunningham found at the police station in the town of Kālanjār, and was reported to have been brought from the temple of Nilakantha, inside the fort at that place. As the pillar was broken, the record is incomplete. The preserved portion contained four lines of writing of almost equal length, the dimensions of which are not recorded.

The letters which are carelessly incised belong to the twelfth century A.D. The language is incorrect Sanskrit, as will be known from corrections made in the following transcript. From the point of palaeography it is worth noting that whereas the letter k has assumed the modern form, j, r and s are older; see kālīñjara, l. 3, and su in sūdi, l. 1. The preserved portion is all in prose. Orthographically, we may note that the letter ma, ending the name of the king in l. 2, has been doubled.

The purpose of the record is not to be found in the existing portion; it is probably to record some benefactions made by one Sri-Trisalka during the reign of the illustrious madanavarman, who is evidently the Chandella king (c. 1129-1163 A.D.).

The date of the record, which is mentioned only in figures, is the ninth of the bright fortnight of Jyēṣṭha of the (V.) year 1187. It cannot be verified, but taking the year as the Northern expired, it corresponds to Sunday, 18th May, 1130 A.C.²

TETX³

1 स(ी)कल्व १२६७ ज(ेढ़ो)क सुदि: ९ ।
2 भीमव(वन)समस्मदिस्म(व) ।
3 कालिज़ज़र(डी) भीविन् ।
4 लक्ष हि”रात्मक् ।

No. 117; Plate CVIII-B

KĀLANJĀR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

| Vikrama | Year 1188 |

His inscription is incised on a rock to the left of northern side of the gateway of the temple of Nilakantha in the fort of Kālanjār in the Bānda District of Uttar Pradesh. The record was first transcribed and translated into English by Lieut. F. Maisey in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVII (1848), pp. 321 f., and subsequently it was published, with a fresh transcript and a small-size photoinscription, by General Cunningham, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), pp. 34-35 and plate x-C. It is edited here for the first time from an impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist.

The inscription contains nine lines of writing which covers a space 46 cms. broad by 33.5 cms. high. The first three of the lines form one group, and, after leaving some space which is more than the ordinary distance requires, the third line is followed by three pairs of two lines

---

² Cunningham, op. cit., p. 34, n.
³ For the Northern V. correct, the date would be equivalent to Wednesday, 29th May, 1129 A.C.; and for the Southern V. expired, to Thursday, 7th March, 1131 A.C.
⁴ From Pl. x-B in Cunningham’s A.S. I.R., Vol XXI.
⁵ Cunningham read Avas (व) before Sādhvī but I do not find the symbol in the plate. It is not known if it has disappeared.
⁶ This word is used without any case-ending. Read ya.
⁷ The reading of this nakhara is doubtful; it may also be read as fr.
⁸ The asterisk is put here to denote that one letter is illegible here. Cunningham read the second of the letters as a and omitted the rest.
⁹ The inscription is incomplete.
KALANJAR PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1187

KALANJAR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1188

Scale: One-third
each. The size of the letters ranges between 2 and 3 cms.; some of them are bigger than others, causing confusion in the reading. The record has also suffered from weather and some of the letters are damaged.

The characters are Nāgarī of the twelfth century A.D. With respect to palaeography, attention may be invited to the form of ch with an angular loop, see charanā, 1. 2; to the form of h in the same example; to that of dh which has developed a horn on its left limb, as in satīradhāra, 1. 7; to r which generally ends in a sharp tail, as in the same word; and finally, to the medial e attached to r below, e.g., in rūpakāra, ll. 7-8.

The language of the record is Sanskrit and it is entirely in prose, though there are some examples appearing as parts of verses, e.g., dharmān-dharmma-parāyaṇa- in l. 5, which is the beginning of a foot of the Śāradaścāndrika metre, and DevaŚrī Nilakanthasya, in ll. 6-7, which appears as a complete foot of the Anushṭubh metre. With respect to orthography, we may note the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in paramāśwara, 1. 1, but not in Śrī throughout; that of the sign for b to denote v also, as in annujā, 1. 2, the reduplication of a consonant following r, e.g., in -varma-, 1. 2, and in one example the preceding l in -putra, 1. 5. Sandhi is not observed in Śrī-Udana in l. 6, and the influence of Prakrit while giving the names is also visible, as in Vachchha for Vatsa in l. 5. It may also be observed here that the person who prepared the draft of the document had a very poor knowledge of Sanskrit; more in this concern will be said below, while studying its contents.

The record refers itself to the illustrious Madanavarmman, the supreme lord of Kālañjar, who is endowed with the royal titles and is also called to have been a zealous devotee of Mahāvāra. The object of it is to record the installation of an image of Nilakantha; and the date, as given in the numerical figures only, is the eighth day of the bright half of kārttika of the (Vikrama) era, 1188, on Saturday. Kiellhorn calculated the date and found it equivalent to 31st October, 1131 A.C. when there was a Saturday. Thus the date is quite regular and the year was Chaitra expired.

The date of the record has no special interest since we know the Chandella Madanavarmman to have occupied the throne from 1129 to 1163 A.C. And to summarise the contents of the record, we find that both Maisiey and Cunningham expressed a wide difference of opinion, since the language used here is such as not to enable one to interpret the expressions quite satisfactorily, as to be seen below. Here it may also be observed, however, that both these scholars have missed the prominent floral design at the end of l. 5, which affords great help in solving the problem, showing the end of the first or the historical part of the inscription, as we find in several other cases which have often been noted by us. Here is introduced one Vatsaraja of the Kumara family, who is described as a son of Mahārāja, a general and a son of Sūlaṇa. As his father's name is explicitly mentioned to be Sūlaṇa, he cannot be taken identical with Kirtivarmman's general Vatsarāja mentioned in the Deogadh inscription of the time of the king as a son of Mahārāja. But from the tenor of the record he appears to have been a military officer under Madanavarmman and governing some region around Kālañjar.

Here ends the first part of the inscription, separated by the flowery design, as stated above. But the expression occurring in the second part of it, viz., about the name of the deity whose image was installed and also about the persons who did it have been differently understood by both the above-named scholars. For example, whereas Cunningham took the image as of Lakshmīlāha, Maisiey read the name as Varadā; and following the rubbing before me, I agree with Cunningham in this respect, as to be shown below in the text. As for the names of the persons who installed the image, we find that whereas Maisiey took them to be two persons, viz., Raja Deva and Sūlaṇa, Cunningham took them more in number. But considering that each of the names has a punctuation mark (daya) at its end, I am inclined to take the names as two, viz., Kavi-Ghayankā-Achchhōda and the illustrious Rūpajī Udana. After this the inscription tells us that the image was made by the mason (Rūpakāra) Lāhada, the son of the illustrious...
Rāma who made the image of Nālakantha. And with the date, as discussed above, the inscription comes to a close.

**TETX**

1 निहृत्वा व्यस्तित् \[\text{[1]}\] परमभुत्कमहाराजाविराजपरात्मक(वर)परमात-
2 हेल्स(वर)रथीकान्तपरस्तातिमीमदनरायणस्मृतयोऽः
3 जार्यासारी भीमाकल्पसपुराण्योऽः महाराजाजुः
4 ग्राहीस्वाभिः \[\text{[9]}\] भगवतमह(हर)रथीकान्त(हर)होशीकुस्तम-\[\text{[9]}\]
5 'कुलकमल'\[\text{[9]}\] महाराजाजुलक्ष्मीकृष्णराजः\[\text{[9]}\] || ||
6 \[\text{[9]}\] विषयवक्त्वादिः राजा(हर)उजनम \[\text{[9]}\] || देवीभी-\[\text{[9]}\]
7 लक्ष्मी सुझात्राराम\[\text{[9]}\] दुर्लक्ष्मीद्वी-\[\text{[9]}\]
8 त नाभकरीणिमे \[\text{[9]}\] दुर्लक्ष्मीद्वीमी \[\text{[9]}\] वराधाः \[\text{[9]}\] ग्रुपदिर-\[\text{[9]}\]
9 \[\text{[9]}\] तत्स्थित \[\text{[9]}\] संक्ल\[\text{[9]}\] १२\[\text{[9]}\] का तिपांफतिल = सतीसाती \[\text{[9]}\] \[\text{[9]}\]

1 It is not known whether the prefix निहृत्वा is a part of the name.
2 Here too the language is ambiguous, as throughout the inscription. Some of these points will be discussed in the text below. But the record is not of any historical importance. Rāma is the same person as mentioned in No. 110, i. 18, above.
3 From a rubbing.
4 Expressed by a symbol.
5 Cunningham read this aṣṭhara without the maṭāra which is clear in the impression before me.
6 There are traces to show that tṛā was first incised at the end of this line but probably scored off and written in the next line.
7 Maisey read and second letter of the name as tu but what he took as the sign of the maṭāra is a badly formed ha. We have no maṭāra-sign of this type throughout the record. See sūta which is just the next word.
8 The first of the epithets used here is a Prakrit form of sādhanika which means a general; and the implication of the second is not known to me, though the reading is absolutely certain. Maisey read sādhanika, दुर्लक्ष्मी but it is not vouched for by the rubbing before me. The third aṣṭhara is ni and not ni for the form of the comonom n. c. n. pāvī, pāvī, pāvī, I. 3. It again cannot be definitely said whether the sign denoting the medial ā was engraved at the end of the line so as to read kunāra.
9 Cunningham read this aṣṭhara without the sign of maṭāra which has faintly come out.
10 The Sanskrit form of this word is Vatsarāja. After this name there is a floral design where Maisey sees letters reading them as Dēvāndrī, and following it, his transcript gives नितांतिद्रयस्नेनात्रस्मात्तिताय, which I do not find in the rubbing.
11 The first aṣṭhara in the line has totally disappeared and has been adopted here from Cunningham's reading. Maisey read here niya, as stated in the preceding note, but the space shows that only one and not two letters could have been accommodated here.
12 The reading of the bracketed letter, which also seems to have been jā, is uncertain. In that case the name would be Jādānā. It may also be noted that the names are all without case-ending but they are separated by the dangān.
13 The reading of both these aṣṭharas is from the traces left and therefore uncertain. Cunningham read both these letters as Badrī and Maisey read the whole expression as श्री नाथजयददेशानवलक्ष्मी- which is merely fanciful.
14 The reading of this and the preceding aṣṭhara is uncertain. The reading of the name Lakṣmiṇidhāra is certain but it is doubtful whether this was the name of the deity or of the mason. The language is very defective here, as stated above. Moreover, it may also be observed that the two deities Lakṣmiṇadhāra and Sāntī can in no way be connected.
15 Here Maisey read रघुत्रारामिन, for रघुत्राराम and this reading may be adopted. But I do not find the space to accommodate the last three letters.
16 The vertical of the maṭāra of this aṣṭhara may have been on the original but being lightly engraved, it could not come in the rubbing.
THE copper-plate which bears this inscription was found in the Augâsi parganâ of the Bândâ District in Uttar Pradesh and was presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, by A. Cadell, then Assistant Magistrate at Bândâ, some time in the eighteenth decade of the last century. No information is available regarding its original find-spot and of the circumstances in which it was obtained. The inscription engraved on it was brought to notice, in 1878, by the late Babu Rajendralal Mitra, by publishing transcript of it in Nâgarî characters, followed by a translation by Durga Prasad Basu, in the Journal of the same Society, Vol. LXVII, Pt. I, pp. 73 ff., and a facsimile facing p. 73 (Pl. VI). In 1887 it was critically edited in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI, pp. 202 ff., by F. Kielhorn, who gave his own reading of the text from an inked impression supplied to him by J. Fleet, and who also stated that his own reading of the record 'will be found to differ considerably.' His article is accompanied by a fresh translation and also by an illustration. Some time subsequently, the plate was transferred to the Indian Museum, but as I am informed, it is not traceable there; and also failing to obtain its impression, I edit the record here from the facsimile accompanying Kielhorn's article in the Ind. Ant.

It is a single copper-plate, inscribed on one side only, and measuring about 41.5 cms. broad by 26.8 cms. high. It is smooth, and all round it there is a flat rim about 1.27 cms. broad and 0.64 cms. thick, fastened on very tightly by twenty-one rivets. The plate is not very thick but the letters, being shallow, do not show through on the other side of it. There are nineteen lines of writing, covering a space 37.5 cms. by 25.3 cms. In the middle of the last line is a round hole, 1.2 cms. in diameter, apparently intended for a ring, which, with a seal, if attached to it at all, was never found. In the first four lines the continuity of the writing is disturbed by a rude representation of the four-armed goddess Lakshmi with an elephant on either side, pouring water over her head, with raised trunk. The whole device is enclosed in a rectangular border 5.5 cms. broad and 3 cms. high.

The writing is well preserved. The mechanical execution, however, is crude as the letters are not well formed and some of them are out of recognition, rendering it somewhat difficult to be certain about the personal and geographical names occurring therein. The lines too do not run straight, for, after about one-third portion from the beginning, they tend to creep upwards and again come down towards the end, showing a sort of hump in the middle. In the first seven lines the letters are rather slightly bigger and sparsely written.

The characters are Nâgarî of the twelfth century A.D. As regards the formation of individual letters, the initial ई appears with two small circles placed side by side with curved or hooked ends turned in opposite directions; see स्वर, l. i.; the initial ः, e.g., in सहा, l. 5, completely resembles ढ; and the conjunct consonant ग्ग in निर्मिता-l. 12, looks, like ग्र, and ठ as ल; cf. -पर्यमुमा, l. 11. The letters ध, ढ and ढ are often almost alike in form and can be distinguished only by the sense required; e.g., ध in चातुर्व, l. 9, and ढ in विबूधि, l. 2, where ढ shows no horn on its left limb but is endowed with a top-stroke. The same letter appears also with a horn on its left limb, as in सिद्धवत, l. 11, and in rare instances as in दिप्ता, l. 1, it resembles a tautrine. Sometimes no distinction is observed between ी and ०, both of which are in their antique and advanced forms — the former with a straight vertical above and a curve below, and the latter as a vertical suddenly ending in a loop with a tail; cf. respectively -न्रम्मली-, l. 6 and लिक्षता- in l. 19. The subscript त as in स्थावरम, l. 9, is laid flat and the letter द is generally engraved as न्द as in यात and तात, both in l. 19, though it appears in its graceful tail as in आत, l. 4. त as a superscript is engraved only as a horizontal stroke, as in हवान and स्वात, both in l. 12. य is occasionally engraved as प as in नूयव्या, l. 12, but often like स, as in

1 The Augâsi of the maps, Lat. 25.24 N.; Long. 80.23 E. The name is also written as Augâsî. It lies on the southern bank of the Jumna at its confluence with the stream Garara.

2 These remarks are based on Kielhorn's writing as the original could not be had for study.
pravāraṇa, both in l. 15. The usual form of r appears as a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to its left in the middle, as in chatur-, l. 9 and rāma, l. 12, but its slightly varying forms are also to be seen in -māhesvara, Kālañjaya and pārama, all in l. 4. Wrong strokes of the chisel give altogether different forms to this letter at several places, e.g., in -dirō, l. 1, vrōdhī, l. 2 and vārē, l. 11. There are several examples of wrong and careless engraving throughout the record, e.g., in -kāryā in l. 2 is incised as tisā, prā in l. 13, as da, bhū in l. 19, as ḫrī, l. 19 and -sti, l. 14, as trī.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and except for the initial verse as to be found to begin a Chandellā grant and another at the end, it is all in prose. With respect to orthography, we may note that (1) the letter h is always denoted by the sign v, as in -vāhā, l. 17 (2) the dental sibilant is put for the palatal in many cases, e.g., in viveśvara, l. 1, though s is written in -dirō—which immediately follows: (3) a consonant following r is doubled as in -sava, l. 16; (4) the sign of omgōtha is employed only once in l. 7, to denote the merging of a into ō, though there are several other cases of this type: (5) the word nāvula, in l. 1, is wrongly spelt with a single j; and local influence is to be seen in the spellings of panya, ll. 11-12 and tru for tri in l. 13; it is also to be found in words like vāhā, l. 7, dañdhaku, l. 8 and vriksha and valmiṅka l. 9, for which Kiellhorn has invited attention to Hemachandra’s Prakrit Grammar, IV 331.

The inscription begins with the oft-quoted verse glorifying the family of the Chandrātrēya (Chandellā) kings, and after mentioning the names of their earliest ancestors Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti, it proceeds to give the ancestry of the donor beginning from the Paramahāṭṭhāraka-Mahārājādhivavā-Parmāṭṭhāraka, the illustrious Kṛttivirman, his successor the P.M.P. Prithivirman and his successor the P.M.P. Madanavarman, who was a devout worshipper of Mahēśvara (Śiva) and the supreme lord of Kālañjaya (ll. 2-5). This account is followed by the formal portion of the document (ll. 5-15), the object of which is to record the donation of a plot of land by Madanavarman, in favour of a Brahman named Rabhala (or Rāsala?), who was the son of Jāta, the grandson of Sānhi (Sākhi?) and the great-grandson of Vāpura (Vāmana?). His gōtra was Bhāradvāja, and his pravāra were Bhāradvāja, Āṅgira and Bāhrapatiya. The donated land existed in the village Bambhardā in the Sudāli nīchha and its dimensions were as measured (probably to be determined later on) by ten ploughs, etc., as much as could be ploughed in a day by ten pairs of oxen, as mentioned both in figures and words, and also by the total quantity of 7½ drāpas of seed sown.¹ The boundaries of the plot are stated to be as follows: in the eastern direction the boundary-mark of the village Raṇassā; in the southern direction the village Kamānauḍa; in the western direction an ant-hill near a madhūka tree; and on the north the boundary-mark of the village Vijauli.

The king donated the above-mentioned plot of land after performing all the necessary preliminaries, and he also announced the gift in the presence of all assembled in the village. The conditions of the grant are stated in ll. 15-17, according to which, the donor was entitled to enjoy, plough, cause to be ploughed, give away, mortgage or sell the plot, with the ways from it and to it, with all its sap-trees (śrāva), sugar-cane, cotton, safflowers, hemp, mango, madhūka (madhūca latifolium) and other trees, with the treasure in its forests and mines, and together with the other things contained within its boundaries and with the income from within and without.² With a request to future rulers to preserve the gift and quoting a well-known verse to the effect (ll. 18-19), the record concludes, stating that it was written by the writer of legal documents (dharmaśekha) Sūḍha and engraved by the skilful Cēhā. As we shall presently see, they are respectively the writer and the engraver of the following grant also.

The date of the grant is expressed both in words and figures in ll. 10-11. It is Monday, the full-moon day of the month of Māgha, (Vikrama) Suvarn 1190, which as calculated by

¹ The reading of this and some other names that follow is uncertain, as shown below in the text.
² The reading here is: hala 10 saha bhūmitarīṣa vāñg. While editing a grant of Madanavarman’s grandson Paramardin, A. Venis takes vāñg to be the same as the Prakrit svāñg, from the Sanskrit vāpagañthī and adds that ‘it describes the grain as sown broadcast, i.e., not as sown first in seed beds and then transplanted’ (Ep. Ind., Vol. X, p. 47). While publishing Venis’ article the editor quotes some instances to show that land was often measured also by the amount of seed required to sow it; but we have a number of similar instances in the Paramāra epigraphs edited above, as in No. 13, l. 13; No. 43, l. 27; and also in c. i. 1, Vol. IV, page 191, l. 32 and n. Also see No. 131, l. 8, below.
³ This account is based on Kiellhorn’s translation. The last expression means, as we have seen in the text below also, ‘with internal and external taxes, i.e., on custom and excise duties.'
Kielhorn, corresponds to 12th January, 1134 A.C.; but it was a Friday and not a Monday, and thus the date is irregular.1

The importance of the inscription under study lies in the fact that it furnishes an undoubted evidence regarding Madanavarman's political relations with his neighbouring powers in the south and south-west. The grant was issued by him from his camp in the vicinity of Bhāllasvāmin, which has been identified with the town of Bhīla (modern Vidishā); from his camp at that place in 1134 A.C. when he donated the land may be interpreted in the terms of his leading an aggressive campaign against his adversary in that direction, who can be no other than the contemporary Paramāra king of Mālava. The history of the royal Paramāra house shows that subsequent to the death of the great king Bhūjādeva in c. 1055 A.C., his successors were incessantly in troubles and their military resources were almost exhausted by protracted warfare with their enemies amongst whom the Chaulukyas of Gujarāt were a source of constant menace; and though Bhūja's brother Udayāditya (c. 1089-1094 A.C.) had succeeded reviving the glory of the house, the latter's son Naravarman (c. 1094-1134 A.C.) and his son Yasōvarman (c. 1133-1142 A.C.) suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Chaulukya king Jayasimha Siddharāja (c. 1094-1142 A.C.), who is known to have annexed the kingdom of Mālava.2 And the year of the present inscription, that is 1134 A.C., which was incidentally the first regnal year of the Paramāra Yasōvarman also, tends to show that Madanavarman had definitely extended his dominions further in the south, gaining victory over the Paramāra king who was then hard-pressed.

The expressions of the Khajurāhō inscription viz., that Bhājagādeva was like a death to the Mālavas and that his kingdom in the west extended so far as Vidishā on the Mālava-nadi,3 are only of a general type: and of equally indefinite nature is the account of the victory of Kiritivarman's general Vatsarāja who claims to have constructed the fort of Kirittidurga in the Bētwā region.4 The statement of the Ajayagāthi rock inscription of V.S. 1817 about Sallaksānayarvarman, that he took away the fortune of the Mālavas,5 is also not explicit on the point and what is more is that it is a later report: and hence the record under notice which definitely shows Madanavarman's sway over a part of the Bētwā valley near Vidishā is of great significance. It may also be noted here that the present charter was issued about 82 years after V.S. 1108, the year when Devavarman issued his Chakhārī grant. And the absence of any copper-plate issued during this long period by the Chandella house may be explained by supposing that either we have not so far found them or they were not at all issued, as the rulers were constantly busy establishing peace and order in the State from the time of Kirtivarman who revived the glory of the house which had been eclipsed by the Kalachuris, as already seen above.

Of the geographical names occurring in the present grant, the place where the deity locally known as Bhīllasvāmin was worshipped is evidently the modern town of Bhīlla or Vidishā, and the vishaya Siddulī was the region close to it. The modern name of this place I am unable to find out; and I am also unable to identify the villages Ranasaṇā and Bijaṇī mentioned in the record. Since the donation was made by Madanavarman from his camp near Bhāllasvāmin, i.e., Bhīlla (modern Vidishā), as we are informed by the inscription, the places occurring in it are to be looked into in the area lying to the east of this town. A village of the name of Banhāri exists about 8 kams. north by east of the Bina Station (near Jiainsī), with another village known as Kamarkhedī to its south. The names of both these villages suggest their identification respectively with Bāmnasūṇā and Kamhanālā mentioned in the present inscription. Both these

---

1 This is what Kielhorn observed while editing the inscription in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, on p. 202. And finding the date to be irregular, he also calculated the details with the month Mārgga, i.e., Mārgaśīra for Mārga when he concluded that the date works out satisfactorily not for 1190 but for 1192, expired, when it was a Monday. See ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 368 l., No. 187. But the facsimile published with his edition of the inscription shows that the second aksara of the month is not gga but gha; in two instances side by side, in l. 11. My own calculations for the Southern Vikrama, expired, shows the equivalent as 22nd January, 1135 A.C., falling not on Monday, as stated, but on Sunday. A satisfactory solution of this irregularity may perhaps be sought in presuming that though the Purunā really occurred on Sunday, but the donation made or desired to be made on that day was registered the next day (Monday).
2 Above No. 98, v. 5.
3 No. 111.
4 No. 145, v. 4.
5 Above No. 105, v. 6.
villages are now included in the Khurail tehsil of the Sagar District, which is separated by the Vetravati from the Vrindâlâ District. If this identification is correct, it also appears almost certain that the Sûdâlî vishâka, in which these places are said to have been then included, denoted the region lying to the east of the river and more or less comprising the modern tehsil of Khurail (now in the Sagar District).

TEXT

1. सिम्भा सिभ्वत् ॥ जयकान्तां वर्षिस्त्रप्रेति ॥ बड़ीवाणीमनेरेणा भंसे(ह) च चढ़ देवले(ह)॥ ॥ [12] ॥ सत्य प्रव-।
2. दे माने विरोधिविवेजःशिवाजीसिद्धिविवेजःशिवीरिवासधरमविवेजः॥ धर्मं विवेजः॥ सूत्रिको धर्मार्चर्याकारविवेजः॥[13] ॥ वनराज्यविवेजः॥
3. जयकान्तां वर्षिस्त्रप्रेति ॥ कृत्यमनेरेणा भंसे(ह) च चढ़ देवले(ह)॥ ॥ [12] ॥ सत्य प्रव-।
4. दे माने विरोधिविवेजःशिवाजीसिद्धिविवेजःशिवीरिवासधर्मविवेजः॥ धर्मं विवेजः॥ सूत्रिको धर्मार्चर्याकारविवेजः॥[13] ॥ वनराज्यविवेजः॥
5. जयकान्तां वर्षिस्त्रप्रेति ॥ कृत्यमनेरेणा भंसे(ह) च चढ़ देवले(ह)॥ ॥ [12] ॥ सत्य प्रव-।

1. From facsimile accompanying Kiernorn’s article in Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI.
2. Denoted by a symbol.
3. The superscript of this letter is so formed as to appear a combination of the palatal and the dental sibilant, and in the subscript of the same letter that follows, it is shown by a serif. The sign of punctuation is superfluous and the name that follows can also be read as सूत्रि.
4. The consonant of the last aksara of the name appears to have been changed subsequently. Looking to other instances in the record we cannot be certain whether it is त्र or त्र.
5. The whole aksara is struck out but it cannot be धो as conjectured by Kiernorn. For धो, see n. above. यम means ‘belonging to’.
6. The consonant of this aksara can also be read as ऋ.
7. It literally means a pillar (marking the boundary).
8. This expression, which is an example of madhyama-padaśṭipti samāsa means ‘an ant-hill by a madhuka tree’.
9. The first aksara of this expression looks the archaic त्र.
10. The punctuation-marks are unnecessary, as some others in this and the following lines. They are not marked here. The same we find in the Sēmâ grant, below, No. 126.
11. The syllable in brackets also looks like धा but it seems to be intended for त्र, which is all the more certain from a comparison of it in the name Sûdha in l. 19, below, which is so read in the light of the next inscription. Šakārī (and not Šhākārī) appears as a famous place in some other plates also.
AUGASÍ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1190

From Facsimile
BHRATKALI BHAVAN PLATES OF MADANAVARMAN,
VIKRAMA 1192
BHĀRAT KALĀ BHAVAN PLATE-INSRIPTION OF MADANAVARMAN

[ Vikrama ] Year 1192

This inscription is inscribed on a set of two copper-plates, preserved in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, which is now attached to the Hindu University, Vārānasī. They are said to have been purchased some twenty years ago, from a dealer of the name of Thākur Dās Jaiā, a resident of Tikāmghār, the chief town of a district of the same name in Madhya-Pradesh. No information is available as to the original findspot of the plates or about the circumstances in which they were obtained. Rai Krishnādāsji, the founder-Curator of the Kalā Bhavan, took immediate steps to bring to light the inscription by lending its pencil-rubblings to Dr. D. C. Sircar who was then the Government Epigraphist for India, in 1955. Dr. Sircar edited the record in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXII (1958-59), pp. 119 ff., with his transcript thereof in Roman characters, accompanied by facsimiles (between pp. 122-23). The inscription is edited here from a set of impressed impressions kindly supplied to me at my request by Rai Krishnā Dāsji who

---

1 This letter appears as ह but it is य.
2 The danda, which appears as a मातृ in, is redundant as others in this line.
3 The reading of the second akṣara in the name is doubtful.
4 The akṣara in the brackets may also be read as न.
5 The vowel-mark is faintly visible above.
6 The letter in the brackets is damaged and is read by the sense. This expression also shows the confusion between the formation of त and न.
7 Both these letters too are mis-formed and look like द्वादिस. Kielhorn translates this expression as “with the income from without and within”, which can better be explained as “with external and internal taxes”.
8 Kielhorn read – उपनिषदां. But in that case the very name of the writer is missing. The inscription is engraved in a slipped manner; and in the light of the next grant of which the writer was the same, we have to read – उपनिषदाः or हि (सूक्ति) सत्यः.
9 The sandhi is not made here. Kielhorn read – क्रियानमि, but the first akṣara is clearly ध as also shown by the following inscription.
10 Sircar also noticed this grant, along with the other two which are now in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan (our Nos. 134 and 138), in the I. H. Q., Vol. XXXIV (1959), pp. 87 ff.
also allowed me to have a look at the plates. Subsequently, I also compared the text from another set of impressions which I owe to the Chief Epigraphist.

As stated above, the set consists of two plates which are thick and heavy, and each of them bears the writing on one side only. Each of the plates measures 45 by 32 cms. and the inscribed portion on each covers a space about 41½ cms. broad by 29 cms. high. All round the rim of each, flat copper-hands about one cm. broad and two cms. thick are fastened by twenty-two copper-rivets on the inscribed side. The band above the right-hand corner of the second plate is slightly broken. In the middle of the bottom of the first and top of the second plate there are corresponding ring-holes, showing a diameter of about 1½ cm. and interrupting the writing on both of them. But the ring, which originally held the plates together, is now lost. The continuity of the writing in the first three lines is also disturbed in the middle by a rectangular space about 5½ cms. broad by 4 cms. high, which occupies the figure of Gajalakshmi seated on a full-blown lotus with an elephant on either side, sprinkling water over her head. The weight of both the plates together is 6·96 kilograms.

The inscription consists of forty-three lines of writing, of which twenty-two are cut on the first plate and twenty-one on the second. The size of the letters varies from 1 to 1·2 cms. The letters are well formed but not so deeply engraved as to show through on the other side. But despite all this care, the interiors of many letters show marks of the working of the tool, e.g., the akshara pa in Parśyā, l. 14, pari, l. 28; and pā in pāśhāma, l. 31 is engraved as sh and ṣhīṭha in l. 42 as sṛṇhāḥ. Due to wrong engraving the letters tu, ga, sthāna and pā all in l. 31 appear as tu, chá, shva and chā, respectively. Occasional omissions of parts of letters are also to be noted; for example, nyāna in pāṭhāyanā, l. 14, is cut as γya, omitting the horizontal stroke distinguishing the two letters. The sign of amuvara is often very small, and occasionally it is visible only on the plate. However, the mechanical execution is on the whole much better than that of the August plate which was written and engraved by the same persons as we shall presently see.

The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet of the twelfth century and show a close resemblance to those of the August plate of the same king, though more carefully and beautifully formed and engraved. They show that the letters a, k, ch, dh and r were in a transitional stage in the region, at the time when the present document was written. The initial a, which occurs about a dozen times in the record, shows its advanced form beginning with a curve only in two or three instances, whereas it retains its older form beginning with a vertical stroke in others, both the forms being visible side by side in Angirasa-Amavara in l. 16, and again in l. 19. The letter k, which has assumed its modern Nāgarī form, has in rare cases also retained its form in which the vertical is suddenly bent so as to form the loop, as in sankranta, l. 15. Ch also presents two different forms; the older one with a round loop as in cha, l. 6, and the developed one with an angular loop as in vāchara, l. 5. The letter dh appears at least in three different forms; e.g., in śrivijaya, l. 2, it resembles v; in dhārāmśe, l. 5 and vārdhū, l. 8, it shows a horn on its left limb; and in dharmama, ll. 13 and 40, the horn is so formed as also to serve for the top-stroke. R presents at least three different varieties, viz., that with a wedge as in pravara, l. 17; that with a vertical ending in a hook, as in paramāvāra, l. 2; and that with a fully developed tail as in nara-, l. 1. It is also worth noting that in its subscript form, in which it is shown by a serif attached to the lower extremity of the vertical of its superscript, this letter often appears complete and the superscript is half drawn; e.g., see yatra-, l. 6 and chaitra-, l. 14. Of the other letters, n has not developed its dot, as in jāngama, l. 10; the subscript forms of chā and th are almost alike; see -chāhame and -thāvora, both in l. 10; and the stroke on the left of bh is sometimes lengthened so as to make the letter appear as t, as in bhāvāva and bhaṭṭhā, both in l. 2. Attention may also be drawn to the form of gīvinirgata, l. 25, etc., where the subscript clearly appears as g and is also endowed with a top-stroke, though there are examples showing it as gn, as we also find in the inscriptions of the time.

The language is Sanskrit; and the record is written in an admixture of prose and verses. The orthography shows the usual peculiarities of (1) the use of the sign of v to denote b also with a few exceptions where b is used, e.g., in labdhma, l. 6; (2) the doubling of a consonant following r, as in varma ll. 2-3; (3) the occasional use of s for ś, e.g., in vasat, l. 5, and vice versa in the only instance of kṣuma, l. 30; (4) the use of m in place of an amuvara in saṁvat-sara and samvat, both in l. 14; (5) incorrect change of an amuvara to denote n in sankranta, l. 7, and the use of ri for the vowel ri in krimi in l. 57. Occasionally, the vertical stroke is engraved in
such a way as to be easily confounded with the sign for medial š or ś, and these strokes also are often put to separate the names as in ll. 20-21. Sandhis are violated in showing the gōtras etc., in ll. 16-17 and, on the other hand, the visarga at the end of v. 11 is changed to r in view of the following i.

The record belongs to the king Madanavarman of the Chandella Dynasty and the lord of Kālaśāra and gives the details of some plots of land granted by him to learned Brāhmaṇas from his camp at Pārēy-grāma. The date is mentioned to be Tuesday, the fifth of the dark half of Chaitra in the (Vikrama) year 1192 on the Vishvavat samkrānti. The date, as calculated by Dr. Sircar, corresponds to 24th of March, 1136 A.C., if the month is regarded as maṇḍāṭa. The charter was drafted by the dharma-gāttikā (writer of legal documents) Sūḍha of the Vāsaṇa family, by the order of the king (v. 12) and he also wrote it on the plates. It was engraved by Uḷihaṇa who belonged to the brazier (rīṭikāra) family (v. 13).

Opening with an auspicious symbol followed by the customary verse in praise of the Chandrārēya (Chandella) family, the record mentions the name of the Parama-bhaṭṭāraka, Mahāraja-rāja and Paramēśvara, the illustrious Madanavarman, the lord of Kālaśāra, who meditated on the feet of the illustrious P.M.P., Pritivivarman who, in his turn, had stipulated on the feet of the P.M.P., the illustrious Kirtivivarman. This portion of the text is copied verbatim from the August grant issued only a couple of years before. Then we have two new stanzas lavishing praise on the donor, the first of which states that the creator with his ripe knowledge and incessant practice endowed Madanavarman with good qualities such as homeliness, profundity, might, wisdom and truthfulness, and the second that his liberality put the wish-filling trees on the golden mountain with their bent tops appearing as if they turned their faces to the ground due to shame. Then begins the formal part of the record which states that from his camp at the aforementioned Parēy-grāma the king bestowed 24 pādas of land in Valahaudā-grāma in the vishaya of Mahiśīnēla on the Brāhmaṇa, Pāṇḍita Sōṃeśvarman of the Kaustas gōtra, with the three praṇaṃ Aṅgirasa, Ambarisha and Yauvanāśa. He is stated to be the son of the Bhaktāraka Śrī-śrīpāla, grandson of the Dīvādēva Sahāraṇa and great-grandson of the Jñānānanda Dēvata (?) and his family hailed from the Bhaktārakāra of Pāpāliputra. This portion of the charter is followed by the donation of two other plots of land, by the king, in favour of one each of the two Brāhmaṇas, in lieu of those which they had in their possession. This change was made apparently for the sake of convenience. The first of these two Brāhmaṇas was Dīkhita Nārāyaṇaśārman of the Gautama gōtra with the Gautama, Aṅgirasa and Ayāya praṇaṃ. He was the son of Dīkhita Dēvendra, grandson of Dīkhita Vāmanasvāmin and great-grandson of Dīkhita Kīśava, and his family had hailed from the Bhaktārakāra of Panikabhadra. It is stated that instead of the land he possessed in the villages of Pipalāhā in the Tintirī-pattalā, Vasunā in the Kōḷavā-pattalā, Gōlā in the Vānḍirī-pattalā, Dādarī in the Navarātha-pattalā and Dēnaṉā in the Mahiśīnēha-pattalā, the king granted him four pādas of land in exchange for Astavāla-grāma in Tintirī-pattalā as well as his land in Valahaudā-grāma in Mahiśīnēha-pattalā and Dāvaya (or Dāvēha)-grāmā in Nandāvaṇa (or Nanduvēṇa)-pattalā which he had received respectively from Nādūka (or Nādūki?), the priest attached to the queen Lakhāmādevī, and Sōmēka, son of the Bāhātāraka Śrī-śrīpāla. The third donor was the Brāhmaṇa Sahājarāman who was a brother of Sōṃeśvarman, mentioned above, as we know from his details given in the charter. He received 12 pādas of land in exchange of that which he possessed in the Pipalāhā-grāmā in the Tintirī-pattalā and

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXII, p. 119. The year was Kārutikadi expired.
2 This person also engraved the August charter of the same king. In that great the second aksara of the name is distinctly ha, as also read by Kielhorn who edited it. In the present inscription, however, ha is clear and the upper part of what precedes it is bent to the right, showing that it was intended to be i and not the medial ṣ-sign as taken by Sircar who read the name Ṛkṣa. The name can be read definitely by a comparison of these letters in both the plates.
3 For the reading of the third letter of the name, see n. in the text, below.
4 In view of the fact that this name is distinct as Nandāvaṇa in the Ichshārvar grant, we must take it to be correct and not the one in the brackets, the confusion being caused by the vertical stroke which is detached from both the aksaras before and after it. This inscription contains a number of errors of this type.
in Mahulâ-grâma in the Kôlava-pattalâ, donated to him previously by the chief queen Vâlhatva-devî and queen Chândala, respectively, with the consent of the king.

Lines 29-33 mention the conditions of the grant, which are almost the same as to be found in the other Chandella charters. This portion is followed by eight benedictory and imprecatory verses (ll. 54-40); and a prose-passage showing the king's consent. Then the inscription has two verses recording the names of the writer and the engraver, as seen above; and wishing good to all, the grant ends with a symbol between two vertical strokes engraved three times.1

Of the geographical names occurring in the inscription, Kâlânâira (l. 4) has often been seen to be identical with the hill-fort in the Bândâ District, and Pâtaliputra (l. 16 and 25) is the modern Patnâ in Bihâr. Parây-grâma, where the king was staying while making the donations (l. 14), cannot be identified for want of details, as also the names of the villages mentioned in the grant. Dr. Sircar located Nandâvana-pattalâ which is also mentioned in the Ichchâyavâr grant of Paramardin,2 in the Bândâ District and Navaratha-pattalâ (the Navarâshtra-vishaya of the Charkhârâ grant3 in its vicinity on the Yamunâ; and Erachha-pattalâ may be taken identical with the modern Erich, about 96 kms. from Mahâbâhâ, as suggested by Hiralâl.4 Sircar also suggested that Vândiuri, Tintiri and Pipalâhâ (l. 21 and 27) may possibly be the same as the modern Bândâ, Téouthar and Piplôn-durga. Kôlava, after which the pattalâ was so known, has so far remained unidentified. It appears to be represented by the modern village of the same name (also spelt as Kôlava), situated almost 40 kms. due north-east of Vidišâ. This suggestion receives strength from the identification of both the villages which are stated to have been then included in it, namely, Mahulâ (l. 28) and Vasana (l. 20), the first of which may have been the same as Mahulâ, about 20 kms. straight north of Kôlava, and the second as Vasâ, about 10 kms. south-east of it.

A consideration of the places mentioned in the inscription makes it evident that Mahâsavarman's kingdom, which included parts of the modern Hamîpur, Bândâ and Vidišâ Districts and probably extended up to the Yamunâ, in the north, also included parts of the former Rewâ State (now a district of the same name) to the north of the Kaimur range as is also known from the discovery of a hoard of his silver coins in the Téonthâr tehsil of this district.5

\[\text{TET}\]
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1 It appears to be intended to be a chha as we find at the end of a record to show auspiciousness. A stroke also partly appears inside the loop, to show it to be chha.

2 Below No. 129, l. 8 where it is called a vishaya.


4 Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, p. 11.


6 From impressions and the original plates.

7 Expressed by a symbol.

8 There is redundant dot on ra and also on pri that precedes. Similar redundant dots are to be seen also on some letters below, which are not noted separately.

9 The latter member of this conjunct resembles \(\text{ai}\) and on ra that follows, the sign of anuvâra was first engraved and later on erased as redundant, but the mark still remains.

10 Some other aksaras were first cut in place of this and the following aksaras.

11 That is, Yudhâsîthra.
BHĀRAT KĀLĀ BHAYAN PLATE-INSRIPTION OF MADANAVARMAN

6. वि युक्ती निमायमनस्चादी वार्णणो निवारणों गम्यः ||२|| अर्थ च। तत्रः सर्वसमीचीहृदयान्तरानां भवति । जो राजनान्ति मनन्याविक- ।

7. राजमाणि: प्रशस्ति यदा। यह नावांधिकीलिपि पर जामीकरणविक्षेििका(संक्षेपायमीएरोधोपतया) कारणम्: शृवत्ते । [२५] से एस।

8. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

9. धिशिरिणयविवाहादित्यिहारामायमस्थानाः(हा)धुनायन्याविकाल मायायनस्विखातमुद्गे प्रकाशाजलविवेधा- महाराजादेशवस्था।

10. लयप्रयात्मवसंवद्वा(वो)प्रयति समाजप्रवति भरतु || वंसिन्ति यथोपरलिखितसमयिः समस्तरेण सम्मकाचर्ये स्वामी(म)चिह्नः सा—

11. बहुर्ष्यू स्तुतिविनेश्वरभाषानिधिशिया(वा)ःयथा भिर्न्तिः प्रतिपिठष्टास(द)ग्रामः च अतपादक्षमात्मेसामः। धिशिरिणयविवाहादित्यिहारामायमस्थानाः—

12. धिशिरिणयविवाहादित्यिहारामायममायायमस्थानाः(हा)धुनायन्याविकाल मायायनस्विखातमुद्गे प्रकाशाजलविवेधामहाराजादेशवस्था।

13. नीमायमस्विखातमुद्गे प्रकाशाजलविवेधामहाराजादेशवस्था।

14. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

15. नीमायमस्विखातमुद्गे प्रकाशाजलविवेधामहाराजादेशवस्था।

16. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

17. नीमायमस्विखातमुद्गे प्रकाशाजलविवेधामहाराजादेशवस्था।

18. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

19. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

20. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

21. दुध्विख्यातमधामसंकालविकारिणयुक्तेः कुमःस्विभिन्न भवसुविरो निराकालूं परिवारविकालविकारिणयुक्तेः नित्यास्तिकृततः । घुः-

1. Siccar read the letter in the brackets as pdth and then corrected it to bdth. This form of bdth, however, began to appear in the inscriptions of this dynasty only slightly earlier, for which see babhūna in l. 6 of No. 111, where it shows a slight variation from m.

2. See the preceding n.

3. The superscript of this akshara has faintly come out. The consonant of the preceding vi is cut as ch.

4. As n. 9 on the previous page. It would be better to read धुनायन्याविक- as suggested by Siccar. Mitra read the letters as Vahakata, but they give no meaning. See E.R.K., p. 227, No. 20, as Vahakata, but they give no meaning. See E.R.K., p. 227, No. 20.

5. The reading of the akshara in brackets is doubtful. It also appears as ta. The same akshara which is a part of a name, is incised as ha in l. 26 below. It may also be noted that in this and the other lines giving the names, etc., māth is not made.

6. Siccar read the name as pariśvara, but both the last of the akshara are clear, bh resembling d and the second (ß) showing a bend like d with the subscript r. Read also निदानिधिकृता.-

7. The reading of vi is not certain as it also resembles cha. The punctuation marks in this and the next two lines are redundant.
22 सूमिमादय शाक्तरिकप्तः दत्तेश्वरलाभायमन्तवायाम्। महिमिद्येवापत्तायं ववहृतपायसे वै
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23 तदद्यः शुभि राजश्रीवमेदितः तकुपुरीहवाचनादुहनसमाचितवारम्। दत्तव्यवन्दनकारकायां वीरस्तहा।।
24 मे शेषधीया शुभि चकुशिरीवाचनादुहनसमाचितवारम्। दत्तव्यवन्दनकारकायां पिलिहवापाय।
25 मे शेषधीया शुभि यु० परिताः पदकारणः दत्तम।। तत्रा पालिकगुपन्ताहरुविनिमोतायाम्
कौशलिनात्यायाम् शान्तिः।।
26 क्षत्रियवाच्चार्यविनिमोतारां आश्रितवेदेश्वराधृत्यां श्रीीवत्तारणरूपायां दत्तकारकीर्ति
उपवासाय शान्तिः।।
27 त्वमहात्मां श्रीवत्तारणां दत्तव्यवन्दनकारकायां विनिमोतायाम्। दत्तव्यवन्दनकारकायां
पिलिहवापाय।।
28 श्रीवत्तारणरूपायाः अववाद्युत्कारकायां महाकारकायां श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। दत्तव्यवन्दनकारकायां
पिलिहवापाय।।
29 मिति महाशब्दमाधविन्तियां मुदत्तववन्दनकारकायां। महाविश्वववन्दनकारकायां। महाकारकायां
पिलिहवापाय।।
30 प्रस्तुतवत्तारणरूपायां सवपायां (सवा) श्रीकृष्ण (श्री) श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। सवापायां।
सवपायां।
31 कर्डः वामनराजकिन्द्रेण समाइतवरूप वत्तारणरूपायां। जानवरारूप झपुड़ कर्डः सवापायां।
णिपत्यां वामनराजकिन्द्रेण।
32 श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां वामनराजकिन्द्रेण। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां जानवरारूप झपुड़ कर्डः सवापायां।
न होतवानं श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। अत्र राजयुक्ततिष्ठकितवारपायां। सवापायां।
33 वत्तारणरूपायां श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। सवापायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
34 वत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
35 परावती मन्त्रिकार्यां पत्ती वेषः।।
36 श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
37 सा च नामपानं च बोधित्तम संवधानो च बोधित्तम वश्यतः च बोधित्तम वश्यतः। श्रीवत्तारणरूपायां।
A - KALANJAR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1192

From Facsimile
KALANJAR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

[ Vikrama ] Year 1192

His inscription was discovered in 1848, by Lieutenant Maisey, at KALANJAR in the Banda District of Uttar Pradesh. Maisey briefly noticed the record in the Bengal Asiatic Society Journal, Vol. XVII, p. 322, No. 5. His account was generally followed by A. Cunningham, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI, pp. 35 L., and Plate X-D. From the same plate the inscription is edited here.

Cunningham found the record incised on the upper side of a rock beside the figure of Narasimha near the temple of Nilakañtha in the fort. Immediately below it, there is another inscription, which has the same purport and which also has been dealt with here. The present inscription consists of four lines of equal length, the dimensions of which are not recorded. The characters are Nagari of the twelfth century A.D. But in formation they are more ornamental than those of the other inscriptions found at the place. What is again worth noting is that several of the letters either show a crescent below their top-strokes or begin with a notch, as we find in the Dēogāth inscription of the time of Kiśṭivarmana.5

Palaeographically, we may note the formation of k, which, as the first member of a conjunct consonant, loses its loop on the left side, as in Dikshita in I, 1; th is formed as a vertical bar assuming the shape of a loop on the left by the sudden bend of its lowest extremity, as in Thakkura, I, 1; th is represented by two loops placed vertically, as in Prithvadhara, I, 1; dh has developed a horn on its left limb, along with the top-stroke, as in the same example. Attention may also be drawn to the proper sign of b as distinguished from v, and to the form of bh, both in babhuva, I, 2; to that of s in Nyāsiṇha, I, 3, and to that of r in Ravan, I, 4.

The language of the record is Sanskrit, which is generally correct. The consonant t in Sahnavat, I, 4, is not marked; and a kāko-pada sign appears to have been engraved at the end of line 2.6

The purpose of the inscription is to record the construction of an image of Nyāsiṇha, the same deity beside which the record was found, by a Thakkura whose name was also Nyāsiṇha.

1 Originally mma, changed to śma.
2 The letters and figures cut here are only to complete the line. What may possibly be guessed here is that the akshara chha is intended to show, with a floral design on either of its sides.
3 For the situation and antiquities of the place, see above, No. 110.
4 Above, No. 111.
5 The photograph shows a faint trace thereof.
He was a son of the Thākura Rādhā and a grandson of the Dikshita Prithvīdhara. This shows that the family names were not stereotyped in the locality in the twelfth century A.C., as also in Mālavā, as we have so often seen.

The last line of the record mentions the date, only in figures. It is Sunday, the ninth day of the dark half of Jyotisha of the (Vikrama) year 1192, which regularly corresponds to Sunday, the 26th April, 1136 A.C. for the Southern (Kārttiķādi) expired year and the Pūrṇimānta month.1

The record below also consists of four lines which are in bigger letters and written in a different hand. These letters do not show ornamentations in their top-strokes, as noted above. But here the noteworthy is the form of as in Rādhā in l. 2.

**TEXT**

**Above**

सिद्धम् [ll] वीलिसरपुडीगीरमसु: टकुर्वारा- 
लहो बरुवे [l] तथा तन्ने टकुर्वारासुम- 
[ले] अंककरङ्गविषाणु नृत्तिर्य बालयन- 
[ले] लिङ्ग [ll] संकलन(?) 1192 जोयटा द दिन 9 रशी [ll]

**Below**

सिद्धम् [ll] वीलिसरपुडीगीरसु: 
त: राधरा; [ll] लालुसुभ भु- 
नृत्तिर्य बालयन- 
तित: काराणित्रम(सम्) [ll]

**NO. 121; PLATE CXI-B**

AJAYGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1208

This inscription is incised on a jamb of the Upper Gate of the fort of Ajaygad3 the chief town of a tehsil in the Pannā District of the Vindhyā region of Madhya Pradesh. The record was discovered by General Cunningham in 1884-84, and he noticed it, with his own reading of the text and a rough translation thereof, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXII. p. 49 and Plate xii-A. From the same plate it is edited here.

---

2 From Plate x-D in Cunningham’s A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI.  
3 Expressed by symbol.  
4 Cunningham read the consonant of this akṣara as व, but on the plate is clear as taken here. He has, however, corrected the reading of the preceding title Thākura which was misread as Sarkura by the editor of the Bengal Asiatic Society’s Journal. See his A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI. p. 55, n.  
5 In the J. A. S. B. these akṣaras are read as काराणित्रमस्य, and Cunningham read them as parvan.  
6 The letters in the brackets are mutilated. Read गुलाबन.  
7 For काराणित्रम.  
8 Cunningham read this word as saud, but I find the first akṣara very distinct as taken here. Also see Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX. p. 178, No. 125.  
9 Expressed by symbol.  
10 As n. 6 above.  
11 The antiquities of this place are described by Cunningham in his A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, pp. 46 ff.
The record occupies an oblong shape, more in height than in breadth, and consists of 18 lines, the last of which is about half in length of the others. Each of the lines contains about ten letters, but in a few instances, this number goes up to fourteen. The dimensions of the writing are not recorded. The inscription is in a good state of preservation.

The characters are of the Nāgari alphabet of the 12th century A.C. Attention may be drawn to the formation of k which loses the loop when it is the first member of a conjunct consonant, e.g., in kṣaṭriya, l. 4; to the consonant gg appearing as gu, as in some of the inscriptions of the time, e.g., in durgāyi, l. 2; and finally, to the form of dh resembling r, as in dhṛṣṭadrāha, l. 18, also showing a curved horn above its left limb, and not joined to it but to the vertical of the letter, as in Mahādhara, l. 10. Some of the letters cannot be easily recognised and some others are cramped, e.g., the vowel a in Rāiṣṭra and the conjunct grā in grāmīya, both in l. 5. The other instances are drawn attention to in the text and the foot-notes appended to it.

The language is Sanskrit, and the record is all in prose. As to the general orthographical peculiarities, we may note the use of the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in sanu, l. 2, and vice versa, in Sāmavāja, for Sāmavāja, in ll. 13-14, which is obviously due to the local pronunciation of the name. The record was carelessly drafted, and the vertical bar is used to separate names in ll. 4, 10 and 11. The local influence is throughout visible, particularly in proper names.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the illustrious Madanavarman, who is undoubtedly the Chandella king bearing the same name and reigning from about 1129 to 1163 A.C. The record opens with the year 1208 (given in figures only), which must be taken as of the Vikrama era, and the titri was the 15th of Mārga, i.e., Mārgaśīrsha, when it was a Saturday. The date as calculated by Cunningham himself, regularly corresponds to the 10th November, 1151 A.C. The year was Northern Vikrama, expired, and the month pūrṇimanta

The purpose of the record cannot be definitely made out, but from the expression pratipādāvali kriyā in l. 7, and also from the use of the word kṣetra in l. 16, it appears to mention some donation which was perhaps made in a shan-yuddh, i.e., 6. The gift was to be enjoyed by the public of the fort of Jayapura, i.e., Ajayagadh, where the inscription was found. The donor was the illustrious Rāiṣṭra Veda, who was a Kṣatriya by caste, a son of the Rāiṣṭra Jajapāla and a resident of the village of Kōrā. The names of the illustrious Śrī-karaṇa and Thakkura Gahēsvara (?), the illustrious Thakkura Jālhaṇa, the illustrious Thakkura Mahādhara and the illustrious Thakkura Pāsala, and some others are also recorded; possibly these persons were witnesses. In l. 12 the record also shows the figures 13 and 52, the significance of which cannot be made out; possibly they represent the numbers of persons who were present on the occasion; and that they were residents of some neighbouring villages, we can make out from Sānkāli, figuring as the name of a place in another record also.

It is stated in the last line that the record was engraved by the mason Sūpraṇa. Nothing of importance can be gleaned from the inscription, except that it offers an intermediate date for the Chandella king Madanavarman, who was on the throne from about 1129 to 1163 A.C., as already seen above.

As for the names of the places occurring in the inscription, Jayapura (l. 2) is evidently Ajayagadh where the stone was found. This name and not Ajayagadh is invariably to be seen in the Chandella inscriptions. The villages of Kōtī (l. 4) and Sānkāli (l. 12), which appear from the description to have been in its neighbourhood cannot be identified. It may be suggested, however, that about 16 km. due southwest of the find-spot of the inscription is a village bearing the name Kōrā and it is not unlikely that this place may have been intended. The name bears some resemblance to that appearing in the inscription, though philologically it cannot be connected with it. It may also be connected with that of kōṭi-tīra, at kālaṇjār, appearing in No. 108, l. 15.
1 सिंहम्रूँ[१] संवत्त(व) १२०८ मार्ग वदि १५
2 व(व)मो। अवपृणपणा स-?
3 मछलीकान राजउँकोके-?
4 द ५ अन्वितकाव्यकोविदा। ४
5 [वा]भीरातकसोजीणग-?
6 लुभु अनोऽक्रीडाहुँ ६ सि-?
7 रोज्येन प्रतिवादन। काने?
8 तदनलरूँ श्रीकरणग-?
9 तक्षा राजीवराजस्त्र रोड-?
10 जन्मग-؟। जुँ ज्ञानिहिमार। १०-?
11 का राजीवाण। सरेड। लाहुराधा। ११-?
12 तिमुन ११ संकेर्वाण ५२
13 पतीरनीय वेतेथकर। १२ श्रीव(सो)\
14 माराजय वमोविहितम। १५ वा-?
15 मोह भार्यपापा अवधार। १४ शण-?
16 संवेदनाय द्वार। ११। राज्येन च श्री-?
17 सम्मदनवमण। १३। श्री।?
18 लुख(व)र्बार द्वारूँ १२।। ११-?

---

1 From Plate xii-A in Cunningham's A.S.I. R., Vol. XXI.
2 Expressed by a variant of the symbol.
3 The 'राजो' here, as in some of the lines below, is used only to separate the names, as in some other records of the house.
4 Cunningham read a superscript r on the penultimate letter in this line: but in the plate it is missing on this letter, though in some other instances the रङ्ग is distinct e.g. in Nos. 158 and 157, in the fifth line of each.
5 Cunningham read अनुमता, which gives no meaning here. What looks like the sign of anuvāra on a is merely a fault of the stone, or a scratch, when compared with the other marks throughout the inscription.
6 That is, in shum-fight.
7 Cunningham read Sirohāyaṇa pratiśatānam utam Bhadrāvanī, which gives no meaning. He also translated a part of the expression as "built a (Stūthi)?" The meaning of this word is still not known, but the third case makes me inclined to suggest that it should be combined with आनु.
8 The sign of the medial आ on the fourth letter in the name is probably intended for the preceding letter.
9 The sign of anuvāra appears to have been wrongly put on this aśkara. There should be a visarga, or the word should not have a nibhakta, as the others below. See the next w.
10 As stated above, all the names in this line and below, appear without a case-ending and separated by a horizontal stroke.
11 The last two letters in this line cannot be definitely made out, and here I follow Cunningham who took them one and read as given here.
12 The first of the द्रजा is joined to the preceding aśkara, so as to look as the sign of medial ।
13 The meaning of this expression is not known. The reading too is not certain.
14 As above. The reading of a is doubtful. Cunningham took it as vi but gave no sense.
15 The third letter in this line appears more likely to be eka, followed by a द्रजा; but it gives no meaning.
16 That is, तहक्षरा.
17 Possibly the second letter of the name is पा, for which compare da, the second aśkara in 1. 8, above.
B - AJAYGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1208

From Facsimile
T

HIS inscription is incised on the pedestal of a Jaina statue which is exhibited in the Horniman Museum. It was published by Kielhorn, with a reproduction of the figure, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1898, pp. 101 f., and Plate. The image is of Neminatha, the twenty-second Tirthankara, as can be recognised from the cognisance conch-shell, carved on its breast and also on the pedestal; and the total height is reported to be equal to 91.44 cms., and the width at the base, to 71.12 cms. The inscription is edited here from its facsimile in the photograph accompanying Kielhorn's article.

The record consists of three lines, the first of which is unusually larger than the other two. It is well preserved. The characters are Nāgarī of the twelfth century, to which the record belongs. The language is Sanskrit, which is grammatically incorrect; and the record is in prose. With reference to orthography, we may note the use of the dental sibilant for the palatal, e.g., in Vaisākhī, and also that of the consonant m for the anusvāra in Saṁvat, both in I. 1.

The object of the inscription is to record the installation of the image, on the pedestal of which it is incised, by the Śrīśilāhī Māhāva of the Graha-pati lineage, and his homage to the deity by him, along with some of the members of his family. The date, as mentioned in numerical figures, at the beginning, is Thursday, the 5th of the dark half of Vaisākhā of Saṁvat 1208. As calculated by Kielhorn, it corresponds, for the Kārttikādi Vikrama year, expressed, and the pūrṇimāta Vaisākhā, to Thursday, the 27th March, 1152 A.C., when the 5th rāhi of the dark half ended about 5 h. 57 m. after mean sunrise. The date is quite regular.

The original find-spot of the image is unknown, nor is any king named therein. However, a guess in this respect may be hazarded here. The family known as Graha-pati flourished at Khajurāho, as we are informed by one of the following inscriptions (No. 124) which bears the date V. 1215, only seven years later than that of the present inscription; and, as noted by Kielhorn, the names figuring in it are similar to those of the Sēmā grant of Paramārdin, showing a very strong possibility that the image under reference was originally found in the Vindhyā region, and very probably somewhere in the vicinity of Khajurāho itself, from where it may have sailed to London, where Horniman purchased it in 1895, as Kielhorn was informed by Quick, the then curator of that Museum.

The family referred to in the inscription belonged to Madhālapura. In the text given by him, Kielhorn3 corrected this name to Mandalapura; but this correction is not free from doubt for there is also a possibility that the consonant of the second akṣara may have been intended to be h, its left-hand curve being either altogether omitted or engraved so lightly that it could not come out in the photograph. If this be the case, the reading of the name would be Mahālapura, which appears to be identical with Mahēvā, a village about 10 kms. north by west of Chhatarpur and in the very close proximity of Khajurāho itself, which may have been the original provenance of the statue. Following this line of thought, we may take the image to have been engraved during the reign of the Chandella king Madanavarmā who was on the throne from 1129 to 1165 A.C.

---

3 From the construction it is not clear whether this name is given here only to show the genealogy, or that the person denoted by it was also one of the participants for setting the image.
4 J. R. A. S., 1898, p. 102. Also see J. N. I., No. 285.
5 Below, No. 126.
6 Kielhorn, op. cit.
7 For a parallel case, cf. the incision of the last letter in line 1.
HIS inscription was discovered by Alexander Cunningham in the working season of 1883-84, at Mahóbá in the Hamírpur District of Uttar Pradesh. It is inscribed on the pedestal of a statue with a shell (conch) symbol, showing the figure to be of Némináthá, and consists of two lines. Cunningham published an eye-copy of the record, together with an indifferently transcript of the lower line, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI, p. 73, with Plate xxiii-D. The present whereabouts of the statue, on the pedestal of which the record is incised, are not known, and thus it is not possible to have an impression thereof. Therefore, I edit the inscription here, for the first time, from the eye-copy published by Cunningham.

The characters belong to the Nágári alphabet. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is in prose. It is not known how far the eye-copy published by Cunningham is trustworthy, but we can say that the letter dh differs from n only in that it is devoid of the top-stroke, as in sádhā, l. 1; th is formed of two loops placed below each other; cf. náthá, l. 2; and r shows two different forms in the same word Rápakára, l. 2. The orthography does not call for any special remark, except that sh is written in place of kh in the name Lákhaṇa. The mistakes of engraving will be noticed in the foot-notes appended to the text.

The inscription mentions the name of the illustrious ruler Madanavarmans, who was no doubt the homonymous Chadéllá king (1129-1165 A.C.), as also shown by its provenance. Its object is to record the dedication of the image of Némináthá, whose symbol of conch-shell is engraved in the middle of the lines. The image was made by the Rápakára Lákhaṇa and it was consecrated by Gálhú, the son of sádhá Lákhu, who was, in his turn, the son of sádhá Sáthá.

The date of the record, as given only in figures in the second line, is Saturday, the third day of the bright half of Ashaśátha of 1211 of the (Vikrama) era; and, as calculated, it regularly corresponds to Saturday 4th June, 1155 A.C. The record gives an intermediate date for the king Madanavarmans, and thus it is not of any historical importance except that it shows that Jainaism was popular among some classes of people at that time.

1 From photograph.
2 Read सच.
3 I have given here the name as read by Kielhorn. But also see n. 3 on the preceding page.
4 The names are all without the case-suffixes which are marked by me only as could be conjectured.
5 This possible correction is adopted from Kielhorn's reading.
6 This word here means "all together."
7 For the situation of the place and its antiquities, see above, No. 113.
8 See J. N. L., No. 295.
C - MAHÔBA IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1211

From Facsimile

KHAJURÂHO IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1215

Scale: Five-sixth
This inscription was discovered by Sir A. Cunningham and was first brought to notice by him in his Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. II (1862-63), p. 435.

He also published its transcript and a specimen of letters employed in it, in ibid., Vol. XXI (for 1883-84 and 1884-85), p. 61, and Pl. xx-D. The inscription was then edited by Kielhorn in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I (1888), pp. 152 f., where he gave his own reading of the text from an impression supplied by the late Dr. Burgess. But the article is not illustrated. The inscription is edited here from an impression placed at my disposal by the Chief Epigraphist for India.1

The inscription is incised on the top of the pedestal of a colossal stone image, seated, of the third Jaina pontiff, Sambhavamātā, in a small ancient Jaina temple dedicated to Adinātha at Kajurāhā in the Chhatarpur District of the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. The record consists of a single line divided into two parts by a boss showing the seated figure of a horse,2 to right, in a rectangle of a beaded border, with a petal-like object on either side, the whole design occupying a space 6 cms. broad by 3-5 cms. high. The first part of the writing measures 48-8 cms. and the second 43-4 cms. The average size of the letters is 1 cm. The inscription is in a good state of preservation.

The characters belong to the twelfth century A.D., and are precisely of the same type as to be found in the Chandella inscriptions of the age. What is worth noting in this respect is that the form of dh is devoid of the horn on its left limb, as in śidh, and the form of the subscript ṛ is complete, with the former member of the conjunct half-drawn, of which ṛt-putrā is the only instance and prabhīṣ is a probable exception. The medial short u attached to r has the same form as when attached to other letters; cf. -raha, and this consonant, appearing all the three times in the end, shows a loop with a wedge attached to it.

The language is incorrect Sanskrit and the inscription is in prose. In respect of orthography, we note the use of s for ś, only in one instance (-varīś), the doubling of a consonant following r, as in varma, the medial ṛ denoted both by the prīṣṭha- and the ardha-śāstra, the wrong use of an anusvāra in the end, and, lastly, the use of the local element in the name Sirihandra for Śrī-Chandra.

---

1 From Cunningham's eye-copy (Plate xxiii-D) in A.S.I. R., Vol. XXI.
2 The symbol appears as the letter dh, and almost resembles the one in No. 117.
3 What is intended is gajāla, as it figures in No. 190, l. 1.
4 Read ṛtu-
5 The last two akharas also appear to form a name as some others in this inscription. All the names are without the case-endings.
6 This is, maṅgās.
7 There is an ornamentation between the double dāṇḍas, and a couch after the figures showing the tilīka.
9 For the location and archaeological importance of this place, see No. 97, above.
10 This is the laṅkhana of Sambhavamātā.
It is a sectarian inscription; and the object of it is to record the dedication of a statue, on the pedestal of which it is engraved, by Sādhulu Sālhē, who was a son of Pāhilla of the grahapati family and a grandson of Ṛṣāśhīhin Dēhu. Incidentally, the record also mentions Sālhē’s sons vic., Mahāgaṇa, Mahīchandra, Śrī (Śrī) chandra, Jīnachandra and Udāyachandra. The image, as we are also told, was dedicated during the prosperous reign of the illustrious Madanavarmadeva; and though the record is silent in mentioning the name of the family of the king, he is evidently the Chandella ruler of that name, whose inscriptions we have from V.S. 1186 to 1220 or 1129 to 1168 A.C. This view is supported by the fact of the inscription in a reign which is known to have been under him.

The date of the inscription is stated to be the fifth day of the bright half of Māgha(basanapachi) of Sāmvat 1215, which, as a year of the Vikrama era, corresponds to (1157-58 A.C.), and fits exactly into the reign period of Madanavarmar.

The chief interest of the inscription lies in its mention of the name Pāhilla and his genealogy for four generations. Dr. D.C. Sircar takes him to be probably identical with the homonymous Jaina minister under Kirtivarman mentioned in the Darbat inscription dated in V.S. 1132; and the present record which was inscribed eighty-three years subsequently and which mentions the dedication of an image by his son goes to confirm the probability. The name Pāhilla we have also met before in a Jaina temple inscription at Khajurāh, dated V.S. 1011, where he is stated to have been a devout Jaina who was honoured by King Dhanaśa, but we are unable to say anything about the relationship of both these persons though they appear to belong to the same family. The name of this family also occurs in an inscription from Khajurāh itself.

TEXT

1 सिद्धर् ||विक्रेता || तूनि ॥ श्रीमान्यदवामेष्वरवर्मानवर्मः || राजे ॥ सहारितसे || अश्वदेशोऽनुसंधानकितः || पाधिगृहागान्तात्राणम् || राजमा कारतणिति || तुम्हः || महामया || महीचंद्र || विचरिदिद्रश्च || जिनचंद्र || उदयचंद्रशृंगितः || संभाकायं वा || विवर्णाय वा || सुभिन्दुयय || स्वनिष्ठाय || क्रान्तारंमेवः ||

No. 125: No Plate

MAU STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

(Fragmentary)

The stone which contains this inscription is stated to have been found in 1818, "at the foot of a rocky hill in the vicinity of the town of Mau, also spelt as Mhau, in the Jhānī District" of Uttar Pradesh. Lieutenant William Price, who discovered it, published a transcript and translation of the inscription in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XII, pp. 537 ff., and

---

1 The date cannot be verified. For the Northern V year, current, it would correspond to Thursday, 17th January, 1157 and for the expired, to Tuesday, 7th January, 1158 A.C.
3 Above, No. 99, v. I.
4 See Kielhorn’s article in Ep. Ind., Vol. I, No. VIII. This family is also mentioned in No. 122, above, in J. N. I., No. 99, and in a Kāhashrī inscription of 1019 A.C., where the reading is Graha-pati-kalakāra-vasiṣṭha. The origin of the name cannot be satisfactorily explained. It signifies the sun, and not the moon, as taken by Mirashi, in C. I. I., Vol. IV, p. 233 and n. II, where it is taken perhaps as a mistake for Graha-pati in the sense of ‘a house-holder’, or, the ‘head of a village’. The word may also be connected with the modern surname Gahi, members of which family now reside in parts of Bundelkhand.
5 From a rubbing supplied by the Chief Epigraphist.
6 Expressed a variant of the symbol.
7 The danulas are redundant.
8 Between the double danula is engraved the figure of a horse to right, within a design.
9 Drop the danula separating the names and read नसु.
also presented the stone to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which subsequently transferred it to the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The inscription was also edited, without any lithograph, by Dr. F. Kielhorn in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. I (1888), pp. 195 ff. The stone has since then become untraceable, and as an estampage of the inscription is also now not forthcoming, I give below the transcript of it, made by Kielhorn, with minor changes so as to suit the system adopted here, and also adding my notes to it.

"The inscription, so far as I can judge from the impression, consists of 29 lines. The writing covers a space about 4"x6½" (1.37 metres) broad by 3½" 1½" (1.4 metres) high, and a considerable portion of it is greatly damaged. Thus, the last line is almost completely effaced, and portions of about half the number of lines are "either gone altogether or have become illegible."

This damage is of course due to the weather to which the stone remained exposed for long, but probably more due to the fact, as noted by Lt. Price himself, that "the natives were accustomed to sharpen their knives and talwars upon it."

The letters, which are of the size of 2½ cms., were noted to be similar in style to those of the inscriptions from Ayapagah and Mahôba, of which photo-lithographs are published in Cunningham's *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. XXI, Pls. xv and xxi-xxii. The present inscription also shares the peculiarity that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the letters g, n and m.

The language is Sanskrit, and the existing portion of the record is in verse throughout. It contains 49 verses in different metres, including also the rare Sīvāgata and still more rare the Ayapachechhandasaka. The verses are not numbered. The style is classical, often reminding us of the poets of old and using figures of speech also. With reference to orthography, we may note that (1) b is denoted by the sign of v except in a few instances occurring in ll. 3, 4, 18, 21 and 25; (2) the consonant following r is not often doubled, e.g., in *dārpa*, l. 3; (3) the sign of *avaguna* is used to show the elision of a in the preceding e or o, and occasionally also in *dirgha-sandhi*, e.g., in *sīvāvānas*, l. 16; and finally, (4) the dental n is used instead of the sign of *anuvāra* in *vahānā*, l. 10, *vāna*, ll. 11 and 23, *mīnāsaka*, l. 11, and *vaṅgāna*, l. 19; and the word *ujjvala* appears with a single j in ll. 13 and 15 but not in l. 16.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Madanavarman, (who belonged to the Chandella dynasty of Mahôba). The proper object of it is to record the construction of a temple of Vishnu, the building of a tank and the execution of some other works of piety, by one of his Ministers, who appears to have been Gadâdharara. The date and the names of the poet and the engraver, which may have been given in the concluding lines, appear to be lost.

The inscription is a pratasti, and, as customary, may be divided into two parts. The first part, which consists of vv. 1-16, gives an account of the ancestors of Madanavarman, during whose reign the record was incised and put up, and the rest of the record, consisting of verses 17 ff., describes the genealogy of the minister and the object in hand. After two manjala-śikhas in praise of Vishnu, the poet proceeds to state the pedigree of the ruling king Madanavarman, from Dhânga, who is stated to have defeated the king of Kânyakubja (v. 3). Dhangâ's son was Gandadera (v. 4), his grandson, Vidyâdharara (v. 5) and his great-grandson was Vijayapâla (v. 6), whose son, again, was Krittivarman, who is stated to have vanquished his enemies (v. 8). The names of the enemies are not mentioned here, but this statement probably refers to his defeat of the Kalachuri Kârya, as seen above. Dêvavarman, who was the elder brother of Krittivarman, is not mentioned in the present inscription, as he was a collateral. Krittivarman's son was Sallakshanavarman (vv. 9-10), and the latter's son was Jayavarman (v. 11), who was succeeded by his younger brother Prithivarman. The last named king was again succeeded by his son, Madanavarman, who, as stated in the present inscription, defeated the kings of Chêdi and Mîlava, and "through dread of whom the king of Kâṣi passed his time in friendly behaviour."

The Chêdi or Kalachuri king, referred to as defeated by Madanavarman, appears to be no other than his contemporary Gayâkarna who was ruling from circa 1123 to 1153 A.C. A hoard of Madanavarman's silver coins found at Panwar in the Tênubhahr tehsil of the former Rewa State and now a district of the same name may be taken to suggest that Gayâkarna, who had

---

7 Nos. 150, 119 and 136, respectively.
8 As we generally find in the copper-plates engraved by Pâlha, for which see below, Nos. 120, 129-132 and 134.
9 See above, No 113.
10 *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. X (N.S.), pp. 199 f. This, of course, is not a strong evidence.
held the region around Teouchar, lost it to the Chandella king; and thus the claim stated in favour of Madanavarman in the present inscription may be supported. About his conflict with the king of Mālava, reference may be invited to the former's Augasi grant, edited above, where we have seen that the Paramara king vanished by the Chandella ruler was no other than Yaśōvarman, the son of Naravarman.

The king of Kāśi, who too is referred to in the present inscription, is evidently either Govindachandra of the Gadāvā dynasty, the dates of whose reign range from 1114 to 1154 A.C., or his son Vijayachandra (1154-1170 A.C.). Both these rulers were contemporaries of Madanavarman; and the statement of the inscription, as rightly pointed out by Dr. S. K. Mitra, merely goes to suggest that the Chandella and the Gadāvā rulers realised the strength of each other and may have formed a sort of alliance for mutual peace.²

The second part of the inscription, which commences with v. 17, gives the genealogy of the person who constructed the temple and also made some other benefactions. This account is traced back to the creator of the world, i.e., Brahmā, whose son was Āgiras; and in his lineage was born the holy sage Gautama, also known as Akṣhapāda, who is credited with expounding the Nyāya system of philosophy (vv. 18-19). In course of time, in this family was born Prabhāsa, who was held in high esteem, as the holy shrine at Prabhāsa (v. 20). He was the chief minister of Dhaṅga and Gandā (vv. 20-22). His son was Śrīnāgā, who resembled Brhaspati and who was the minister (sachar) under Vidyādhara (vv. 23-24).³ His son was Mahāpāla who was chief minister under Vijayaśālang (vv. 25-26). From Mahāpāla were born Ananta and Yogeśvara; and the former, who was the master of elephants and horses, was appointed minister by the king Kṛṣṇavarman (vv. 27-32). Mahāpāla had two wives—Aṣārā was one of them, and the other's name is lost in v. 34. He had many sons. Mahāpāla continued as minister under Siddhakṣaṇavarman also. One of his sons, Vatsa by name, was appointed Pratīhāra by Jayavarman (v. 40), and another son, probably Gadādhara by name, was the chief minister of Prithivivarman and continued in the same position under Madanavarman (vv. 41-42) also.

All the persons mentioned above are highly eulogised in the present record, but the description is entirely conventional, hardly furnishing any historical information. It may also be noted here, that the names of the kings are repeated in the present record in the same order in which they appear in the earlier part thereof. After describing this long line of the hereditary ministers and other officers, and also mentioning two of Gadādhara's sons, viz., Śrīdharma and Vidyādharma, in v. 45, the inscription goes on to narrate his (Gadādhara's) charitable deeds. Besides constructing the temple of Nārāyana in v. 46, which stood apparently at the place where the stone was originally found, he is also credited with building a tank with broad stones (v. 47), a cistern (?) with dressed stones on the boundary of the village Dēdu (v. 48), and a stepped well in the vicinity of a place, the name of which appears to be Kēndi (v. 49). The rest of the inscription is lost.

Of the geographical names figuring in the inscription, Antarvedi (v. 38) is the region between the Gaṅgā and Yamunā, and Prabhāsa (v. 20) is the famous place of pilgrimage, at Vērśval in Santāṣṭra, as also noted by Kiellhorn. The villages Dēdu and Kēndi as already suggested by the same scholar, must have been somewhere in the vicinity of the find-spot of the inscription. I am, however, unable to identify them.

---

¹ Above, No. 119.
² E. B. K., pp. 116 f.
³ It may be noted here that v. 17, which begins the account of the ancestors of Gadādhara, uses the word mahāmālī which denotes a chief minister.

[The name missing here before nāma may have been śreṣṭhī. Similarly, the first two aśkaraś in the next line may have been sthānā. The lost portion of this verse may conjecturally be restored as bhūta-śrīpratītyahūnāḥ śahān aśvinītaśvatāraḥ.]
7. न[क]णिप्रोज्ञादिने द्रवस्यांत्यात्मकेः च चावतानां सदस्य विभवः नाथस्वरूपोपनम: ||[१२९]||।

8. रज्जुः। अब मुखीप्रमुखपु: कुर्णप्रस्वरुपको बुधः ||[१२९]||। अविश्वसने दृश्ये भूमिप्रभातिः पावनविहृतः जिष्युषा अर्थमयोऽविविधतेऽर्थं विभवेण्याम्। परा (४) दृश्ये भूतेषु न किनाश्यस्यते बृहद्देवे शुद्धिप्रवर्तितस्मिनस्थिरः को ||[१२९]||। अस्मि मनवमपुराके विद्वेशुविमुक्तविकालोऽविकालोऽविमोचनः तस्माद॥

9. भूतं(६)कर्मालोकः वसयः भृगुव्रत्मका जननिमाणः ||[१२९]||। ज्ञेयद्विप्रेय नेकः।

10. कामायने बबक्षुभपुण्यपुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

11. भूतं(६)कर्मालोकः वसयः पुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

12. कामायने बबक्षुभपुण्यपुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

13. सब्बवीणामुङ्गीषुमातुर्मानोऽध्यानमकेत्तिरि: वध्यूः गंदन च मृत्युः त्वः। नवप्रवेधोऽध्यानमवध्यूः शरीयः।

14. कामायने बबक्षुभपुण्यपुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

15. कामायने बबक्षुभपुण्यपुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

16. कामायने बबक्षुभपुण्यपुष्टीस्वितकादमुखुः। सिमायथे रक्षयते। समसत्यैः सृष्टि न च तेन शुभान्धु(अ)लोकः।

* The Isana may conjecturally be filled in by सर; गृहः.
* Figure of speech: रीक्षका. The idea expressed in this stanza is apparently based on नृषद्यीयाचार्यता. Canto XII, v. 66.
* As already pointed out by Kiedhorn, it is an allusion to Gautama's other name Akshapada.
* Ḍपास्त्रेः means rest of hands. Cf. धारमस्पादनस्तवप्रतिष्ठा: वर्तमाब्धो सचिन्नपत्रिपार्वत्य (कःका पुराणे), ३.
* त्रिवृंगो is धर्मा (virtue), अर्थ (wealth) and कामा (pleasure), as also noted by Kiedhorn. The idea expressed in this verse appears to have been borrowed from the शिवापीतका, II. 80.
The letters omitted here in Kielhorn's reading may have been -समावेश- or similar to them. He also takes - रामच- as one word but it cannot be construed in the verse.
1 That is, Yudhishthira. The first three akṣaraś are of the next stanzas may conjecturally be supplied as प्राप्ति(स्म).
2 The missing akṣaraś may be conjecturally restored as भागवन् तव तेषामाले
3 Metrically गा would suit here.
4 The three missing akṣaraś here may have been देवोदर्षी.
5 This foot shows wrong pause by separating the first three akṣaraś from the fourth of the name.
6 Cf. Skandaś, II, 93.
NO. 126: PLATE CXIII

SEMRA COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF PARAMARDIDÉVA

[ Vikrama Year 1229 ]

THE plates on which this record is engraved are said to have been found in September 1892, at SEMRA, a village in the former State of Bihāwar which is now the chief town of a tehsil in the Chatarpur District of the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. The actual circumstances of their discovery are not known, but it is stated that the plates were presented to the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, by the Chief of Bihāwar, through the Political Agent at Nowgong. The inscription was brought to notice by A. Führer who took impressions, and sent the same to Professor Buhler; and from these impressions the record was edited by W. Castellier, with facsimiles of the first two sides out of four in all, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV (1896-97), pp. 153 ff. The inscription is edited here from two sets of impressions prepared and made

---

1 This verse appears to have a pun in the word Gadhāla, also meaning Vishnu, but unfortunately it is much lost.
2 It is easy to conjecture the two aksharas अभि here so as to complete the verse.
3 The first akshara appears to have been ṛṣ in view of the following.
4 As for these aksharas, Kielhorn noted that they may possibly be read on the original, but in the absence of it, I suggest अभि here, which also suit the metre.
5 Kielhorn has noted that at the end of 1.25 some of the aksharas are completely lost and it is not possible to know whether there was more writing after 1.25. But I think the poet's name and the year of the record may have been given here, as is usually the case.
6 The village lies in the extreme south-west borders of the pargana, about 32 kms. south-west of Bihāwar. It is about 15 kms. west of Shāhāghāth, a Police-station in the Sāgar District, and about 50 kms. south-east of Lalitpur; a tehsil in the Jhānsi District and a station between Vīshāla and Jhānsi on the Central Railway.
over to me, at my request, by the Director of the Museum at Lucknow, to whom my thanks are due.

The record is on three massive plates of copper, large in size, each measuring about 65.75 cms. broad by 49.50 cms. high. All round the rims, flat bands apparently of copper and about 1 cm. broad, are fastened, by rivets, on the inscribed side of each of them, so as to approach quite close to the writing and occasionally hiding a part of a letter here and there. Each plate contains a hole, 2 cms. in diameter and interrupting the continuity of writing in the middle of one or three lines on each, at the top or bottom, apparently for a ring to pass through and hold them together. 1 The writing is also interrupted by a rectangular space, measuring 7 cms. each side and carved in the middle of the first five lines, containing a representation of the goddess Lakshmi, seated on a lotus and being sprinkled with water by an elephant on either side, as to be found generally on Chandella charters.

The second of the plates, which is full of Verdigris, is inscribed on both the sides and the rest two on the inner side only. The height of the individual letters is about 1 cm. The record consists of one hundred and twenty-four lines, twenty-nine of which are engraved on the first plate, thirty-one on the first side of the second, and the rest are equally distributed on the other side of the second and on the third plate. All the three plates together weigh 5 kgms. and 600 gms.

The writing is in a state of good preservation, except that one akshara here and another there is wholly or partially lost, though it can be supplied from the context. The letters on the middle portion of ll. 67-75 (on the reverse side of the second plate) are either slightly rubbed or are not deeply carved, probably in view of the fact that it bears letters on both the sides. The letters are well formed but not carefully cut, as to be shown below.

The characters are Nāgarī of the twelfth century A.D., resembling those of the Mahābhārata inscription of the time of Kṛttivarman, as already observed by Cartellieri, and as we may also note, those of the Bihāra-Kālī-Bhavan grant of Madanavarman, which was engraved about 30 years prior to the present inscription. 2 As regards the individual letters, attention may be drawn to the two forms of the vowel a, one, e.g., in Ajau, l. 74, and the other in Asutuha, l. 75, to the formation of k which is sometimes in ligature, e.g., in -dataka, occurring thrice in l. 7, to that of the conjunct ge engraved as gu, as in Bhārgavā, l. 29, and to that of ch and c, both of which are almost similar, e.g., in vācchā, l. 4, where we have both these aksharas quite alike. Whether ṵ had developed a dot or not cannot be clearly known; it however appears possible that the dot was marked in the original, but was engraved so lightly that it could not come out in the impression, as some other signs and parts of letters also. Dh is in a transitional state, sometimes appearing without a horn so as to resemble v, e.g., in sādhu, l. 10, whereas in a few instances it is engraved with a horn on its left limb; the horn is often slanting, as in adhaugā, l. 4, but occasionally it is curved and is either joined to the top of the vertical of the letter, e.g., in -adh-, l. 4, or to that of the mātā attached to it, e.g., in the same prefix in l. 2. The subscript form of this letter, however, is always devoid of the horn. Dh often resembles ṵ, of course by a wrong stroke, as in bhūta-bhavāsīyad, l. 10. R, which has generally assumed its modern Nāgarī form, is often confounded with v, e.g., in mārāvāra, l. 4, sometimes it ends in a wedge, as in gūtra, l. 31, and occasionally, it is only a vertical line with a stroke attached to its middle, on the left, as in Visvarūpa, l. 40. The subscript ṭ shows the full form of the letter with its superscript half-drawn, e.g., Chandrārcya, l. 1. It may also be noted here that some of the numerical symbols bear top-strokes as the aksharas. And lastly, a final consonant in some instances is either not clearly marked or is indicated by its smaller size.

1 Cartellieri observed that the plates were 'joined by a plain ring'. But I am informed by the Director of the Museum at Lucknow that the ring is missing. To give some more details which I noted in my personal examination of the plates, I found that strips of copper, 0.8 to 1 cm. broad, are fastened to each of the inscribed sides, with ten nails of copper, on each of the horizontal, and seven on each of the vertical sides, so as to show the thickness of the strips in the case of the first and the third plate to be 0.5 cm. each and in case of the second plate, which is inscribed on both the sides, it is almost double of this. All the rivets are still intact. The letters are fairly deep but do not show through on the back of the plates which are sufficiently thick.

2 In V.S. 1192. Above, No. 119.
Cartellieri has already drawn attention to the 'smooth' forms of some of the akṣaras; e.g., ādha, with the following danda in ll. 6 and 73, is engraved as pakē; k is occasionally engraved as p, e.g., in Kāladhāra, l. 93, and p as a perfect rectangle in pāda, l. 31. Instances of occasionally omitting limbs of letters are common, e.g., in Dāmādara, l. 110, m is cut as g; in pālākāti, l. 38, m is engraved as n, and in Vyāsthīka, l. 57 and in some other instances below (in ll. 115 and 116) the slanting stroke of ṣh distinguishing the letter from p is omitted, and in l. 123, alichāt appears as alich, without the curve of the mārā on the second of these akṣaras. The signs of amharīcī and of the superscript v are often omitted; and all such flaws make it difficult to ascertain the exact forms of the proper names which are numerous in the record and in which the influence of local elements is also thoroughly noticeable. To give one example only, in ll. 48 and 56 the consonants of the letters giving a name are so formed as to make it read as Dhāvaka, Viśāhaka, Vārṣhaka and Rājaka, etc.; and this sort of slen engraving is also responsible for the reading Viśā-gōtra in place of vatsa—the letter t appearing as a prīṣhata-mārā, as actually taken by Cartellieri without noticing the flaw.

The language is Sanskrit, which is occasionally incorrect, particularly in the long list of names of the donors which are all in their local forms, and also in the names of the villages. The record is in prose, except for the initial verse as to be found to commence the Chandella grants, one verse eulogising the donor in ll. 4-6, and five verses towards the end in ll. 120-24. The verses are not numbered. As regards orthographical peculiarities, we notice (1) the use of the sign for v to denote b as well, e.g., in vāda, l. 9; (2) a confusion between the dental and the palatal sibilant as in vatsandhara, l. 6, and sikhā, l. 15; (3) occasional reduplication of a class-consonant following r; see Pramāndri, l. 4, and also Chandārā, l. 16; (4) The wrong change of umāvāra to m, as in samāvat, l. 13; and finally, (5) the use of a prīṣhata-mārā with a few exceptions as in Keśava and gota, both in l. 82. The prīṣhata-mārā is often confounded with the vertical stroke, which is also used to show that the letter preceding it is a concise form (of a surname), and also confounded with the sign for medial a, e.g., in l. 59, we cannot make it certain whether the name is Jāhīda or Jāhada. (6) The danda is also often superfluous, e.g., after sō in vāsī, l. 13; sandhis are generally neglected in the formal portion of the record which abounds in names; and we have examples of wrong sandhis also, e.g., in chausthāna, ll. 36, 39, 40 and below; and in muṅgalom-mahārīth in the end (7). The Prākrit word sathā in the sense of 'belonging to' is used more than once, e.g., in l. 7 and below, besides some other Prākrit words as pārīcēla in l. 8 and Laṭā in l. 12, which are also occasionally to be seen; and, last of all, to mention (8) that the local element throughout prevails, not only in the names but also in some other instances, e.g., in the spellings of names as in Dharmaśāhada in l. 116, rishi for rishi in ll. 38 and below, sāmi for samē in l. 44, Yaivaśvāda for Yaivāśvāda in l. 62, and kriṃi for krīmi in l. 121. All these and such other errors have also been drawn attention to in the text in the cases of spotting or scoring off the original writings and also over-writing that we find occasionally.

The plates were issued by the Parama-bhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājāhāra and Paramēśvara, the illustrious Paramārdīdeva of the royal house of the Chandellas. The object is to record the confirmation of a grant, from his camp at Sōnasara, for the sake of the increase of his own and his parent's merit and fame, of the villages which had already been donated to certain Brahmānas by his grandfather, the illustrious Mahārājāhāra Madanavarma, from his camp at Vārīdṛuga on the fifteenth of the dark half of Māgha, Thursday, of the (Vikrama) era 1219. The day and the date correspond to Thursday, the 15th of February, 1162 A.C., taking the month to be amanta; but, as already aptly remarked by Cartellieri himself, the solar eclipse mentioned in the inscription did not take place on that day but on the preceding new-moon day, the 17th.

Some of these names can be traced to their original Sanskrit forms, e.g., Paṭaṇa, l. 39 and 94, to Pradhyuma, Tākama, l. 21 and TVāka, l. 25, to Trivikrama, and Viśu, l. 96, to Viṣṭhala. But the names like Aṇādha, l. 65, create a difficulty to ascertain whether it is a corrupt form of Aṇādha or Aṇādhara. It may be noted here that the suffix ha is often added to a name not ending in a, to form the genitive, e.g., in l. 31 we read not only Pithā-patra but also Pāḷhākāra, clearly showing an addition. The other examples of this type are Rīśikāra, l. 22, Dālākāra, l. 25 and Rāhakāra, l. 38.
January, and was visible all over India. Thus the reckoning was according to the parrāmāntha month, but according to it, the week-day was Wednesday. The date of the grant confirmed by Paramardin is stated in figures only: it was 7th of the bright half of Vaiśākha, Thursday, 1223 of the (Vikrama) era, which, following the southern expired year, regularly corresponds to 27th of April, 1167 A.C.

After the auspicious symbol followed by the verse eulogising the royal Chandella house and generally occurring at the commencement of the inscriptions of the house, the present grant gives the pedigree of the donor, introducing the Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārajaḍhapuraja and Parama-čīra, the illustrious Prithvivarman, his successor, the illustrious P.M.P. Madanavarman, and the latter's successor, the illustrious P.M.P. Paramardīvam, and says that he was a devout worshipper of Siva, and the sole lord of Kālaṉjra. Then, we have a verse which conventionally glorifies Paramardin and states that he excelled Cupid by his handsome form, the ocean by depth (soberness), the Sun by his lustre, Bṛhaspati by his wisdom and Yudhishṭhīra by his truthfulness. This verse is an exact copy of the one occurring in the corresponding portion of Madana- varman's Bhārat-Kalā-Bhavan grant. With reference to the genealogy occurring in the present grant, we have to observe that the names of the first two of the rulers mentioned here are already known from the other records of the house, and the present inscription supplements our knowledge by stating that Paramardin was the grandson of Madanavarman. The latter's son was Yāsivarman, whose name occurs only in the Bājēvara stone inscription of Paramardin; and whether he ruled or not will be seen while dealing with that inscription where there is a proper place for it.

The necessity for Paramardin to confirm the grant which was made by his grandfather Madanavarman in V.S. 1219, suggests that the latter may have died soon after the grant was made and it could not possibly be stabilised. Indeed, we have no record to show Madanavarman's name after this date. And the suggestion made here receives a strong corroboration from the fact that Madanavarman's last known year is V.S. 1220 or 1168 A.C.; and during his last days his attention may have been constantly required in driving off the Chaulukya army which under Jayasimha Siddhārja (1094-1148 A.C.) had already annexed the Paramāra dominions and began to invade the territories of the Chandellas, as we have already seen in the political history of the house.

The villages which were donated are mentioned in ll. 7 ff. They are:

1. In the district (vishaya) of Vikrama, Khāta-12, Tāya-12, belonging to Kāla, and Ḫāra-18, and Sēsayigrāma.
2. In the district (vishaya) of Dudhai, Pīlkhīya-paṭchēla (group of five) and Ijāva-paṭchēla.
3. In the district (vishaya) of Vadtavārī, Isarakara-paṭchēla, Udanda and Kākaraḍāha.
4. In Gokula (?), Hathihāḍā ll. 7-8.

The mention of the procedure of sanctioning the grant begins in ll. 10 ff.; it is all common, as stated in the other grants of the house and need not be repeated here. It is also stated here that the king donated all these villages with the exception of the following:— The town of Madanapura and the ground belonging thereto, (viz.) Gaḍdarakula, and the glorious deity Soma-nātha, further, the villages of Vadtavārī and Dudhai, the property belonging to Lāṅgī and Jalhāi connected with the town of Madanapura, and also a plot of land in it, measuring four ploughs which is the property of the Laṭāś and is connected with the Ajayasīgar (ll. 11-12).

The dunes are mentioned in ll. 17 ff. Their total number was 309 and they had immigrated from the various agrahāras of learned persons (bhāṭṭagrahāra) and belonged to the various

---

1 Op. cit., p. 156. It may be remarked here that the charity in honour of a lunar eclipse is given actually on the next day when the eclipse is over. Also see I.N.I., No. 313, n.
2 See J.N.I., No. 325.
3 Above, No. 119, text II. 4-6. It may be observed here that the present grant copied many of its expressions from the same.
4 By the use of the expression 'samāt-piṣṭhākha' in ll. 13.
5 Vide the Mahābali Jāma Tuṣaī inscription, Cunningham's A.S.I., Vol. II., p. 448, No. 25. It is not traceable now.
6 Also see the Kālaṉjra stone inscription of Yiravārman (undated), No. 148, below, which, claims that Madanavarman defeated the king of Gūrja (i.e., Jayasimha).
gōtra. It is interesting to note that this list also includes a general and a pātihāri (ll. 19-20), who appear to have been Brāhmaṇas like the others. Most of the Brāhmaṇas were also distinguished by their surnames which were subject to change from father to son in the period to which the grant belongs.

The names of the donees are arranged according to their Vedas, gōtras, fathers' names with their surnames given in an abbreviated form, followed by their own names with surnames in the abbreviated form, each of these being separated by a vertical stroke, and in the end is the mention of the share (pada) which he received. This procedure is occasionally deviated, e.g., in l. 74, where more than one donee is mentioned together; and also in ll. 113 and 115 where their names are jointly mentioned with the expression saṃbhārē. Another point that is worth noting here is that in l. 115 the number of the Brāhmaṇas mentioned in a group is written 82, in figures, and after the use of the expression saṃbhārē, the shares which were really 41, as each of them was to receive a half, are mentioned to be 43, both in figures and words. It is thus evident that the remaining two shares consisted of land to be left fallow between the two adjoining fields.

The gift was perpetual and was to be enjoyed by the donees and their sons and grandsons, in their turn. The conditions of the grant are mentioned in ll. 115-120; they are all usual, as to be found in the other Chandelā grants. Following this, we have four beneficent and imprecatory verses in ll. 120-22, and then the sign-manual of the king in l. 123. This is followed by a verse giving the name of Prithvīdharā who wrote the document 'with distinct and elegantly formed characters and under the order of the king. Prithvīdharā is stated to have belonged to the Vāsāva family of the exalted name, who had performed meritorious acts and possessed all good qualities and who was the writer of religious documents. A prose portion in the end states that the grant was incised by the brazier Pābhana, and with the expressions meaning "auspiciousness, great fortune," the inscription comes to a close.

Most of the place-names occurring in the present inscription have already been identified. Vikauṟa, which is probably the same as Vikrami of the Gārhaḫ plātes of Tīrākṣyavarman, is Beekore of the maps, situated in N.1. 24°15' and E.1. 78°41' in Sāgar District. It is about 6 kms. south-west of Madanapura. Khatadā (Khotoura) and Sēsay (Sajce?), as noted by Cartellieri, lie south-east of Beekore. Dudhāi, mentioned as the principal town of another territorial division of the grant, is the modern place retaining its name in the form of Dūhāi (N.1. 24°26' E.1. 78°27') and the find-spot of the inscriptions of Kris ṇupa, Dhangā's brother. Itāva as suggested by Cartellieri, is the modern Etāvah (N.1. 24°12' E.1. 78°16'). While proposing this identification he had some doubt, but his conjecture is justified by the consideration that the place lies about 80 kms. south-west of Dūhāi i.e., the modern Bīrā, a railway junction between Bhōpāl and Jhāōli and is known by its complete name Bīrā-Itāvah, in the khurāt tehāl of the Sāgar District. Vāḍavārī, still another district mentioned in the inscription, is probably represented by the modern Bērārā (N.1. 24°30' E.1. 78°41'), and Ulādana has been identified with Ooldanjākhurd, about 12 kms. north-east of Madanapura. but a place more appropriately falling in the vidāna in which it is stated to have been then included, is Uldān (24°00' N.1. 78°45' E.), situated about 15 kms. south by east of Bāndhā, the headquarters of a tehāl in the Sāgar District. This place is on the junction of the rivers Dhasān and Bhandā and a legend is associated with it. Pathā, as read by Cartellieri in ll. 8-9, has been identified by him with the modern place of the same name lying about 6 kms. east of Bērārā.

1 For example, in ll. 41, the father of Alha who was a Chau. i.e., Chaturvedin, is mentioned as divīvedin, and in the line that follows, the father is mentioned as Payātō but the son as Ṭhakkura. For similar examples, see above, No. 60.
2 For another instance of the kind, see above, No. 51.
3 It may be noted that Nos. 129-130 were also written and engraved respectively by the same persons. Pāḷhāna also engraved Nos. 126-132. 184.
4 Below, No. 141. The name of the place is spelt as Bikaura by Cunningham, who noticed some small temples there. See his A.S.I. R., Vol. XXI, p. 175.
5 Above, Nos. 101-106.
Kakaradaha, another village situated in the Vājāvāri vīshīra, appears to be identical with Karhaiya, lying about 55 kms. south-southwest of Lālītpur. This place is also mentioned in the grant of Trailōkya-vaṅgana, as to be seen below. Madanapura, which still retains its old name, is the find-spot of Prithvirāja’s inscriptions: it is about 38 kms. to the south-east of Dūdāṭa. Sōnasara, which is stated in the grant to have been the camp of Madanapura, has not been previously identified. It appears to be identical with Saunār, the headquarters of a tehsīl in the Chhindwāḍa District of Madhya Pradesh. The rest of the localities cannot be traced.

It may, however, be stated here that a study of all these place-names reveals that Paramardia’s kingdom comprised, besides his main dominions in Bundelkhand, the whole of the present Lālītpur division of the Jāñā District stretching to the west up to the Bēśāla and to the south up to some parts in the Chhindwāḍa District

APPENDIX

As prepared by Cartellieri (E.P. Ind., Vol. IV, pp. 170 ff).

A. List of Names of gōīra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atri</td>
<td>II. 39, 63, 79 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhārvaya</td>
<td>I. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandhula</td>
<td>II. 38, 95, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauḍhāvania</td>
<td>I. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>II. 18, 20, 23, 24, 45, 51, 61, 62 (twice), 65 (twice), 66, 74, 75, 76 (twice), 77, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhrāvagesa</td>
<td>II. 83, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhrāgava</td>
<td>II. 21, 29, 43 (twice), 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 78, 92, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrāṣṭhīrā</td>
<td>II. 57, 58, 60 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darbhī</td>
<td>I. 94 (three times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dādīvīchūṇa</td>
<td>II. 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhavanī</td>
<td>II. 52, 53, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gārgya</td>
<td>II. 35, 100, 106, 107; Gārgya, II. 47, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>II. 17, 18, 22, 27, 29, 36 (twice), 38, 39 (twice), 44, 49, 52, 57, 65 (twice), 76, 84, 87, 96, 97, 109 (twice), 111, 114, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāṭham</td>
<td>II. 25, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāṭikārma</td>
<td>I. 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīvanāyaṇaya</td>
<td>II. 89, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>II. 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, 51, 52, 53 (twice), 54, 55, 56 (twice), 60, 62, 63, 68, 74, 75, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88 (twice), 91, 92, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104 (twice), 107, 109, 110, 112, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṭyāyaṇa</td>
<td>I. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇḍūṃvāna</td>
<td>II. 24, 80, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauḍākī</td>
<td>II. 30, 61, 67, 78, 82, 83, 85 (twice), 104, 105 (three times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kautsa</td>
<td>II. 27, 40, 64, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇakṛṣṇa</td>
<td>II. 20, 21, 25, 28, 32, 37 (twice), 40, 54, 89, 103, 110, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuta</td>
<td>II. 44, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugākā</td>
<td>I. 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māhula</td>
<td>I. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māṇḍaviya</td>
<td>I. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maundghūya</td>
<td>II. 73, 85, 88, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauna</td>
<td>II. 86, 97, 108 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāmiṇi</td>
<td>II. 41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parśātra</td>
<td>II. 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 53, 64, 69 (twice), 71, 73, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 95, 101, 102, 118, 116 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkārya</td>
<td>II. 18, 22, 23, 32, 33, 37, 98, 101, 102, 106, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṇḍilya</td>
<td>II. 22, 43, 49, 50, 60, 78, 81, 89, 90 (twice), 96, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudravasa</td>
<td>I. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāvartīṇa</td>
<td>I. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāvartīṇa</td>
<td>I. 19 (twice), 43, 54, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālīkāvāna</td>
<td>II. 47, 48, 76, 96, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālīkāvāna</td>
<td>I. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasiṣṭha</td>
<td>II. 26 (twice), 30, 33, 41, 42, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 69, 71, 72, 108 (twice), 110, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>II. 56, 60, 68, 70 (twice), 74, 77, 82, 83, 99 (twice), 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīshnuvidādhra</td>
<td>I. 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. List of Names of Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhaya</td>
<td>I. 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhinanda</td>
<td>I. 66 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajai</td>
<td>I. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajai</td>
<td>I. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajayapāla</td>
<td>II. 10, 20, 67 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkuna</td>
<td>II. 23, 53, 55, 65, 77, 107, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alī</td>
<td>I. 90 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alī</td>
<td>I. 108 (Gen. Alūkāsya, II. 35, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anakai</td>
<td>II. 45, 102, 112, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td>II. 20, 62, 95, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anapapala</td>
<td>I. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asadhara</td>
<td>II. 55, 63, 64, 75, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avasa</td>
<td>I. 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSRIPTIONS OF THE CHANDELAS OF JÉIKA HUKHTI

Bahadhrara, l. 114.
Bhula, l. 24.
Bhualdeva, l. 51.
[Bhābhū], Gen. Bhābhūkasya, l. 77, 84.
Bhuyavēra, l. 110.
Bhānuša, l. 71.
Bhakara, l. 82, 83, 85, 84.
Bhāvanavātana (perhaps Bhūvana), l. 44.
Bhāvanavātana, l. 84.
Bhāvayāt, l. 53.
Bhūgaūta, l. 48.
Būdhīn, l. 17.
Brahman, l. 43, 47, 77, 110.

Chakraśīvāmin, l. 82, 101.
Chandādāitya, l. 60.
Chaturbhuj, l. 22.
Chanbhūja, l. 65.
Chitān, l. 101.

Dāmara, l. 50, 89.
Dāmōdara, l. 29, 50, 31, 32, 72, 109, 110.
Dič, l. 100.
[Dūtv], Gen. Dūtvakasya, l. 29.
Dēda, l. 112.
Dēde, l. 104, 108.
Dēdi, l. 116.
Dēḥā, l. 83.
Dēḥā, l. 90.
[Dēhā], Gen. Dēhākasya, l. 25.
Dēlāna, l. 21, 44, 98.
Dēlā, l. 33.
Dēlā, l. 90.
[Dēlā], Gen. Dēlākasya, l. 25.
Dēlān, l. 90, 98, 113.
Dēlāna, l. 105.
Dēlānābha, l. 87, 104.
Dēlānshā, l. 48, 73.
Dēlānshā, l. 17, 41, 62, 74, 75, 87, 102.
Dēlānshā, l. 35.
Dēlāntā, l. 56, 86.
Dēlāntā, l. 115.

[Diṭkā], Gen. Diṭkākasya, l. 18.
Diṭkā, l. 72.
Diṭkāk, l. 29, 28, 70, 74, 79, 83, 86, 101, 102.
Dīmara, l. 113.
Dīmara, l. 66, 116.
Dīmara, l. 28.
Dīmara, l. 105.
Dīmakara, l. 88, 83.

Gāḍhāra, l. 100.
Gāḍhā, l. 78, 92 (?); Gen. Gāḍhākasya, l. 66.
Gāḍhā, l. 43, 74, 92 (?); Gen. Gāḍhākasya, l. 87.
Gāḍhā, l. 23, 75.
Gāḍhē, l. 94.
[Gāḍhē], Gen. Gāḍhēkasya, l. 32.
[Gāḍhē], Gen. Gāḍhēkasya, l. 80.
Gāmē, l. 100.
Gāmē, l. 99, 111.
Gāmē, l. 97, 102.
Gāmē, l. 62, 63, 71.
Gautama, l. 24.
Gautama, l. 22, 26, 68, 73, 106, 104, 113.
Gūḍhā, l. 94.
Gūḍhā, l. 82, 83.
Gūḍhē, l. 36, 110.
Gūḍhē, l. 91.
Gūḍhē, l. 94.
Gūḍhē, l. 79, 86.
Gūḍhē, l. 48, 77, 90, 95, 97, 93, 101, 114.
Hāṭa, l. 60.
Hari, l. 24, 41, 43, 104, 112.
Haridatta, l. 78.
Haridhāra, l. 99.
Harifārman, l. 36, 116.
Haridīṭyā, l. 97.
Harīnāya, l. 99.
Jādi, l. 42.
Jagadīṭhāra, l. 26, 56.
Jagadeś, l. 108, 110.
Jagadśvā, l. 101.
Jagī, l. 27.
[Jaṅgī], Gen. Jaṅgīkasya, l. 78.
Jaṅgī, l. 59, 61, 79, 113.
Jaṅgī, l. 58.
[Jaṅgī], Gen. Jaṅgīkasya, l. 36.
Jaṅgī, l. 98.
Jaṅgī, l. 68.
[Jaṅgī], Gen. Jaṅgīkasya, l. 27, 93.
Jaṅgī, l. 32, Gen. Jaṅgīkasya, l. 77, 87.
Jayadratha, l. 109, 112.
Jayānandā, l. 93.
Jayānandā, l. 82, 71, 84, 116 (twice).
Jayash̄a, l. 110.
Kadā, l. 97.
Kamālasūna, l. 70.
Kamān, l. 42.
Kamānṣṭhā, l. 106.
Kamāmaṇi, l. 33.
[Kanḍī], Gen. Kandākasya, l. 23.
Kapilēśvara, l. 51.
Kāṃsā, l. 17, 46, 52, 60, 82, 85, 92, 100, 102.
106, 114.
Kilāna, l. 19, 72, 108.
Kīrtīśan, l. 83.
Kīrtīśā, l. 28, 29, 66, 116.
Kīrtīśa, l. 112.
Kīrtīśa, l. 66.
Kīrtīśa, l. 69.
Kīrtīśa, l. 40.
Kīrtīśa, l. 100, 113.
Kīrtīśa, l. 71.
Kīrtīśa, l. 95, 114.
Kūṇḍāna, l. 19, 93.
Kūṇḍāna, l. 63.
Kūtē, l. 111.
Kūṭāna, l. 112.
Kūṭāna, l. 96.
Kūṭāna, l. 97.
Lāhā, l. 23, 51, 86, 87, 93, 103.
Lāhā, l. 79.
Lāhā, l. 95.
Lāḥkāṇaganḍī, l. 72.
[Lābhar], Gen. Lābhākasya, l. 20, 39, 50, 54.
Lakṣāṇadātā, l. 21, 22, 28, 37, 47, 61, 74, 77, 98.
108, 110.
Lākṣāṇa, l. 106.
Gen. Lābhar, l. 84.
TI:K, I. 68.
Triichana, II. 49, 55.

Udvanabha, I. 103.
Utha, I. 74.
[Cilhe], Gen. Ulheksaya, I. 85.
Uttradiitya, I. 98.

Vachchha, II. 22, 40, 106.
Vachchhazupa, II. 43, 67.
Vachchhila, I. 70.
Vilhnya, II. 31, 94.
[Vilhnya]. Gen. Vilheksaya, II. 26, 36, 84.
Vamadeva, II. 61, 82.
Vaman, II. 18, 35, 38.
Varaha, I. 38.
Vasadhara, I. 58.
Vasit, I. 76.
Vasudeva, II. 34, 40, 46 (twice), 38, 94, 115.
Vasuki, I. 67.

VAJPA, I. 94.
Vatsa, I. 88.
Vatsaraja, I. 107.
Vah, I. 97.
Vayu, I. 92.
Veda, I. 99.
Vedakarnan, I. 98.
Veli, II. 73, 103.
Vidyadevara, II. 31, 43, 56, 60, 81, 86, 88, 95, 108, 114.
Vidyamandana, I. 66.
Vijayashaka, I. 55.
Vikaya, I. 82.
Vilhana, I. 116.
Vilhe, I. 85.
Vimaladitya, I. 25.
Vishnu, II. 17, 46.
Vishvakarmam, I. 105.
Vivarupa, II. 30, 40, 49, 50 (twice), 85.

Yajashdra, I. 44.
Yasodava, I. 100.
Yatudha, I. 91.

ABBREVIATIONS OF SURNAMES USED IN THE INSCRIPTION

A, or Agni = Agnihotra.
Chau = Probably, Chaudhuri, also figuring in No. 131, below.
Di = Dikshita.
Devi = Diveda, or Divedina.
Nä = Nāyaka, found in some other Chandella records also.
Pam = Pamata, i.e., Pandita.
Rā = Rājuta (Rājaputra), or, Rājanaka,
Tri = Triveda, or Trivedin.

Note.—The letters Devi, Tri, and Di are occasionally so formed as they could not be distinctly made out even on the original.
From impressions. Subsequently I have compared the reading from the original plates, placed at my disposal by the Director of the Provincial museum at Lucknow, to whom my thanks are due.

3. Expressed by a symbol.

4. The bracketed akshara is redundant. It seems to have been cut while copying the draft of a grant of Madanavarmman and was not struck off even after it was known to be superfluous.

5. This punctuation mark, as many others below, is joined to the following letter so as to appear as a mātrā.

6. Originally the sign of nīlajna, which was subsequently altered.

7. The consonant of this akshara appears as m.

8. This punctuation mark is quite close to the letter that follows, which may also be read as ḷ.

9. Cartellieri (denoted as C. below) reads these two aksharas as patha by similarity of forms, but it is not suitable here. He also divided the previous portion of the text as शेखुके कालाज्ञाद्विद्या; but I hesitate to agree with him as the name शेखुके is rather too long.

10. The horizontal stroke of this letter is missing, and consequently, it appears as न.

11. This word is not known to me.

12. The horizontal stroke of the bracketed akshara was not cut.
15 तापिनोराकानक्र्ष पुष्यायोलिसिने। नानाबाबुवारिनिमालिसमो नानामस्मे। नानासा(शा)-
काणायिनयो नानानामामो
16 शा(शा)हुणिक्र: कुञ्जानुवान हर्षदेवन सर्वित्वपत्थसुवृक्ष कान्तकमकाण्डे पुष्यक्र:राजस्यानुसारिनिक्रः शाक्तिसमुपूरः समक(शा)क्रः काणायिनमृः
17 दहस। माघे॥ कामकेवर॥ कामप्रणाथ चौ। वायसे पद्मकम॥ उपांचुमोग्रः दिः।
देव(शा)अमुकपुष्यः केसायाम पद्मकम्। गौतमग्रः दिः।
18 लोकपुष्यः दिः। नीतिसमरक्रः कस्म समाद्रम्। भ(शा)वानक्रः दिः। तीक्षणम् दिः। भाषिकस्य पद्मकम्।
गौतमग्रः दिः। गौतममृः दिः। बाणस्य पद्मकम्। शा(शा)क्रः
19 लोकपुष्यः दिः। सीरी(शी)षुपुष्यः दिः। कुञ्जानुवान श्रणी। वेदाकाय(शा)गौतमनायीताश्रयावस्थीय पद्मकम्।
केशाकाय(शा)जातसानातिः।
20 अजगाराणुवानस्तततोगान्त्रिक्रा पद्मकम्। ज्ञानेयोगोच त्रो। तरसित्तुष्य पृः। अामदस्य पद्मकम्।
वर्धकाय(शा)क्रः। तीक्षणम् दिः। लाबकसः
21 पद्मकम्। कामप्रणाथ श्र। वेदाकाय(शा)वानक्रः। भाषिकस्य पद्मकम्। गौतममृः दिः। तीक्षणम् दिः।
देव(शा)अमुकपुष्यः कान्तकमकाण्डे पुष्यक्रः। गौतमसमुपूरः शाक्तिसमुपूरः
22 दिः। सह(शा)कस्य पद्मकम्। गौतममृः दिः। पापणक्रः दिः। रूपकस्य पद्मक्र(शा)मृः। शाक्तिसमुपूरः शाक्तिसमुपूरः दिः।
लाबकसः गौतमसमुपूरः शाक्तिसमुपूरः दिः।
23 मघास्वादः। वाणस्य पद्मक्रः। कामप्रणाथ श्र। गाजुपुष्यः क्रुः। लाबकसः पद्मक्रः। शा(शा)कुञ्जानुवान श्रणी।
राहस्य पद्मक्रः। वा भ(शा)कुञ्जानुवान श्रणी।
24 राजस्यपुष्यः। होः। पद्मक्रः। गाजुपुष्यः। अजगाराणुवान श्रणी। [1] गौतमसमुपूरः पद्मक्रः। कन्यकपरी पद्मक्रः। नारायणपुष्यः। चौ।
25 लोकपुष्यः। कामप्रणाथ श्र। ज्ञानेयोगोच दिः। पापणक्रः पद्मक्रः। ज्ञानेयोगोच दिः। तीक्षणम् चौ(शी)क्रः। देव(शा)वानक्रः। गौतमसः
26 श्र। दिः। गाजुपुष्यः। चौ। अमोरानुवान पृ.[शा]दिः। वाणस्य पद्मक्रः। ज्ञानेयोगोच दिः।
27 बाणस्य पद्मक्रः। बाणस्य पद्मक्रः। नारायणपुष्यः। दिः। रितिरायः पद्मक्रः। [शा]क्रः। षुमणक्रः। बाणस्य पद्मक्रः। गौतमसमुपूरः शाक्तिसमुपूरः दिः। नागसः
28 मघास्वादः। चौ। भाषिकस्य पद्मक्रः। परसार(गोपावसाव)क्रः। भा(शा)षुपुष्यः। दिः। भाषिकस्य पद्मक्रः।
ज्ञानेयोगोच दिः। वेदाकाय(शा)षुपुष्यः। दिः।
1 The reading of this name is uncertain due to the similarity of the forms of श्र and श्र. The stroke here, as also below, is probably used to show that the letter preceding it is a concise form of a word denoting a surname.
2 The consonant न is not marked below, here and in most of the instances, below; but it is not every-
time shown in the transcripts.
3 The first syllable of a word showing गृह is changed here to भड (from भा), which is really the first
letter of the गृह which traces descent from the sage भह्मरावद्वार.
4 The sandhi is not observed here, as also in almost all the cases below. Similarly, the भङ्कितक दी
are missing, and no corrections have been shown in the transcripts, to minimise the numbers of foot-
notes. So also with the redundant insertions of the punctuation marks.
5 A मान्ताय also above this letter was originally cut, and later on erased.
6 C. observed that this name is perhaps परमाभ, but it can also be a corrupt form of पाधमाभा.
7 The curve of the मान्ताय above this letter is not visible.
8 The दांडा is so placed as to appear as a punctuation mark or a मान्ताय-sign of the next letter. There
are many cases of this type, below.
9 The consonant of this akṣara can also be read as श्र or श्र.
10 By a wrong chiseled stroke, this akṣara looks like चैत.
11 The letter in the brackets is mutilated and may also have ष before it.
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From Facsimile
30 बल्ल पदार्द्धः। प्रस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। नारायणः हि। विभक्तस्य पदार्द्धः। कोशःकृम् हि।
नारायणः हि। द्रामोरसः पदार्द्धः। बल्ल|छावाः
31 हि। द्रामोरसः हि। पदार्द्धः। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। विभक्तस्य पदार्द्धः।
पालकुलः पदार्द्धः। कल्याणः हि। बाल्ल|छावाः पदार्द्धः।
32 कल्याणः हि। बल्लकृम् हि। नारायणः हि। विभक्तस्य पदार्द्धः। मातृभक्तः हि। बाल्ल|छावाः हि।
नारायणः हि। बल्लकृम् हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। नारायणः हि। विभक्तस्य पदार्द्धः।
33 बल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि।
34 बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि। बाल्लकृम् हि।
35 रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि।
36 रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि। रामसः हि।
37 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
38 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
39 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
40 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
41 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
42 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
43 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
44 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।
45 परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि। परस(परापरा)ऽपशोऽ हि।

1 This syllable is cut as kēda.
2 Both these akshara are unnecessary. Moreover, the last akshara of the preceding name appears to have been engraved as kē, and k (one of the consonants) was later on scored off.
3 The reading of this letter is uncertain. It is so formed as also to be read as dhā, as also both the consonants in stū in l. 7, above.
4 That is, Pradyumnamaya.
5 The reading of the first letter of this name is uncertain.
6 The akshara in the brackets looks like dhā, and the dhā of Paśupatha as suh.
7 The first of these aksharas is crossed, and the consonant of the second; appears also as d.
8 The superscript of the bracketed akshara is cut as k.
9 C. suggests that it is perhaps Bhavvanāvāmin.
46 आतरुसुदेश्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद(प्राचीन)। तथा अत्रु छ। गोविन्दस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद(प्राचीन)। तथा अत्रु छ। ["1"] केदारस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद(प्राचीन)। भार्यांमालोग छ। ["1"] विसुधुपुरुś। वासुदेश्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
47 वार्ताम्। ["1"] गाम्यांगोल छ। परसु(शु)रामाणुज छ। लक्ष्मीस्वरस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
48 महाराजादिन्द्र छ। महाराजादिन्द्र छ। ["1"] अश्रुसरस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। गोविन्दस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
49 विकल्पस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। गोविन्दस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
50 केदारस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। गोविन्दशुद्रस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। गोविन्दशुद्रस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
51 परसु(शु)रामाणुज छ। नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
52 नीतिवर्षस्य पद्मकाम। घीम्यांगोल छ। वा(प्राचीन) भीमालोग छ। केदारस्य पद्मकाम। गोविन्दशुद्रस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
53 भण्डारीयांगोल छ। गोविन्दशुद्रस्य पद्मकाम। घीम्यांगोल छ। वा(प्राचीन) भीमालोग छ। केदारस्य पद्मकाम। गोविन्दशुद्रस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
54 ज्ञातात्मक छ। लक्ष्मीस्वरस्य पद्मकाम। गोविन्दानुज छ। परसु(शु)रामाणुज छ। नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
55 नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
56 भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। वार्ताम्। ["1"] वेदान्तस्य पद्मकाम।
57 सविज्ञानोत्तर(प्राचीन)। परसु(शु)रामाणुज छ। नामाकुलस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
58 भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद। वार्ताम्। ["1"] अश्रुसरस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद।
59 ध्रुवस्य पद्मकाम। घीम्यांगोल छ। मथुरुकस्य परद्वृद्राधूलाद। घीम्यांगोल छ। परसु(शु)रामाणुज छ। केदारस्य पद्वृद्राधूलाद। भार्यांमालोग भव। परद्वृद्राधूलाद।

1 Delete what is within the brackets, as already noted by C.
2 C. observed that probably रक्षास्य is intended here.
3 Either there is no mention of ध्रुव after गोवित्तु and the name begins with भ्र, or it may be that the father's name was त्रिबोद्ध and the son was देवोदाता.
4 The surname is omitted here.
5 This name figures in another grant of the king and hence the first of its letters is read as dh.
6 See No. 134, I. 12.
7 Originally अथ, changed to अth.
8 Originally उ, changed to उ.
9 He may have been अक्षरहर or अक्षरहर, also mentioned in I. 64 below.
10 These two letters may also be read as तस्थ. Here too the surname is not mentioned.
11 See n. on I. 48 above.
12 The bracketed akshara looks like gita; and the two letters madha, that follow, are crudely engraved.
13 The reading of the first two syllables is distinct, but the name may also have been जाभाद्धा.
14 This akshara was first cut as pa and later on altered to sa. The original sign is still visible. The same is the case with g in गोत्रa before it in the same line.
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60 मौच हि। केष्यकुट् हि। रिद्धि(हर्मीयकेंद्र(ग)व्यय पदार्थम्। शायिद्यमोहिय ति। चंद्राविद्युत् हि। विद्यामर्फ्टय पदार्थम्। कपंमोहिय ति। धामयोविलुहुत् गा। हािस्य पदेम्।
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61 कम्। भद्यमोहिय ती। नायमणुष न ता। त्वयमोहिय पदेमकम्। अतिघातः रे गा। जयहुरुक्रम्। रा। महिलाकुट्य पदेमकम्। नननिश्चित(क)क्यमणिामोहियप्रायमण्वेत्॥—

62 दात्मक ति। कपंमोहिय पि। नतिभुजुष न पि। केशकुट्य पदार्थम्। जयहुकुट्य(ज)बचःचरणी। भद्यमोहिय पि। आलंकृत्त गा। पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। भद्यमोहिय अ। गा। साज्यविहुत् हि। जवािस्य पदेमकम्। गािस्य पदेमकम्। कपंमोहिय पि। जयहुरुक्रम्। अतिघातः रे। कुलग्राममणिाम। पदेमकम्। भद्यमोहिय हि। अतिघातः रे आजः। गािस्य पदेमकम्। भद्यमोहिय पि। गािस्य ् हि। [१७] सोङियहुक य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् पि। पिभारुकुट्य हि। अस(अविष। आजः)आजः)स्वर्य पदेमकम्। परासी(ड)स्वर्य हि। समस्य।

65 तपस्या वि। अतिधातः विहुत्य पदेमकम्। गोिवा मोहिय हि। पुष्पुकुट्य पि। चेमुनयुष पदेमकम्। गोिवा मोहिय वि। [१७] सुषुप्तुष पि। द्वीपविहुत्य पदेमकम्। भद्यमोहिय पि। पुष्पुष्पुष।

66 तपस्या हि। गािस्य पि। गोिवा मोहिय हि। कपंमोहिय हि। अतिघातः वि। विद्यामर्फ्टय पदेमकम्। भद्यमोहिय हि। अतिघातः वि। धामयोविलुहुत् हि। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि।

67 नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि।

68 केसः पदेमकम्। अतिधातः हि। रतिभुजुष पि। गािस्य पदेमकम्। कपंमोहिय हि। जयहुरुक्रम्। अतिधातः हि। धामयोविलुहुत् हि। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमुनयुष पि। न्यायमणिाम। पदेमकम्। नेत्रातिविकाृष्य नपुरुष हि। केशकुट्य पदेमकम्। केसिकम् हि। केसिकम् हि। महोहुकुट्य हि। चेमु

---

1. C. read this abhām as this and corrected it to this, possibly in view of the ra that follows. But it is not necessary as the sūtras were changing in that age, as seen above. The actual name of the dōme is not mentioned here.
2. The consonant of ka may also be read as k.
3. Here agni and not a as it is written before. It is an abbreviation of agnisātra.
4. This name is a compound of sāmaka, and in that case we have to supply the preceding sāmaka.
5. This name may also be read as a, with the supply of the preceding sāmaka.
6. Here appears a superfluous sūdina, with its top curved to right so as to appear as pīḍa.
7. At C. suggested, read. yahāvaiya.
8. Read pārāśa or pārāśa.
76 नौतमसिद्धि हि। ब्रह्मविद्यानिर्णयः। पौराणिकपदार्थहिं। भ्रमण(न)हृद्यते हि। तुहेव पदार्थहिं। उपमालोकित हि। नाहेदुः पि। श्रीरस्त्रपदार्थहिं। भ्रमाकारण- 
77 न हि। जाह्न्वेनु पि। नारायणस्य पदार्थहिं। परस्पर(श)गणणे हि। य(श)हृद्यते हि। भासुखस्य 
पदार्थहि। कसमगो हि। ब्रह्मेश्वरसः पि। जाह्न्वेनु पि। भ्रमाकारण हि। म- 
78 हृद्यते दो। महाराष्ट्रस्य पदार्थहिं। शाङ्किविज्ञान हि। गायुद्वर हि। जासुखस्य पदार्थहि। 
भागम्यो हि। हरिरत्न हि। शोभयस्य पदार्थहि। कोष(ि)केन्द्रहि। सीमित- 
79 ज्ञूप हि। श्रीरस्त्रपदार्थहि। अविवाह हि। नारायणपुन हि। जाह्न्वेनु पदार्थहि। भ्रमणो 
हि नारायणपुन हि। परस्परस्य पदार्थहि। भ्रमाकारण हि। लक्षण-1 
80 पुषु हि। मातृकास्य पदार्थहि। कौशिकमःस्यनोगो हि। श्रीकृत श्रीवरस्य पदार्थहि। 
वोढ़(ो)वपनोगो हि। वामस्य प्रकाशम् हি। परस्पर(श)रगण हि। प्राचार- 
81 रघु हि। मातृकास्य पदार्थहि। परसाः(श)योगो हि। प्राचारकुश हि। विशाख्यस्य पदार्थहि। 
कौशिकमःस्यनोगो हि। विशाखाकुश हि। भास्करस्य पदार्थहि। शाङ्किविज्ञान- 
82 न सोमेश्वरसः पुषु हि [१'] विवाहादिवस: पदार्थहि। कुः(ि)स्यव्रोगो हि। केलकुश हि। चक्षाधिपिन: 
पदार्थहि। कथिक्कान(ि)त् हि। गायुद्वर हि [१'] वोढ़(ो)वपनो: पदार्थहि। कभः(ि)भौम्भरजिवादेवसः 
हि। पौषु- 
83 स्य पदार्थहि। कोष(ि)केन्द्रहि। गो (ि) हृद्यते हि। मातृकास्य पदार्थहि। कस्य(ि)प्रोक्त विवाह(श)- 
केन्द्रहि। विशाख्यस्य पदार्थहि। व(ि)स्यनोगो वोढ़कुश हि। सांगमस्य पदार्थहि। 
पदार्थहि। 
84 स्य पदार्थहि। गामुस्य पदार्थहि। कथव(ि)स्यस्य सुधरसः पुषु हि [१'] लालकस्य पदार्थहि। 
भूमिकादिवस: प्रकाशमः पदार्थहि। [१'] भास्करसः स्मरण: पदार्थहि। परसाः(श)रगण हि। भास्करसः प्रकाशमः पदार्थहि। 
85 मोषिक(ि)राब्तरीहि। तोकपुरसः हि। भ्रमणस्य पदार्थहि। कोष(ि)केन्द्रहि। 
वोढ़(ो)वपनो: पि। कंसायस्य पदार्थहि। कोषिकान(ि)वोढ़कुश हि [१'] पालकुश हि। अलेक्ष्यस्य पदार्थ- 
केन्द्रहि। भ्रमाकारण हि। भ(ू)र(स) कंसक- 
86 ज्ञूप हि [१'] देवश्रस्त्र पदार्थहि। कथव(ि)स्यव्रोगो हि [१'] ब्रह्मोपवरसु: पुषु हि। नारायणस्य पदार्थ- 
(ि)प्लुत हि। कथिक्कान(ि)हि। नारायणपुन हि। विशाख्यस्य पदार्थहि। भ्रमाकारण गोधुः च च। 
87 गोधुः पदार्थहि। कथिक्कान(ि)हि। जाह्न्वसः पदार्थहि। कथव(ि)स्यव्रोगो हि [१'] मोषिक(ि)चिकुश हि [१'] 
गायुद्वर हि। भ्रमाकारण हि। मोषिक(ि)चिकुश हि। नारायणपुन हि। विशाख्यस्य पदार्थहि। भ्रमाकारण 
गोधुः च। देव- 
88 मोषिक(ि)चिकुश हि। कथिक्कान(ि)हि। कथव(ि)स्यव्रोगो हि। कथव(ि)स्यव्रोगो हि। विशाख्यस्य 
पदार्थहि। 

---

1 The bracketed aksara also appears as sth.
2 See n. on the same word in l. 25. The mātrī of nyu that follows is faint.
3 Perhaps ma is redundant here.
4 Above this letter is a faint slanting stroke appearing as a mātrī, erased later on.
5 Probably, Phānus is intended.
6 As both the verticals are joined by a stroke, this aksara is ili and not sā as read by C.
7 The mātrī above this letter is faint, and the name may also be read as Gāhāḍa with a damita after as in some other cases.
8 C. proposed to correct this letter to dā but it may be taken to denote Dikshita and the change is not necessary.
Here, as in some cases below, the subscript of this letter is either faintly visible or is altogether missing. The enclosures have all been made in view of this.

The lower portions of the last three letters were already lost in the time of C. As also noted by him, the sign of anusvara may be accidental and the first two aksharna may be Gāgī, Gāgī or Gāgī. On the original, which I subsequently scrutinized, the reading is distinctly Gāgī.

The bracketed letter is indistinct, and the traces show it to have been ī, as also suits the context.

The anusvara is doubtful. It is clear on the plate, as I noted in my examination subsequently, as also noted by C.

This letter is perhaps to be read with a subscript ṣ. It is not known whether ṣi is intended here.

The molding of the in this letter is doubtful.

This aksharna contains some redundant strokes in its formation.

The slanting stroke distinguishing this letter from pe is not formed.

The Sanskrit word is Yāsodēvā.
MAHÔBĀ STATUE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDĒVA

[Vikrama] Year 1224

This inscription was brought to notice by General Alexander Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India. Reports, Vol. XXI (for 1885-1886), p. 74 (No. 7), by publishing a transcript of its text, accompanied by a lithograph, which appears to have been prepared from an eye-copy. The record is stated to have been incised on the pedestal of a broken Jaina statue, found by him at Mahôbâ in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh. Nothing about its exact find-spot is stated in the Report, and its present whereabouts are unknown. Thus it

1 Read तेईम.
2 Some of these five akṣaras are mutilated but the reading is certain, as also seen from the plate. In view of this, we cannot agree with H. K. Sastri, who had no opportunity to examine the original and who suggested the reading to be sa-pari-akṣara, which gives no sense. For his suggestion see Epi. Indi., Vol. XVI, p. 275, n. 5. The word ānapa used here has to be modified to āna, in the sense of (a plant) from which spirituous liquor has to be extracted, as also used in some other grants of the house; for example, in our No. 118, l. 7.
3 This letter is ornamental formed and looks like pta.
4 C. read akṣara here, but it is not suitable to the sense.
5 The topstroke of this letter is the same as the curve of the medial long त above it. The repha on ण that follows is distinct on the plate but it is not deeply engraved.
6 The repetition of the two letters is redundant as also in No. 119, above, from where this portion appears to have been taken.
7 Nyâ is crude. The loop is separated from the horizontal stroke.
8 Read भक्तिः [11]* छत्ती.
9 The joining horizontal stroke is either not marked or has not come out in the impression. The letter looks like रण.
10 Probably to be read as स्त्र्याम् वा का.
11 For situation and antiquities of the place, see above. No. 113, the inscription is also referred to by Smith in J. A. S. B., Vol. I, Pt. I (1881), p. 29.
is not possible to obtain an impression, and therefore the record is edited here from the small-scale lithograph published by Cunningham.

The inscription consists of one long line, the length of which is not known. The characters are Nāgari of the eleventh century A.C., to which the record belongs. The language is Sanskrit and the record is all in prose. The orthography does not call for any special remark, even taking the inscription reproduced is a faithful eye-copy.

The record refers itself to the victorious reign of the illustrious Paramardin, the sole lord of Kālāñjar; and thus he is undoubtedly the homonymous Chandella king ruling at Mahoba from 1166 to 1202 A.C. The aim of the inscription is evidently to record the installation of the image of a Jaina pontiff, whose name does not appear in it.

The inscription is dated in the year 1224, on Sunday, the 2nd titli of the bright half of Ashadh. The year and the titli are expressed in numerical figures only. The year, as in the other cases, has to be referred to the Vikrama era, and the date, according to Kielhorn’s calculations, corresponds to Sunday, 9th June, 1168 A.C., taking the year 1224 to be the Southern Vikrama, expired. The present inscription was thus issued only a couple of years subsequent to Paramardin’s accession to the throne, and it speaks of the popularity of Jainism during his reign.

TEXT

1 संवत(ल) 1224 अक्षाद शुद्धविद्व दलील || ॥ कालदलोपरिवर्तितिचमकमदेवसादानाति महिम्मवीणानकवानविवरणाम् [ . . . . . . . ]

No. 128: PLATE CXV

AJAYAGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDEVA

[Vikrama] Year 1227

This inscription was discovered by Alexander Cunningham; and a transcript of it with a rough translation and a facsimile was published by him in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (for 1884-85), pp. 49-50, and Plate xii-B. Subsequently, F. Kielhorn corrected and discussed its date, as to be seen below, but it has not been systematically edited so far. The record is edited here from an inked impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, to whom I am grateful for taking the trouble of preparing it fresh, at my request.

The record is inscribed on a jamb of the upper gate in the fort of Ajayagadh, in the Paimā District of Madhya Pradesh. Just beneath it, and as if in continuation thereof, is another inscription which will be edited below. The present record consists of eleven lines of writing, covering a space 26.5 cms. long and 42.5 cms. high. The length of the last of the lines is only about 10 cms. The height of the individual letters varies from 2 to 3 cms. The writing has suffered considerably by exposure to weather, and consequently, one letter at the beginning of l. 10 and probably some more at the end of ll. 9 and 11 are altogether lost. Besides, the portion on which the record was inscribed was not originally well dressed and the technical execution too is most sloven.

1 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, pp. 36-37, No. 64.
2 From Plate xxii-G in Cunningham’s A. S. I. R., Vol. XXI.
3 An ornamentation is engraved between the double danfā.
4 Cunningham read विकारात् which is evidently wrong or a misprint. The inscription appears to be incomplete. In the eye-copy published by him, the consonant of the first askhara is clearly ष.
5 The installation of an image appears to have been intended here.
6 For the situation of the place and reference to its antiquities, see above, No. 112.
7 No. 137.
MAHÔBĀ STATUE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDEVATA, VIKRAMA 1224

From Facsimile

AJAYGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDÉVA, VIKRAMA 1227

Scale: One-half
The inscription is written in the Nāgari alphabet of the 12th century. The initial a which occurs twice in kōṭiśa- and uṃēna, both in l. 5, shows its form slightly different. Attention may also be invited to the initial a which has begun to assume the modern form; see rūtā-, l. 3; to the loop of k, which, when it is the first member of a conjunct consonant or when the medial ri is attached to it, gives place to a horizontal stroke; see -bhakā-, l. 6 and -kīta-, l. 8; the conjunct consonant gg appears as gn, as generally in the inscriptions of the time; cf. mārgga-, l. 6; and lastly, the letter r is represented by a vertical with a slanting stroke attached to its middle on the left, as in rūta-. l. 3. Orthographically nothing is worth noting, except that a consonant following r is reduplicated in mārgga- and durgga-, respectively in l. 6 and 2. The mārta of the dipthongs are marked above.

The language of the record is Sanskrit and it is all in prose. It is full of errors, as will be shown in the foot-notes appended to the text that follows. The inscription has in it a number of local words also. The purport of the record is probably to commemorate the construction of a step-well (bǎuli, l. 11) by the rūta (rājputra) Śrī-Vītra, the son of Tējala who was a Kshatriya of the village of Kōrtiā, on the road, during the time of famine.

The date of the record, as expressed only in figures, is Monday, the second day of the bright half of Ashādha of the (Vikrama) year, which was read by Cunningham as 1237. But the impression before me shows the decimal figure more similar to two than three, and a careful scrutiny goes to indicate that the curve at the top of the figure has suffered from a slanting stroke which may have been either the original fault of the stone, or a redundant stroke of the chisel, or a later development due to weather or human agency, of course some time before Cunningham discovered the inscription. And here I agree with Kiellhorn who took the figure to be 2. Thus according to him the year is 1227; and the date, as calculated by him, corresponds to 7th June, 1171 A.C., which was a Monday.

The record purports to mention some more purposes also, as we can gather from the use of -pañānum, appearing twice in l. 6 and 8; and also from the expression tāṇānāsīnaḥ cha, after kṛiśi in l. 8. I am unable to make out this portion.

The inscription does not mention the name of the king, but he was evidently the illustrious Paramarādmun of the royal house of the Chandellas whom we know as occupying the throne from c. 1166 to 1202 A.C., and as is also shown by the provenance of the record. As already stated above, the rest of the record is uninterlegible to me.

Of the geographical places mentioned in the inscription, Jayapura (l. 2) is the same as Ajayagadh; and the village Kōrtiā (l. 5) I am unable to identify.

1  सिद्धा [१] संवत् १२२७ अप्रेह-  
2  सु(यु)वित २ सामे  जस्वरुरुर्मि ०।

---

1 And not nauti, as read by Cunningham. He did not explain the word.
2 Here Cunningham read the name as -Vr̥ṇa, but the impression shows the sign of the medial i very clearly. It is not if the Śrī was a part of the name.
3 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 357, No. 102. It may also be noted here that reading the year as 1227 and making his calculations according to it, Cunningham found that the day could not be worked out to be a Monday, as stated in the inscription, but a Wednesday; and to solve this difficulty, he also observed that the word soma, in l. 2, may be a mistake of the writer or the engraver for saṃyā, i.e., Wednesday, as Budha is regarded to be the son of the Moon-deity (Cunningham, op. cit, p. 50). This ingenious suggestion, however, goes against the poor knowledge of the writer and the engraver.
4 From an impression.
5 Expressed by a symbol.
6 The sign marking this consonant is not cut in its proper place and appears as touching the top of the mārta of s; just below it in the next line. For the reading of the year that follows, see n. above.
7 A redundant stroke makes this syllable appear as daḥ or dhiḥ.
8 It is probably the original fault of the stone that makes this letter appear as bhā.
9 The last of the verticals of the mārta of s is ornamental, resembling ya.
ICHCHHĀVAR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDĪDEVĀ

[Vikrama Year: 1228]

The two copper-plates which bear this inscription are stated to have been found some time in the closing years of the last century, in the ruins on the western side of the modern village of Ichchhāvar, which is also known as Nīchhāvar and lies in the Pailānī talīst of the Bāndā District in Uttar Pradesh. The ruins go by the name of Dhanēśvar, or Dhanēkhoja, and are surrounded by a lake which is called Bahlī Tāl, and sometimes as the Madhava-Sāgar, the latter of these names being applied to it in commemoration of the Chandella king Madanavarmman who was the grandfather of the ruler who issued the present grant. The circumstances under which the plates were obtained are not known; but it is stated that they somehow came in the possession of Dr. William Hoey and appear to have been presented by him to the Provincial Museum at Lucknow, where they are now preserved. Dr. Hoey published his article on the inscription, jointly with V. A. Smith, giving a full summary of the contents of it, in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. LXIV, Pt. I (1895), pp. 455-58, with a facsimile Plate (VII), but without a transcript. Subsequently, the record was edited by F. Kielhorn, who transcribed it from the photolithograph appearing in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, and his article, without a facsimile, appeared in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXV (1896), pp. 205 ff. The inscription is edited here from a set of fresh impressions which I owe to the Director of the Lucknow Museum where the plates are now exhibited.

As stated above, they are two copper-plates, each of them measuring about 35.65 cms. in length and 25.3 cms. in breadth. Both the plates are inscribed on the inner side only. For the

---

1 The reading of this letter is not certain but I have adopted Cunningham's reading. The Ṙaṇa on the second syllable is indistinct, but it is clear on the same letter in No. 137, 1, 5, below.
2 Cunningham read niṣyaptanam, but the first two of the letters are quite distinct, and the reading as in the transcript appears to be certain. However, with either of the readings the sense is not clear.
3 The whole line appears to have been intended for a word appearing in the inscription which is edited below, No. 157.
4 The reading of this syllable is doubtful. If it is as taken here, this letter is a contraction of dhakkura. The other possibility of reading it is ṛu and taking the whole as caṅeṇa.
5 The first letter in this line has disappeared, leaving only a trace. It has been restored here from the same word appearing in the inscription which is edited below, No. 157.
6 Perhaps it means lord of the Svarbhāya, i.e. applied to the excavator of the well. See n. on the same word on No. 121, above.
7 Some traces after this word probably indicate that a portion of the inscription is lost in this line.
8 Situated in Long. 80° 34' E.; Lat. 23° 32' N. The name is also spelt as Ichchhāvar.
ICHCHHÄVAR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDIDEVA

protection of the writing, as to judge from the impressions and also from the original plates, their ends were bordered with strips, about 1 cm. broad and obviously of copper, secured by rivets, four on each of the vertical and five on each of the horizontal sides. All the strips are now lost. The plates were originally held together by a ring passing through a hole, which is about two cms. in diameter and bored at the bottom of the first and the top of the second plate so as to disturb the writing in two lines in the middle; but the ring is stated to have been lost, presumably also with the seal which may have been originally attached to it. The weight of both the plates together with the existing nails is 3 kagas.

The inscribed surface on each of the plates measures about 30 by 23 cms. The first plate contains 17 lines of writing and the second 18 lines of equal length, leaving a fair margin on all the four sides. The top of the first plate shows a crude representation of the goddess Lakshmi, seated on a lute, and on either of her sides is an elephant sprinkling her with water from a pot held in the trunk. This device, which is usually to be seen on the charters issued by the Chandella kings, roughly measures 5½ cms. long and 5 cms. high and interrupts the writing in the first four lines. The average height of the letters is 1 cm. They are deeply incised but are not seen on the other side of the plate which are thick. They are fairly legible and the writing is in a state of good preservation.

The characters are Nagari, bearing a close affinity to those of the Senugra grant which was written and engraved only five years before, in V. S. 1223, by the same persons who respectively wrote and engraved the present inscription, viz.: Prithivídharā and Pāhāra, who were respectively the writer and the engraver of some other grants of the house also, as to be seen on proper occasions. And though the technical execution is neat, as observed above, the work is not although faultless, for we find throughout the whole inscription the same type of slips as in the Senugra grant, e.g. deforming some of the letters, omitting their limbs, and also omitting the signs of mātrās, amitāva and the superscript r above the top-stroke. For example, m in bhāme, l. 27, is engraved as g, and in the same word in l. 29, and also in matā, l. 33 and kunada, l. 34, it is cut as n; the joining horizontal stroke is missing in the first instance, and the vertical stroke in the second.

In bāmā, l. 2, the consonant of the first letter appears as ch, and the sign of the amitāvā is not marked; in yanaka, l. 29, and in pārthave, l. 31, the sign of the superscript r is omitted; and in utkārma, l. 35, the curve of the secondary i has not come out. There are several such slips in the present and in the other grants engraved by Pāhāra.1

To note the peculiarity of the individual letters, attention may be here drawn to the slightly varying forms of k in ashta, l. 12, atra, l. 25, and āchāra, l. 29; to the occasional ligatured form of k in ācchala, l. 8; to the conjunct tt appearing as gn, e.g., in suryagā, l. 28; to n which resembles d, as in zabhangana, l. 24; to n shown by a cursive bar across the letter, cf. swarmpa, l. 30; and in sha engraved as sh, as in Krishna, l. 16. The akṣaras ch, dh and v are only occasionally distinguished, e.g., in chāhara and Bhārā, both in l. 15 and in samudrā, l. 9; but ch is often engraved as v; see yādava, l. 32; dh is transitional; for whereas in dharma, l. 32, this letter is devoid of its horn on the left limb, in madhū, l. 7, the horn is prominent and joined not to its left limb but to the top of its horizontal; in virāha, l. 2, it is joined to the curve of the mātrā, and in vidhēya, l. 21, to the sign of the prishtha-mātrā. And above all, in nidhāna, l. 23, this letter shows a top-stroke instead of the horn, which is a rare example, if not a mistake. The form of bē is occasionally confounded with that of ī, e.g., in bhāsī, l. 27; and lastly, r appears in all the forms as in the Senugra grant, e.g., whereas the ordinary form of this letter can be seen throughout in the inscription, it resembles v in narakē, l. 30, ch in Rākṣa, l. 14, and its form with a wedge can be seen in prārthana, l. 17. The subscript form of this letter is occasionally shown by a double slanting stroke, for which see grāma, l. 10.

1 Pāhāra is known to have engraved as many as half-a-dozen grants, all issued by Paramardi. They are Nos. 126, 131, 132, 134. In addition to the present one; and No. 138 also appears to have been engraved by him, as seen on the proper occasion. In the earliest of them he is called a brahmar, then in the subsequent records, an artisan (śilpi), and in one, the term viṣṭhāna (skilled artist) prefixed to his name; but as Hiralal has already noted, a comparison with the earliest that was engraved by him (No. 126), does not indicate "any marked improvement" in the mechanical execution seen all through these inscriptions.
The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and with the exception of one verse at the beginning and six in the end, the whole record is in prose. The verses are not numbered.

As to orthography, we note almost the same peculiarities as in the contemporary inscriptions, viz., (1) the use of the sign व to denote ह, as in विशाखा, l. 23; (2) the reduplication of a class-consonant following त, e.g., in वर्मी, but not in वर्मा; both in l. 35; (3) occasionally putting the palatal for the dental sibilant, cf., अनहर्व, l. 12; (4) rarely the use of the sign अनस्सा, even wrongly at the end of a stich; (5) sometimes leaving the final consonant unmarked; (6) the use of the ब्रजक्षण in most and (6) wrong spellings as in मनवत्रिः, l. 12 etc., and wrong sandhi, e.g., in विक्रयानां, l. 25.

Besides these, we also note the confusion between a प्रश्नक्षण and a दाना, and occasionally the influence of local elements, e.g., in नन्दिनी and नन्दिवान, both in l. 8, where we find the lingual nasal instead of the dental. As in the Śeśā grant, the दाना is put to separate the names of the pravas in l. 15.

The object of the inscription is to record the grant, by the illustrious Chandella king Paramardīn, of the village Nandini situated in the territorial division (vidisha) Nandavan, in order to increase the merit and fame of his parents and himself (ll. 16-21). The donor was the Brāhma-General Madanapāla, the son of Ṭhakura Mahēśvara, grandson of Ṭhakura Bhūgā-pāla (Bhugovanpāla) and the great-grandson of Ṭhakura Tilmanpāla (Tribhuvanapāla). He was a student of the Chhāndoga śāhē and his gīttā was Kṛṣṇapātha, with the three pravas Aṛēya, Āchāramasa and Śyāavrā. He had migrated from the bhājīgālēr (a village granted to named Brāhmaṇa) of the name of Naugava. The gift was made, as expressed both in figures and words in ll. 12-14, on Sunday, the full-moon day of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa when there was an eclipse, in the Vikrama year 1228. The date, as calculated by Kielhorn, corresponds for the Chaitrédi Vikrama year 1228 expired, to Sunday, the 18th July, 1171 A.C. when there was a lunar eclipse visible in India, 20 h. 54 m. after mean sunrise. The charter was written by the learned Kāyastha Pṛthivihūrā, by the order of the king (Paramardīn), and was engraved by the artisan Pāthana, the son of Rajapāla (ll. 6-7). The engraver can evidently be identified with the homonymous brazier (pītularā) as mentioned in the Śeśā grant engraved by him; and the writer too is the same person who drafted it and also the one that follows.

The inscription begins with a verse in the ānusṭubh metre in honour of the Chandrārā (Chandella) race, and referring to its earliest heroes Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti, it provides us with the genealogy of the kings born in it for three generations, viz., the Paramatmaḥśatrūṇa, Mahā-vijāṭārīṇa and Paramēśvara, the illustrious Pṛthivivarman, his successor, the P.M.P., the illustrious Madanavarman and the latter’s successor, the P.M.P., the illustrious Paramardideva who is mentioned also as the great lord of Kālaṇjara and an ardent devotee of Mahēśvara, or Śiva, (ll. 3-7). All this portion is mutatis mutandis identical with the corresponding portion of the Śeśā grant and thus we cannot glean from it any new historical information. The chief portion of the document begins in l. 8, stating that while residing at Viśāsapa, Paramardideva donated the village Nandini, falling in the territorial division Nandavan, to the Brāhmaṇa-General Madanapāla, whose ancestry is given above. The details of the grant and the conditions pertaining to it are stated in ll. 21-27, where there is nothing particularly noteworthy. Following this, we have four impercary and beneficary verses in ll. 27-32; and the next two stanzas (ll. 34-35) state the names respectively of the writer and the engraver of the royal charter, bringing the inscription to a close.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Kālaṇjara (l. 6) is, of course, the well-known fort in the Bānd District, as seen above; and the village Nandini or Nandini (l. 9) has with some probability been identified by V. Smith, with the village of Nandandiōe or Nandadeō, lying about 16 kms. south-west of Ichchāhār, the find-spot of the plates. The territorial division Nandavan or Nandavan (l. 8), in which the gift-village was situated, may be taken to represent the region around it though a name corresponding to it cannot now be traced in its neighbourhood. This division may have extended up to the Jambū in the north. Viśāsapa, from which place the grant was issued (l. 12), seems to be the same, as already suggested, as modern Pachhār, about 20 kms. to the north-east of Jhānsī in Uttar Pradesh.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XXV, p. 205. Also see J. N. I., No. 851.
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, p. 44.
About the exact location of Naugāva, the original place of the donce (I. 16), we can hardly be certain for want of details. However, it may be noted here that one Navagāmva is mentioned in the Māndhātā grant of the Paramāra king Jayasvarman II, of V-S, 1317, but there the name appears with the word stāna applied to it; whereas in the present grant it is mentioned as a bhūtāgrahāra.

TEXT:

Metres: Verses 1-4 Anushṭubh; 5-8 Sālāṇā

First Plate

1. सत्यं । जयदास्मयकाम्यते विसंकारकोपुष्यस्त । जयदेवम्
2. रेंद्राणां अनुस्मार्कोष्टकेष्व ॥ [11] ॥ तस्मिन्माते विरोहिताष्ट्र-कामकान्दितिकारकाणि विमानिः समस्तस्य प्रमाणः
3. हरिवंकशाहारिकारकायास्मिर्मणिः प्रत्यक्षावदायात्। याहेद अन्नमानेसमस्तस्य भारम्यासनात् आरक्षितारकायास्मिर्मणिः प्रत्यक्षावदायात्।
4. हरिवंकशाहारिकारकायास्मिर्मणिः प्रत्यक्षावदायात्।
5. भारम्यासनात् आरक्षितारकायास्मिर्मणिः प्रत्यक्षावदायात्।
6. हरिवंकशाहारिकारकायास्मिर्मणिः प्रत्यक्षावदायात्।
7. विक्रमः एवं क्रियाकालानुसारापि । तत्र भूताग्रहारिकायास्मिर्मणिः। तत्र भूताग्रहारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
8. तत्र भूताग्रहारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
9. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
10. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
11. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
12. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
13. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
14. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
15. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
16. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।
17. विनिश्चितारिकायास्मिर्मणिः।

See No. 60, text, l. 31, and my remarks about the location of the place mentioned in it.

1. From a set of estrampages supplied by the Director, Provincial Museum, Lucknow. After my writing on the record was completed, I have also compared my transcript of this inscription from the original plates in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, for which I am thankful to its Curator Sri V. N. Shrivastava, for placing them at my disposal and giving me all facilities for my work there.

2. Denoted by a variant of the symbol.

3. The upper stroke of the 'h' is not engraved.

4. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

5. The upper stroke of the 'h' is not engraved.

6. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

7. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

8. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

9. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

10. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

11. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

12. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

13. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

14. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

15. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

16. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

17. नीलाणा, नीलाणा, नीलाणा.

Both these nīlāṇas are inscribed and the first of them appears more like so than तः. It may also be noted here that the third phrase of this gīti is śrūya. Read औपेक्षिकारिकायास्मिर्मणिः. By wrong strokes of the chisel, rhēcyā appears as velha and so in pārcēva as trē. Vā in -aḥāni- also appears to have been tampered.
18 श्रेष्ठ कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
19 य ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
20 ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
21 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
22 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
23 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
24 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
25 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
26 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
27 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
28 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
29 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
30 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
31 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
32 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
33 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
34 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।
35 कृपया ज्ञात कृपया निल्लेखनाला लिखिक ज्ञात ज्ञाता कृपया निल्लेखनाला।

The correct Sanskrit form of this name is Bhuwanapāla.
The horizontal stroke of the second akṣara is missing, making it appear as ek. This danda is rather attached to the following letter and appears as a pā locate. The preceding sign of amuc. as and others below, is so faintly marked as to be visible only on the plate.
The dandas are redundant. For this danda, that follows, Li. suggested a sanātak.
This akṣara in brackets is engraved as ek. Drop it at the beginning of this line.
The consonant of this akṣara is engraved as g with the horizontal stroke missing.
The curve above is omitted in the process of engraving.
The superscript r is lightly engraved and the medial sign is detached so as to look like a danda.
Read bhumaṭṭha followed by a danda, and then titi.
Read n or s, as in No. 119, l. 41.
Here again the upper curve of kha is missing.
This akṣara is distinguished by some redundant strokes.
The subscript dha is only partly engraved and looks like r with double strokes, as in gama in l. 10.
The copper-plates which bear this inscription are stated to have been discovered in about 1929, in course of digging for earth to build a house, at Mahobā in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh. The inscription was edited, with lithographs, by Rai Bahadur Hiralal in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XVI (1921-22), pp. 9 ff. The present whereabouts of the plates are not known, and no fresh impressions of the same are now possible; and hence the record is edited here from the lithographs accompanying Hiralal’s article.

The plates are two in number, and about their discovery Hiralal has stated that they were "deposited in a stone-chest, about 30’ (9-14 metres) below the surface. They were swung together with a ring having a seal, which the finder took for a lock and broke, inferring from the figure of Gajalakshmi (Goddess of wealth) in the middle of the first four lines, that the record dealt with some hidden treasure". Each of the plates measured 39 by 30.5 cms. and their weight, as recorded by him, is equal to 3.173 kilograms. The rims of both the plates are said to have been bordered with flat copper strips, about 6 cms. in breadth, fastened with nails; and on cleaning, both the plates were found to be in a good state of preservation; as is also shown by the lithographs.

The record consists of 33 lines, 16 of which are inscribed on the first plate, and the remaining 17 on the second. The characters are of the Nagari alphabet, and generally resemble those of the Sāṃśa and Ichchhāvar grants, which were written and engraved by the same persons as of the present grant; and the palaeographical peculiarities are therefore almost the same. To pick up some examples from the present grant, we find that the vowel ɐ is formed as ɐ; see ṭṣama in l. 7; the consonant ʋ continues to be devoid of its dot, as in vānka, l. 16; ɒh, ḍh, ʋ and ɒ are often not distinctly distinguished, though ḍh in several cases shows a horn on its left limb, as in vrōla, l. 2, but not in vadhit, l. 7. R also occasionally resembles ʋ, as in Vīṣṇuva, l. 1, and its different form is to be noted in ṭhakura, l. 2. The palatal ṣ sometimes begins with a loop, and at others without it; see Vīṣṇuva, l. 1, where we have both the instances side by side. A notable peculiarity is, that occasionally some of the letters are formed with their bends angular, e.g., v in vishra, l. 17, and shashyamvita and pūrva both in l. 12.

So far as technical execution is concerned, the letters are clear, but we find here the same type of mistakes as in the Sāṃśa and other grants which were engraved by the same mason, e.g., often omitting parts of letters, the ṛma, and the signs of anusāra and visarga, etc., as also noted by Hiralal. For example, m is cur as ɐ in bhāmi, l. 29; ṭst as ṭṣ in Kṛṣṇa, l. 16; ʋ as t in nāg, l. 6 and ṭṣ as vṛ in chatushṭaya, l. 11. The transcript below will show slips of this type, all through.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for a verse in the beginning and two in ll. 30-33, which are all not numbered, the record is all in prose. As regards orthography, we may note the use of (1) ʋ to denote b, e.g., in Vṛṣṇama, l. 13; (2) the dental for the palatal sibilant, and vice versa; see sākhā, and Sāṅkṛtā, both in l. 20; (3) the doubling of a class-consonant after ɻ, as in mirmma, l. 8; (4) the change of anusāra to m as in samud, l. 16; (5) the use of the prishṭhamatra, and finally, not marking the final consonants in ll. 31 and 33.

It is a royal charter, issued by the Chandella king Paramard, the lord of Kālajāra; and its object is to record the bestowal of some land in the village Dhanaura, falling in the territorial division of Erachha, by the king, in order to promote the religious benefit of his parents as of himself, from his temporary residence at a village named Gahilū (ll. 8-15). The date of the record, as mentioned both in words and figures in Il. 16-17, is the fourth day of the dark half of Magha of 1230, Tuesday, when the Sun entered the zodiacal sign Makara. This date must plainly be referred to the Vikrama era, and as calculated by Hiralal, it regularly corresponds to 25th of
PACHHĀR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDIDEVA

[Vikrama Year 1283]

The copper-plate on which this inscription is engraved is said to have been found some time in the third quarter of the last century, by one Ganēśu, in course of excavating the foundation of his house at Pachhār, a village about 20 kms. north by east of Jhānsī, the headquarters of a District of the same name in Uttar Pradesh. The record was edited by Arthur Venis in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. X (1909-10), pp. 44 ff., with a facsimile. It is edited here from inked impressions kindly supplied to me, at my request, by the Director of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, to which the original plate was presented by the Zamindār of the village and where it is now exhibited.  

---

1. Originally mē, changed later to ye.  
2. *The letters forming the name cannot be read with certainty.*  
3. *The *gīta* usually appears as *Sakhrīta*, and its *pravāsa* as *Sakhrītya*, *Āgirana* and *Gaurītā* (not *evata*). See *Gātātaraśaurabindū-kadamba*, p. 14.  
4. *The ten *ākharas* ending with this are omitted in Hiradāl's transcript.*  
5. *The bracketed *ākharas* is definitely formed.*  
6. *Hiradāl read *kramāṇa* (III) = *kramaṇa* but it is due to the fault in engraving.*  
7. *The two letters in the bracket are indistinct. Hiradāl read this expression as *pravāsa* in the sense, according to him, 'together with forest, mines and hollows'. It appears as *kramāni* in the Simāl gift* in the *Lalitāvritta*, p. 118.*  
8. *This letter has an additional redundant stroke at the end.*  
9. *The *daṇḍa* is redundant.*  
10. *The subscript of this letter looks like ṣ, with the loop of ṣ.*  
11. *A *kāka-pāda* sign appears at the end of this line.*  
12. *It is not known if the sign marking m is hidden below the band, and what looks like the sign of aumāra above this *ākharas* may be a redundant stroke of the chisel, or there are some others.*  
13. *The exact spot of the discovery of the plate is not known, but the presumption of Venis that it was somewhere on the raised mound (consisting of the usual debris of old houses, etc., on which the village stands) may be taken to be true till we find anything to the contrary. In my visit to the Museum at Lucknow for examining the inscriptions exhibited there, in January 1975, I found recorded in the Register that this plate, which is catalogued as No. 453, was presented by a Brahmin, named Bindranabha of Pachhār, through Mr. Silberad, I.G.S., and reached the Museum on the 5th December, 1908. The information is due to Mr. V.N. Shrivastava, Curator of the Museum, to whom I am thankful.*
From Facsimile
It is a single copper-plate inscribed on one side only. All round the borders it shows a flat strip of copper, about 1 cm. broad, fastened on to it very tightly with twenty rivets—six on each of the horizontal sides and four on each of the vertical. The strips are so close to the inscribed portion that some of the aksharas could not completely come out in the impressions which were prepared fresh. The engraving, as far as I could judge from the impressions and also from the plate which I examined subsequently, is rather shallow; and the interiors of a number of the letters show, as in some other inscriptions, marks of the engraver's tool, which is also responsible for mis-shaping or incompletely engraving several of them owing to the carelessness of either the writer or the engraver, as will be pointed out in the text given below. The writing too, which appears to have suffered from the deposit of verdigris on the plate, demands patience on the part of the reader. It covers a space 38 cms. broad by 27 cms. high, and contains 22 complete lines. The formation of the letters is not symmetrical, and whereas in the first fifteen lines they show an average height of 7 to 8 cm., the height gradually increases in the following lines till in the last five or six lines it is not less than 1 cm. The plate together with the strips and nails weighs 2 kgms.

In the middle of the last line of the writing, the plate has a ring-hole, about 15 cm. in diameter, and it is natural to conclude that it was meant either for hanging the plate or holding with it another plate which was never discovered. But the ring with the seal, if at all attached to it, was not found. In the middle of the first four lines also, the writing is disturbed by a rude sketch of the goddess Lakshmi, in a rectangle, measuring about 5½ cms. broad by 4½ cms. high. The deity is seated cross-legged and is being sprinkled with water by an elephant on either side; she has four hands, the upper two of which are raised, with a lotus in each. The tips of the trunks of the elephants and the upper part of the diadem of the goddess are hidden under the strips fastened tightly on this portion of the plate.

The characters are Nagari, showing more or less the same palaeographical peculiarities as of the Sêmra and the Ichchhâvar grants, which were engraved by the same hand. To note the peculiarities of the individual letters of the present inscription, we find that the vowel i is formed of two loops, the first of which shows a tail and the second a horn above, as in iem, l. 1; i is still devoid of its dha, cf. oihik, l. 9; ch and v are often alike, and occasionally dh and r also share the same peculiarities. For example, ch is formed as v in xchandra and r as v in xrr, both in l. 1, and we find r engraved as v in xrt, dh as v in xdhit and v as ch in xijja and xira, all in l. 2. Dh has developed a horn on its left limb; this horn is occasionally joined to some other part of the letter than to the loop, e.g., to its vertical stroke or to that of the matri, as in xraîdâs, l. 2, and sometimes, though rarely, it takes the place of the top-stroke itself, as in xvishdâ, l. 18. The verticals of xihâ continue to be joined by a stroke in the middle. The vertical of x is often not drawn below the point where it meets the curve of its left limb, and consequently this letter is confounded with the vowel x, e.g., see -puti and xhâm, both in l. 4. The conjunct 99 continues to be cut as go; cf. xumrâgata, l. 11, and the curve of the superscript r is at times only a cursive stroke, as in the same example. Occasionally, the forms of ch, dh, r and v are so alike as to be distinguished only from the context.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and excepting one initial verse and five imperative and beneficent verses in the end, with two more which record the names of the writer and the engraver, the record is all in prose. The verses are not numbered. Grammatical and other errors are more to be found in the last portion.

As regards orthography, we may notice that v is throughout written for b and the dental sibilant for the palatal in some places; see, e.g., in xvdha, l. 15 and xvada, l. 20; the palatal sibilant is sometimes put for the dental, as in xwivdhâ, l. 18; a class-consonant following r is generally doubled; see dharmma, l. 21. Besides these, the final consonant is occasionally not marked, and sometimes the mark cannot be clearly distinguished, as in xvarî, l. 20; the dental nasal is wrongly put for the lingual in xgyndtî, and the lingual for the dental in puryûni, both in l. 17; the matri of xî is wrongly changed to xî in xvrim, l. 19; anusvâra is wrongly changed to m in xsomat, l. 9, and in some other examples; and finally, the vertical stroke of a matri and the danâ used for marking punctuation are sometimes not distinguished from each other, e.g., in xo, the fifth letter in l. 9. The anusvâra is occasionally either not marked, or put haphazardly and in such a minute form as it could not come out on the impressions.

The plate was issued by the illustrious king Paramardin of the Chandella dynasty, from
his camp at Villasapura. The object of it is to record the bestowal, by him, of a plot of land measuring ten halls, in the village Lauva in the territorial division Kārīgāva, on a Brahmāna-Pandita of the name of Kēśava, the son of Drvēdīn Tikava, grandson of Rāpuka (or Rāti?). Tiṃṇapāla and great-grandson of Chaturvedin (?). Valaha. The date of the record, as expressed both in figures and words, in ll. 8-9, is Wednesday, the eighth of the dark half of Kārtika, of Vikrama 1233, which regularly corresponds to 27th October, 1176 A.C. The inscription, or tāmrapaṇja as it is called in v. 7 (l. 22), was written by the order of the king, by Subhānanda of the Vāstavya family, who knew all the āśtras and was the writer of the legal documents (dhatima-lēkhān). It was engraved by the artisan (jilpi) Pālhaṇa, the son of Rajapāla, who, as we know, engraved some other inscriptions also, as we have seen while editing the Ichchhāvār grant.

The inscription opens with a variant of the symbol for Siddhām, and with the oft-quoted verse eulogising the royal house of the Chandrāṭrēya kings, it gives the genealogy of the house for three kings, viz., the Paramaḥatīrṣuka, Mahārājaśītikīrṣa and Paramāvīravāra, the illustrious Prithivivarman, his successor, the P.M.P., the illustrious Madanavarman, and lastly, his successor the P.M.P., the illustrious Paramāvravāra who is also mentioned to have been a devout worshipper of Mahēśvara (Silva), and the lord of Kālaṇjara (ll. 2-4). This portion, which is evidently copied from the earlier grants of the ruler, does not furnish any new historical information. Lines 6-13 record the formal portion of the grant, stating that the king, from his camp at Villasapura, and on the date which we have seen above, donated ten halls of land pertaining to the village Lauva, falling in the territorial division (vīṣhaya) of Kārīgāva, to the Brahmāna-Pandita Kēśava, whose ancestry we have seen above and who belonged to the Kāśyapa ṛgṛha, with the krama Kāśyapa, Avasāra and Naudhrva, who studied the Vaiśnava śākha and who had emigrated from the hātātγhātā (land donated to learned Brahmānas) Mūrdhāsha.

The land which is here stated to be worth ploughing by ten halls, as we have seen the significance of the expression, is also said to be measured by its sowing capacity of seven-and-half dīvēga of seeds, 'as to be sown broadcast' and leaving a dividing line or boundary after each prāsāha of seed sown. The same expression occurs also in the Mahābhiṣika inscription of the same king issued only three years earlier in V. S. 1230., while dealing with the same we have discussed it fully; here it is also interesting to note that the way of recording the measurement of land is also mentioned in the Augāsī grant of Paramāvravāra's grandfather Madanavarman, issued in V. S. 1190. From all these instances it may safely be concluded that the method of measuring land by the quantity of seed required to sow it was not only popularly known but also officially recognised. The grant was to be, as we are further told, perpetually enjoyed by a succession of sons and son's sons (ll. 12-13).

The terms of the grant are mentioned in ll. 15-16; and accordingly, the donor was endowed with all the usual right over the land, without any obstruction. This portion is followed by five of the ordinary impregmatory and beneficentary stanzas, and thereafter we have the sign-manual of Paramāvravāra. Then the charter comes to an end with two stanzas, the first of which mentions the name of the writer and the second, of the engraver, as seen above.

As for the localities mentioned in the inscription, Kālaṇjara (l. 4), as often seen, is the renowned fort in the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh and a stronghold of the Chandella kings. The village Lauva (l. 6) has been identified by Veniss and it is said to have been situated 5 kms. west of Pachhār; and Kārīgāva which is mentioned as a vīṣhaya in l. 5, cannot definitely be identified as in the region of Jhānsī there are several villages with this name. But as suggested

---

Footnotes:
1. See Ep. Ind., Vol. X, p. 46. The year should be taken as Chaitra, expired.
2. Above, No. 129.
3. Above, No. 129, text, l. 11.
4. No. 118, Text, l. 11, 7-8.
5. For comparison, we may note that in the surrounding regions also land was measured both ways, viz. by its capacity of being ploughed and also by that of quantity of seed sown. Sometimes both these methods are mentioned in one instance and sometimes either. See C.I.I., Vol. IV: Nos. 19, 20 and 42, II-10, 10 and 32, respectively.
6. This identification seems to be in complete accord with his notice that the village contains some remains of Chandella workmanship, viz., a large well lined with square stones and "a granite slab that clearly formed originally part of a Chandella building but now used as a Sāti stone" (p. 46, n).
by Venis, it may have been the one which is the largest and most important and which is situated about 8 kms. north-east of Chirgaon and 15 kms. north-east of Pachhār. The place where the king took bath before making the grant is not mentioned, but it may have been on the banks of the Vētravati which flows not far from the find-spot of the inscription. And finally, Mutāśha, the original place of the dūcie (l. 11), I am unable to trace.

TEXT

[ Metres: Verses 1-6 and 8 Amśāśabhā v. 7 Mahāśī]

1 विद्वे ॥ विद्वे अत्ययाज्ञाट्यमनवविभवक्षविद्वे विमधौषयराग्यरूपं। विमधूषयराग्यरूपं इनिकृष्टवाल: ॥२॥
2 राजस्वविस्तिनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
3 प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
4 प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
5 प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
6 प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
7 प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्। प्रमाणविनिर्विनिर्याज्ञाट्यमनविभवक्षविद्वे विमधूषयराग्यरूपम्।
The first of the bracketed letters may also be read as va, and the letter preceding it has the sign of a 
prāñjata-mārtī which has not been joined to the stroke at the top; it has also a redundant curve as of the 
medial t. The second of the bracketed letters I take as ḍhē and not as ḍē, as also conjectured by Venis.
The whole word appears also in the Auglā grant of Madanavarman (No. 118), where the second aksara is 
dearly ra, as also read by Kielhorn, who remarked that these syllables denote some particular kind or 
kinds of grain which he was unable to explain. But in that grant the third letter of the word is uncertain, 
appearing either as de or ḍē. In the present inscription, of course, the second letter may be read 
either as ra, or de, and the third I take to be ḍē as the upper portion thereof ends in an angle and as it 
is also shown by the subscript which is faintly visible. Thus the reading of these three syllables appears 
to me as kūndrē or kūndrē, for kūndrē, in the sense of the common millet known as kūndē and 
kūndrē, as is also suggested by Venis as an alternative in the sense of 'dry', since this word, which is 
in Marāṭhī, appears to have been unfamiliar in the region of Bhandelkhand.
The subscript of the bracketed letter is mutilated by a scratch on the plate.
The danda, which was originally engraved, appears to have been later on scratched off as unnecessary.
The bracketed letter was originally sa, later on changed to sa.
Read सङ्करस.
Both the consonants of the second aksara are deformed and the curve at the end of the following figure 
appears as the slanting stroke marking the consonant t. Read सङ्ख.
The danda is redundant.
As noted by Venis, this is one of the glaring examples of engraving, without caring for the exact forms 
of letters.
As n. 21 above. Better read -वचक.
As Venis has rightly remarked, this stroke is probably used to show that the letter preceding it is a 
concrete form of a word like Chaudhuri, or so.
The reading of the first and the last aksara of the name is uncertain.
This is a contraction of atavatā (or -ātā), and the path that follows is a contraction of Pratātā, i.e., 
Pandīrī.
As also in some other cases, the first aksara of this and also of the next two lines is completely hidden 
under the strip, but they are clear in the facsimile published in Ep. Ind., Vol. X, facing p. 48:
Venis read — oana — which gives no such a meaning as may be applicable here. Therefore we 
have to adopt the reading as in the other grants of the house as "mahātrī, in the sense of "palm trees 
and sugar-cane".
The consonant of the bracketed letter is rather peculiarly formed and it also occupies more than the 
usual space. Here the use of the palatal sibilant instead of the dental appears probably due to the 
local influence, as we also find in some other records of the house, e.g., in No. 159.
Venis read शाखा (शः)मा, but this is because he mistook the horizontal stroke joining the verticals of 
dhā for ma.
These two letters are redundant here. See my remarks on the same word in No. 129.
PACHHĀR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF
PARAMARDĪDEVA, VIKRAMA 1233

From Facsimile
This is one of the four copper-plate grants edited by R. B. Hiralal in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XX (1929-30), pp. 125-136, all without facsimiles. As to their find and the present deposits, we have already remarked above, that all of them were found with the Chief of Charkhāri, formerly a State in the Bundelkhand region of the Central India Agency and now included in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh. The original find-spots of these plates are not known, and no information as to their present deposits is forthcoming; and even an impression is now not possible to have. Under the circumstances, I edit this record from the text given by Hiralal, appending my notes to it.

The inscription is on two plates, both of which are incised on the inner side only. The first plate is stated to measure 60.95 by 28.57 cms, and the second 61.25 by 26.70 cms. Their
rims are raised to a height of about 1 cm., to protect the writing. The first plate contains the figure of Lakshmi, the usual design to be seen on the plates issued by the Chandella rulers, in the middle of the first three lines, and at the bottom, a space for a hole, interrupting the writing in the middle of the last line. But what is peculiar is that the hole was never made. The size of the letters on the first plate is about 5 cm.; on the second it is slightly bigger. Each of the plates weighs 2.4 kgs. and 108 gms.

The characters are Dévanâgari of about the 12th century A.D. The letters are distinct and well written, but the formation of v, ch, dh and r is such as to cause difficulty in distinguishing them from each other; and the letters also share the peculiarities of the work done by Pâlhana, who engraved some other plates also, about which we have already remarked above, e.g., the omission of parts of some of the letters, and of the signs of anusvara and the superscript r, as to be noticed respectively, in Bhâma (for Sêma) in l. 9, and bhuvirîśat and vattamâna, both in line 8.

The language is Sanskrit: and, with the exception of the introductory verse eulogising the race of the Chandrátryas and seven imprecatory verses in the end, the record is entirely in prose. It consists of 92 lines, 18 of which are engraved on the first plate and the remaining 14 on the second. The orthographical peculiarities are as in the preceding grants, for example, (a) the use of the sign of v to denote b also, e.g., in sumodhanyata, l. 7; (b) a confusion between the correct use of the palatal s for the dental s: see silpa- and visen-, both in l. 32 and prasada in l. 24; and (c) the doubling of a class-consonant following r, as in svr̥gga, l. 26. The influence of local pronunciation is noticed in the use of j for j in jâmadagnya in l. 12; examples of wrong sandhis in pravârîhītō = chhâmâgā, l. 12, and bâhîh = bâhita, l. 14; and the visr̥gga of bhavâdhbhīh, which is the last word of a verse in l. 28, is combined with the following r.

It is a royal charter issued by the Paramârajâḥśr̥tâ, Mahârajâjâhśr̥tâ and Paramârajâ, the illustrious Paramârîdevî, who, from the expression “lord of Kâlânîjara”, was evidently the Chandella ruler. The text is copied verbatim from the preceding record, excepting the portion dealing with the details of the grant. The object of it is to record the royal donation of the whole land in the village Sâgaujô, included in the vishaya of Kâlânîjara, by Paramârîdevî. The grant was perpetual and it was made in favour of four Brâhmaṇas, all hailing from the Brâhmanas known as Mutâûtha. All the Brâhmaṇas belonged to the Vatsa gotra and had the live pravârâs, Vatsa, Brâhgha, Chayâna, Apunâvâna and Jâmâdagnya, and all were the students of the Châhâdôya śâkhâ.

The following table is intended to show the names of the Brâhmaṇa donees, with some other details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of the donee</th>
<th>Father’s name</th>
<th>Shares donated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sûmâka</td>
<td>Dâvara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Svatapâta1</td>
<td>Bâhîc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ratana (Ratna)</td>
<td>Pâpē</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sîhâha</td>
<td>Sûlhaõa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 5 shares.

The grant was issued by the king from Vishâputra, the same place from which the previous grant was also issued. It may be noted here that one of the donees of the previous grant, viz., Kârâvârman also hailed from the same place as of the present grant; and it is also noteworthy that in the gift-village exclusion was made of the five halas of land which had already been donated to a Buddhist (monastery ?), l. 14, which appears to have been in existence there some time in the past.

Among the royal officers mentioned in the grant, we also find štrâka in l. 22, denoting one in charge of forest and wild tribes, as noted by Hirâlal, who also invited attention to the same word in Kauîlîya’s Arthasâstra.2 But there is another expression which appears here for the first time, viz., sakârûka-pâkâva-varîg-vâstavya. While publishing Hirâlal’s article in the Epigraphia

---

1 See above, No. 126.
2 This name is perhaps Sîpaça, as we find in some other grants of the house, e.g., in the Sêmâra grant, No. 126, l. 63, 70 (twice) and 104.
3 See n. on the same word in l. 22.
Indica, the editor remarked that "the exact implication of this expression is not understood", but at the same time he is inclined to suggest that perhaps it means "together with potter's mud and what has been left by merchants." I am, however, afraid this explanation is not at all suitable here; and I may suggest that the word kāraka appears to be the same as kāra, i.e., an artisan, and pānaka-vanaik means one who is a trader in a thick mass or large quantities. And last of all, vaśayana is used here to denote an inhabitant, it being formed according to Pāṇini, Vārtika No. 1920.

The inscription is dated, in ll. 8-9, on Monday, the seventh of the bright half of Chaitra, falling in the year 1236, which is expressed both in words and numerical figures. According to Hiratal, this year, which is of course to be taken as of the Vikrama era, regularly corresponds to Monday, the 27th March, 1178 A. C., taking it to be northern current as shown by the word upeta. It is one of the few Chandella grants expressing the northern current year.

The charter was drafted, or rather adopted from that of the preceding grant with necessary changes, by the illustrious Subhānanda of the Vaśayana family, by the order of the king. It was engraved by the artistana Pālana, the son of Rajapāla. It may be noted here that both these persons are the same who drafted and engraved, respectively, the previous and some other royal charters issued by the house. The sign-manual of the king is incised in line 29.

Of the geographical places mentioned in the inscription, Kālānjarā (l. 4) is of course the well-known fort in the Banda District and Vīlaspura, the place where the grant was issued (l. 8), is Pachār, as we have already seen. Kirāyida, after which the vaśayana was known (l. 5-6), has been suggested by Hiratal to be identical with Kirāti, about 12 kms. from Mahābā. I have not been able to trace Saganḍu the gift-village (l. 6), in the vicinity; and last of all, Mutāūtha, the original place of the donees (l. 11), cannot be identified for want of the details.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 15. Amruti: v. 6. Śālīra: v. 7 Mārtīr].

First Plate

1 [A] स्वरूप [अथ] विनचित्रं विनिकेश्वरविनिरोपेत: । वन्धवंशवर्णभवायं वन्धवंश ईवोऽवसादः ।
2 [R] [स] ॥[88] ॥
3 मित्रपंक्षान्ति उपेता ।
4 विनिकेश्वरविनिरोपेत: ।
5 वन्धवंशवर्णभवायं वन्धवंश ईवोऽवसादः ।
6 [स] ॥

\[1\] From Hiratal's transcript in Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 129.
\[2\] From Hiratal's article in Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 181.
\[3\] Expressed by a symbol, as usual. It has not been noted by Hiratal. It is for kāra.
\[4\] This punctuation mark is redundant, as some others below. We may also remark here in a general way, that the curve on the top stroke above the preceding 'r' may not have been engraved at all, or it is faint and hence it did not come out in the impression, from which Hiratal prepared his transcript; and thus he read 'r' instead of 't'. So is the case of his reading 'f' for 'fi'. For similar reason, the 'm' in the line. Errors of this type exist throughout, which are due to the carelessness of the engraver Pālana, as often noted by us.
As already noted by Hiralal, the letter ष्टि is superfluous.

2 This akṣara is perhaps त्रिवेद, an abbreviation of Trīvēda.

3 For the correct reading of the name, see n. 2 in p. 172 in the main article above.

4 I agree with the editor of the Ep. Intr., who remarked that plural ought to have been employed here and also in l. 21 below.

5 For the meaning of this expression, see n. 2 in p. 153 in the article above.

6 It appears probable that in the original all these words are in the plural, as required by the context, but the defective engraving led Hiralal to make improper corrections. See n. 4 above.

7 Amūtha is a government officer in charge of the forest and wild tribes.
AHĀR STATUE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDEVA

| Vikrama | Year 1237 |

This inscription, which is edited here for the first time, is incised on the pedestal of a colossal image of the sixteenth Jaina Tirthankara Sāntinātha, at Ahār, which is a sacred place of the Jaina community and lies about 25 kms. from Tīkamgadh, the chief town of a district and tehsīl in the Vindhyā region of Madhya Pradesh. The record came to my notice in my exploration tour in the region, some 20 years ago, when I also obtained there a small brochure meant for circulation, in which I found a transcript of the record, somewhat incorrect, though illustrated. The lithograph, besides being indistinct, is of an extremely small size and thus altogether helpless. In view of the importance of the inscription, I requested the Chief Epigraphist to kindly prepare and provide a good impression thereof, and he was kind to depute his assistant for the work. The inscription is edited here on the basis of this excellent impression; for which my thanks are due to the Chief Epigraphist.

The record consists of 9 lines of writing, interrupted by the deer symbol, which is clear in the impression and which divides the lines into two sections which may be marked A and B, for the sake of convenience. The length of the writing on the left-hand side is 30.5 cms., and that on the right-hand side is 33 cms. The first three lines on either side are about 6 cms. shorter than the others, since a portion of them is occupied by the śāhēla. The general height of the writing is 20.5 cms., and the average height of the letters is about 1.5 cms. The writing is well preserved, except in the last two lines which are obliterated in the impression.

The characters are Nāgari of the 12th century A.C. The initial ṭ, which occurs twice in L. 2 and once in L. 4, is formed of two circles placed below the third, and are joined with each other by a curve; and the initial ṭ occasionally resembles the consonant p, e.g., in pāṭha. L. 8. Of the consonants, ch can hardly be distinguished from v, e.g., in chaitya. L. 3; the horn of dh is prominent, as in vyādha-. L. 1; the slightly differing two forms of bh can be seen in bhātama- and bhāta-, both in L. 6; and finally, the subscript ṭ is marked by a serif at the lowest extremity of a letter to which it is attached.

The language is Sanskrit; and excepting a short sentence paying obeisance in the beginning and the date in L. 6, the record is metrically composed. There are seven stanzas, all of which are numbered. The only orthographical peculiarities that call for notice are that (i) the consonant following ṭ is reduplicated, e.g., in nimmimā, L. 4; (ii) that the dental and the palatal sibilants are occasionally not correctly put, e.g., in śrīmānaḥ and śālī, both in L. 1; (iii) that the priedha-mātī occurs only sparingly; and that (iv) the sign of anusvāra is generally also to be found at the end of a sentence, except in a few cases as in śītātman, L. 8. The signs of mātrās and anusvāra in the topmost line are elegantly engraved.

This verse occurs in the preceding and some other grants also.
The inscription refers itself to the victorious reign of the illustrious Paramardideva (1. 7), who is no other than the Chandella king Paramarin; and its purpose is to record the installation of an image in a chhatra, which was then constructed. The date of the record is given in l. 6, in figure only, as Friday, the third day of the bright half of Mārga, i.e., Mārgaśirsha, of Śaṁvat 1237, which has to be referred to the Vikrama era, following the practice of giving the year in that age. The date regularly corresponds to 21st November, 1180 A.C. The year is the Chatriyā Vikrama, expired.

No special value attaches to the date since Paramardin, the grandson of Madanavarman, is known to have been reigning from 1166 to 1202 A.C.

The inscription commences with a prose sentence paying homage to Vitarāga, as already stated, and introduces the lineage of the persons who built the temple. The first ancestor spoken of here is the illustrious Devapāla, who is stated to have built a multiple-peaked temple (saṅkṣatikāta) at Bānapura. He belonged to the graha-pati family. The two verses that follow inform us that his son was Ratapāla. His descendant was Rālapa, whose son was Gālaṅa, who built two temples of Sāntinātha, one at Aṇandapura, and the other at Madanapura (known after the tank and after the king Madana, i.e., Madanavarman). Gaṅa's son was Jāhada, who had a younger brother called Dayachandra, as we learn from the next verse. The following verse, i.e., verse 5 informs us that both these brothers, i.e., Jāhada and Dayachandra, desiring to obtain salvation, jointly constructed the Sāntinātha chhatra, i.e., the sanctuary where the image of this Arhat was installed. Then comes the date as given above, and the name of the reigning king, which too we have seen above. Verse 6 desires the temple (kirtīma) to be everlasting, by stating that it may stand as long as the Sun, the moon, the sea, and the stars continue. And the last stanza (v. 7) states that the image was prepared by the intelligent Pāpaṭa who was an architect (vāstuśāstraṭa) and also a mason (ṛīpākāra), and was the son of Bālaṅa. The inscription is silent about the person who constructed the temple.

The Graha-pati family referred to here is known also from some Chandella and other inscriptions, showing its prevalence, importance and continuation from the time of the very rise of the royal house. For example, the Khajurāhö inscription of V. 1011 mentions one Pāhila belonging to this family as held in high esteem by Dhūṅā. About two decades subsequently, flourished a person with the same name and taken identical with him by D. C. Sircar, as consecrating with his brother Jajjhā, an image of Sāntinātha at Darbat. Still another person bearing the same name and belonging to the same family is referred to in an inscription of V. 1215 (1158 A.C.), which states that his son Sābhē installed an image of Sambhavanātha at Khajurāhö. In course of editing the respective inscriptions, we have seen that some of the members belonging to this family occupied a very influential position under the Chandella kings and also that these persons were noted for making gifts and donations. And the present inscription which gives the pedigree of the brothers Jāhada and Dayachandra who jointly installed the image, indicates the donations made by the same family, though they did not actually belong to the house of Pāhila. It also tells us that their father Galhaṇa was the supermost of the kṛṣṭhīn (kṛṣṭhī-varṣṭhā) in the locality.

As for the geographical names occurring in the inscription, Bānapura where Devapāla, the earliest ancestor of the house mentioned here, is stated to have built a shrine (l. 1), is obviously the modern place of the same name (Lat. 24° 43' N.; Long. 78° 45' E), lying about 30 kms. east

---

1 In view of the expression sāhuśa in v. 3, I take the two temples to be built by Galhaṇa. The construction is somewhat obscure here.
2 For the reading of the name, see n. in the text, below.
3 No. 99 v. 1. Also see J. N. L. No. 99.
4 No. 100, A. I. 2.
AHAR STATUE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDÉVA. VIKRAMA 1237

Scale: One-fourth
of Lalipur in the Jhansi District and about 90 kms south-southeast of Jhansi itself. Vasuhatikā where the family resided (L. 2), cannot be identified. It may, however, be pointed out that a village of the name of Hāja lies about 45 kms due east of Banpur. Similarly, we have no definite clue to identify Anandapura (v. 3) and last of all, Madanīsasagarapura (v. 5), as already mentioned above, is Ahār itself, where the inscription was found.\footnote{1}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{TEXT}
  \item \textbf{Verse 1}, \textbf{Arya}; \textbf{v. 2, 4 and 5} \textbf{Pamukhali}; \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{Sāntūlikā}; \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{Rāthādakā}; \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Anuvṛtti}.
  \item \textbf{Verse 2}, \textbf{Verse 3}, \textbf{Verse 4}, \textbf{Verse 5}, \textbf{Verse 6}, \textbf{Verse 7}.
\end{itemize}

1 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

2 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

3 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

4 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

5 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

6 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

7 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

8 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

9 \textit{\textbf{Asūra}}\footnote{2} \textbf{v. 1} \textbf{v. 2} \textbf{v. 3} \textbf{v. 4} \textbf{v. 5} \textbf{v. 6} \textbf{v. 7} \textbf{Asūra}.

\footnote{1} I am indebted to Shri B. C. Jain for the information that this place contains an old temple which may probably be identified with the Sahasrakāśa of the inscription.
\footnote{2} Traditionally, the place is still so called as I came to know in my visit to it.
\footnote{3} From an impression.
\footnote{4} Denoted by a symbol.
\footnote{5} The sign of the mātrā of this asūra resembles the subscript n and the preceding asūra is deformed by an additional wrong stroke of the chisel.
\footnote{6} Both these asūras, which are now lost, have been conjecturally restored from the context.
\footnote{7} Owing to a wrong stroke of the chisel, the bracketed asūra is deformed.
\footnote{8} The sign of the mātrā on the second is not distinct on the impression. It may have been clear on the original.
\footnote{9} The letter in the bracket was so engraved with the sign of viṣarga, which was later on changed to the mātrā.
\footnote{10} The first asūra of the name was originally omitted in writing and was later on inserted just above its proper place, in a smaller size. The patasūkhāṇa shows that possibly the name may also have been Udasyachandra, but to accept it would involve a literary error (Vidhēyāνāṁraṇa).
\footnote{11} These letters indicate the end of recording the main purpose.
\footnote{12} These four asūras have been restored from the traces left.
\footnote{13} The whole of this line which has faintly and partly come out in the impression, has been restored from the traces left, and the reading has been finalised with the help of the brochure referred to above.
BHĀRAT KALĀ BHAVAN COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDĪDEVA

[Vikrama Year 1289]

This copper-plate, which is now preserved in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan Museum of the Hindu University, Vārānasi, is said to have been purchased, along with some others, from a resident of Tikamgarh, the head-quarters of a district in Madhya Pradesh, sometime fifteen years ago. The provenance of the plate is not known but it appears to have been obtained by the dealer somewhere in the surrounding region, as we shall see below. The inscription on it was edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, with its transcription in Roman characters, and a facsimile, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol., XXXII (for 1958-59), pp. 123 ff., and plate facing p. 126. It is edited here from an inked impression which was kindly supplied to me, at my request, by Rāi Krishnadasji, the founder Curator of the Museum.

It is a single plate, incised on one side only, and measures about 39.2 cms. in height and 23 cm. in thickness. To protect the writing, flat copper-bands, about 1 cm. broad and 3 cm. thick, are rivetted on all the four borders of the inscribed surface. This rivetting is done by means of copper-nails, five each at the top and the bottom, and four on each of the other two sides. The plate, together with the border-bands and nails, weighs 3 kgms., and 274 gms. The writing covers a space about 36 by 25.5 cms., and contains 20 lines, which are in a good state of preservation. In the middle of the first four lines is a rectangle, 5 by 6.5 cms., containing the representation of the four-armed goddess Lakshmi seated on a full blown lotus, and on her either side is an elephant sprinkling water over her head. Similarly, the writing is also interrupted in the last line, by a vacant space, about 4 cms. long, which is apparently intended for a hole that would have been required, if the inscription would have been continued on a second plate. The average size of the letters is 1 cm., except in the last three lines where it reaches up to about 1.5 cms.

The alphabet is Nagari, bearing a general resemblance to that of the Sāmā and the other grants which were engraved by the same mason who incised the present grant. And the palaeographical peculiarities too are more or less the same as we notice in them. For example, n continues to be devoid of its dot; see jañjana, l. 7, but the dot is marked in vañḍhā, l. 9 (if it is not an original fault on the plate): dh and r show a transitional stage; the first of these letters, e.g., is incised with a horn on its left limb in dhṛtta, l. 1, and without it in vañḍhā, l. 16; and the second, i.e., r, which has assumed its fully developed form as in the modern Nagari, survives in a few instances in its form resembling v, e.g., in rupu, l. 5, and is occasionally also marked with a wedge, as in parama, l. 4. Besides these, we may also note that ch is often confounded with v, as in vaññadvadrana, l. 11; and bh with t, as in bhūga-bhhōga, l. 14; and lastly, ṇ as a latter member of a conjunct consonant is written as l: see bhadrāṣṭra, l. 2 and utkṛṇa, l. 20. Simpler, lines in marking the sign of anuvāda and of the maṛṭas above, continues as in the preceding grants, e.g., a redundant anuvāda is put on ma in maññadhivya, l. 10, whereas it is not cut on the last letters in likhita and utkṛṇa, both in the last line.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; it is generally correct, excepting a few minor types of mistakes which have been corrected in the text below. And leaving the initial verse and three imprecatory and beneficent verses in ll. 17-19, the whole record is in prose. The orthography shares the same peculiarities as those records issued in the contemporary times, viz., (1) to denote b by the sign for v; cf. vañḍhā, l. 16; (2) the doubling of a consonant following t, as in dvaravahana, l. 5; (3) the use of the dental for the palatal sibilant in viṁsa, l. 1; and (4) occa-

---

1 Nos. 119 and 138.
2 In the meanwhile I was also favoured with another impression by the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India. This was indeed helpful to me in ascertaining some points in the reading.
3 See p. 422 n. 3.
4 In this connection see n. 5 on l. 6 in p. 160 below.
sionally placing a *danda* as a punctuation mark so close to the preceding or the following letter, as to be confounded with the sign of a *mātra*. Besides these, we also find a developed tendency to use the *prishṭha-mātra* and the *anuciśāra*, though the use of the *parā-svarṇa* too is often resorted to, sometimes wrongly, as in *samudita*, i.e., 7. The verb *grihmāti* is wrongly spelt with the dental *n*; the influence of the local pronunciation is reflected in proper names, e.g., in *Padumādhava*, l. 12; and lastly, as in the other grants of the king, a *danda* is put to indicate that the syllable preceding it is an abbreviated form, as is the one after *tha* and another after *path*, both in l. 12, to denote respectively *Thakura* and *Pandita*, i.e., Pandit.

The inscription refers itself to the Chandella king Paramardin of Kālaṇjara, and its object is to record the gift of the village of the name of Chachōḍa which was then included in the territorial division of Duddhi, by the king Paramardin himself, when he was encamped at Sallakṣaṇa-Vilāsapura, on a date which is expressed both in words and numerical figures. It is Tuesday, the fourth day of the dark half of Phālguna of the (Vikrama) year 1239, which, taking the year to be Chaitṛādi, expired, corresponds to 23rd of February, 1182 A.C.1

To summarise the contents of the record, it begins with the auspicious symbol for *Siddham* and is followed by the expression *Śavati*, which, in its turn, is followed by a verse in the *Amuśṭhī śruti* which we generally find at the beginning of the grants of the house. Thereafter, the record mentions the *Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja* and *Paranēśvara*, the glorious Paramardin, who was a great devotee of Mahēśvara and the supreme lord of Kālaṇjara, and who is stated to have meditated on the feet of the P.M.P., the illustrious Madanāvarman, who, in his turn, meditated on the feet of the P.M.P., the illustrious Prithivivarman. This portion has been copied from the earlier grants of the king and thus it affords no new historical material. Here it is worth noting that Paramardin’s father Yasovarman’s name does not figure in the genealogy, for the latter had either predeceased his father Madanavaran, or may have ruled only for a short time, as we have seen above. The formal portion of the charter begins in l. 6; it goes on to convey the king’s order to the Brāhmaṇas and all the other people who had assembled at the village of Chachōḍa when he had encamped at Sallakṣaṇa-Vilāsapura. The grant was made in favour of a Brāhmaṇa, *Pāna* (i.e., *Pudita*) Padumadharasvaran, who belonged to the Kantaṇa gotra and the Vaiṣṇavēyī śākhā with the three *pravartas*—Āngira, Āmbasētha and Yauvanāsētha, and who was the son of *Tha*, i.e., Thakura, Dhaim, grandson of Śripāla and the great-grandson of *Tha*, i.e., Thakura Sāhārama and hailed from Pātaliputra. Lines 13-17 describe the usual conditions of the grant, stating that the donee and his descendants should enjoy the gift of the village with all the objects in its limits and without any obstruction from any quarter, and also that it may be continued by kings in future. Thus, as usual, follow three of the benedictory and imperative verses and the *sign-manual* of the king Paramardideva, in ll. 17-20. And with the statement that the inscription was written by the *dharmanākhin* (writer of legal documents) Thakura Vidyutaka, and engraved by Pālśana,2 the record comes to a close.

As for the localities mentioned in the grant, Kālaṇjara (l. 4) is, of course, the renowned fort of the name, as we have often seen; and Duddhi or Duddhi (l. 6) has been correctly identified by Sirinar with the modern Duddhi in the Lallitpur sub-division of the Jhansi District. Chachōḍa (l. 6), the gift-village, seems to be identical with the modern Chachōḍa or Chachbura in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh. This place is about 100 miles or 160 kms. west-southwest of Duddhi and about 120 kms. north-west of Vidiśā; and we know that the Vidiśā-Duddhi region was then included in the Chandella kingdom. Vilāsapura (l. 8) has already been identified with Pachhār,3 the find-spot of another grant of Paramardin, lying about 20 kms. north-east of Jhansi. Here, however, the name Sallakṣaṇa is added to it, and it was so known probably because after the name of Sallakṣaṇa, the elder brother of Prithivivarman, who was the great-grandfather of

---

3 This adjective is applied to the donee alone and hence the meaning is that he and not his family, as Sirinar observed, hailed from Pātaliputra. He is obviously a nephew of the donee in No. 119, as known from his ancestry.
4 As already seen above, this person also engraved some other charters.
5 Above, No. 151.
Paramardin. All these circumstances show that probably the plate was obtained by the dealer somewhere round about Jhansi. And lastly, *Pātaliputra-nagara*, which is stated here to have been the original place of the donor (I. 11), is evidently the city of Patnit in Bihar. It may be noted that here it is called a nagara (city) and not a bhartīgāhāra, as in another grant of the same king. And this statement may probably be taken to suggest that a rent-free locality of Brāhmaṇas existed side by side with the city of that name during that period.

TEXT

[Metre: Verses 14 Anushthāṇ].

1 सिद्ध 2 स्वरत 3 विश्रल 1 विश्रलतिरितरुपत:। विश्रलतिरितरुपत: । संहारणदास:। ।
2 तन्न । तन्न । तन्न । तन्न ।
3 ए 4 उपनि संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।
4 हम । हम । हम । हम ।
5 सन। हम । हम । हम । हम ।
6 री । हम । हम । हम । हम ।
7 लवनि संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।
8 उन्निर्देशः। हम । हम । हम । हम । हम ।
9 कालादर्शितानुपस्थयासः। एँ संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।
10 दैविकः संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।
11 लवनि संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।
12 नेरि संहारणशास्ति-शिक्षितकरिपुकुसः। कुलसमुपुरबराशिराजगुला: परिपालनभक्तिविशिष्टकरिपुकुसः ।

1 No. 158, I. 10.
2 From the original plate and an impression.
3 Expressed by a symbol.
4 The consonant of the second letter of the name is formed as lingual & (round-backed), but the dental d is probably intended here as we find in the name appearing in some of the grants of this house.
5 The consonants of the first and the second letter of the name can each be read either as ch or v, but I prefer to take it as the former, as the place being so called is situated in the territorial division in which it is mentioned here. See under identification of place-names in the article.
6 Originally engraved as dayi, with the curve of the mātra scratched off. The ta of chalta that follows was also originally engraved as da and corrected later on.
7 The bracketed akṣara is not well engraved, and the v of vi that follows has a redundant stroke in it.
8 Drop the danda and read दां/रा. बाहुल्यविकल्पान्नसाधनवीकरणम/|।
9 The bracketed akṣara is not well engraved, and the v of vi that follows has a redundant stroke in it.
10 Drop the danda and read दां/रा. बाहुल्यविकल्पान्नसाधनवीकरणम/।
11 This is a contraction of Paṇḍita i.e., Paṇḍit.
BHARATKALĀ BHAVAN COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDĪDĒVA, VIKRAMA 1299
KĀLANJAR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDĪDEVĀ

[Vikrama] Year 1240

This inscription was brought to notice by F. Kielhorn, who discussed its date, from a rubbing supplied to him by Burgess, in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX, p. 37 (No. 67), and also included in his List of Inscriptions of North India. It is incised on a rock between the fourth and the fifth gate, locally known as Budh Budr (Būdhī Bhadrā) and Hanumān Darwāzā, respectively, in the fort of Kālanjāra, in the Nanāti Tēhsīl of the Bāndā District in Uttar Pradesh. It does not appear to have been noticed by Lieut. Maisey or General Cunningham who visited the place in the last century. It is edited here for the first time from an inked impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist.

It is a short inscription consisting of 5 lines of writing, which covers a space 24½ cms. broad by 22 cms. high. The writing is well preserved except that it has lost two akṣara of the middle of L 1, which, however, can be made out from the context. The height of the individual letters, excluding the top-mātrā, is about 3½ cms.

The alphabet is Nāgarī. The letter dh has developed a horn on its left limb, and r is denoted by a vertical with a stroke attached to its middle on the left, both these examples to be seen in Yāśodhara, L. 3. The language is Sanskrit, which is generally correct; and the record is in prose. The orthography calls for no special remarks.

The inscription refers itself to the victorious reign of the illustrious Paramardīdevā; and though nothing about his family or his titles is stated herein, from the provenance of the record, it...
lie is undoubtedly the Chandella king bearing this name. The purpose of the inscription is to record the installation of an object which is not mentioned, by the illustrious Pandita Jajó, the son of the Náyaka Pandita Yásodhara. The inscription is dated Thursday, the fourteenth of the bright half of Vaiśākha of the (Vikrama) year 1240. Kiellhorn, who discussed the date in the volume of the Ind. Ant. which we have referred to above, has already concluded that this date regularly corresponds to the 26th of April, 1184 A. C., taking the year as of the southern Vikrama era, expired.

Yásodhara and his son Jajó are not known from any other record, but from the title attached to his name, the former appears to have been an influential person. No special value can be attached to the date of the record which gives only an intermediate year for Paramardin who is known to have occupied the Chandella throne from 1166 to 1202 A.C. In the present record, moreover, no imperial title is attached to his name, and this should not be taken to conclude that after the fall of Mahóba in 1182, i.e., only about two years before the time when the present record was incised, he was relegated to be a petty local ruler by the conqueror, Prithviraj. The inscription is, after all, a private record and we have evidence to show that Paramardin ruled in the capacity of an imperial ruler even thereafter.

No geographical name occurs in the inscription.

TEXT*

1 स्रीमलरमहेंद्रवर्धनांकाम
2 चन्देलकालरोजिः
3 श्रीमलकुमार
4 श्रीमलकुमार
5 श्रीमलकुमार

NO. 1364 PLATE CXXIII

FRAGMENTARY MAHÓBA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDEVA

[Vikrama | Year 1240]

The slab which bears the subjoined inscription is said to have been discovered in 1848, by General Alexander Cunningham, at Mahóba in the Hamúpur District of Uttar Pradesh, and is now in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow. It was found placed upside down as a common building stone in the fort wall at that place. Cunningham very briefly noticed the record in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (for 1883-85), p. 72, with a facsimile in Plate xxii, drawing attention to its date and conjuring it to belong to the reign of the Chandella king Paramardin. A brief account of the record was also published by Vincent Smith in the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, for 1879, pp. 143-44; and subsequently,

---

* For example the Bajêwara Stone Inscription, No. 139, v. 10.
* From an impression.
* Of the akshara in the brackets, the first is partly visible and the second is completely lost.
* The first of these two letters is mutilated and the second has lost its subscript.
* Probably due to some overwriting the reading of this akshara is doubtful.
* For the situation and antiquities of this place, see my remarks above in No. 115.
KALANJAR ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIDEVA, VIKRAMA 1240

From Photograph.
The inscription is a fragment, incised on a slab which is broken at the top and also on both the vertical sides from top to bottom, and the broken parts are all lost. It contains seventeen imperfect lines, the first of which shows only the lower parts of four or five letters. The total height of the extant portion of the writing is 46/5 cms., and the length of it, beginning with 35/5 cms. in the second line, gradually increases to 65/5 cms. in l. 11, and decreases again to 61/9 cms. in the last line. The breaks are all irregular. The upper proper right corner of the stone, which already had a crack extending up to 1.9 cms. at the time of Cunningham, has also since been lost. An approximate idea of the original length of the writing can be had from l. 11, which has lost only six of the letters, three on either side, the total breadth of which can be estimated to be about 6 cms., in view of that of the others; and thus the total length may be considered to have been about 71/9 cms. As for the original height of the writing, Prof. Mirashi observed that "it is now impossible to conjecture; but if it contained a prasasti of the reigning king's ancestors, as it is not unlikely, its height must have been at least the double of the present one of 1' 3" (31-75 mm.)." But we generally find that in a prasasti one of the kings is described in more number of verses than another and often some of them are mentioned only by name or are even omitted; and thus it precludes the possibility of saying anything definitely about the original height of the writing. The size of the letters is between 1'5 and 2 cms.

The record has also suffered due to weather and rough treatment, but excepting two letters which are totally lost though they are of minor importance and can conjecturally be restored with confidence, viz., ν in l. 12 and συ in l. 14, the extant portion of it is all legible. The letters are all symmetrically and carefully drawn and engraved. But there are some slips; some of the signs of mātrās, anusāsana and the superscript ṛ, which are expected on the top-strokes, are either familily visible or are altogether missing; however, comparing all the three impressions before me, I could only conclude that these signs were engraved shallow on the original itself rather than taken as lost on account of the exposure. This was confirmed in my examination of the original, as stated above.

The characters are Nāgarī. They are ornamental, showing their bends and joints angular, and in this respect they resemble the Mahābā inscription ending with the name of Kritivarman. To note the general feature of the forms of the letters, their vertical strokes are often not drawn below where they meet the ends of the left-hand curve, particularly in the case of p, y and v. As regards individual letters, the loop of k when the first member of a conjunct consonant is replaced by a horizontal stroke, as in kahobha, l. 8; the left limb of kh begins with a loop as thanpatal J, e.g., in khmādhasu, l. 6; gh is distinguished from n; cf. cāttāi and vikārpa, both in l. 8; the conjunct mn appears as nl, see the letter of these examples; and t as superscript, and often s also, are devoid of their tail, e.g., in ṭamasu, l. 2, and ṭal, l. 4. Dh continues to be
without its top-stroke, but the horn on its left limb is sometimes joined to the loop below, as in sādhvatī, l. 7, or to the top of the vertical, e.g., in sūdhī, l. 15; and occasionally the top of the vertical itself is slightly curved to the left so as to appear as the horn, for which, cf. adhiha, l. 4. The slightly different forms of bh can be seen in āshūbhā, l. 3, ābhiya, l. 4, and bhūta, l. 9; and r which has assumed its modern form, occasionally appears as a vertical marked with a horizontal stroke in the middle, e.g., in mārata, l. 9. The subscript form of this letter continues to be marked by a serif as in pralaya, l. 2, and occasionally also by a stroke to the left, as in -agra, in l. 6; and lastly, the middle of the left limb of l is formed as a vertical stroke, cf. pralaya, l. 2.

The language is Sanskrit, which is almost correct, and with the date in the end, the extant portion of the record is all in verse, containing 20 stanzas in the usual embellished style. The verses are not numbered; and with the exception of verses 10, 15, 16, and 19, all of them are fragmentary. In respect of orthography, we may note that (1) b is throughout denoted by the sign for v; see sūdhī, l. 13; (2) the dental sibilant is wrongly put for the palatal in some instances only; cf. sāvata, l. 18, and of verse v we have only one case, akravātī, l. 16, where we find the wrong use of the dental sibilant; (3) a consonant after r is generally doubled; see karpū, l. 2; (4) the prabhāmātrā is used with a few exceptions like uhmē. l. 12; the final consonant is not marked except in sāhvat in the last line; and lastly, kusāyapa in l. 3 is spelt with the dental nasal, and ujijāla, in l. 12, appears with a single j, which cannot be defended grammatically.

The inscription is a prasasti, a laudatory account, as shown by the word used in v. 15 in l. 14; and its immediate object is to record the erection of a temple in honour of the lord Smārātī (Siva, the destroyer of Smara), as we learn from v. 17 in l. 15, by the learned Mādhava, a pious dvija and a teacher of arts and dance, who was the son of Lakshman and grandson of Nāṇe of the Kāyapa lineage (vv. 16-17). The prasasti was composed by Jayāpāla, the son of Sūhila and grandson of Hallaṇa of the illustrious Vāstuva family (vv. 13-15). It was engraved by Dēvārāja, the son of Sūmarāja, and was probably written (on the stone) by Kartripāla, whose name alone is fortunately preserved in verse 18.

The date of the inscription, as expressed only in words in the end, is Monday, the ninth of the dark half of Āśādha of the year 1240; and the year is also mentioned in v. 18 in word-numerals, stating that it was the era of Sāhasānka. As stated above, the era was taken by Cunningham as of Vikrama and so by Kielhorn also, who calculated its date accordingly. But in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, D. R. Bhandarkar conjectures it to be the Kalachuri era, on the basis of his assumption that Sāhasānka is the same as Sāhasamallānka, used to denote Malayasiṅhā, in his Rēwa stone inscription dated in the Kalachuri year 944, and hence the year of the present record, if taken as that of the Kalachuri era, works out all right for that era also; and accordingly, it is equivalent to Monday, the 22nd June, 1184 A.C.1 Showing that this view is incorrect, and also pointing out that Sāhasānka was the name of Vikramāditya, Dr. V. V. Mirashi concluded that the date of the inscription must be referred to the Vikrama era, as already done not only by Cunningham but also by Kielhorn, who calculated the year of the epigraph for the Southern expired Vikrama year 1240 and found the date equivalent to the 4th of June, 1184 A.C., when it was a Monday.2

The existing portion of the inscription does not mention the name of any king or the family to which he may have belonged, but from a reference to the Moon and from the expression iathulabhāṣṇa used soon after, we can conclude that the family belonged to the lunar race

1 See his List, p. 282, n. 2.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 179, No. 127. For the whole discussion see Rāghava-Kaumudi, p. 435 and n. In ibid., p. 435, Mirashi also draws attention to Kharivarāmin's commentary on the Amarakūsa, II, 9, 2, which identifies Vikramāditya with Sāhasānka. For the whole discussion also see C.I.I., Vol. IV, pp. 349-50. It may, however, be noted here that Mirashi's conjecture in taking the words sāhava and aṅkha signifying four and nine respectively, may be taken to be incidentally applicable in the case of the singular example of the Rēwa stone inscription of Vijayasīṅhā, dated in the Kalachuri year 941; but not anywhere else as in the present inscription. Also cf. Pattāra Sāhasānka in v. I of the Rāhūlāgadhi rock inscription of V.S. 1279 in Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 511, where Kielhorn took the second word to denote Vikramāditya.
as pointed out by Mirashi. The mutilated condition of the record does not mention the name of the king, but the provenance of the inscription, together with the mention of the date in the end of the year 1240, leads us to conclude that he could be no other than Paramardin, whose known years range between V. 1223 and V. 1258. It may also be rightly conjectured that the initial portion, which is now lost, must have contained an account of this king, ending with his name, and verses 1-10 of the extant portion of the record may have given a eulogistic description of this very king. Though of a highly literary worth, these verses are of less historical interest.

To summarise the contents of the record, we find the first verse describing the flames of the king's glowing vigour pervading the sky, and the second refers to his diguṣajya in a general way. The next verse purports to say that he was bounteous, and his struggle against Ariga, Banga and Kalinga is referred to in the fourth verse. As his invasion of these regions is not known from any other source, this statement may be taken as a poetic panegyric. Verse 5 again refers to his conquests, in vague terms, and verse 6 states that the lord of Tripuri 'fainted whenever he heard the songs of the valour of his arms'. This reference seems to indicate that the contemporary Kalachuri king, who was probably either Jayasimha (1163-1188 A.C.) or his son Vijayasimha (1188-1210 A.C.), the last known ruler belonging to the Kalachuri dynasty, submitted to Paramardin. We have seen above that Paramardin's grandfather, Madanavarman, claims to have achieved some success against the Kalachuri Gavikarna (1128-1153 A.C.); and as since then the strength of the Kalachuris was on its wane, the statement of the present inscription about Paramardin, that he brought under submission the Kalachuri king, may have some justification, though this account cannot be verified from any other source.

The rest of the verses describe the king in a conventional manner. Thus, verse 10 means to say that he was devoted to Śiva; and vv. 11-12 mention the main purpose of the record, viz., that during the reign of the prince described above (that is, Paramardin) was erected this lofty temple of Śiva, evidently the same where the inscribed slab may have been originally set up. The following portion of the record mentions the name of the poet who composed the praśasti, that of the sculptor who erected the temple and also that of the engraver of the praśasti. The last verse (20) wishes good to the lunar (i.e., Chandrārāya) family, and with the date as we have discussed above, the inscription comes to a close.

There is no geographical name in the existing portion of the record.

Cunningham noticed three inscriptions on the pillars of a temple at Madanpur, all stating that the Chāhāmāna king Prithvirāja III (1178-1192 A.C.) defeated Paramardin and ravaged his kingdom in V.S. 1239.3 And the present inscription, which is dated only a year after, doubtless shows that soon after the ravage was over, the affairs in the Chandra kingdom were again normal.

TEXT:

1. [Metres: Verses 12, 14-6, 7-0, 14 and 20: sādaśāstrikādita; vv. 3 and 15: ārya; vv. 6, 10, 13, 16 and 18-19: Annūśānā; vv. 11: Vamūrāvilā; vv. 12 and 17: śīkharī]

2. —— [करिक्रमात्यन्तरात्मकः] अभ्यासानकल्पमाहाक्षक्रमांक(भ)रक्षित(व)तिश(व)परप्रभावानतापमत्सिनुः ।

प्राक्कालसाधतिशः ॥

1 As shown by Mirashi, the word mūricechhāma has a double sense (1) a swoon, and (2) melody; and according to the other meaning is that the king of Tripuri sings a melody in praise of Paramardin. See ibid., p. 436, n. 6. Both the meanings, however, go to show that the Kalachuri king was subordinate to Paramardin.


3 From impressions. Portions marked with an asterisk are read from Cunningham's A.S.I.R., Vol. XXI, as the stone has now lost the portions containing these abhavan.

4 Prof. Mirashi read -makou, but the sign of medial e is distinct on ma, though partly visible, and the letter that follows it is kha, for which cf. the same letter in khānūlata in l. 6. The lower parts of la are also visible. The whole expression means 'the slope of the Himalayas'; and the first half of this verse appears to be an adjective of the group of the Sun's horses, the word now missing.
3

4
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--- [fūkār] averse or the same, it is clearly visible in the end of this line and not the sign of medial \( \dot{a} \); and \( kI \) is probably intended.

The sonorant of the abhara in brackets appears as \( ch \).

The kalis-parvatas (seven mountain ranges) are well-known. See Mark parvata (Bib-Indica series). p. 284.

The horizontal stroke distinguishing this letter from \( g \) is not marked.

The consonant of the abhara in brackets appears as \( ch \).

The stroke partly visible in the end of this line is probably the curve of \( ka \) and not the sign of medial \( \dot{a} \); and \( kI \) is probably intended.

The d anging stroke of this letter distinguishing it from \( p \) is not marked.

The space for the sign of medial \( \dot{a} \) is blank in the impressions.

The mātrā above this letter is probably placed above the preceding letter.

The bracketed letter appears as \( sa \).

The original has \( n \) which Mirashi suggests to be taken as \( nān \); but to it appears to have been \( n \), forming an adverb of \( manah \).

The bracketed abhara looks like \( trū \). Probably \( chālū \) may have been intended here.

The mātrā of the first \( ka \) is partially visible and of the second, it is completely lost. For the idea expressed in this verse cf. Naikadtha-Charitra, Canto VI, v. 27.

This verse also appears in No. 60, v. 35, which is a Parami granth.

Mirashi read these two abhara as \( dhanama (cmna) \), but the first of them has a top-stroke, unlike that of \( dh \) and the second has a point, and not a loop as of \( m \) in the left limb. Besides, his reading does not give any sense which may be applicable here.
11 — बालाकेश्वरी। कोसाकटवाचार्यांत्रिकीयीनी कवागः(ने)द्वारक विन्यास दलालसरणम्।[[२१]]
12 अबुबुच शासनयोग्यता। स्थिरकाँतीयाचार्ययोग्यितैः।[[२२]]
13 यह अवतारणसिद्धिमण्डल यह अवतारणसिद्धिमण्डल।[[२३]]
14 मनुष्यांसमाजः(सरसी)सत्ता दिवसः।[[२४]]
15 सत्यार्थमण्डल सुभोमलस्वरूपम्।[[२५]]
16 [[२६]] श्रीमानंदेने द्वारका तिलिन्दिन्या।[[२७]]
17 — — — — — — पृथ्वीमान मनुष्यसंप्रदायविवेकः।[[२८]]

---

1. Mirashi suggests to read the following two letters as, 'nado', but following his suggestion, we miss here the finite verb. The lacuna may conjecturally be restored as सा नीना दिविनी।
2. This word has to be construed with the first word in the second quarter of the verse. Mirashi reads प्रविलोप्यप्रवन्धको, which cannot be construed.
3. The slanting stroke of the मार्ग्र above this letter is wrongly cut on the preceding one.
4. The bracketed and the preceding akshara are murinated.
5. These three letters may have been -पाध्यपी।
6. A redundant stroke makes this letter appear as bha, for which cf. bhanuma in I. 15.
7. Suggesting correction of नि० to नि०, Mirashi translates this expression as "the only son of Nandā"; but it also appears possible that the name was Nandā and the suffix के may have been added to it for metrical exigencies, or, what appears to be more probable, to give a form of the चारत्क of the word Nandā, as we find in some other grants of the house, eg., in No.128. This suffix is added to the name to form its case even today by those who have only some smattering of Sanskrit.
8. The akshara in the brackets has disappeared, leaving only traces. The letter akṣāṇa that follows is engraved as ḷaṇa.
9. The bracketed akṣāṇa is totally lost and I have adopted the reading as suggested by Mirashi. But it may also have been bha.
10. This lacuna may conjecturally be restored by the reading गृहः गृहाकर्षकं गृहको-।
11. The unit figure is ornamental with four mridipāla around it and only one of them is complete. The vowel that follows is formed differently from others in the inscription.
12. This akṣāṇa is deformed by a redundant closed stroke.
13. Only the vertical of the मार्ग्र and the first half of this letter are visible.
14. After I finished my article on this inscription, I had an opportunity to see what N. P. Chakravarti wrote on it in the section on Epigraphy in ASI, AR. 1936-37. He remarked that in the fourth line of the extract portion of the epigraph the name of Madanaka (manb) is found partly preserved. But in my examination of the original I found that though the last of the bracketed letters ending the line may be doubtfully taken as मार्ग्र, the second and the fourth of them are conjunctions and thus not fitting in the name. Again, in I. 22, he took the name as Abhalana, which, of course, may be possible, as shown by the pudinghōda. In I. 14, he read the name as Nālaka and not Nānaka, as taken by me and also by Dr. Mirashi. The consonant of the second akṣāṇa appears also as ḷ, but the sign of the prasika—including before it is absolutely certain and cannot be overlooked.
AJAYAGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIN

[Vikrama] Year 1243

THIS inscription, which exists on one of the jambs of the upper gate of the fort of Ajayagadh1 in the Punnâ District of Madhya Pradesh, was found by Alexander Cunningham, who transcribed a portion of it in Roman characters, and published it with a photographograph in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (for 1888-1889), p. 50, and Pl. xii-c. It is edited here for the first time from a fresh inked impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The inscription is incised on the lower part of the jamb which also contains a record of V. S. 1227, which we have edited above.2 It contains eight lines of writing of equal length, covering a space 26 cms. broad by 25 cms. high. The breadth of both these inscriptions is almost the same. The record shows the same sort of carelessness on the part of the engraver. The size of the letters varies from 2.5 to 3 cms. in height. When Cunningham visited the place, the record contained probably one more line in the end, but unfortunately the whole of it is now lost.

The inscription is written in the Nâgâri alphabet of the twelfth century. From the point of view of palaeography, attention may be drawn to the form of a, which begins with a vertical stroke ending in a loop and then going up with a tail to the left; see ārâma, l. 3; to the conjunct consonant ĝg appearing as ĝn; cl. durâga, l. 2; to the almost similar forms of ch, dh; and v; see vihâ, l. 1 and châ, l. 7; to the somewhat older form of s in shta, l. 3; and lastly, to the formation of the subscript of kâ to resemble an initial u, for which see kshatrâya, l. 4.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; it is incorrect at some places and also contains some local words, as some of the records discovered at the place. The record is all in prose. From the point of view of orthography, nothing is worth noting, except that durâga in l. 2, is written with ĝg and the use of the ardha-mārâs throughout.

The purpose of the inscription appears to record that a chaâitâ (l. 5), i.e., a platform, was constructed by a Râjâ, i.e., Râjâputra of the name of Shâda, who was a son of the Râjâ Sântana (Sântani?) of the kshatriya lineage, and was a resident of the village of Kûrti, for the use of all people of Jayapura. The date of the record, as expressed in figures only, is Wednesday, the eleventh of the bright half of Jyêśtha of the (Vikrama) Samvat 1243, which, according to Cunningham, corresponds to 1st June, 1186 A.C.; and observing that the week-day should be Sunday, accordingly, the same scholar states that the letters vihâ in l. 1 can also be read as mûnu.3 But the sign of the medial u attached to the first of the letters showing the name of the week-day is quite distinct, and consequently it cannot be taken as mûnu. The date was again discussed by Kielhorn, according to whom, it corresponded to 20th of May, 1187 A.C., when there was a Wednesday and the twelfth of the bright half ended 4 h. 15 m. after mean sunrise.4 The year was the Southern V. expired.

The name of the king, in whose time the construction of the platform is stated to have been made, does not figure in our record; but from the provenance thereof, he is evidently no other than the king Paramardin of the Chandella house, who is known to have occupied the throne from c. 1166 to 1202 A.C.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the record, Jayapura (l. 2) is evidently Ajayagadh, as known from several other inscriptions found at this place; and the village of Kûrti, the original place of the benefactor (l. 4-5) I am unable to identify. This place is also mentioned in another inscription found on the upper surface of the same pillar which contains the present inscription, as already stated.

1 For the situation and archaeological importance of this place, see No. 112, above.
2 No. 128, above.
This plate is now in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan attached to the Hindu University, Vṛrāga, and is reported to have been purchased, as already stated above, some fifteen years ago from one Thakurdas Jain, a resident of Tikamgadh, the chief town of a district of the same name in the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. The original find-spot of the plate is not known, nor is it possible to know it as the person from whom it had been purchased is now no longer living. The inscription on it has been edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar in his article "Three Chandella Charters", published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXII (1958-59), pp. 126 ff., with transcript in Roman characters and a facsimile. It is edited here from two impressions, one of which I owe to Rāj Krīṣnāda, the founder-Curator of the Kalā Bhavan, and the other, kindly supplied to me by the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, to whom the plate was some time back sent for examination.

It is a single copper-plate, inscribed on one side only, and measures about 48.5 by 29 cms. All round the inscribed surface, flat copper-strips about 1 cm. broad are fastened on to it very tightly by means of copper-rivets, which are now broken at some places, leaving only the holes bored for them. The plate is heavy, and the letters, though they are deeply cut, are not seen through on the reverse side. The plate is in a perfect state of preservation; and together with the border-hands and nails it weighs 2 kgs. and 220 gms. The size of the letters varies from 1 to 15 cm.

1. From an impression.
2. Denoted by a symbol.
3. Most probably this consonant appears to have been marked.
4. Both the bracketed letters are deformed but the reading is certain.
5. What looks like the sign of anusāra above is an original fault of the stone, as some others below.
6. The sibilant; that follows it is cut with its left lower limb detached.
7. Ta is incised as ma.
8. The nāgara sign is faintly and partly visible here, and was read by Cunningham as the sign for medial . This and the following words are adjectives of Sīhāda.
9. The syllable Śrī is now almost disintegrated and hence the reading of it as taken by Cunningham has to be adopted here.
10. This letter and the whole of the last line are now lost, and the reading is from Pl. xii-B in Cunningham’s A.S.J.R., Vol. XXI.
11. Read Thakurā. The first of the danda is incised quite close to the preceding syllable and with the same topstroke as on tha. The implication of the figures that follow is not clear. Sīnkālā, from the sense, appears to be the name of a place in this region, as we know also from Nos. 121 and 128.
12. The two figures that follow this name were read by Cunningham as 55 but in the accompanying plate the second figure appears as 2. Nothing can be definitely said now as the whole line is completely lost.
13. See Nos. 119 and 184, above.
The inscription consists of eighteen lines of writing, and the inscribed surface measures about 40 cms. in breadth and 26 cms. in height. About the middle of the first four lines, the writing is interrupted by a square of about 8 cms. showing in it the figure of the four-armed goddess Lakshmi, with lotuses in two of her raised hands. The writing is also likewise disturbed by a hole of the diameter of about 1 cm., in the central part of the last line, indicating that it was cut for a ring passing through it for holding the plate with another, which is not now forthcoming, as we shall see below in the concluding portion of this article. The engraving is neat and boldy executed, but some of the letters are misformed and also bear redundant chisel strokes, as we shall presently see.

The characters are Nagari of the latter part of the 12th century a.C., and bear a general resemblance to those of the Sêmra plate record and some others of the same king. The letters ch, dh and v, and occasionally r also, are often alike in form, though dh occasionally appears with a hook on its left limb; for example, compare the resemblance between ch and v in vîchana, I. 12; between r and v in pravara, I. 11; and between dh and v in varûda, I. 2. As a member of the conjunct consonant the letter r continues to appear as t; e.g., in kâryâkâ, I. 9; confusion is occasionally caused in the formation of t and bh both looking almost alike; e.g., bhûtâraka in I. 2 looks like tâtaâraka, and varuna in I. 3, as dvaruna. The loop of the palatal t is often altogether missing, as in Paramêkâm-ch, at the beginning of I. 3, or is not completely formed, as it appears more than once in I. 1. Instances of omitting some letters, their strokes or limbs, particularly those above the top-marks, are to be seen in the engraving of svariti as sâda in I. 1, in varha engraved as varra in I. 18, and in lêkhi in I. 7, engraved as lêkha. In marking the signs of anusvāra, the engraver has become most lethargic, sometimes in putting them as minute dots and in some other cases omitting them altogether.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and with the exception of one verse in the beginning and three in the end, it is all in prose. Orthographical peculiarities are almost the same as often noted above, e.g., (1) the use of v to denote b also; cf. vahûhitir, I. 17; (2) the reduplication of a class-consonant after r; e.g., in suvra, I. 15; the occasional confusion between the palatal and the dental-sibilant, as in vadhûdras in I. 5 and vâdûra in I. 17; and (4) the use of the anusvāra in phalâi, which is the last word of a verse in I. 18, but the wrong use of the consonant m in samvadhûm and samvadhûr, respectively in II. 7 and 9. Sandhi is violated while showing the name of the gift-village in I. 6 and the pravara in I. 10; and the influence of local pronunciation is to be seen in jôvanâsa for janmanâsa in II. 10-11; and the abbreviations tha and pâni followed by a damma are also noteworthy.

The inscription is one of Paramardin of the Chandella (Chandrâtra) Dynasty ruling at Kâlâjâra. The genealogical portion giving the names of his grandfather and great-grandfather along with that of his name is identical with that of the preceding grants of the king. The object of the present charter is to record the grant of a plot of land measuring ten lêvas' in the village Itisâ situated in the Pâsumi vîshaya, made by the Paramadâhikâra, Mahârâjaâhâra, and Paramêkâra, the illustrious Paramardîdeva who is also stated to have been a devout worshipper of Siva and the great lord of Kâlâjâra. The grant was made at the Manikârûkâhastra, during the king's stay at Vârigna, obviously in course of a pilgrimage. We know that at the time the grant was issued, this holy city was the headquarters of the Gahaçvâla kings, and we also know that Paramardin's contemporary of the Gahaçvâla throne was Jayachandra (c. 1170-93 a.C.), who is known to have helped the Chandella king in his encounter with the Châhâmâna Prithví-râja II. (c. 1177-92 a.C.). This evidently shows that Paramardin carried on friendly relations with Jayachandra; and in view of this, it is hardly possible to agree with Shri N. Bose who

---

3 The dictionary meaning of this word is 'cutting, lopping or lopping off'; and in this sense we find its use in the classical literature, e.g., in R.V. XIII. v. 43. But it is unknown to inscriptions; and in none of the Chandella records I find this word used. Thus the word may be taken here in its secondary meaning 'a part'. If, on the other hand, it is presumed that the writer of the present inscription may have omitted the akadha ha before lā from the original draft, as we find in some other cases also, cf. viśē for viśēka in I. 5, the expression would mean 'ten bâlas of land'.


5 The dictionary meaning of this word is 'cutting, lopping or lopping off'; and in this sense we find its use in the classical literature, e.g., in R.V. XIII. v. 43. But it is unknown to inscriptions; and in none of the Chandella records I find this word used. Thus the word may be taken here in its secondary meaning 'a part'. If, on the other hand, it is presumed that the writer of the present inscription may have omitted the akadha ha before lā from the original draft, as we find in some other cases also, cf. viśē for viśēka in I. 5, the expression would mean 'ten bâlas of land'.

suggests that the Vārānasi region formed a part of Paramardin's kingdom about the time of the record.1

The date of the inscription is quoted in words and repeated in figures, in ll. 9-10. It is Saturday, the 14th of the bright half of Phalguna, (Vikrama) year 1247, which, as calculated by Dr. Sirca,2 regularly corresponds to 9th February, 1191 A.C.

As seen above, the genealogical portion of the present grant is a copy of Paramardin's grant of V.S. 1239; and the variation is only in the formal portion of the grant, i.e., the details of the donations made. Even the donor in both the cases is the same, Padmannāvarāman, though his name figures in its Prakrit form in the earlier grant; and his father's name is written with a slight change in spelling. It is therefore not necessary to repeat here all that has been stated above, while editing the foregoing document. It has, however, to be observed here that in the present charter we do not find the name of the writer and of the engraver,3 after or before the imprecatory and the beneficent verses, as in that of which it is a copy and as we find in almost all the other grants of the king; in view of this it is possible to hold with Dr. Sirca who has remarked in course of editing this grant in the volume of the Ep. Ind. referred to above, that the writing was continued on another plate which is now lost and which would have borne inscription of the sign-manual of the king together with a reference to these two persons. The hole in the lower surface of the plate, which was meant evidently for a ring to hold it with another, also lends support to this view.

As for the localities mentioned in the inscription, Kālājīpura (l. 4) and Vārānasi (l. 8) are well-known. Pāśunīvishaya (l. 9), where the gift-land existed, appears to have been the region in the valley of the Pārsi river which flows in the eastern part of the Bāndha District and joins the Yamuna. And in view of this, the village Itali in which the land was situated (l. 6) suggests its identification with the modern village Eklal (Lat. 25° 43' N., Long. 81° 6' E.), lying about 25 kms. north-west of the confluence of these two rivers and about 30 kms. cast-southwest of August, the find-spot of one of the grants of Madanavarman.4 Pāṭalipurā, which is mentioned here as a ṛṣṭtiyavāhāra from which the donor Padmannāvarāman is stated to have hailed (l. 10), is obviously the same locality figuring in another grant of Paramardin, as already seen.5

TEXT:

[Metre: Verses 1-4: Ausinthubh]

1. सदनाम ॥ स्विति ॥ जयाद्यादयादिनिधिः कविलेक्षविहद्रीरुपद् ॥ कंद्रयनेनरेण्याणा सवारनाम हतोऽरुकः ॥[१] ॥

2. देवसे निरेशविनिष्प्राभविणुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपदोऽरुक्तवार्तिनिष्प्राभविणिपद0

---

1. See N. S. Bose, Hist. of the Candellas, pp. 96 ff. D. C. Sirca has discussed this problem in detail in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXII, p. 126, and elsewhere also. The fragmentary Man inscription of Madanavarman (No. 125) has a clear statement regarding the friendly relations between this king and Kāśīrāja, and his contemporary Gāndhavīla kings were: Govinda añandra (1114-54 A.C.) and his son Vījavachandra (1154-70 C.C.); thus it is hardly possible to conceive that during the very next generation and within about 20 years of Vījavachandra's death, the situation may have changed. Similarly Dr. Ganguly's assumption based on the slender statement on Nāyachandra's Ramkhamālipti that 'Madanavarman was then at war with the king of Kāśī', appears to be hardly acceptable. For Ganguly's conclusion see Hist. and Cult. of the Ind. People (Bharatīya Vidyā-Bhavan), Vol. V, p. 53.


3. Above, No. 124.

4. As the present charter contains the same type of errors, e.g., of occasionally omitting limits of letters etc., it appears likely that it was probably engraved by Pāñhuma who engraved some other grants of Parmardin.

5. Above, No. 118.

6. No. 131, above.

7. From the original plates and impressions.

8. Expressed by a symbol: In the following word the curve of the mūrti of ti is not formed and the vertical of the same is placed close to the preceding letter so as to read the whole as mūrti.

9. This letter is disfigured by a redundant chisel stroke.
5. देवा(मै) बिज्ञाति, पु एवं हृत्वाद्वपि प्रणासितकारणिः शुभ्राकार्षकिं वश्यते(सू) सरास्रिनिराकृति विश-पालयमितिकारकिं विशिष्टी सिद्धिति।

6. क्रुदलमिति। पातुःप्रविवर्णयति: पूर्विकविहरस्तृतानन्दराजकी। शुभ्राकार्षकिं वश्यते। इति क्रमविवर्णसिद्धताकुकिंस्वाभासः।

7. शुभ्राकार्षकिं वश्यते। गृहस्थितानन्दराजकी। शुभ्राकार्षकेति। गृहस्थितानन्दराजकेति।

8. गृहस्थितानन्दराजकेति।

9. गृहस्थितानन्दराजकेति।

10. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

11. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

12. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

13. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

14. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

15. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

16. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

17. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

18. शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

This *danda* is redundant, as also some others below.

1. Read = शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

2. The consonant of *पू* is formed as *प* and the curve of the *मित्र* on *व* is not cut.

3. The curve of the *मित्र* on the first and the whole of it on the third letter is missing.

4. The sign of the superscript *र* is very faint.

5. Both the bracketed *किरार* are misformed.

6. The curve of the *मित्र* of *दी* is partly visible and is joined to the vertical.

7. Both the consonants of the bracketed letter are misformed. In the word *साहित्य* that precedes, it cannot be ascertained whether the consonant is marked, as the verticals of most of the letters in this inscription have their lower ends digitely bent to the right.

8. Each of the names of the *प्रायः* here is separated by a *danda* so often used in the Sanskrit grant of the same king. Read = शुभ्राकार्षकेति।

9. In the other records the name appears as *पृङ्खळा*; see also. The *तुम्मिरता* on *हदः* appears to have been struck off but the mark is still visible.

10. The sign of *मित्र* of *पू* appears as a subscript *न*.

11. Sircar suggests the correction of this word to *गामिनः*, but in the compound word this qualifies *हलः* and thus the emendation does not appear to be necessary.

12. The consonant of the bracketed *किरार* was originally cut as *ह*.

13. The curve of the *मित्र* of *ह* is missing and the horizontal stroke before the letter is also missing.

14. In this and the following line there are a number of redundant strokes appearing as the signs of *सुहिरः*.

15. The letter in the bracket is engraved as *लः*.

16. Originally यः, with the earlier part of the curve scored off so as to make it the sign of superscript *र*. 
BHARATKALĀ BHAVAN COPPER-PLATE OF
PARAMARDIDĒVA, VIKRĀMA 1247

From Facsimile
The inscription was transcribed for the first time by Dr. Hultzsch in *Zeitschrift D. Morgenl. Ges.*, Vol. XL (1886), pp. 51-54, and subsequently it was edited by F. Kiellhorn in the *Epigraphica Indica*, Vol. I (1888), pp. 207 ff. But neither of these articles is accompanied by a facsimile, and I have not seen the slab itself but only a copy made by Hultzsch. It is true that a slab similar to the present one was discovered by Kiellhorn in the town of Agra, but it is not certain that the two slabs are identical, and I am unable to say whether the present slab is identical with the one recorded by Kiellhorn.

The inscription, which is cut in a single line of a black stone, contains 24 lines of writing and measures about 62 cms. broad by 48 to 50 cms. high. It is in a very bad state of preservation. A large crack has cut the stone vertically on the left side, destroying one or two *abharas* in each of the lines and three in line 12 where the break is wider. These *abharas*, however, have not yet been made out from the context, except one in line 1, 8, and two in line 12, and in line 12, where the break is wider. Furthermore, the surface of the stone which was made none too smooth before the letters were engraved on it, is very smooth, and the impression before me, has been felt considerably owing to the effect of weather, and several letters which were probably in a somewhat better state of preservation in Kiellhorn's time, have now become worn or indistinct as the engraving is shallow, and consequently I had occasion to refer to Kiellhorn's readings as I have noted in the *subjoined* transcript.

The characters are Nāgarī, closely resembling those of the Mahābālī stone inscription of V. S. 1240. The size of the letters ranges between 1.2 and 1.5 cms. To note the peculiarities of the individual letters, the loops of the initial *k* which are rectangular and placed horizontally, are superscribed by a horizontal stroke, as in *stā*, 1, 2, 3, in a few instances, e.g., in *śāvika*, 1, 9, as in *śāvika* 1, 2, 3; *c*, and *c* are often alike, e.g., in *śāvīt*, 1, 21; and in a few instances the first of these letters is cut as the left limb of the *k*; e.g., *śāvīk*, 1, 1. *N* in rare instances resumes its older form, as in *śāvī*, 1, 19; the slightly different forms of *bha* can be seen in *śāvī*, 1, 3, and finally, *r*, which has assumed its modern Nāgarī form, is in several cases devoid of its tail and occasionally it resembles *w*, or has a wedge. The form of this letter as a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to its left in the middle, is seen in *śāvīk*, 1, 9.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for the introductory *śāvīk* and *śāvī*, the whole record is metrically composed. In all there are 34 verses; they are not numbered. They are composed in an artistic *kāṣa* style, containing figure of speech like *śāvī*, *śāvī*, *śāvī*, *śāvī*, *śāvī*, *śāvī*, and *śāvī*, and the style, and the way of expression is much similar to those of the Mahābālī stone inscription, from which the author of the present inscription has derived not only ideas but also expressions. As regards *orthography*,

---

Kiellhorn is doubtful about this; for, as he observed, the present inscription appears to be the same as mentioned by Cunningham in *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. XXI, p. 82. No. 32, as found on the bank of a lake at "Baghū", which appears to be consistent from the number of lines mentioned in it. The antiquities found at Bāṭēśvara are described in Cunningham's *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. VII (1873-74), pp. 57 ff.

For example, in line 6 both the strokes of the *śāvī* on *śāvī* have disappeared, and so the sign of *śāvī* on *śāvī* and *śāvī* in the same line. In both the latter examples the consonant *ś* is devoid of its slanting stroke distinguishing it from *ś*. It may also be partly due to the shallow engraving that the two impressions taken at the same time show some minor differences, e.g., whereas the word *śāvī* in line 1 has correctly come out in one of them, the other shows the third letter as *ś*.

This statement was verified also by my examination of the original stone.

---

No. 156: above.
(1) the sign of \(v\) is used all through to denote \(b\), except in \(ud\)bhakhyuḥ and bhavarti in ll. 10 and 24, respectively, and in bhavvā, which occurs as many as six times in ll. 10, 13, 14, 16, 20 and 22 and 24; (2) the dental sibilant is often employed in place of the palatal, and there are a few instances of vice versa, e.g., in svaśatrāvā, ll. 11, showing both the instances; (3) a class-
consonant is often doubled after \(s\), as in darppiya, ll. 4, but not in nivm, ll. 8; (4) prṣṭhā-mātrīs
are generally used except in a few cases as in Dvādārāna- and saḥcīdā, both in ll. 22; (5) the sign of
antaśvētra is wrongly used instead of the final \(m\) at the end of a stīch in ll. 5, 8, 10 and 15,
though we have instances of the correct use of the consonant \(m\) also; (6) the anuśvētra is changed
to the dental nasal before a sibilant as in omām, ll. 2 and padvā, ll. 9, but not in avatāra, ll. 2; and
lastly, (7) the word uppoḷa appearing twice in ll. 14 and 18 is spelt with a single \(j\). The word
avbhanga in ll. 12, as also noted by Kielhorn, is used in the sense of bhanga.

The proper object of the inscription is to record the construction of a temple of Vishnu,
and one of Śiva, by Sallakṣaṇa, the Minister of the king Paramard of the Chandrātrīya
(Chandella) family, and also that the latter of these temples was completed by Sallakṣaṇa’s son,
Purushōttama, who succeeded him as the Minister. The poet who composed the record was
Dvādārāna, and it was written by Dvādārāna, both of whom were sons of Gādādāra, the
king’s Minister for Peace and War, and it was engraved by Mahārāja, the son of Sūmarāja.
The details about all these persons are noted below.

The inscription is a prāsam, a laudatory account, as stated in ll. 31 in it, and falls into
three parts. The first part, which comprises vv. 1-13, contains the genealogical account of the
Chandrātrīya (Chandella) kings. After a short sentence paying obeisance to the venerable
Vāśśvētā and followed by two verses invoking the blessings respectively of Sauri and Kāthāṅga-
pāṇi or Chakrapāṇi, both being the epithets of Vishnu (the second of the verse being lost in
its latter half), the inscription proceeds in vv. 3-4 to refer to the origin of the race, the first
the two letters of which are again lost, but from the third and the fourth of them, νἰν, τ्रेयa, which
are extant, it can be known to be the family of the Chandrātṛyas. Verse 5 introduces
Mādānavaṁma, the lord of the earth, as a brave prince who, by extirpation of the armies of
the hostile kings resembled Indra who cut off the wings of the mountains with his thunderbolt
and who also killed the demon Bala. The enemies of this prince are not mentioned here by name,
but this verse may have a reference to the Kalachuris on the one hand and the Chauhānas
and the Paramānas on the other, all of whom were vanquished by him, as we have seen while
dealing with the Bāhūśa and Maṅi stone inscriptions of the time of this ruler.2

The next two verses describe Mādānavaṁma’s war-like activities in a conventional manner,
and vv. 8-9 state that his son Yaśaवरman, an ornament among great rulers, caused joy to the
people. Yaśaवarman’s son, as we are informed in ll. 10, was a powerful prince of the name of
Paramard, “whose foot-stool was pale-red with the lustre of crest-jewels of kings bowing down
(before him)”. Verses 11-12 are again devoted to eulogise Paramard, the latter of these verses
also describing his digēśjaḷa in a conventional manner, as the Mahābāl stone inscription.

This part contains no new historical material, excepting that it introduces the name of
Yaśaवarman, as the son and successor of Mādānavaṁma and the father of Paramardideva. That
this prince actually ruled is not known from any other source; and unless this information is
corroborated by any other record, we hesitate to accept it as a historical fact.3 Verse 8, which
describes him, does not give him any regnal title, as to both his father and his son.

1 This appears to be rather curious as the inscription refers to the completion of a temple of Śiva, as to
be shown below.

2 See Nos. 120 and 123, respectively.

3 Different views are prevalent on this point. Dr. H. C. Ray suggests that Yaśaवarman had a very short
reign and the present inscription hints at the unlimily end of his career which may have been due to
shortly after his accession, however short a time it might have been (E. R. K., p. 118); and Dr. D. C.
Sircar is inclined to the view that the epithet Mahābāḷavimśvarmaṇi (the crest-jewel of the great rulers),
of the present inscription (v. 8) is justified even if Yaśaवarman was the ruler of a district under his
father. But it is significant that Yaśaवarman’s name appears in none of the charters issued by his own
son Paramard, as also observed by Dr. Sircar (Ib. Ind. Vol. XXXII, p. 118, a. 1), nor also in the
Ajaysaghat inscription of Virarvan (No. 145), which gives an exhaustive list of the rulers from
Kavirvan to Virarvan, his name should have been overlooked. It may be noted here that the
name of this prince is omitted also in the account of ministers in the present record.
The second part of the inscription, which comprises vv. 14-29, contains a description of the ancestors of the Chief Minister of Paramardin who completed a temple begun by his father. Verse 14 introduces a family belonging to the well-known Vasiştha gotra; and the next two verses state that in that family was born one Lakṣmīdhara, who was well-versed in all the Sūtras and who also performed sacrifices. His son was the twice-born Vatsarāja, who was of good conduct, reputed for his qualities and possessed of righteous wealth (v. 17-18). His son, again, was Lāhada, who had studied the sacred lore (v. 19). He was placed at the head of his counsellors by the king Madana (v. 20). Lāhada's wife was Prabhā (v. 21), whose son was Sallakṣaṇa, through whom (because of whose efforts) Paramardin became the lord of earth with three eyes. The next two verses are historically important. They mean to say that the illustrious Paramardin entrusted Sallakṣaṇa with the government of the kingdom and gave himself to taking delight in licentiousness with women. It is stated here that "he became all the time immersed in the enjoyment of deckng the breasts of those whose eyes resembled those of a frightened young deer and who were filled with unbound love". This information is indeed noteworthy as possibly being the cause of Paramardin's defeat at the hands of Qutb-ul-din Aibak in 1202 A.C. about 47 years after the present record was set up and the Minister-in-chief who was then taking care of the kingdom strongly resented surrendering the fort of Kālatājara to the Muslims. Verse 24 of the inscription again eulogises Sallakṣaṇa; and in the next two verses it is recorded that this person constructed a lofty temple of Vishnu and one of Śiva. The next three verses introduce his son Putusūttama, who was his successor in the office of minister and who completed the Śiva temple, evidently the same which was begun by his father and at which the inscription was put up.

The third part of the inscription, which commences with v. 30, gives the genealogy of the poet who composed the prasasti. The first of his ancestors introduced here was Lakṣmīdhara, who was an ornament of the Gauḍa family. His son was Gadvāhara, a supreme chief among the poets and the first among the learned. He was minister of Peace and War of Paramardin. His son Dēvadāra, a chief among the poets (kavyādāra), composed the prasasti (v. 31); and it was engraved by Mahārāja, the son of Somarāja. Verse 33 expresses the hope that the temple may stand for ever; and verse 34, which is the last one of the record, mentions the date by means of word-numerals, stating that it was the Vikrama era connected by wings (2), the faces of the three-eyed, i.e., Śiva (5) and the Adityas on the fifth of the bright half of Āsvina and on the day of the lord of the day, i.e., Sunday. According to Kielhorn's calculations, the date corresponds, for the Northern Vikrama 1252, expired, to the 10th September, 1195 A.C. when the fifth tithi ended 14 hours 14 minutes after mean sunrise. It was a Sunday; and thus the date is quite regular.

Hereafter the inscription comes to an end with the expression which means "may fortune attend".

The inscription does not mention any geographical name, but from the expression idam = mandiram, used in v. 28 and from idam, again in v. 29, we may conclude that the inscribed stone was originally set up in a temple where it was found. It may also be mentioned here that it is one of the latest known records of the reign of Paramaridēva.

---

1 That is, Śiva, Sallakṣaṇa was the third eye of Paramardin, according to the well-known saying chārāḥ paśyanti rājāh, etc.
2 Elliot and Dowson, Hist. of Ind., Vol. II. p. 228.
3 The first two letters of the third quarter of this verse are lost and hence mahārāja, which also means, 'great king', has to be taken as a name. He appears to have been a brother of Dēvārāja who engraved the Mahābā stone inscription of V.S. 1240 (No. 156) and who too is stated to have been a son of Somarāja. This view is of course based on the presumption that Somarāja was not a different person.
4 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 30, No. 38. Also see Kielhorn's remarks in ibid. where he states that Hufsch's reading of the date differs. He took the year as V. S. 11[8]2.
[Metres: Verses 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 21, 22, 25, 29, 32 and 34 Anushtha; v. 2 (latter half) Upādhyāyā; vv. 3, 5, 7, 13 and 30 Paumāntakā; vv. 6, 23 and 24 Sūrīvalīkṛiti; vv. 9, 10, 14, 16, 19, 22, 26, 27, 31 and 33 Upāṣṭi; vv. 12 and 28 Puṣkpiṭāgrā; v. 13 Rāthūdāhala; v. 17 Mānīrī; v. 18. Tryūt; and v. 20. Śrīgātā].

1 सिद्धम् ॥ दौ नमो भक्तेऽवामुयाच। अभद्वि ॥ ॥ अनुदत्स भवोवत् कोणातृत्वः। नविनके परसीनके धन्यः। प्राणिने हुल्काः।

2 दि ॥ इदं नखाक्ष्यानोत्तरशुद्धिपायणः। यो यवानात्॥ ॥ ॥ अभद्वि ॥ ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ ब्रह्मलोकेण ॥ ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ ॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

3 मुकुटं ॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः। अभद्वि ॥ ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ ब्रह्मलोकेण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

4 उदात्तसमूहवाहारायणः। उपाधिमोहिनीचन्द्रानं ॥ ॥ अभद्वि ॥ ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

5 वृक्षम् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

6 यथाद् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

7 यथाद् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

8 यथाद् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

9 यथाद् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

10 यथाद् ॥ अभद्वि ॥ तदावलीण ॥ ॥ हो यवानात्॥ नविनके परसीनके धन्यः।

\[\text{From an impression, comparing the reading subsequently from the original (Lucknow Museum: catalog, No. E.25).}\]

\[\text{Expressed by a symbol.}\]

\[\text{Partly from the traces and partly from conjecture the missing letters appear to be -akarāb.}\]

\[\text{The consonant of this letter appears as th.}\]

\[\text{Both the letters in the brackets are from Kilchorn's reading. It is not known whether he restored them conjecturally or from the traces visible in his time which are now no longer extant.}\]

\[\text{Read कुम. The lost letters at the end may have been -क्रमः कुर्दाले, or कुर्दालकम, as may be conjectured.}\]

\[\text{Kilchorn's transcript shows that only the sign of visarga was then lost. But since his time the stone has lost some more aksharas, particularly near the crack.}\]

\[\text{Here, and also in some cases below, the slanting stroke distinguishing the preceding akshara from p is not distinct. From some traces before this word and below the line, it appears that the preceding a may have been engraved there. A curve above the medial of kī may possibly have been struck off in the original.}\]

\[\text{The reading of the second of these letters is not certain. The bracketed aksharas may also have been दक्ष.}\]

\[\text{The medial of क्ष is lost, leaving only a trace.}\]

\[\text{The bracketed syllable is formed as mu and the preceding ए is engraved as the last limb of ga.}\]

\[\text{The subscript of द्व is cunct as द्व and what appears as the sign of anuvraha above is only an original fault of the stone.}\]

\[\text{All the aksharas of the second quarter of this verse are only in form of traces now.}\]

\[\text{Read दिदिनः.}\]

\[\text{The letters in the brackets which are indistinct in the impression, are adopted here from Kilchorn's reading. They are, however, distinct on the stone.}\]
KĀLANJAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDĪDEVĀ

[Vikram] Year 1258

This inscription was discovered, in 1848, by Lieut. F. Maisey, at Kālanjār in the Narain āstāvi of the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh, and he published a transcript of it with a translation of some of the concluding lines, but without a facsimile, in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVII (1848-50), pp. 313 ff. Maisey found the record inscribed "on a large black stone slab leaning against a pillar opposite the entrance of the Cave" adjoining to the temple of Nilakantha at that place. The place was subsequently visited by Alexander Cunningham, who found the inscribed slab inside the temple, and who, noticing the record briefly, corrected Maisey's reading of the date in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), pp. 57-58, but without the facsimile. The transcript prepared by Maisey also suffers from inaccuracies; he neither marked it in the line nor did show the omissions of letters that were illegible to him, and what is more is that he continued in the same lines, without even showing the breaks, whatever was legible. No scholar has theretofore attempted to give a correct transcript of the inscription, since, besides the deteriorating condition of the record, a great part of it consists of an eulogistic address to Śiva and Pārvatī, and thus it is of much less historical interest. The inscription is edited here from a fresh impression kindly supplied to me, at my request, by the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.

The record is inscribed on a countersunk surface and contains 32 lines of writing, besides a sentence paying homage to Nilakantha, which was later on engraved on the left of the upper border thereof. The writing covers a space 81 cms. broad by 66 cms. high. It is in a very bad state of preservation, for a greater part of it and particularly the middle has become obliterated, as Maisey himself had noted in the last century, was "used at one time to macerate tobacco on

---

1 The bracketed Akṣaras are engraved as dhūna sa.
2 Some traces with two upright strokes on each side here, and also in line 40, show that either the akṣara 
    cīha or some flowery design was used to mark the end of the stanza.
3 The horizontal stroke of sa is broken or not fully engraved, making the letter appear as ṣa.
4 Of both these letters only traces are left now.
5 For Maisey's description of Kālanjār and its antiquities, see J.A.S.B., Vol. XVII, pp. 171 ff. He wrongly 
    read the date as 1258, instead of 1238.
6 Most of the letters have not clearly come out on this impression, and from line 19th to the end, it fails 
    to give the actual reading, though it has enabled me to prepare a somewhat improved version.
The average size of the letters is 1.5 cms in the first half, and in the remaining portion thereof it is gradually reduced till the letters in the last line are about 1 cm. high. The characters are of the Nāgari alphabet of the 15th century to which the inscription belongs. They are symmetrically formed but are not deeply engraved, as can be judged from the impression showing most of the letters indistinct. As regards individual letters, attention may be drawn to the distinct form of \( ch \), e.g., in *chandra* and *chidā*, l. 1; to the horn of *dh*, which is sometimes oblique, as in *dṛpta*, but often curved, as in *vīdhura*, both in l. 1; to the forms of *v* and *p*, as in *pragāṇa*, l. 1; and to the slightly different forms of *bh*, as in *śāvībhava* and *bṛhās*, both in l. 3.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for a short sentence paying obeisance to Śiva in the beginning and the date with the words *maṅgalam mahāśirha* in the end, the record is metrically composed. There are 19 verses followed by some which are fragmentary and cannot be counted; they are not numbered. As regards orthography, attention may be drawn to the few ordinary points, e.g., the use of the sign of *v* to denote *b* as well; the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sibilant; the indiscriminate use of the sign of *anuśāva*, *parāśavara*, etc., the use of both the *pratihāra* and the *ārdhva-mātrās*, and finally, the doubling of a consonant following *r*.

The inscription is a *prāasti*, as stated in a verse in the end, and was composed by the king Paramardin, who is well known to us as the Chandellā king who bore this name. The composition, which is in a highly flourishèd *kālā* style and abounds in figures using long compounded expressions, speaks highly of his poetic talent. It was written on the stone and also incised by the wise Pudna, superior to all artists and the favourite of the valiant king Paramardin, the grandson of an eminent artist whose name is not mentioned, and the son of Anupā, in company with his younger brother Deuka. The inscription is dated in figures only, on Monday, the 10th of the bright half of Kārttika of the (Vikrama) year 1258. The corresponding Christian date has been calculated by Kielhorn to be the 8th October, 1201 A.C., taking the year expired, Northern Vikrama. It is regular.

The inscription may be divided into two parts, the first of which contains the eulogy of Śiva and Pārvati, which is its main purpose, as stated above. This portion is devoid of any historical interest.

The first five stanzas of the second part which begins with line 25, are devoted to the description of Paramardin himself, in general terms. It is stated here that he was the greatest of all the kings and the sole ruler (*adhitahā) of Daśāraṇa, and that he subdued his foes by his valour. By his liberality he won the esteem of his subjects. He also sought pleasure in company of women and his glory excited that of the Divine jewel and the wish-granting cow.

The next verse states that Paramardin himself composed the eulogy owing to his spontaneous devotion to the feet of Parārā, i.e., Śiva. This account is again followed by a verse making general remarks about the poem, by way of instructions to the reader. The next verse mentions the names of the writer and the engraver, as seen above; it is followed by a verse expressing that the eulogy may be everlasting. And finally, the last line of the inscription mentions the date, as we have discussed above, and with the words *maṅgalan mahāśirha*, the *prāasti* comes to a close.

The inscription under review provides the latest known date of Paramardin. It is worthy of note that in it the king claims for himself the title of Daśārāpadhitadhā, i.e., the supreme lord of Daśāraṇa; and it also indicates that he effectively administered the entire dominions inherited from his grand-father Madanavarma, despite the reverses caused by the Chāhamāna ruler Prith-

2. For example, in the shifting from place to place, for, whereas Maisey found the stone leaning against a pillar opposite the entrance of the Cave, Cunningham found it inside the temple; and the technical assistant of the office of the Chief Epigraphist, who visited the place in March, 1972, reports that it is “kept near the door of the sanctuary of the same temple”. In these attempts it is quite natural for this massive stone to suffer.
3. Here I do not agree with Maisey in translating the expression *ālikhyā svayam-sālālākha* as “composed and inscribed the praise of the husband of Giriśa” (p. 317). As we learn above, it was composed by Paramardin himself.
vitāra in 1184 A.C. That he continued to maintain his dignity and the glory of the house even subsequent to this reverse is shown by v. 10 of the Batēśvara stone inscription and thereafter, by the present record, dated in V. 1258 or 1201 A.C. It is, however, curious, as already noted by Cunningham, that just 18 months after the present inscription was composed, Paramadān had to surrender the fort to the Muslims, on 27th April, 1203 A.C.1

The only geographical name of importance mentioned in the inscription is that of Daśārṇa. Two countries are known by this name: the Western Daśārṇa comprised Eastern Mālava, including Bhopāl; and the Eastern Daśārṇa signified a part of Chhattisgarh.2 Following this clue the name appears to have been used here to denote both the territories roughly forming the region of the Western Vindhyas.

TEXT

1. "1. a) नाम: ब्राह्मण ॥ तदपेक्षा नीतिबिमों अवस्था-वेयाल निवासीय दीवं वृद्धि-वियान समय समजानुदिता: ॥ वितारिनवाद; भजनया नवमन्त्रान्वावारं बङ्काकारं दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन् ॥
2. “भारतीय भारतीय
3. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्। वितारिनवाद; भजनया नवमन्त्रान्वावारं बङ्काकारं दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
4. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
5. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
6. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
7. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
8. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥
9. ते नाम अवस्थाया निवासीय दीवं चारित्रणवान समस्वन् दत्तात्रयाय समस्वन्॥

1. N. L. Dey, G. D. A. M. I., p. 94.
4. It is not known if the symbol for Siddham was engraved in the beginning, as the portion is lost. Metre of this and of verses 2, 6, 8-11, 14-16 and 18-19; Srāghārā.
5. The doṇda has almost mingled with the vertical of the preceding akshara.
6. Maisey read — जडान,, but the sign of the secondary i with the consonant i is distinct in the impression. It means 'false or frightened' and has to be taken as governing the next word.
7. Metre of this and of vv. 4-5, 7, 12-13 and 17: śārdhakrśaṅkita.
8. The reading of this letter is uncertain, as it is matted.
9. These letters, which are indistinct in the impression, have been adopted from Maisey's reading, but they appear to be incorrect, particularly the first of the ekshara.
10. Maisey read here — श्रेय, and he has not marked the doṇda, which is clear in the impression.
KĀLANJAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF PARAMARDĪDĒVA

10 फलोदासमे प्रलोकुम (स्मपू) ।...... ।          | ।          |

11 । (स्) कांतनातिकularyपात्मकमस्तिनितम् । परस्यमः ?।

12 नासानांतभाओनायजस्मनमुरुमातात्कुलमातिनितम्

13 कोठे शुद्धारिन्हे प्राणवर्ता। फलोदासे कुमीतरामविशिष्टे। — | —

14 । (स्) [वा ?] चुंबाकड़(स्र)-

15 वास लक्षरस्यमुनीतनितममलिनेतः कंठ — | —

16 हनु मुक्तसत्तॉल वरः ।। (स्) स्वस्या श्रीमाहकः (?) अवसमय — — — — जन्माध्यमपणः चंद्रीमथ —

17 [क举报(स्र)भुकृतः] कालकालानुव्रुत्वं विशिष्टिनितसा। ।। (स्) कुला पाण्डा — — — — पाणितरामास्तिकितसा।

18 वास ये लक्षरस्य वि लोगी — — — — (स्) ।।। (स्) 11.61 ।।। (स्) 11.12—11.13 ।।

8...कुलमुनुमुक्तसत्तॉलमुक्तसत्तॉलमुक्तसत्तॉलमुक्तसत्तॉल (""") करणां असामात्मिन्ता। पानु लक्षरसिद्धामत्रस्वुमुक्त ।।।।

10 श्रीलक्षरसि:। परस्य कुला पाण्डा। स्माधि।

1 The whole of the latter half of this verse is lost.
2 After the end of the first half of the verse, Maisey read: ....... हनु मुक्तसत्तॉल वरः, which is in fact the end of the next verse. Thus he has mingled parts of two verses and gave the reading continuously, not even putting the punctuation marks. His reading therefore is not helpful, and, as stated above, the impression too is indistinct at several places.
3 The letters in the brackets are lost on the original due to flaking off on the stone, and have been adopted from Maisey's reading.
4 Maisey read the last aksharas of this verse as जैह श्रीमाहक: , but they are indistinct in the impression. Here too he wrote all his reading continuously without showing the breaks, and thus it all becomes unintelligible.
5 Maisey read स्र, but the consonant य is distinct in the impression. The first two letters in this line are lost in the original and have been adopted from his reading. Moreover, leaving these 14 aksharas, the whole verse is lost, as can be calculated from the space in the impression.
6 These four aksharas, which are lost in the original due to flaking, have been adopted from Maisey's reading.
7 Much of this verse is lost, as also of the following two verses. That they were two is known from the space in the impression.
8 The impression being very indistinct for the remaining portion of the inscription, I am obliged to give Maisey's transcript which does not show the exact portions lost, or those which he was unable to read at places. His transcript is not line by line, though I have retained it. The minor corrections made in brackets are mine, and in the rest the numbers of verses could not be followed due to haçuma.
9 Invert a double dasa here, as it appears to be the last foot of a verse in Śārddālāśākṣītā. The preceding line is obviously disconnected with it.
10 Metre: Śrāgāḥsū, which appears to end here. Maisey's reading of this verse is again full of omissions, as in some other cases also, below, which are not separately noted, every time.
परिचयं यि क्तिकैन कृत्यं विश्वास्यनुकृतार्थं स्वामिं मतं सर्वं श्रुयः। कशो आश्वायं नरयाजस्ति । स्वामिकृति यि क्तिकैन कृत्यं विश्वास्यनुकृतार्थं स्वामिं मतं सर्वं श्रुयः। कशो आश्वायं नरयाजस्ति । स्वामिकृति यि क्तिकैन कृत्यं विश्वास्यनुकृतार्थं स्वामिं मतं सर्वं श्रुयः। कशो आश्वायं नरयाजस्ति ।

1 Here is the end of a verse in Sragdhara.
2 A part of a verse in Sārdhulaśārvikādītā.
3 As above. The same metre in the next verse also, which is numbered 25 by Maisey in his transcript.
4 Metre of this and the next verse: Sragdhara. This verse uses such expressions as are applicable to the enemies of the king and also to the bird known as ṣīrākā.
5 Here Maisey's reading is evidently wrong, as this word has three letters whereas the metre requires only two, the first of which has to be short and the second to be long.
6 Metre of this and of the next verse: Sārdhulaśārvikādītā. There is a play on the word khaḍgilā. The expressions used in this verse apply to kāminī, as also to the enemies of the king. In the first case the second word of the third foot means charana, i.e., foot, and in the second, i.e., in case of the enemies, who has to be separated from rana, i.e., battle.
7 Metre: Vaṣantālaśārvikādītā.
8 Metre: Anusūbh.
9 Metre: Vaṣantālaśārvikādītā.
10 Metre: Sārdhulaśārvikādītā.
11 Metre: Mālinī. It is doubtful whether all the verses of this inscription were composed by Paramdārān himself. The latter part of it contains his own eulogy, but from one of these verses we also learn that it is a eulogy of Purāṇī, though the expressions such as ṣāma are applicable to the king, suggest that the latter part was composed by some other person, probably the engraver, for whom we find only the word nālaka, meaning wrote on the stone (also). Under the circumstances the point cannot be decided.
12 The year of the date is wrongly given for 1238, as Kirol has already drawn our attention to in Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 354. Similarly, he has also remarked that the corresponding date is stated to be, in A. S. I., Vol. XXI, p. 38, the 26th October, which is evidently a misprint.
GARRĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTIONS OF TRAILŌKYAVARMAN

NO. 141 : PLATE CXXVIII

GARRĀ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTIONS OF TRAILŌKYAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1261

These two copper-plates, each of which bears a complete record in itself, are stated to have been found in a tank near the village of Gārrā (locally known as Gaḍḍhā), situated to the south-east of Chhatarpur, formerly the capital of a State and now the chief town of a tehsil and district of the same name in the Vindhyā region of Mādhya Pradesh. The plates were sent by Pt. Shukdeo Bihari Mishra, then the Diwan of the State, to Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, who edited both the inscriptions together, with lithographs, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XVI (for 1921-22), pp. 272 ff., and while doing so, he also stated that the plates were then "exhibited on the Provincial Museum, Lucknow". Despite my constant attempts, however, I failed to know anything about the plates, and as fresh impressions could not be obtained, I edit the inscriptions here from the facsimiles accompanying K. N. Dikshit's article.1

The plates measure 34.2 by 20-35 cm. and 32.38 by 20 cm., respectively. Each plate is inscribed on one side only, and each of them has a small round hole of the diameter of 9.5 cm., at the top, indicating that originally they were held together by a ring, which is now missing. In the middle of the first four lines on each of them is engraved the figure of the seated goddess Lakṣmi, with four arms, holding a lotus in each of the upper hands, as we find on the Chandella charts. The writing on both the plates is protected by flat copper-bands, about 95 cm. in breadth and 3 to 45 cm. in thickness, riveted along the edges of the inscribed surface, approaching quite close to it and sometimes hiding beneath them a letter or two and completely also the last line on the first plate. The writing is well preserved, as to be judged from the facsimiles. Each of the records consists of 17 lines, but the last line on the second plate is damaged. The plates are stated to weigh 124 and 122 tola, approximating to 1 kgm. and 45 grms., and 1 kgm. and 45 grms., respectively.

The characters are of the Nāgarī alphabet. They are slightly advanced than those of the Sūrā grant of Paramardin, with the Mahābā and Bāhārat Kalā Bhavan grants of the same king marking the intermediate state.2 The noteworthy peculiarity of the alphabet in which these plates are engraved, is that the angular forms of the aksaras of the chronologically preceding inscriptions give place to their round forms. To note some of the more progressive forms of letters in the present inscriptions, the vowel i gives us its earliest form of the modern Nāgarī; see ins., ll. 1 and 2, respectively (of both the plates); the vowel ā continues to be much similar to the consonant p, cf. ēśa, ll. 5 and 6, respectively; the left-hand limb of kh begins with a loop as we have in the palatal s see khā, l. 13 (first plate), ch has occasionally developed an angular loop, as in chā, l. 10 (second plate); dh, with its horn developed, has assumed its form as in the modern Nāgarī, see madhāka, l. 15; and lastly, r occasionally resembles ch, as in rā (rāṣṭra), l. 11 (second plate).

The language is Sanskrit, which is almost correct and except for one verse in the beginning and one towards the end, each of the inscriptions is in prose throughout. The orthography presents more or less the same peculiarities as to be found in the contemporary inscriptions, e.g., (1) the use of the same sign to denote v and b; (2) the occasional reduplication of a class-consonant following r; (3) the wrong use of the consonant m for amśvāra in samuditīya, l. 8, but not in saṁvīta in ll. 9 and 10, respectively in the first and the second plates; (4) the correct use of the siblants, perhaps excepting two instances, vṛ-, āśana (for āśana) and -asvī (for āśvī), both in l. 13 in each plate. And lastly, we find in ll. 10-11 of the first plate a danda used to show that the preceding rā is the initial letter of Rāṣṭra.

---

1 Lastly, the plates were known to exist in the Lucknow museum. Subsequently, I had an opportunity to examine the plates in the Museum, and I found that they are not very thick, but the engraving being rather not very deep, the letters do not show themselves through on the reverse side. In the last line of the second plates, parts of letters already put by me in brackets, in the text, are lost with the copper.

2 See Nos. 126, 130 and 138, respectively.
Each of the plates constitutes a royal charter, recording the grant of a village by the Paramabhūtāraka, Mahārājāhāruṇa and Paramēṣvara, the illustrious Traillōkya varmanadēva of the royal house of the Chandelās, from his encampment at the village of Vādavāda, in favour of Sāvanta whose father, Pāpē was killed in a battle with the Turushkas. The first of the records relates to the grant of the village Kādōha, included in the territorial division Pānūli (l. 7), and the second to that of the village Lōhashūnī, in that of Vikraunī (l. 7). The first of the documents is dated Friday, the 2nd tīhī of the bright fortnight of Vaiśākha in the year 1261 and the second, on Friday, the dark fortnight of Vaiśākha in the same year. Both the years, which are given only in figures, are to be referred to the Vikrama era. Calculating the corresponding Christian dates accordingly for both the inscriptions, K. N. Dikshit, the editor of the inscriptions has shown that the true equivalent of the first of the grants is 22nd April, 1205 a.C., and that of the second is 6th May of the same year, according to the Southern Vikrama expired and taking the month to be amāti so far as the second date is concerned. Here we are also to note, as aptly remarked by him, that here we have instances of Northern Indian epigraphical dates calculated as southern expired Vikrama years with amāta months. Thus the second grant was issued two weeks later.

Quṭb-ud-dīn Aībak’s invasion of the fort of Kālānjī, during the last days of the Chandelā king Paramardin, in 1292 a.C., is well-known: and it is also known that Paramardin died a natural death during this invasion. Aībak succeeded in capturing the fort and subsequently directed his invasion on Mahōbī, which too was captured. This has been taken by some scholars to hold that Mahōbī and the surrounding regions were no longer part of the Chandelā dominions. Vincent Smith also observed that “the history of the Chandelā dynasty, as one of the powers of Northern India, ends in 1203 a.C., and that Traillōkya varman succeeded his father as a mere local chieftain, holding the eastern part of the ancestral kingdom of Jējākabhukti.” But it is clear from the present inscriptions that shortly after the catastrophe, Paramardin’s son, Traillōkya varman, rescued the country from the grip of the Muslims. He drove away the Muslim officers from both these places and the surrounding region, following them up to Kakādahā, where an encounter appears to have taken place and his general Rāhiṭa Pāpē seems to have lost his life in it. It is also significant, as remarked by Dikshit, “that the claim should be assumed over the place within two years of its loss”; and here we are also to note that in the Dharātī copper-plate record, dated 1212 a.C., Traillōkya varman is mentioned as the sole lord of Kālānjī, and thus the paramount sovereign of the whole region of Bundelkhand. In one of the inscriptions of his successor he is also eniolged as a “veritable Vishnu in lifting up the earth immersed in the ocean formed by the stream of the Turushkas.” All these references along with the paramount titles claimcd by him in the present inscriptions, go well to indicate that Traillōkya varman was not a mere local chief, as held by Smith and others, but a paramount lord of his ancestral dominions, and that he also raised the prestige of his house by clearing off the temporary flood of the Muslim invasion. The restoration of the Chandelā rule in the region may be dated between 1202 a.C., when Aībak attacked Kālānjī, and 1206 a.c., the year of the present records, which furnish the earliest date for Traillōkya varman.

Each of the inscriptions ends with a verse speaking highly of making donations, followed by the sign-manual of the king. The engraver’s name is not mentioned in either.

Of the geographical places mentioned in the inscriptions, Kālānjī (l. 5), is, as we have often seen, the well-known fortress in the Hamīpur District of Uttar Pradesh; and all the other places have been identified by Dikshit in his article. Thus, Vādavāda the place of encampment

---

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, p. 273. According to the calculations made by him, the date of the second grant also shows its equivalent to be 19th of March, 1204 A.C., following the Northern Vikrama expired, if we take the month pūruṣādī, which too was a Friday. But I agree with him in rejecting this solution in view of the fact that the two grants must have been recorded almost simultaneously. His rejection of this date appears to be justified in view of the consideration that both the grants which were issued by the same king to the same donor and with the same object in view, should have been dated according to one and the same system of counting.


4 Below, No. 142, l. 5.

5 See No. 145, text v. 7.
From Facsimile


This inscription is on a single plate of copper which was found by Pt. Govind Sitaram Harshe, in course of digging a pit in his house, in 1943, in the Lakshmipurā mahālā of Sāgar the headquarters of a district in Madhya Pradesh. The epigraph was noticed in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy of the Archaeological Survey of India, for the year 1946-47, and was edited by B. M. Barua and P. B. Chakravarti, in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XXIII (1947), pp. 46 ff., and was re-edited, with a lithograph, by Dr. Sant Lal Katare in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXI (1957-58), pp. 70 ff. from an impression supplied to him by S. S. Patwardhan who was then the Curator of the Central Museum, Nagpur, where the plate is now deposited, and the impression supplied to me by the Chief Epigraphist, and another, by Shri V. P. Rode, the present Curator of the Museum, to whom my thanks are due.

It is a thick plate measuring 36.2 cms. by 26.67 cms., and is inscribed on one side only. It weighs 5 kgms. and 208 grms. It contains small round holes bored at intervals, on all the four sides, indicating that strips of copper were at some time fastened by rivets along its edges, to protect the writing, as to be seen on some other plates issued by the Chandella kings; but the strips were destroyed some time subsequently. The inscription contains 19 lines of writing, and the aksharas are all well preserved, except in the last one which has altogether been broken with the lower left corner of the plate, and a few of the aksharas are damaged but can be made out with some perseverance, in two or three lines in the middle of the plate, which was vertically bent when received but had to be straightened.

The first four lines of the inscription are divided by the figure of a seated Gaja-Lakshmi engraved at the top, as we find generally in the charters issued by the house to which the present inscription also belongs. The letters are not of the uniform size, their average height being about 1.3 cms. in the first six lines, but from the seventh line their size is reduced and in the last 2-3 lines they are almost half of this size. Since much of the space available on the plate was in the beginning covered by a small portion of the text, the rest of the document was crammed into a much smaller space.

The script used is Nāgari, resembling that of the immediately preceding Gārā plates and showing more or less the same sort of palaeographical peculiarities, e.g., a confusion between the forms of υ and v, and occasionally between that of these letters and of σ, e.g., in śrī- and nārēndra, both in l. 1, chēna in l. 10, and cēnā in l. 16. The letter 创投 continues to be without its dot, the conjunct gū is written as gn and the subscript n as l. e.g., in jāṅgama, l. 9, mārgama, l. 15, and Kīrtin, l. 11, respectively. And lastly, dh marks a transitional state, appearing sometimes as v as in vādhā, l. 17, where we also note the verticals joined by a stroke, while in the other instances its left limb has a horn above, which is sometimes joined to the preceding

*The reading from ml. to the end in this line is as taken by Dikshit. But it is conjectural as all these aksharas are concealed beneath the copper-band.

*In his article Katare called it as the "Tezri plate", but as rightly remarked by the editor of the Ep. Ind., while publishing the article, I prefer to name it as the Sāgar plate, after its find-spot. The record was also edited, with a photolithograph, by B. C. Jaiti, in Vindhyadhāram (a Hindi magazine from Rāwa), in its special issue on archaeology, 1935, on pp. 31-32.

It is his No. 50 of 1940-41.
stroke of the mātā, as in vīrōdhi, l. 2. The characters generally exhibit a distinct slanting curve at their right hand bottom.

The aṅkharas were well written, but their incision betrays carelessness on the part of the engraver, who, besides leaving some redundant strokes, is prone to make superfluous additions and omissions deforming their shapes, as we find in the Śemēra grant of Pratardana. Instances of this sort of slovenliness are pointed out in the text or the foot-notes appended to it.

The language is Sanskrit, which is generally correct; and except for one verse in the beginning and two imprecatory verses in the concluding portion, the record is all in prose, being almost a copy of the preceding grant so far as the initial portion is concerned, the change being observed only in the formal portion. As regards orthography, (1) b, as usual, is denoted by the sign for v, cf. vādhā, l. 17; (2) the dental and the palatal bilabials are often confounded with each other even in very common words like pātu written with the dental and aṣuama with the palatal in lines 14 and 15 respectively; (3) a class-consonant following r is not often doubled, e.g., in parāva, l. 16, and sometimes this sort of reduplication is also noted when the consonant precedes r, e.g., in jattā, l. 2; (4) the sign of anusvāra is used more often than the sign of the nasal; (5) the influence of the local element is noticed in the spelling of Jāmadagnya written as Yāmadāgnya in l. 12; and lastly, (6) the use of the prāṣṭhā-mātā, which is in some instances so put as to be confounded with a dānte and vice versa.

It is a royal charter recording the donation of land by the illustrious king Trailokyaavarman, who is endowed with the usual royal titles and is also stated to be the sole lord of Kālānjarā and belonging to the Chandellā house. The initial portion mentions the genealogy of the king in the same way as the Gārā plates. The formal part of the present record begins in l. 7, stating that the king granted, from his encumbrances at Tihāri, the village Mandātāra included in the vīsaya (territorial division) of Vadavāri in the “administrative or territorial unit” in Sihaṇḍū. The donor was a Brāhmaṇa named Kutośārman, who had hailed from Rawkōra and was a son of Nāyaka Goyādhara, a grandson of Rāhita Sihaṇḍu and a great-grandson of Rāhita Nangrahana (2). He belonged to the Vatsa gōtra, with five Puvāraś, viz., Vatsa, Bāhragava, Chiyavana, Aurvva and Jāmadagnya, and was a student of the Vājānasya sūkha.

The inscription is dated in l. 10-12, in the year 1264 (expressed both in figures and words), on the second tithi of the dark half of the month of Bhāḍrapada, on Śukradaṇa, or Friday. The year must of course be taken as belonging to the Vikrama era, and, as has been calculated by Katare, the details of the date regularly correspond to 29th August, 1208 A. C.4

Lines 14-18 contain the usual admonitions to give to the donor whatever might be due to him and to obstruct him enjoying the gift: and with two customary benedictory and imprecatory verses followed by the sign-manual of the king Trialokyaavarman in ll. 18-19, the record comes to a close.

While dealing with the Gārā grants of 1205 A.C. we have seen that immediately after his accession Trailokyaavarman consolidated his strength, and driving away the Muslim forces from the region, he succeeded in regaining his ancestral kingdom some time before that date. The present grant, which was issued about three years subsequently, goes to indicate that in 1208 he was again in the same region in which lies the place of his camp mentioned in the present inscription, viz., Siyaṇḍu, which is only about 50 kms. due north-west of Vadavāri where he

---

1 Above, No. 120.

2 It is difficult to reconcile the mention of Sihaṇḍu-sisayā, l. 7, with Tihāri-samākāla in l. 10. While editing the inscription, Dr. Katare is inclined to hold that “the announcement of the grant was made at the Siyaṇḍu military camp (gārīga), and the king, when he actually issued it, was residing at Tehtī”. Dr. D. C. Sircar, while publishing Katare’s article, observed that “the language of the recod shows that Siyaṇḍu was the name of an administrative or territorial unit in which the gift land was situated” (op. cit., p. 71, n. 4). But we find the vīsaya actually mentioned in l. 7 as Vadavāri, and Dr. Sircar appears to have ignored it. It appears to me, however, that the grant was issued when the king was residing at Tehtī and his forces were encamped at Siyaṇḍu which is not far off from the camp, being only about 50 kms. distant from it. For the sake of some facility, kings have their camp often at a small distance from the scene of the battle, though not far from it.

3 As we have so often remarked, this is another example to show how the surnames were subject to change with generations.

4 Katare, op. cit., p. 71.
was camped when the Grra grants were made. On the strength of this we may also assume that in 1208 he had rather advanced further in the north.

Of the geographical names occurring in the record, Tilhari, the place of the king's residence when he issued the grant (l. 10), has been identified with the same village and also known by its longer name Tebr-i-Baqapur, near Tikamgadh, the chief town of a district in Madhya Pradesh. Mandaiara or Majanura, the gift-village (l. 7) has been identified with the modern Madaora in the Lalitpur sub-division of the Jhansi District and lying about 45 kms. south of Tikamgadh; and Tehri is at almost the same distance to the south-east of Lalitpur. Shiadāun (l. 7) is, of course, identical with Siydānumi of the inscriptions and has been taken identical with Sirīn Kudra, situated about 15 kms. west-northwest of Lalitpur. And lastly, Vadavāri (l. 7) is obviously the same as Vadavāda of the Grra plate (No. 1) and is also mentioned in the Sānu grant of Pāramard. There is no sufficient data in the inscription to identify Raikūra, the original place of the donor, mentioned in l. 12.

TEXT

[More...: Verses 1-5 Anuśṭhānā.]

1. ṛṣeṣvāhit [1]  
2. tatra eva mahānana mārvajā naśvāhitā
3. mārvajā riṣvikāryakāmā vyāsānāvāhitā
dvayeśvānaraṇāvāhitā
4. vṛti lātāmārvajā
5. lātāmārvajā lātāmahāvāhitā
6. mārvajā mārvajā kāryaśākhādāvāhitā
dvayeśvānaraṇāvāhitā
7. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
8. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
9. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
10. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
11. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
12. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā
13. mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā mārvajā

---

From impressions.

Expressed by symbol, which is more probably for Śādāmar.

* The vertical of the consonant  is not completely cut and it appears as . A faint trace above the top-stroke indicates that the sign for the mātrā was incised very lightly and it could not come in the impressions.

* A redundant stroke makes the subscript of appear as bh.

* Both these names appear as carved after rubbing out some other alaḥams engraved originally. The first of the names may also be read as . The situation on top of the name that follows is doubtful.

* A redundant, horizontal stroke appears between this letter and the name that follows is doubtful.

* Kasture read the letter as da, but it is mutilated and the pṛthvi-mātrā appears partially.

* The alaḥam pa is not fully cut, as also in some other lines below.

* The name can be read also as Rākṣōra.

* The dhāpas in this and the preceding lines are redundant.
DHURETI COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF TRAILOKYAMALLA

[ Kalachuri ] Year 963

This inscription was first brought to notice by N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist for India, who published a brief account of it in the Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of India, 1935-36, pp. 90 ff., and also edited it, with a photolith, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXV (1957-58), pp. 1 ff. and Plate facing p. 5. Subsequently, a revised transcript with translation of it was published by Dr. V. V. Mirashi in his Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. IV, pp. 369 ff. and Plate, from impressions provided by the Government Epigraphist. The plates from which Chakravarti took the impressions were preserved in the Treasury at Rewa which was then the capital of a State and is now the headquarters of a district of that name in Madhya Pradesh; but no information is forthcoming as to the present whereabouts of the original. And as a fresh impression thereof could not be obtained, I edit the inscription here from the plate accompanying Mirashi’s article.

The inscription is on two plates of copper, which are said to have been found by a cultivator in 1926, in course of ploughing his field in the village at Dhureti, about 10 kms. south-east of Rewa, the headquarters of a district in Madhya Pradesh. The edges of the plates are turned up all round the rim, and each of them measures 38.75 cms. broad by 26.67 cms. high. They

1 The word patu, mentioned here, in the list of other taxa, probably means “the supply of bullocks for the conveyance of royal officers on tour”. Cf. n-parampatu-balbhairada-grahana in E. L. Vol. XXVI, p. 169. Dr. Sivara interprets it in the sense of “cattle or animal for sacrificial purposes”, for which see I. E. G.
2 The bracketed aukhara is cut as va. There are some other instances of the type, not noted separately.
3 Both the bracketed letters are misformed, and the prithuimatra of lo is cut close to the preceding aukhara, making it appear as al.
4 midam, as it appears in the writing, cannot be defended and the expressions should be taken as I have corrected here.
5 This aukhara may also be read as va.
6 The portion of the plate bearing the last letter has peeled off, and probably divasaya after the name may have been intended.
7 The plates appear to have sailed off to the British Museum along with the four other copper-plates which are stated to have been presented to it by the Rajas of Rewa, for which see Ind. Ant. Vol. XVII, p. 244, n. 1. And as their present provenance is not definitely known, I prefer to call them after the name of its find-spot, following Mirashi.
DHURETI COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF
TRAILOKYAMALLA, KALACHURI YEAR 953

From Facsimile
were originally held together by a ring, which was cut off some time before Chakravarthi examined them in the Treasury at Rēvā. The ring has a seal measuring about 17/14 cms. by 11/43 cms., bearing the figure of Gaja-Lakṣāni and the legend Śrīma-devī Trailökāyamallī in one line below it. The weight of the two plates along with the ring and the seal is stated to be equal to 190 klgms.

Each of the plates is inscribed on the inner side only; and the writing, which is well preserved in consequence of the raised rims of the plates, as stated above, consists of 22 lines, each of the plates containing 11 lines. The approximate height of the letters is about 1/3 cms., except in the last two lines where they are written in a slightly smaller size, in view of completing the remaining portion of the record in a limited space.

The characters are Nāgarī. In spite of our observation that the signs of the mātrās and anusvāras are gracefully treated, the mechanical work evinces extreme slovenliness. The record contains glaring mistakes of grammar, for example, often using the names without case-endings, as in l. 20, neglect of sandhi-rules even in a compound word where it is necessary, and wrong sandhi in sūtra, l. 13. The inscription was composed jointly by two village Panḍitas who had, as can be gathered from the gross errors occurring therein, very little knowledge of Sanskrit. The work of engraving is also slovenly in omitting a letter here and another there, and occasionally also omitting strokes and limbs of letters: some of these foibles being possibly due to oversight. All these mistakes have been drawn attention to and corrected in the text or notes accompanying it.

With reference to the formation of letters, it may be pointed out that the vowel ō is confounded with po, as in ekā, l. 13, and pāni, l. 22; and ch with v, e.g., in vischāra, l. 6; and that it is at times rather difficult to distinguish between the palatal ɾ and the dental s, a sort of combination of both these abharas.

The language is Sanskrit, which is often incorrect, as already stated above; and, excepting three verses in the beginning, the record is all in prose. There are no imprecatory verses as it is not a royal charter. The orthographical peculiarities are all as usual, for example, (1) the sign for v throughout does the duty to denote b also, as in sāndha, l. 19; (2) occasionally there is a confusion between the correct use of the palatal and the dental sibilant, e.g., in sīvāṇīsūtra, l. 18; and lastly, (3) the prāṇīsa-mātrā is used only here and there. The somewhat rare word pravari occurs in l. 14; and (4) often the signs of the mātrās and anusvāras above are gracefully formed.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Trailökāyamallādeva; and its object is to record the mortgage (vitta-bandha) of a village by the Saiva ascetic Sāndśā in favour of one Rāparaka Dhāreka, on a date which is expressed in l. 7, in words, as the 7th day of the bright fortnight of Jyēśṭha in the year 963. The era, which is not specified, is taken by Chakravarthi to be the Kalachuri era, and the equivalent Christian date, as calculated, is the 9th of May, 1212. But this fails to satisfy the requirements of the case, for, as rightly observed both by Chakravarthi and Mirashi, in the current Kalachuri year 963 (1212-11 A.C.) the titli fell on a Friday, and in the expired year 965 it fell on a Wednesday. We have therefore to agree with these scholars in their suggestion that the word Sānā may have been wrongly written for Suamā (i.e., Buddhē) in the inscription. Without offering any other justification on the date-problem, however, I feel it doubtful if the use of Suamē to indicate Buddhē was known to the composers of the inscription with their limited knowledge.

The inscription opens with the auspicious Om, followed by salutation to Śiva and Gajaśāri and three verses thereafter, in honour of Mukunda, Śūlapāni (Śiva) and Sarasvatī, of which the last one is reproduced from the introductory portion of Ďaṅjin's Kāvyādaśa. After this, the record refers in ll. 5-7 to the victorious rule of the illustrious Trailökāyamallē, whose epithets, besides the imperial titles commencing with Bhūtāraka (i.e., Paramārthaśāraka, Māhārājagaurīraja and Paramēśvara), occur also as the lord of horses (akṣapati), the lord of elephants (gaṇapati), the lord of men (nara-pati), the overlord of the three Rājas (Rājārayādhipati), and what appears rather curious, the lord of Kānyaśā (Kānyaśāguṇādhipati).

Noticing a copper-plate grant from Rēvā, dated in the (Vikrama) year 1298 or 1240-41 A.C., Cunningham has already pointed out that the king Trailökāyamalla mentioned therein is doubl-

1 As suggested by Chakravarthi, this title may possibly have been assumed by the Chandella ruler with the decline of the Gihadaśāra rulers who originally used it. See op. cit., p. 3.
less the Chandelas prince Trailókya varman: and this view is also accepted by Kielhorn while editing the grant. Here we follow these scholars in regarding both the names identical, and, in view of this, it would appear that this ruler evidently extended his sway around the Réśā region at the cost of the Kalachuri ruler Vijayaśītha (1188-1210 A.C.), and, in consequence of it, he adopted the titles of asavaśīpati and guṇapati which were borne by the former. Here we may also note that this particular portion of the present inscription agrees very closely with the corresponding portion of the Kalachuri Vijayaśītha’s grants; and the writers of the present grant, who possessed only a smattering of Sanskrit, as seen above, copied this portion from some Kalachuri charters where these titles appear.

In I. 10-14 of the document it is stated that during the reign of the aforementioned king, i.e., Trailókya varman, who had then encamped at Bhövahaṭṭa included in the patalī of Dhanavāḥi, and on the date mentioned above, the Saiva ascetic Sāntaśīva of the Vasa gōtra, who was a son of the Bhūtabāha, the holy Rējaṣūrṇa Vimalāśīva, and who had attained the lordship of the Saiva ascetics through the practice of self-restraint, observances, study of the sacred texts and meditations and who was the foremost among the learned and had mastered all lore, had placed, by way of mortgage, the village Alurā, with all its dues, i.e., all the rights of collecting taxes, to the Rēśaka, the illustrious Dhārāka, the son of Sévarāja, who was, in his turn, the son of the Thakkura Rāsala. The taxes are not specifically mentioned in the record, nor the amount of money taken as loan; but the expression yādavādāyastī (in I. 18) tends to indicate that the village was to be kept on pledge till all the dues were realised.

Vimalāśīva of the present inscription appears to be no doubt identical with the homonymous sage mentioned as the religious preceptor of the Kalachuri king Jayaśītha (1163-1188 A.C.), the father of Vijayaśītha, two of whose inscriptions we have, one dated in 1164-65 A.C. and the other in 1174 A.C.; and though we have nothing on record in this respect, it is not unlikely that the sage may have received the village as a donation from the king who was, like the other Kalachuri kings, a devoted Saiva.

We are further informed in I. 15-19 that the deed was actually executed by Nāḍāśīva, a younger son of Vimalāśīva, with the authority of Sēnraśīva. Line 20 contains the names of eight persons as witnesses of the deed. In the end it is stated that the record was drawn jointly by two Pandita whose names were Visēśvara and Gāndāṭhara, and also that it was engraved by Strūka.

The record also names, in II. 8-9, some officers who were then present, on duty. They are:—(1) the Mahāmahātāha, Maṇḍrī and Māṇḍatīka Malayaśīvar; (2) the Śrīmāhāvīgahā (minister of Peace and War), the Thakkura Haripāla; (3) the Koṭṭapāla (guardian of the fort) Vāṭāna (Chānagāra); and (4) the ārhat śṛṅkha (keeper of accounts), the illustrious Chandraśeśaśīva. Of these persons, Nos. 1 and 2 have been identified with their namesakes mentioned in the Réśā stone inscription of Vijayaśītha, and No. 3 may have been the same as Vāṭāna, the son of Sallakshanaśīva, the feudatory chief of Karkrédi, figuring in a record from Réśā.

The mention of the name of Malayaśītha in the present inscription deserves more than a passing notice. He is no doubt the same officer who had defeated a ruler of the name of Sallakshana, in a battle fought at Kurkāṭā, modern Karkrédi, lying 45 kuts. north of Réśā, and forced him to acknowledge the suzerainty of Vijayaśītha (1188-1210 A.C.), who was the last Kalachuri ruler, as we know from the Réśā stone inscription of Vijayaśītha, dated in the Kalachuri year 944, which corresponds to 1193 A.C. Another inscription of the same king, the

---

3 This particular title which was originally assumed by the Kalachuri Kaṭha was used not only by his descendants but by several other kings of other dynasties. See G.I.L., Vol. IV, p. 6.
4 In I. 17 below, he is also stated to have been proficient in welding arms as in the Śēstra, reminding us of: Maṇḍrī, maṇḍatīkā āśāvastī śenaśīvaḥ = guṇapati = śeṣaḥ kṣētraḥ = upākāśīpaḥ upāsīnaḥ.
5 G.I.L., Vol. IV, Nos. 63 and 64, respectively, in II. 22 and 17.
6 This term is rendered by Chakravarti in the sense of 'writer of deeds' and by Misra, as 'Secretary'. But we take the word artha to denote accounts.
7 For all these identifications, see G.I.L., Vol. IV, p. 570 and n. 6. Also see n. in the text below where we have shown that the name may also be read as Chānagāra.
date of which is not clear but is calculated to range between 1208-09 and 1210-11 A.C., mentions the same Malayasinha as a Mahāmāyādika of the Kalachuri ruler. And his mention in the present inscription as a Mahābhaṭṭaka, Māntrī and Māyādika of the Chandella prince makes it almost certain that within two or three years thereof, this erstwhile zealous feudatory of the Kalachuri king had to transfer his own allegiance to Trailokyaavarman who had by that time annexed the region around Rēvā from the Kalachuris, in whose dominions it had been so far included.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the present inscription, Dhōvahāṭṭa (I. 10) has been identified by Chakravarti with Dhureti, whereas Mirashi thinks it more likely to be identical with Dhubhat near Mahendrapur, about 16 kms. south by west of Rēvā. The former view is supported by the fact that the plates were actually found at the place, and the latter by a closer similarity in the names of the places, which, as far as I think, can hardly be regarded as a decisive argument. In favour of Chakravarti's identification of the place, it may also be pointed out that the village that was mortgaged, as to be seen below, is situated not only nearer to Dhureti but also in the same direction. Dhānāvēḍī, the headquarters of a pataḍā in which the village was then included (I. 10), may be identical with the village of the same name lying about 35 kms. to the south-west of Dhubhat, as already suggested by Mirashi. And I propose to identify the mortgaged village Alaurā (I. 14) with Laurā included in the present Mahajani tehsil of the Rēvā District and lying about 48 kms. north by east of this city itself, on an metalled road to Mirzapur. The geographical consideration thus suggests that the Chandella territory then extended in the east as far as the region of the present Rēvā District, including its north-eastern portion beyond the Kaimur range, in the early years of the thirteenth century A.C. That the northern portion of the district may have been under the Chandellas still earlier in Madanavarman's time is suggested from the find of a hoard of coins at Patvār which is in its northern part in the modern Tyōṃthar tehsil of it.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1-2 Mālīnī v. 5 Anushṭubh]

First Plate

1 अँ नमः सः(भ)वयः || गण्यते समः || अतः अतः अभये वर्मीकिंद्रितः || अतः अतः हर्षोऽवरन्ति वृणांके(२)वृणेष्वरे: || (२) अः
2 विषज्ञ अस्तित्वाभि(४) कोमलामा जशतु जशतु जशतु नामा(५) महारे (५) मुक्कद: || (२) अतः सकलकीकालि-}

1 Ibid., p. 366. text II. 9-10.
2 N. P. Chakravarti attempts to make this date more precise. Drawing attention to an inscription of Vijayarāsinī of (Arbela year) 982 (A.R., A. S. I., 1933-36, pp. 89 f) and pointing out that the record under consideration is later than it by one year, only, he suggests that the territory contiguous to the Rēvā town passed from the Kalachuris to the Chandellas between the dates of these two records. But this view is not certain in consideration of the fact that the reading of the date in Vijayarāsinī's record is only tentative, as he himself states, and its provenance too is unknown. The document is still unedited.
3 For the disappearance of the first vowel of the name, we have a number of examples to cite e.g. the name Anajapradha later on changed to Ranipradha and gradually to Rānkal (Shivpuri District. M.P.), for which see J. M. P. I. P., No. IV, p. 12. Another parallel case where not only the initial vowel but also the consonant of the name has disappeared is that of Pādhānibradas changed to Saṇḍarī. See C. I. I., Vol. IV, p. 45.
5 From facsimile facing p. 372 in C. I. I., Vol. IV.
6 This ānata, as also some others below, is redundant.
7 This is how the two akhetas were read by Mirashi. The first, however, appears as sa and the second as tr with a trace below, as of the sign for medial short u. Can it be saḥātra?
This yati has one letter more. Mirashi corrects it to तुष्कसनवले. It may also be restored as चिन्द्रसनवले as already suggested by Chakravarti.

This danda as also some others below is redundant. As already noted by Chakravarti and Mirashi, this verse occurs in Daṇḍin's Kṛṣṇāदvarita. I, 1.

The aksāhara ग is written above the line.

The śabdha is neglected here, as also in some places below; sometimes not noted here separately.

The medial sign of ka is applied to the preceding letter by mistake.

The third letter in this line looks somewhat like na. Read नामविशिष्टाद्वितियते.

The consonant of the last letter of the name can also be read as ch, for which see chayitaka and paścaka in the next line. Read चतुर्विशिष्टं as suggested by V. V. Mirashi.

A redundant stroke appears above the first letter of the line. Read चिश्विशिष्ट, which appears without any case-ending as some other titles and names below.

In the singular amsāhara and amsūtāravāti are redundant. It appears to mean 'with due deliberations'.

As already noted by Mirashi, 'this expression seems to be out of place in a deed of mortgage'.

It appears rather curious that the sārva svetā should call himself as devoted to the feet of the king.

Read कृपा न्ययः —

Read ग्राहितक. As already noted by Chakravarti, the name is here in the honorific plural, whereas all the qualifying adjectives are in the singular.

That is, जयः.

The reading of the bracketed aksāhara is doubtful and I have followed Mirashi's reading.

Here also I agree with Mirashi in taking the second aksāhara of the name as lau, and not it, as taken by Chakravarti, remarking that lau which was first engraven was subsequently corrected into it. Mirashi particularly draws our attention to similar mātrīs of medial aś in Kālaus. II, 11-12.

Mirashi elsewhere takes this word in the sense of 'banker' (C, I, I, Vol. IV, p. 351, n.), but it does not suit here. The word, which is obviously derived from prasātā, meaning 'a descent' and also 'a place where four roads meet', appears to denote the customs duty charged here on articles brought from other places.

The correct construction would be श्रीमानः. Also read वाक्रियाः...
CHARKHÄRI COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF VĪRAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1511

This inscription, which is on a copper-plate, was edited along with three others by R. B. Hiralal, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XX (1929-30), pp. 132 f., without a facsimile. The plates bearing all these inscriptions are reported to have been possessed by the Chief of the former State of Charkhäri, now a tehsil in the Hamirpur District of Uttar Pradesh, but there is no information as to their original find-spot or regarding the circumstances under which they were found. Hiralal's edition of the present inscription is not accompanied with a facsimile, as also of those of the other three edited along with it; and as an impression too of it is not now forthcoming, I edit the record here from his transcript, adding my notes to it.

As said above, it is a single copper-plate which is stated in measure as equal to 38.5 cms. by 28.9 cms., with its rim raised to the height of about .5 cm. and rivetted with nails all round. It is inscribed on one side only and the inscription consists of 19 lines of writing. It weighs 2 kgms. and 689 grams. In the middle of the upper part of it, there is a hole, apparently made for a ring, which, with any seal if it was ever attached to it, is not forthcoming; and thus it appears more likely that the hole was made not to join it with a second plate but (subsequently by the owner) to string the plate with some other plates, since the inscription on it is complete in itself. In the middle of the first six lines the writing is interrupted by a representation of the goddess Lakšmi, holding a lotus flower in each of the two upper hands and water-pots in the two lower hands. The letters are stated to have been well formed, showing an average size of .5 cm.

1. The dandās are superfluous.
2. The akṣara श is written above the line.
3. As remarked by Miraddhi, the text is corrupt here and what is intended appears to be तः तः तः तः which
4. This contraction cannot be explained. It probably denotes तिलिच्छान्ति or तिलिच्छान्ति.
5. Probably a letter has disappeared at the beginning of this line, as shown by a trace.
6. The text is again corrupt here. Probably तस्तिक्षे is meant.
7. Read वाकाप्पः.
8. For मुङगेनः.
9. An ornamental design appears between the double dandās.
10. For the other three inscriptions, see above. Nos. 108, 122 and 151.
The characters belong to the Nāgari alphabet. The language is Sanskrit; and, except for one verse in the beginning and three in the end, the whole record is in prose. It shows the usual orthographical peculiarities, such as (a) often putting the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in subha. l. 19, and the palatal for the dental, as in preśāda, l. 14; (b) the reduplication of a class-consonant following r, e.g., in vîrmalâ, l. 8; and (c) the use of the sign v for to denote b as well. The influence of the local pronunciation of n for n is seen in the spellings of hr̥tr̥ṣvahya in l. 2, gyhṇâ, in l. 18 and pûṣya in l. 18, but not in the same word in l. 12 and 13. We may also note that the word yûjâla is wrongly spelt with a single j in l. 1.

The engraver, whose name is not mentioned, is also responsible for a few mistakes, e.g., those of the omission of limbs of certain letters and of the signs of anusvâra, visarga and the superscript r, all of which have been corrected in the text, below. It is also doubtful whether all these were engraved lightly and may not have come out clearly on the impression from which Hirâla prepared the transcript.

It is a royal charter issued by Viravarman of the Chandella Dynasty. The object of it is to record the grant, by Viravarman, the sole lord of Kâliñjara, of the village Tumûñjami, situated in the territorial division (vishaya) Dâhit, from this camp at Vîśâspura, in favour of the Râta Abhi, son of the Râta Hariñjâ, grandson of the Râta Devashamû of the Kâshayapagotra and of the family of Chandresvara (ll. 12-3). The donor is stated to have performed a deed of valour in the struggle with Dabhâyudavadvarman, and the donation was made in recognition of the meritorious service rendered by him. He does not appear to have been a Brahmana, for, as Hirâla has rightly pointed out, his pravaras are not mentioned and as is also indicated by the family-name Chandresvara and his title Râta. But it appears rather curious that despite all this, the purpose of the grant is stated to be the promotion of the religious merit and fame of the king himself and of his parents (ll. 13).

The grant is dated in l. 12, on Monday, the 8th tithi of the bright fortnight of Âśvin in the year 1311, expressed in the decimal figures only. The year, of course, must be referred to the Vikrama era, and the corresponding Christian date, as calculated by Hirâla himself while editing the record, is the 21st of September, 1254 A.C. The date is quite regular for Chaitrâti expired, or Kârtikâdi current year. But as current years are cited very exceptionally, I am inclined to take it as the former.

The arrangement of the contents of the record is similar to what we see in many other Chandella charters. Opening with the usual verse eulogising the house, it gives the genealogy of the donor, the details of the grant followed by the address to the inhabitants of the donated village, the date and the purpose of the grant, and finally, the benedictory and imprecatory verses.

The genealogical portion (ll. 3-7) mentions the Paramahâñjâraka, Mahânâjâdirâja and Paramächâra, Madanavarman, his successor the P.M.P. Paramardin, his successor the P.M.P. Trailökavarma and the latter's successor the P.M.P. Viravarman, who was the sole lord of Kâliñjara. The succession of the first three of these names is well known; and we also know from the Ajaygadh stone inscription of Viravarman himself, dated V.S. 1317, that he was the son of Trailökavarma whom he succeeded. The present record, however, which is the only plate-grant of the king known so far, furnishes the earliest date for him.

While dealing with the Gâra plate inscriptions, we have seen that the remarks of V. A. Smith as to the end of the Chandella dynasty as one of the important powers of North India, with the death of Paramardin in 1203 A.C., is baseless in view of the fact that the epithet Kâlaïîârâdhâpati is applied to his successor Trailökavarma; and since the same epithet is again borne by the latter's son and successor Viravarman in the present grant, the conclusion is irresistible that Viravarman had under his sway the whole of the region controlled by his father; and the evidence of the present inscription also goes to indicate that he had extended his kingdom up to the Sindh on the west, as we shall see while identifying the places mentioned.

---

1 The word used here is nagnûma, involving the whole village, and thus the battle appears to have been severe.
2 Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 132.
3 For an analogous example, see Kielhorn's remarks in Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 113.
4 Below, No. 145.
5 Above, No. 141.
in the record. Some of the distant regions of his kingdom, however, appear to be slackening in control, as we know from the present inscription itself that the donor of the grant had performed a deed of valour by vanquishing Dabhyudavarma, whose identity remains uncertain. From his name ending in varman, Hiratal took him to be a member of the Chandella family, but S. K. Mitra, on the other hand, is inclined to hold that he was "either a usurper or a rebel trying to create troubles within the state", though for want of any definite evidence, nothing on this point can be said with certainty. It can however be imagined that some of the remote provinces were probably not in full grip and caused troubles as is also shown by Viravarman's struggle with the contemporary Yajnapāla king Gopāla, only about 27 years subsequently, in the same region, lying to the west of the Chandella kingdom in the neighbourhood of the Sondhī fort, which is in the modern Datiā District of Madhya Pradesh, on the Sindh, as correctly identified by Hiratal.

Of the place-names mentioned in the inscription, Kāliṇjara (l. 6) is of course the well-known fort, and Villāṣapura (l. 12) is Paṭāḥār, as we have seen above. Dāhi is identical with the modern village of the same name, lying about 6 kms east of Bijawar, the chief town of a tehsil in the modern Cīhātarpur District of Madhya Pradesh. Tumutumā, the gift-village (l. 8), I am unable to trace in the vicinity. And last of all, Sondhī, as already observed above, is the modern fort of the name in the Datiā District of Madhya Pradesh. It is about 60 kms north by east of Datiā and connected with it by a metalled road.

TEXT

[ Metro: Verses 1-4 Anuṣṭubh ]

1 || ओ दििहिदं || अर्थावतादिकवविवं विद्येय्यविरोक्तत: || 16 वनतम(च)वर्षिकाण्यं बस(व)केलन्द्र इभेन्हः || [11] ||
2 तत्र प्रववादति विद्येयविरोक्तत: || अर्थावतादिकवविवं विद्येय्यविरोक्तत: || क्यया द्रिष्टार्थिभिविभावत(स) || प्रववादति [क] महाराजाधिकारकर्महीनविरोक्तत् [16] || पसम(च) || दीर्यकम- 3 हराराजास्वस्तवस्तवस्तवस्तव- || परमभूतकमहाधिकारकर्म- 4 सत्येश्वरसाहित्यप्रमहेश्वर- || परस्मतकमहाधिकारकर्म- 5 हराराजास्वस्तवस्तवस्तवस्तव- || परस्मतकमहाधिकारकर्म- 6 राजाराजशेषसन्धिकारकर्महीनविरोक्तत्वाराजी(च) सदी- 7 राजाराजशेषसन्धिकारकर्महीनविरोक्तत्वाराजी(च) सदी- 8 देहान्तप्रविकारकर्महीनविरोक्तत्वाराजी(च) सदी- 9 न(च)प्रविकारकर्महीनविरोक्तत्वाराजी(च) सदी-
10 वत्तिन समाजा(च)प्रविकारतिव वस्त्रुत्वाय वस्त्रुत्वाय वस्त्रुत्वाय वस्त्रुत्वाय

1 See E. R. K., p. 135.
2 See Buṅgāla inscriptions, below, Nos. 162-174.
3 In No. 129, etc.
4 Hiratal has remarked that in this plate the consonant s is often engraved as t, and the vowel a as ma. And in view of this, if we presume that the last two okhares of the name, which were engraved as na, may have been read by him as tamā, the intended village is Tīmā, which lies about 100 kms south by west of Dāli and about 15 kms north-east of Sāgar, the headquarters of a district in Madhya Pradesh. The village contains an old temple attributed to the Chandellas. See Sāgar Dāj. Gaz., Bhopāl, 1967, pp. 548 ff.
5 From Hiratal's transcript in Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, pp. 133 f.
6 One of the dāṇḍas is superfluous.
7 Read वर्ग.
8 The dāṇḍa is redundant.
9 The dāṇḍa is redundant.
10 The dāṇḍa is redundant.
No. 145 : Plate CXXXII

AJAYAGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VIRAVARMAN

[ Vikrama ] Year 1311

This inscription was noticed for the first time, with a photograph and a somewhat incorrect abstract of its contents, by Sir Alexander Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), p. 51 and Pl. xiii-F. Subsequently it was edited by F. Kiellhorn, with a translation but without a facsimile, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I (1888), pp. 325 ff. In this edition Kiellhorn, who prepared the text of it from Cunningham's rubbings placed at his disposal by Fleet, has also pointed out the errors in Cunningham's account of it, which was based on its reading by his Simla Pandit. The inscription is edited here from a fresh impression which I owe to the courtesy of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.1

1 The syllable च is omitted here either in the transcript or in the original.
2 The danda is redundant.
3 Simda is not performed here.
4 The use of च shows that it may have been proceeded by भास्मान, as we find in the other grants of the house.
5 Read वातिकान.
6 His No. B-189 of 1909-70.
The inscription is engraved on a rock above a well which is locally known as Gaṅgā Jānnā, in the fort of Ajayagaddhī in the Panna District of the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. It consists of fifteen lines, the first seven of which are on the proper right side and the remaining eight on the proper left side, both the portions being divided by a crack between them and showing the width of about 1·5 to 2 cms. The portion on the proper right side measures 72·40 cms. broad by 16·5 cms. high, and that on the proper left, 91·45 cms. broad by 16·5 cms. high. In Kielhorn's time it was "on the whole fairly well preserved," but as far as I can judge from the impression before me and comparing the same with the plate in the A. S. L. R. the letters have suffered now a little on account of exposure, particularly in the last two lines on either side, though they can be made out with certainty. Only one akṣara each at two places near close by the crack has disappeared, which is of minor importance; and I have read it from the photolithograph given by Cunningham. The average size of the letters is about 1·5 cms., except that they are slightly smaller in the last two or three lines on either side. The mechanical execution is also not free from slovenliness and redundant strokes of the chisel have deformed some of the letters here and there.

The inscription is written in the Nāgārī alphabet of the 12th century A.C. Almost all the letters have assumed or begun to assume their modern form. However, to note some of the peculiarities of the writing, the vowel e differs in bhūṣā, l. 1 from that in indu, l. 2; and in khaḍge, l. 3 from that in madhapu, l. 15; i continues its older form; see ājū, l. 3; bh in kumbha is more advanced than in bhūšāna, both in l. 2; and the letters ch, dh and v have developed their distinct individual shape; cf. Dādīchu-vāsu, l. 8; gg continues to be engraved as gn, as in ḍurγa, l. 6, and no is shown by a single letter marked with a slanting stroke across it, as in Karṇa, l. 2. B has a distinct form of its own, as in bhāju in l. 10. And finally, r occasionally appears in its older form as in rucchā, l. 18, where we find the mātrā marked below the letter.

The language is Sanskrit, which is correct; and except for the introductory Oṁ Om Sidāhī and the date in the end, the record is metrically composed. In all there are 22 verses, all of which are numbered. The language is fluent and the style is chaste. The poet was conversant with the works of Kālidāsa, whose thoughts are reflected in vv., e.g., 3, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12. The orthography calls for no remarks other than the usual, e.g., (1) the use of the sign of v to denote h except in bhāju, as stated above, and in vaddha, l. 14; (2) putting the dental sibilant for the palatal in some instances, e.g., in yasa, l. 13, and vice versa is the case in suta, l. 8, and śma, ll. 9 and 10; and lastly, (3) sh is employed for kh in Vaiśākha, l. 15. The sign of avagraha has been used six times, in ll. 1, 4 (twice), 5 and 8 (twice), to mark the elision of the initial a into e or o, except in one instance in varma=ābhāvat, l. 4, to denote the dirghasandhi. The final m is frequently substituted by an anusvāra.

The proper object of the inscription is to record that Kaliyāndēvi the wife of the Chandella king Viravarman, built a well, called Nipura-kāpo (v. 18), established a place where water was to be distributed to travellers, furnish it with a water-pot and a pavilion, and also built a Siva temple at Naḍipura (vv. 19-20). The prāsasti, as the composition is called in v. 21, was written by Kairapāla, the son of the poet Haripāla and the grandson of the poet Vatsarāja, and it was engraved by Rāma. The date of the record, as given in word-numerals in the next verse, is the Vikrama year measured by the seas (7), the moon (1), the fires (3) and again the moon (1), i.e., in the (Vikrama), year 1317 on Thursday, the 13th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha. According to Kielhorn's calculations, Thursday, the day mentioned in the record, falls on 14th April; and the Vikrama year mentioned in the inscription is taken to be the Southern expired year, which is equivalent to 1261 A.C. The year 1317 and the date are repeated in figures in the last line, which also mentions the name of the king Viravarman and of Jēmā who was then holding office.

Usually a prāsasti commences with the pedigree of the king in whose reign it was put up; and accordingly, the present inscription also devotes its first part comprising vv. 1-17 to this purpose. Invoking the blessings of the Ganges in the first verse and referring to the moon-born, i.e., the Chandrātrēya (Chandella) race, in the second, the inscription introduces the illustrious

---

1 For the situation of the place and its antiquities, see reference under No. 112, above.
ruler Kiritvarman, who was born in it, and adds that he was an Agastya in swallowing the ocean who was Karṇa and also Brāhma in creating the kingdom anew. We have seen above how Kiritvarman succeeded in subduing the Kalachuri king Karṇa or Lakṣmatikarna, who was then bent on wiping out the Chandella kingdom, and after vanquishing him, stabilized the kingdom on firm grounds.1 Kiritvarman's son was Sallakshanavarman, "whose sword took away the fortune of the Mālavas and the Chēdis" (v. 4). This king is presumed to have occupied the Chandella throne from about 1100 to 1110 A.C.2 and his contemporary on the throne of Mālvā should be taken to be only Naravarman who was then incessantly busy with the overwhelming Chhumukyas of Gujārāt. We have seen that during the time of Kiritvarman the Chandellas were well settled in the Bētāwā region3 and from there Sallakshanavarman may have carried on a sweeping raid on some of the adjoining provinces which then formed the Paramārā territories. As for his success against the Chēdis, his contemporary on the Kalachuri throne was Vāshikarna (1078-1125 A.C.), who had suffered a defeat at the hands of Naravarman's elder brother Lakṣmatidēva (circa 1086-1094 A.C.), as attested to by the Nagpur Museum stone inscription of Naravarman himself.4 We have, no evidence, however, to conclude that the success of Sallakshanavarman against both these powers was more than a sweeping raid which did not result in any territorial gain.

The prabāsti proceed to state that Sallakshanavarman was succeeded by Jayavarman (v. 4), and he by Prithivivarman who resembled Prithu, the well-known legendary king, who was again succeeded by Madanavarman, who was constantly wrangling in the minds of his enemies (v. 5). Madanavarman's successor was Paramārān (v. 6), and the latter king was succeeded by Traḷākṣyavarman (v. 7). The relationship that each of these kings bore to his predecessor is not explicitly stated in the present inscription, but it is known from the other records of the house. Traḷākṣyavarman is again mentioned here as Vīs наук who lifted up the earth immersed in the ocean formed by the streams of the Turushkas; and this is a reference to his temporarily recovering the Chandella kingdom from the Muslim invaders who had captured the fort of Kālaṇḍjara, as we have already seen above.5 Traḷākṣyavarman's son and successor was Vīravarman who is conventionally eulogised in vv. 8-9. Here ends the first part of the inscription, giving the account of the members of the royal house.

The second part which begins with v. 10, describes the descent of Vīravarman's chief queen Kālyānadevi. The first personage spoken of here was Chādāla who belonged to the race of Dādhi and who was a Kṣatriya (bhujaṇa), and his son was Āśāpala (v. 10). The latter's son was Mahēśvara who was revered even by crown-princes (v. 11). This person married Vēsaladevi, the daughter of Gōvindarāja, and from this union was born Kālyānadevi, who was the chief queen of Vīravarman (vv. 12-13). None of these names can be identified for want of evidence. The next three stanzas are devoted to eulogising Kālyānadevi in a conventional way. Reverting to the main purpose of the inscription, here we are told in the usual way, that receiving the fickleness of life, fortune and charms of youth and also that the creeper of good fame alone grows, Kālyānadevi made this never-failing well (where the inscribed stone was found), and made the other provisions as seen above.6

There is only one place-name mentioned here, viz. Nandipura, which, as suggested by Kielhorn, may have been identical with Ajayagadī itself. But this name of the place is not found in any of the inscriptions of the house whereas Ajayagadī is often mentioned as Jayapura in them.7

---

1 Above, No. 113.
2 As suggested by V. A. Smith in Ind. Ant. Vol. XXXVII, p. 127.
3 Above, No. 113.
4 Above, No. 33.
5 See No. 141.
6 This is as presumed by Kielhorn. But I have seen in my personal visit to the spot that the well has a natural reservoir of water constantly trickling from the hill above.
7 See e.g., No. 128, 1, 2.
TEXT

1 | धर्मशा सिद्धि। अशुभार्तावली | सिद्धि=विलोकनविवाह (सम)।  
|  | द्वारकश्रीमण्डल | द्वारकश्रीमण्डल।  
|  |  |  

2 | द्वितीया (कित्तिक) | इनक्तिति: विसंगतिविवाहबन्धन (नम)।  
|  | द्वितीया (कित्तिक) |  
|  |  |  

3 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

4 | द्वितीया (कित्तिक) | इनक्तिति: विसंगतिविवाहबन्धन (नम)।  
|  | द्वितीया (कित्तिक) |  
|  |  |  

5 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

6 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

7 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

8 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

9 | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र | शीर्षक सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र।  
|  | सिद्धांतसम्बन्धमात्र |  
|  |  |  

---

1 From an impression.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 The consonant of शि appears more like झ.
4 Kielhorn read the preceding letter as शि, but it has no horn on the left limb, as the other letters in this inscription.
5 Kielhorn translated this expression as 'a god of love to opponents', and added in a note that 'it admits of no other interpretation, as the word madana itself is one of the synonyms of manmatha (op. cit., p. 329, n. 26). But this sense is not applicable here and we have to take the word manmatha in its literal meaning, manmatha = manmatha, i.e., wrangling (as a thorn) in the minds of his adversaries. In this verse, moreover, the word tamāḥi has to be taken in the sense of sambudhanavartam, i.e., after him, and not from him as we know that Prthivisvarman was an uncle of Jayavarman.
6 The abhasas in the brackets have now totally disappeared.
7 The letter appears as झ. The expression bhiḥ = bhiḥ bhiḥ reminds us of an analogous instance of the Pāla King Gopāla II, who rules to the throne when he was a child. See Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXV, p. 232.
8 These three abhasas are now totally lost and Kielhorn's reading is adopted here. But possibly mahendrārtha appears to have been originally engraved here.
9 The word Flos in the first quarter of this verse is a contracted form of the name of the king, and following this clue, I read varmanah (varmanah) here, as the first of these letters is without a horn on its left limb, as the second in this expression.
10 Perhaps it may be read as चिन्मयारम्भ.
11 As Kielhorn also remarked, this letter may have a मात्र or an anumāna above. The Khatriya caste is fabled to have sprung from the arms of Brahmā.
12 Shiva is a synonym of Pātrāti. Kielhorn reads śiva which cannot be construed here.
13 The consonant of the first letter may also have been द, and the second letter is mutilated.
10 संवैधिक सौद्यगुणामालिति । क्लमण्वेदीति मृता तथा अभ वसीति ॥ ११॥ सेवं सहा योगिसंगम। केलमारः। नीरीरागऽ राजसऽ महतीत्वमाप्ततः ॥ १२॥ भोगऽसंगमऽ विलक्कर्षेवबंधु पुष्पि परिकितं विसा ॥ १३॥ के वायु वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं वाहनं ॥ १४॥ नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते नस्ते। ॥ १५॥

11. The reading is certain, but Kielhorn read स्व-चरिततारि, which is not possible besides that it also offends against the metre.
12. This is as read by Kielhorn; but both these letters are distorted and it is possible that अधीक्षता may have been the intended reading.
13. Read टर्क.
14. Both these अक्षरस are damaged beyond recognition and I have adopted Kielhorn's reading here.
15. The sense requires here something like श्रीक्षतिस्, which also suits the metre.
16. Kielhorn read these two letters as गिता, which cannot be construed. The first of the letters is indistinct but त is certain.
17. The nine अक्षरास ending with त्रिता are distorted and are adopted here from Kielhorn's reading. It is, however, not known why such a place needed a protection as mentioned here.
18. Originally त्र्, perhaps altered to त्रा, as Kielhorn observed.
19. The anuvā̄da is fairly visible on the impression.
20. Originally मृग.
21. The first two letters in this line were read by Kielhorn as महात्, but I am confident about my reading which is also applicable here.
22. The bracketed अक्षरास are now totally lost and I have adopted them from Kielhorn's reading.
23. The letters शुभा are repeated here and the first combination of them is probably struck off in the original. Moreover, the first अक्षर we have to read as सि. This quarter, though of the अनुशक्तिभ्र class, offends against the metre बोक्ता which requires the sixth letter to be long.
24. Read राखा, or राखरा.
25. Kielhorn found about eleven अक्षरास here which were illegible in his impression. The impression before me however shows only eight and they appear as अक्षरास [गुप्ता] The line is complete, without space for any other letter.
AJAYGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF
VIRAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1325
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AJAYGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF
VIRAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1337

Scale: Five-twelfth
AJAYGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VIRARVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1325

This inscription is incised on a wall of a temple in the fort of Ajaygadh in the Pumā District of the Vindhya region of Madhya Pradesh. It was first noticed by Alexander Cunningham in 1884–85, and he also transcribed and translated the record in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI, p. 51 and Plate xiv-F. It is edited here from the same plate.

The record contains three lines, the last of which is slightly longer than the other two. The characters are Nāgarī of the thirteenth century A.C., to which the record belongs. But they are very badly formed, for example, the letter sa in pravatati (1.2), is in vatsa and r in -raja (both in 1.3), can be recognised only by the context. Palaeographically, the two forms of the initial vowel a, one in asa and the other in abhaya, both in 1.1, go to indicate that this letter was in a transitional stage. The initial short i, which is the forerunner of its modern form, shows its loop and the tail as a hook; see isvara in 1.2, 8 the first member of a conjunct consonant sva in 1.1 and 2, begins with a loop as of s. As regards orthography, what is worth noting is that the consonant following r is doubled in -varma, in 1.3.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit, which is full of grammatical and other errors. The sign of a supatra of the nominative singular form in putra, l. 1, and Abhayadeva, and isvara, both in l. 2, have not been engraved, and in suhsvat, l. 3, the final consonant is not marked. In this word the palatal sibilant is also used for the denal. Errors in technical execution are in Viravarmanvarji; for the correct Vairavarmanvarji, in l. 3.

The object of the inscription is to record the adoration of one Abhayadeva of the Vatsa gōtra, who was a son of Tha (Thākura) Bhōjakā, who was expert in curing horse diseases, in the reign of Viravarman, whose genealogy is not mentioned but who was evidently the Chandella king ruling in the country around Ajaygadh from c. 1247 to 1286 A.C. The record is dated only in figures, i.e., (V.) S. 1325 or 1268 A.C. For want of details the exact date cannot be worked out.

The name of one Bhōjakā figures in the Ajaygadh stone inscription of Viravarman’s successor, Bhōjakā. It is possible to identify the Bhōjakā of our record with this Bhōjakā, and the calculation of the time of both these persons would favour this view. But in the absence of any definite evidence on this point, nothing can be said with certainty.

TEXT:

1 लिन्हू[६] अविनाश त मोक्षकर्त्र पुज(क) अ-
2 भयय(क) भ(क)वर(क) निमं प्र(ं)मिति । बो-
3 रुब(र)नेवर(र) | [१] स(स)पत(त) र १३२५ । ब[स]गोमा : १॥

1 These remarks are based on the Plate given by Cunningham, which seems to be an eye-copy.
2 Below, No. 150, v. 19.
3 From Pl. xiv-F in Cunningham’s A.S.I. R., Vol. XXI.
4Expressed by a symbol.
5 The two strokes following the symbol probably represent the punctuation mark.
6 The letter Tha is an abbreviation for Thākura. The reading of pa is not certain.
7 The syllable in the brackets is not well formed.
8 The letter in the brackets is badly incised; and the doṣa in the end is endowed with a top-stroke which is combined with that of the preceding one.
T

This inscription is incised on a rock bearing the statue of Gaṇapati in relief, on the fortress of Ajayagāh, the headquarters of a tehālī in the Pannā District in the Bundelkhand region of Madiya Pradesī. It was found by General Alexander Cunningham in 1883-84, and noticed by him, with a transcript of the last two lines containing the date and with a lithograph, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), p. 52, and plate xiv-G. Subsequently, its contents were summarised by N. P. Chakravarti in the Annual Report of the Survey for 1935-36, p. 91; but it was not transcribed so far. It is edited here for the first time from my own transcript prepared from an inked impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist, and also from the lithograph published by General Cunningham.

The inscription consists of twenty-one lines of writing in a lined border on all the four sides, and covers a space 53 cms. broad by 42 cms. high. The height of the individual letters is about 1½ cms. The technical execution is rather crude, betraying want of skill not only on the part of the writer but also on that of the engraver; and what is besides is that the writing has suffered considerably due to the influence of weather and peeling off some of its portions, particularly in ll. 9-17. Even in the portion that is now preserved, some of the letters can be made out only with patience and perseverance.

The alphabet is Nāgari of the twelfth century a.c. The antique and modern forms of the letter j are to be seen side by side in viçayayi, l. 7; m and s are often engraved alike; and it may also be noted that sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between the signs of ch, dh, v and r, those of g, n, m, and those of t and r, some of the examples of these being afforded by nāga, l. 2, hastra- and jaganti, both in l. 3, and srīndhara, l. 6. And finally, the superscript s often appears without the tail of the left limb so as to resemble n, e.g. in yasya, l. 5.

The language is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the customary adoration to Gaṇapati in the beginning and the portion containing the date, in figures, in the end, the whole record is metrically composed. The total number of verses is 14; they are all in the amuṣṭhīḥ metre, except the first one which is in Indraudā. Grammatical mistakes are few and of the minor type.

As regards orthography, we may note that (1) h is denoted by the sign for v, except in bhūvā, l. 12 and -buddhi, l. 16; (2) the letter following r is generally doubled, e.g., in kṛttā, l. 4; (3) prīṣṭha-māṭras are used throughout, with a few exceptions as in Sōṃā, l. 21; (4) the word srūṣṭha in l. 2 is spelt with sh; (5) the sign of aṣṭaga appears only once in l. 7, though there are some other occurrences for it; and, finally, (6) the word viṣṇu is wrongly spelt as uṣṇa, in l. 10.

The immediate object of the inscription is to record the installation of a statue of Gaṇapati. Vāṇī-वाणी, as the name occurs therein, by Vāṇudēva, a son of Gaṇapati, who was the younger brother of Jaya-virā, the minister of Viravarman (v. 12). The family name of the king is not mentioned in the record, but he was undoubtedly the Chandellā king of that name and the son of Trailokya-varman, as can be known from the genealogy recorded therein, from Kṛti-varman down to him. The date of the record is expressed in the last verse, by word-numerals, viz., Sāgara (the ocean), standing for 7, anala (fire), for 3, Vēda for 8, and Indu (the moon), for 1, and thus giving the year 1337. The śṛsti is stated to be the 13th of the bright fortnight of Māgha and the week-day Monday. The date is repeated in decimal figures in the end, and according to the calculations made by Cunningham, the corresponding Christian date is 3rd February, 1281 A.D., which fell on Monday, showing the date to be quite regular.1

Beginning with the auspicious symbol for Siddham and paying obeisance to Gaṇapati, the inscription has one verse to invite the blessings of the same deity. This verse is followed by a list of the names of (the Chandellā) kings from Kṛti-varman to Viravarman, as already stated above, and it records the names of ministers and the other distinguished officers, under each of

---

1 Also see Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 25, No. 168.
them, also showing that they all belonged to one and the same family to which Jagadvīra belonged. The names of the kings and the other officers mentioned herein may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>King's name</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Other details</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kiritivarman</td>
<td>Lakshmīdhara</td>
<td>ornament of the king's court</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sallakhanavarman</td>
<td>Yaśāhpāla</td>
<td>(minister of Sallakhanavarman)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jayavarman</td>
<td>Śrīdhara</td>
<td>a military officer under Jayavarman; devoted to Vishnu &amp; Śiva</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prithivivarman</td>
<td>Gökula, or Gōdala (?)</td>
<td>(minister of Prithivivarman)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paramardin†</td>
<td>Mahīpāla</td>
<td>(an officer under Paramardin)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Traiōkyavarman</td>
<td>Mādhava</td>
<td>Traiōkyavarman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vīravarman</td>
<td>Jagadvīra</td>
<td>(minister)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inscription further states that the minister Jagadvīra had a younger brother of the name of Gaṇapati, who is poetically called here Gaṇādhara; and he had two sons Vāsudeva and Rajapati (vv. 10-11). We further learn that Vāsudeva, who is called here mahābuddhi (of great intellect),3 installed the image of Gaṇapati in honour of his father who actually bore the name Gaṇapati.

The inscription is closed with the date which we have already discussed above.

All the kings mentioned in this record are well known with their precise relationship in the Chandella house, and there is nothing new about any of them here. The importance of the present record, however, lies in the fact that it reveals for the first time the name of Jagadvīra, the minister of Vīravarman, with his pedigree for the last seven generations, as we find in some other Chandella records also.4

**TEXT**

[Metres: Verse 1. Indraṣṇīra: vv. 2-14 Anushūbh.]

1 सिद्धम् । आँ नामो गणाधरे नमः । पद्यदनामसः किल कृपाय नवोऽवर्ण ।
2 व त् । वित्ताः प्रभात सदा गणाधरमाण । बलाः । विमुग्ध । दाइ । किल । राभि । लोका ।
3 नामस्य हस्तानां ज्ञात धारण प्रति । नमो वै । अनुरुपमेऽवर्तमानो नाम मृतयु- ।
4 वसूले । मुनियुणाम् । कर्मिनमहानन्दकय येत राममेल्लेस्तुम् । नमः- ।
5 वाले(न)सतो जातो वसन- । वर्तनिमित्यय । ओमन्तस्वाम्यमिष्ठो निंक्षेप(स) ।

1 This name cannot be distinctly read in the impression.
2 This verse, which is not complete, may have recorded the name of Madanavarman and his minister or an officer under him.
3 What is really intended is 'of sharp intellect (kṣīnagro-buddhi)'.
4 For example, see No. 142, below.
5 From an inked impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist and also from Pl. xiv-G in Cunningham's *A.S.I.R.*, Vol. XXI.
6 Expressed by a variant of the symbol.
7 The first and the third of the letters in the line are lost in the impression and in the plate in *A.S.I.R.*, and their consonants appear somewhat like bh and dh, respectively, but the whole word cannot be made out. It is also noteworthy that this foot of the verse contains one akṣara more than necessary.
8 Read: गानाटो । गानित ।
9 The reading of both the akṣharas in the brackets is uncertain, but it appears that what was possibly intended is व त्।
10 The reading of the last letter is certain, but better restore it to —वथ्—, for the sake of metre.
11 This letter is mantirised. In the plate in *A.S.I.R.*, it appears as ma, but the sense is not clear. The following त् may have been त् also.
6 नानावकाम ॥ ॥ "यस्ये(से)नुरीवरे"भक्तिः(ब्र)मुक्तिः बाह्यसत्ता:। य[लेने]कर्म:।
7 लेनविजयवजयमण:। ॥ ॥ मी[कू]ठी सुखी महान जयान:।
8 नति बयव माले ॥ ॥ पुनर्विक वचनवस्माणाः सुनुवला य[म]नमा ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
9 विजयु नरासी ॥ ॥ ब[र]भुवनाए(साम)।। शुभसिवानागीमिव भवनमुः ॥
10 अनुवनां ॥ ॥ ॥ सत्यश्रद्धानिश्चितास्वागीलशरीरत:।। फलं कर व[कू]
11 सुदेशेवर?सममहिं ॥ ॥ श्री[स्व]वर्मीस युत्तत्वं कृत पाद्यः।। कार्यान्तर ॥
12 निरंजन वेन बिल:।। केरवणवगणः।। बो[व]ृह वतात व्यात जागीर:।
13 स्वदस्मः।। श्रीवेंद्रस्वपनालमके ये मायको मणि:।। तदानु:।
14 जोमण्योशस्त्रस्वतिनिद्धो गाणितवित:।। नासाविकः ॥ वारी वक्तः।
15 ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ कालिणी।। गणरेत: सुभो व्यात राजवस्तमाविव।। बार-।
16 सुदेशी महावीरः राजपातिविवाहः।। शाति ॥ ॥ पव:।
17 भेटति समस्तावपाहिनि(सीमु)।। गणरेति(हा)दििववलितथी:।।
18 कस्य:।। दासविविम्ब:।। पुत्रम्य गणरेतस्वपनातिय:।।
19 वायुविकालिकः नाम सुभो:।। शिलुषु पवित्रता:।। सामायः।
20 नयेद्वेदस्त्रृः संकल्पे वरे।। मागे मागे सिते फले ग्याते।।
21 ज्ञा विषय्दिने।। ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ संकल्प:।। ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥

1 Perhaps something like 'नानावकाम is intended, in the sense of 'was as prominent as Indra'.
2 That is, he was devoted to both Vishnu and Siva. The letters are mutilated, and it is not known if "नो" is intended.
3 The verticals of श्र are jointed by a stroke as of द्धां.
4 The reading of the bracketed letter is not certain; it may also have been ग or ष. From the lithograph in A.S.I.R., the name appears to have been श्रीवर्मी, but nothing is certain.
5 Both these akharas are obliterated and their consonants appear to have been त and म, respectively. A word meaning 'governed' may be expected here. With some hesitation Chakravarti read here the name Bhôja (७).
6 Most of the letters of the latter half of this verse are either altogether lost or partly visible. One would expect here the name of Madanavarman and of either his minister or his subordinate.
7 The traces indicate that these two akharas may have been श्रीवर्मी, but the complete word cannot be made out so as to give some sense. The last two akharas in the line may have been niśyāḥ or saddi, to fill in the gap.
8 Chakravarti read this name as Jagaddhara; but besides the fact that it would not suit the metre, I find the sign of the śāte (of long अ) very clear in the impression.
9 That is, the two Avins (physicians of gods). It is unfortunate that the letters showing the names of the two brothers are broken here.
10 Only traces of these three letters are left. A word like श्रीवर्मी which also suits the metre, may have been written and engraved here.
11 The consonant of the first akhara in this line is त, as also read by Chakravarti; but it appears to be the engraver's mistake who left the middle portion of the vertical in the process of carving, of which we have a number of examples. Dāmi would also give no sense.
12 The unit figure is mutilated but the reading is certain.
KĀLAṆIAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF VĪRAVARMAN

(Fragmentary)

This inscription was first transcribed and translated into English by Lieut. F. Maisey, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. XVIII (1848), pp. 317 ff., and some thirty-five years subsequently, it was again noticed by General Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), pp. 38-40. Neither of these writings is accompanied by a lithograph, and the record too has not been critically edited so far. At my request, the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India favoured me with a fresh impression of the inscription which showed that the record is highly weather-worn and several aksharas have become illegible or are completely lost owing to the flaking off of the surface of the stone, here and there, whereas some others, being damaged or obliterated, have become altogether illegible. Under the circumstances, I prefer to give below the transcript of it made by Maisey, together with my notes and occasionally taking help of the afore-mentioned impression.1

Maisey found the record inscribed on a soft sandstone leaning to the left of a pillar, opposite the entrance of the cave in the fort of KālaṆi in the Naraini tahsil of the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh.2 It is at present kept in the sculpture shed in the temple of Nilakantha which is near by, as reported by the technical assistant who prepared the fresh impression for my use. And it is possible that during the process of shifting it from place to place, the stone, which was already a fragment of an apparently very large inscription, has furthermore suffered. It contains 31 imperfect lines. The total height of the writing is 90.5 cms.; and the length of the lines is about 38 cms. in the beginning and the end; some of the lines in the middle being one or two cms. longer. An idea of the original length of the lines can be had from the writing which is now preserved; thus for example, the first line which now has 37 letters, appears to have lost the latter half of a verse in Mālinī (i.e. 30 letters) and the whole of a verse in the Sārdalaukiritā metre, except 6 letters which begin the second line. And thus calculating the number of the letters which are lost, to be 30 of Mālinī plus 70 of the Sārdalaukiritā, along with the signs for punctuations etc., it can fairly be conjectured that the lost portion was only slightly less than the double of that which is now available. The inscription, moreover, appears to have lost some lines at the bottom also, of which no correct estimate can be made. The height of the individual letters is about 2 cms.3

The script in which the record is written is Nāgarī, and the language is Sanskrit. Except for a small sentence saluting Siva, as usual, the extant portion of the record is all metrical. The last number of the verse is 72; some of the verses are totally and some others are partially lost. Nothing can definitely be said as to the orthographical peculiarities, as Maisey's transcript of it suffers from inaccuracies, as already stated above. In the extant portion there is no definite mention of what was intended to record; it appears, however, to have been the setting of some images as can be judged from the last lines of it. The date and the other features, for example, the names of the composer and the engraver, if at all recorded in the end, are also lost.

---

1 It may be noted here that Maisey's transcript is not only inaccurate but is occasionally wrong also. For example, in l. 19 he writes pratyaśkamudākaśya and joins the following śi with the next word, whereas uddayakyaś is the verb used here; and again in l. 23 he does not take śvarūpāī separately, as it vividly appears. Nor does he mark the double-dandás on either of the sides of the numbers of the verses, the existence of which can be seen in the impression. Moreover, sometimes he continues writing without showing the breaks, what could be fitted to him in the later portion of the line. All these things have made confusions in his transcript. I have, however, made some minor amendments in the text below, e.g., changing the place of a letter here and there, marking the double dandás as required, and putting question-marks wherever the sense is not clear.

2 J. A. S. B., Vol. XVIII, p. 193. For another record found by the side of it, see above, No. 140. For the description of the place, see above, No. 110.

3 For all these observations the impression was very helpful. It also shows some later scribbling at the top and on the proper right side of the stone. This seems to have no connection with the present inscription.
In spite of the deficiencies, however, the record is important, as will be seen by noticing its contents. After paying the formal homage to Śiva, in a small sentence, the inscription adores Jīvaśāh, as can be judged from the description given in the first verse, and possibly pays homage to some other deities also in some of the following verses, as it can naturally be presumed. Coming to the historical portion, verse 12, a part of which is now preserved, appears to eulogise (the Chandella) Yāsōvārman, as indicated by the expression auto yālaḥ; his name along with that of his father, is lost; and his great-grandson Vijayāpāla is mentioned in I. 7, without this relationship. The next line mentions Vijayāpāla’s son whose name is again lost but who, from the Ajayagad inscription of Viravarman using almost similar expressions, is no other than Kṛiṇavarman. A portion of v. 19, which is now preserved in parts, states that this king “removed (repulsed) Karna in the form of an ocean”, which is evidently a reference to his conquest of the Kalachuri Karna. The same Chandella prince is further eulogised as penetrating into a part of Mālava, which is of course, a new statement indicating his victory over the army of his contemporary who was the Paramāra king Udayāditya the details of which are not known.

Verse 10 of the record introduces (Kṛiṇivarman’s) son Jayavarman, who was devoted to Nārāyaṇa, and, as stated in v. 25, being weary of the government, he made the throne over to a person whose name is lost in the earlier portion, giving us only the latter part of it as “varman”. This successor of Jayavarman is well known to have been his younger brother Prithivivarman, and the clear statement that he was entrusted with the government by Jayavarman solves the whole problem of succession here. Jayavarman is also stated to have proceeded to the Ganges in v. 25, which again, is fragmentarily preserved. Verses 29-33 describe Prithivivarman’s successor, Madanavarman, who vanquished the lord of the Gujjaras, as Kṛiṇa vanquished Kaniṣa. This statement appears to have a reference to Madanavarman’s success over the Chaunukya king Jayasimha Siddharāja (1109-1148 A.C.), who, after annexing the kingdom of Mālava, proceeded to invade Kāññājar, as recorded in the Gujjarat chronicles.

Verse 36 introduces Madanavarman’s younger brother Pratāpavarman, who is not otherwise known. He looked after those “who were maimed, sick and distressed”, and was also brave and liberal.

The names of Paramardin and his son Trailokyavarman are again lost in the record, but fortunately, that of Viravarman, the son and successor of the latter king, is completely preserved at the end of I. 22. The description of his bravery that follows is all figurative; but from v. 59 we learn that he constructed temples, planted gardens and excavated tanks and wells here and there. No definite places are shown in this description. The next verse informs us that he donated (to Brāhmaṇas) gold weighing against himself, and further we learn that he installed Nilakṣana (in the form of līnga) and the images of Kamalī (Lakṣmī) and Kāllī in splendid temples. He also performed sacrifices.

The composition is a prāhāsa, as the word is used in I. 30; and just following it, we find the word Vaiṣṇava-nāma. It is not known whether it was the name of the person who composed the record or the expression may be taken as applicable to Viravarman himself, meaning that he was "expert in playing on lute"?

The extent portion of the inscription ends here, leaving us in the dark as to what it may have stated below.

Besides Gujjaras and Mālavas which are well known, the extent portion of the record does not mention any geographical name.

TEXT

1 ओँ नमः: श्रीयाम। अनुपार्थि सरोऽस पारिजाताय वसिः सर्वो विषद क्षत्रयायं रोदती संबोध्यां।

1 No. 147.
2 Cf. Trivindhari in case of Arjunavarman (Paramardin). In No. 47, v. 19, above.
3 From Maisey’s transcript in J. R. A. S., Vol. XVII, pp. 317 ff. As already observed, the reading is fragmentary and also often incorrect, but I have no means to amend it.
4 Metre: Mālānī, the latter half of which is lost. Here is a reference to the mythological story where Kṛiṇa assembled the divine tree from Indra. See Vīdhāṇa, Chs. 30-31; Brahmaṇaśāstra, Chs. 205-206, etc. The legend is the theme of a māhākāvya entitled Sārjanaṇa by the poet Kānarpār (Vithūla, 1556).
2 कोजन भोजन ॥१॥ मुपेणायतबृद्धि वलयानलांविन्य फऺ तनिमत्त्र(?) नी पांढ़े भज्ञतकलवा निविव। (?)
3 मुपाताराशी दशकिकेन्द्र फऺ तनुमालुक ॥४॥ अवातप्रितानयुक्तविश्ववाक्यावलीकरण वे
4 विशिश्वविद्रहसमुपाय भगवानयुक्त भुजु ॥ ॥५॥ नारायणो मृत्तकातं श्रीहर्ष भोजकुलतालात्(?)
5 श्रीहर्षीय राजसे योगि: मुनि: भराबस्यरसि: देशकलापकोष: ॥६॥ रामायणमन्त्रादिवित्तमिनुयण्डित अङ्गभागः
6 विद्वान् नवाशी नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां
7 विद्वान् नवाशी नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां नन्दिकां
8 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
9 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
10 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
11 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
12 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
13 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
14 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
15 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
16 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
17 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
18 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
19 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
20 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
21 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
22 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
23 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र
24 दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र दशकिकेन्द्र

6 Metre: श्रीदावलिक्रिद्वितीया, of which only six letters are preserved, and the same of the next two verses which are partly preserved. The number of the verse to be read 2, as shown by the impression in which it is slightly wornout.
7 Metre of this and the next verse: Upaṣṭi. The reading here is often incorrect and also offending against the metre.
8 Metre: Stāghārī. The first twelve letters in this line cannot be correctly construed and the last two offend against the metre. The transcript is obviously incorrect.
9 Metre: Stāghārī.
TH: stone which bears this inscription was discovered by General Steward and, according to James Prinsep, he presented it to the Museum of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In the Catalogue of the Society Vol. XV, it is inserted as 'a stone slab from Ajaygadh in Bundelkhand with a Sanskrit inscription' or 'a stone bull from Kala-ji with a Sanskrit inscription'. For the first time, the text of the inscription, with a specimen of the letters (7 ff. facing p. 881), and a translation, was published by Prinsep in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, Vol. VI (1837), pp. 881 ff., and Plate XLIII, with specimen facsimile. Subsequently, a brief account of the record was given by General Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-84), p. 52, where it is mentioned that the inscribed stone existed (in his time) in the Indian Museum. The corresponding English date of it was calculated by Kiellhorn in the Epigraphia Indiae, Vol. I (1888), p. 332, n. 1; and D. R. Bhandarkar included it in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 620. The record was finally edited by H. L. Srivastava in the Epigraphia Indiae, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 98 ff., and a Plate. It is edited here from an impression which was kindly supplied to me, at my request, by the authorities of the Indian Museum where the slab is now deposited. Later on, I also compared my reading from an impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist (No. B 245 of 62-63).

The inscription consists of 21 lines of writing, covering a space about 20 metres broad by 0.82 metres high. The letters are beautifully formed and carefully cut, the signs of nātha being ornamentally treated. The average height of the letters ranges between 2.5 and 3.3 cm, except in the last line where they are smaller in size and are also partially preserved and more or less lost or damaged. Besides this, except for two and four akṣaras respectively at the beginning of lines 18 and 19, which are totally lost due to the breaking off of the lower part of the right corner of the stone, and one or two others here and there, which are partially abraded or broken away, the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation.

1 Metre: Upajitī.
2 Metre: Upajitī. Here also Māsey's transcript is not accurate and there are metrical errors in it.
3 Metre: as above. Insert a danda after sūr.
4 Metre of this and the next verse: Nāgīndrāyāt.
5 Though worn out, this is a letter and not the figure, as can be seen from the impression. Is it υ?
6 The transcript of the inscription published by Prinsep is full of errors to be found almost in every line, and the opening sentence showing salutation to Vānadeva is altogether omitted by him. H. L. Srivastava also invited attention to the statement of Prinsep's Assistant pt. Kamalakanta who remarked that "he was not responsible for the various defects of grammar, prosody and rhetorics occurring in the text since he read as he saw it and copied it so." All these mistakes were corrected by Shri Srivastava in his transcript in the Vol. of the Ep. Ind. referred to above.
The characters are Nāgārī, resembling those of the other inscriptions from Ajayagadh or Kāḷīnāgar. As regards the individual letters, attention may be drawn to the form of the initial a which somewhat resembles sr; see avāya, l. 16; to the vowel i which has assumed its modern Nāgārī form but with the loop and the tail detached from the main body, see itī, l. 6; to kh which begins with a loop, cf. maṅkhyā, l. 8; to the similarity between ch and v, either of which occasionally also resembles the left limb of g; see, e.g., bhābhṛat- and chakṣat, both in l. 1; to gṛ which is marked by a single letter with a slanting bar across it; see pūrṇa, l. 1; to dh, the left limb of which shows a cornered horn joined not to the lower limb but to the top of the vertical; e.g., in vadāṭa, l. 3; to the palatal and the dental sibilants which are sometimes so formed as to show a combination of both these letters and thus cannot be easily distinguished; e.g., sa in l. 18, and the first of which also shows two forms as in āruṣa and prakāśa, both in l. 15. The letter b has a sign of its own, as in bibhṛatu, l. 1 and babhṛa, l. 8, but it is often confounded with that of v, the loop of which is sometimes marked circular but more often rectangular.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for Oṃ nāmō bhagavatō Vāsudevaḥ in the beginning, which is partly lost, the date in figures in ll. 19-20 and the names of the writer and the engraver at the end, the inscription is metrically composed. In all there are thirty-eight verses, which are all numbered. The number of the last verse is wrongly entered as 24 for 38. The verses are composed in an artistic style and the poet is fully justified in comparing the composition to an invaluable fabric which he has woven by fibres of letters of manifold complexion and has highly decorated it (with alabhaḥs). But with all this, the inscription is not altogether free from literary failings. Though written in a fluent style, it has some grammatical errors, e.g., in the use of vidadhāna for vidadhāt in l. 2 (probably a scribe's mistake) and in bhavānō for bhavānāni in l. 6. To note one or other points, the use of the word jantu (creature) for a person is not happy: the expression kālākṣaṇa-kāţi-sundaraḥ in v. 19 is inappropriate; for it is not the body but the mind that is purified by good deeds; and the long expression munībhīṣya mūlaṁ atadādhātī in v. 29 is used only for the sake of alliteration. Verse 22 does not admit of a proper construction. But despite this, the poem is of a high order.

As regards orthography, (1) b in some cases is denoted by the sign for v, e.g., in vibhṛatu, but not in bibhṛat, both in l. 1; (2) when r is a superscript the following class-consonant is frequently doubled, as in mārga, l. 8 and ruchir- = muḥvār śl, l. 2, but not in mātrit = diti, l. 1; (3) s is occasionally put for t, e.g., in visuddha, l. 10, and vice versa frequently, as in nivaśa, l. 9. Besides these general points, the final m at the end of a verse or a stich is sometimes wrongly changed to an anusvāra though we find its correct use also; the anusvāra is wrongly replaced by m as in samah, l. 19; the use of the dental nasal and anusvāra is seen side by side, as in anārdeṣya-anmaṇḍanam, l. 14; medial diphthongs are more often expressed by the urkha-mātrās; the sign of awagraha occurs only twice in ll. 12 and 17; and the kāka-pāda only once at the end of l. 5. Local element is responsible for writing sāmukhi- for sāmūki- in l. 8 and also in the forms of the names in l. 11; and finally, the sign for the medial a is sometimes engraved closer to the following letter so as to appear prīthika-mātrā, e.g., in kamaṭa, l. 10, which was read as kamaṭa by Prinsep himself.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the king Bhājavaraman of the Chandrātīrṣya (Chandella) Dynasty (v. 25). The immediate object of it is to record that his minister Nāna constructed a temple of Hari, or Kēśava at Jayadurga, or the fort of Ajayagadh, for the increase of (his own) fame (vv. 35-31). But in reality the inscription furnishes an account of the clan known as that of the Vāstavya race of Kāyaṣtas to which Nāna belonged, and also that of his ancestors. The inscription was composed by the poet Amaṭa, and was written by Paṇḍita Uṣah, the son of the illustrious Thakura Ayan, who was in charge of the fort at Jayaputa (Ajayagadh).

---

1 For example, Nos. 143-148, above.
2 The number of verses wrongly appears as 39 instead of 38 since a portion in prose showing the date in l. 20 is also numbered, as 38, and this number is continued. It is not known whether a name was given in verse 38 which is now lost. In fact, there is no sufficient space for it. But at the same time it appears curious that the father's name in v. 38 is lost (2).
3 And not Amarapāti as read by Cunningham in his J. S. I. R., Vol. XXI, p. 32. Similarly, chiṅci-vāṇām in v. 36 is an adjective of the composition (vāṇapāta) and does not mean that it was written (on the stone) in ornamental letters, as Cunningham wrote and commented upon.
with its highway. It was engraved by Gõpala. The record is dated at the end in ll. 19-20, first in word-numerals (v. 37) and then in figures in prose, as in Vaiṣākha of the year measured by kṣaṭaṇḍa, i.e., the moon (1), Śiva’s eyes (5), śruta, i.e., the Vedas (4) and bhūtā, i.e., the elements (5). Thus the year is 1345 (Vikrama). It is here noteworthy that this method is contrary to the usual rule of reading the figures from right to left (aṁkaṅaṁ vīmāṇo gatiḥ). The tithi, the fortnight and the week-day, if at all given in it, are lost at the beginning of l. 20.

After the customary obeisance to Vāsudeva, the inscription has as many as ten verses in praise of, respectively, Viśvāmitra (Viṣṇu), Murārī, Hari and the incarnations of the deity in the forms of tortoise, Varāha, Nyāś śiva, Vāmana, Parasurāma and Rāma. It then mentions the great sage Kāśyapa, who was born of Brahma (v. 11). Kāśyapa had two sons Kuśa and Saṃbhava (v. 12), the first of whom was residing at Kauśāmayupura (v. 13), perhaps the modern Kuṇāmbi (?). He was the Chief minister of a king whose name is not mentioned (v. 15). He was a renowned kāśyapa and his intellect was highly esteemed by learned persons (v. 14). His family was known as Śrīvāsava as it was an abode of wealth (v. 15). In that family was born Hariṅka whose son Jāhāna was a resort of excellences and was like the preceptor of the gods in helping kings in their work of the world (administration) (vv. 16-17). His son was Gaṅgaḍhara, who possessed noble qualities and who was a devotee of Viṣṇu (Kamalāyati) and was therefore called Kamale, thus signifying his name (vv. 18-19). From him was born Mālēka, who was of pure body and possessed all merits (v. 20). Mālēka had four sons named Padmaśiṅha, Rāmaśiṅha, Jagatśiṅha (Jagatśiṅha) and Kumaraśiṅha (Kumaraśiṅha) (v. 21). Rāmaśiṅha had three sons who were all self-controlled (v. 22). The eldest of them was Nāma, who was handsome in form, devoid of pride, clever, a resting-place of knowledge, and because of his exalted rank he attained honour and dignity in the royal assembly (v. 23). He was minister of Bhūjavarman who belonged to the royal house of the Chandrāyāyas i.e., the Chandellas (vv. 24-25). The next four verses are devoted to glorify Nāma in a conventional poetic way and to say that he bore his name significantly. His son was Prathivdhrana (v. 30). The following two verses inform us that Nāma constructed a temple at Jayadurga and installed in it the image of Hari. Verse 35 expresses the desire that the temple may stand so long as the mountains, the earth, the gods, the seas and the Sun and the moon endure; and the next two verses furnish, respectively, the name of the poet who composed the record, and the date. The next verse (38) probably mentions a name which is lost. This man had two sons by his wife Champakā (v. 39). The names of these sons were Suma and Anantaśiṅha. They were righteous. Then follows a passage in prose which probably mentions the names of the writer and the engraver, as seen above; and wishing blessings to the builder of the temple, the inscription ends.

The genealogy of Nāma as recorded in the inscription, is of little historical interest, but what is here noteworthy is that his ancestors were hereditary ministers under the Chandella kings. Some of them we know from the Ajayagadh inscription of the time of Kiritvarman which mentions Jājukā and Mahēśvara of the Vāstava family of the kāśyapa, and also from the Mahēśi inscription of V.S. 1240 which speaks of the great and illustrious Vāstaya family, in which was born Śuhaḥ, whose son Jayapāla composed the prāśasti and also constructed the temple where the stone bearing it was originally set up by Mādava who too belonged to the same lineage. The inscription that follows here mentions another family of the same clan, as we shall see on the proper occasion.

---

6 The line giving these names is partially broken and this is what could conjecturally be called out from what remains.

7 From the construction it is not clear whether Hariṅka himself was called Kamalē or he had a son of that name. I take the first of these alternatives more probable than the second, as taken by Shri Śrīvāsava.

8 As already stated above, this part is broken.

9 Here the construction which is not clear precludes the possibility of knowing the two names clearly.

10 Above, Nos. 112 and 136 respectively. Kielland and following him, Śrīvāsava, drew attention to some other inscriptions mentioning the Vāstava family. These records are: (1) the Mallā inscription of the Chéli year 919 or 1167-68 A.C. (Ind. Ant. L. p. 22, 1, 27); (2) the Śiṭ-Mahēśī inscription of V.S. 1296 or 1297-98 A.C. (Ind. Ant. XVI. p. 62); and (3) the Garwa inscription of V.S. 1199 (Cunningham, A. S. I. R. XVII. p. 284). And to this list we may add the Ratnapur stone inscription of the Kālapurī year 1207, or 1145-50 A.C. (C. I. I., IV. p. 483, No. 89). Also see the word Vāstaya in the Index in C. I. I., Vol. IV.
This is the first known record of the reign of Bhōjavarmān of the Chandella house of kings, though his exact relationship with any of them is not mentioned in it. The latest known date of his predecessor Viravarman is V.S. 1342, or 1284 A.C., and from this it is evident that Bhōjavarmān succeeded Viravarman sometime between these two years. It is not possible to know the exact relationship between the two rulers from this or from any other record known so far, though he appears to have been the son or a younger brother of Viravarman.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Kauṇāyapura (I. 8) cannot be identified for want of details, though the name suggests its identification with the modern Kauṇāmbi or Kōsam, on the Yamunā, near Allahabad, as stated above. Jayadurgā (I. 17), which is also mentioned as Jayapuradurgā in I. 20, is evidently the fort of Ajayagadh, as seen so often.

1 As already noted by N. P. Chakravarti, who also conjectured that Bhōjavarmān reigned only during the minority of Harimārayan. See A.S.I. A.R., 1953-56, p. 92.
2 From an impression.
3 The letters in the brackets are totally lost and the next two letters are mutilated. Originally engraved अ, corrected later on to श.
4 The comitant of the superscript of रृ is so formed as to resemble श.
5 The akshara in the brackets has totally disappeared.
6 These two letters are lost, leaving only the verticals of the second.
7 Read जेदः.
8 Originally रे, later on corrected to रे.
9 An attempt appears to have been made to correct the comitant of this letter to त.
10 By a wrong stroke this akshara appears, as गो or दध.
11 There is a तितिविद्ध sign at the end of this line.
12 Probably द्वे, meaning 'magnanimous', is intended.
7 का विषयः स विनितु समथ। असीमंहिमः स विनितविदीयं चंद्रविष्णुं नामप्रसंवादः। य जातवेदी विलितम् गुरुवाणं संतुस्ते हुम विम्मि तस्मार्यः। 12.31.3 कुलकामाय इति प्रकरोण शुद्धिविण्यः 12.25. कु- ।

8 शशीः कृताभूते सततः वयः पुनर्विज्ञातसः। अवगयः सविद्यामल्लं शब्दं ततः सविभाविन्करः सत्त्वसमर्पिन्तः 12.32.3। स काल्यकर्तव्यं प्रज्ञातिः शब्दविनिर्माणिं 12.32.4। साधुनामाधिन्यंविवाक्तव्यंशक्तिमोक्षनिमातिः 12.32.5। यहां प्रेमनुर्ज्यं ततो शुभावं सुविद्यामसाहि-।

9 वयंतु विनितविण्यं। निवयो विनितविण्यं। दक्षिणेऽन्त यो विनितविण्यं। 12.32.6। जहां नामनामायणम् अन्तः सत्त्वसमर्पिन्तः शब्दविनिर्माणिं। 12.32.7। सुविद्याः शब्दविनिर्माणम् शब्दविनिर्माणमनः। जननौ। 12.32.8। अज्ञानायां मनः। ज्ञातवेदी शुद्धिविण्यं 12.32.9। ततो गुणानां सविनितविण्यं। गंगाधरजयंग च। 12.32.10। विविधविनिर्माणिं 12.32.11। कलावतिपादनेऽन्त शब्दविनिर्माणम्। कथायो इति

11 नामार्यं कालायामतः। 12.32.12। तत्रस्मिन्चक्रविण्यं। 12.32.13। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः विनितविण्यं। 12.32.14। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.15। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.16। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.17। अज्ञानायां 12.32.18। देयविनितविण्यं। 12.32.19। गंगाधरजयंग 12.32.20। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.21। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.22। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.23। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.24। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.25। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.26। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.27। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.28। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.29। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.30। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.31। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.32। शब्दविनिर्माणमिः ।

12 ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.33। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.34। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.35। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.36। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.37। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.38। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.39। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.40। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.41। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.42। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.43। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.44। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.45। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.46। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.47। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.48। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.49। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.50। ज्ञातवेदी 12.32.51। शक्तिविनिर्माणमिः। 12.32.52। ज्ञातवेदी ।

13 यद्यपः कथायो । भाषाविनिर्माणमिः 12.32.53। यद्यपः कथायो । भाषाविनिर्माणमिः ।

14 श्रीमानार्यं श्रीमानार्यं। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। 12.32.54। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। 12.32.55। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। 12.32.56। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। 12.32.57। गुणानाथर्यनाथ। ।

15 शाहाशाहीविदिशेऽन्त। शाहाशाहीविदिशेऽन्त। ।

16 मृतत्र नामदीर्घविशेषेऽन्त। 12.32.58। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.59। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.60। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.61। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.62। विनितविण्यं। 12.32.63। विनितविण्यं। ।
This inscription was found by General Cunningham on a slab near the Asha-Sakti image at the Tirhawvan Gate of the fort of Ajayagadh in the Panni District of the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. It was brought to notice by him in the Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXVI (1885-1886), pp. 47, 53 and 88 and Plate xx, and was subsequently edited by Dr. F. Kielhorn, with translation but without a facsimile, in the Epigraphia Indica,

1 The mārtā of nā is mixed with the following one.
2 The daṇḍa is placed closer to the letter that follows it.
3 The lower parts of the bracketed akṣaras are lost.
4 The letters in the brackets have been dotted off, and the reading of Srivastava is adopted here. While composing this verse the poet had in mind the idea expressed in the Naishadhyya-Charita, I, 12, which compares Nala's fame to a cloth piece woven by his (or his warriors') dexterity on the battlefield.
5 The horizontal stroke of this akṣara is faintly visible.
6 Six or seven akṣaras, which may have mentioned the tīthi, the fortnight and the week day, are lost here.
7 The letters in the brackets are damaged and have been adopted here from Srivastava's transcript. But the meaning is not clear. Prinsep read... nā... mūtām... 
8 The second mūtā on this akṣara is partly abraded and it is not known if that too was scored off in the original. The allable part that follows is a contraction of Paṇḍita, i.e., Paṇḍita: its use in a sanscrit cannot be grammatically defended. Perhaps we have also to read the two names as Ashan and Sabhata, as they appear below in No. 193.
9 The whole portion which is in brackets is incised in smaller letters which are not very clear in the impression and here I have adopted Prinsep's readings as also done by Srivastava. The first seven akṣaras are probably to be amended to... nā... tablll... vātā...
10 For the situation of this place and its description, see above, No. 112.
Vol. I (1888), pp. 330 ff. The record is edited here from a fresh and excellent impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India.

The inscription consists of 10 lines of writing, and covers a space measuring 28 metres broad by 64 cms. high. The average height of the letters is about 2½ cms, which, with the mátrās above, reaches up to 4 cms. The last of the lines, which is engraved close below the beginning of l. 15, in very small characters, is only about 30 cms. long and some of the letters in it are lost whereas some others are not clear in the impression, though, possibly, they can be read with certainty on the original stone. Besides this, the penultimate line, which shows a peeling on the surface of the stone, has completely destroyed eight aksharas at the commencement and the four that follow them are visible only in their lower parts. Leaving off these breaks, however, the record is in a tolerably good state of preservation. The letters are beautifully formed and neatly engraved, but we also note a number of mistakes when the original engraving is altered and also that the sign of the visarga and of the vertical strokes are often omitted, as pointed out in the text, below.

The characters are Nāgarī. They closely resemble those of the immediately preceding inscription which too was discovered at the same place and was incised near about the same time. Thus they naturally share the same peculiarity in their formation, but to mention some other points, the akṣara ḍ has developed its dot, e.g., in saṅgha, l. 2: p is frequently confounded with y; see tuhya written as tuṣpa in l. 7, and vice versa, satya as suṭṣpa in l. 10; the slightly differing forms of s may be noted in āśaṇa, saṃṣṭha and kaṇṭha, all in l. 1, saṅgha in l. 5, and saṃvara in l. 6; and lastly, ḍ is often devoid of its left-hand stroke, as in māha- and kuṭha, both in l. 4.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for a short adoration to Keśāra, being a form of Śiva, the whole record is in verse. In all there are thirty-two verses which are all numbered. The language is no doubt fluent, as also remarked by Kielhorn, but the composition is not of a very high order, as can be known from mistakes of grammar, prosody and rhetorics occurring therein. For example, śat-tīṁśatiḥ or ṭal is used for śat-trīṁśat and sammadhiṣaṁya for adhitāganya, in ll. 1 and 2 respectively; yukṣaḥ for nuyukṣaḥ in l. 5; niṣṭhitā for niṣṭhāti in l. 4, and kṛtyatām (or kṛtyatām) in l. 15, which cannot at all be grammatically defended. The expression naṁ niyamata in v. 7 is less known and possibly wrong: a redundant cha occurs in v. 28, tu in v. 10; sat is very often used; and the word sadā has been put not less than ten times in vv. 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 24, 25, 27 and 29. Verses 19 and 20 do not admit of a proper construction, as to be shown below while giving the text; and lastly, redundant words are often put merely to fill up the verses, e.g., kalpā in v. 2, ātō in v. 7, lākā in v. 10 and mākṣha-kārī in v. 11.

As regards orthography, we note (1) the use of the sign of v for that of b as in vudāhī in l. 14, though the latter has its own sign, e.g., in prabhaḥän in l. 6 but not in nabhāca in the same line, (2) a confusion between the use of s and z, e.g., in prāśāna, and suha, both in l. 6, (3) a class-consonant under a superscript v is generally doubled, as in karṇapa, l. 1; and (4) the prāshthavā-mátrās are mostly used. Besides these, the sign of the viśva is that of the upasāmādiya and that of the upādādānāya occurs each once in l. 2: the angāraḥ has been used only twice in ll. 6 and 7 where its form slightly differs from each other; the influence of the local element is to be seen in the use of kṣ for kṣi in ākṣeyā, l. 8 and prakṣāhitā, l. 14; and in vāgaya in ll. 8 and 10. And lastly, vāgmin is spelt as vāgmin in l. 13 and vṛjala as vṛjala in l. 9. The lāka-oka sign is occasionally used.

The proper object of the inscription is to record the construction of a temple by Subhara, the Superintendent of the treasury of the king Bhāja, or Bhājarman as it would appear from vv. 28-31, and that this shrine was dedicated to the god Keśāra, as we also know from vv. 28-31 and from the introductory salutation and v. 1. But this main object is only very briefly stated in the inscription which gives a detailed account of the clan to which Subhara belonged, i.e., the Vāṣāva race of the Kāyasthas some of the members of which held high position under the Chandella Kings. The record is not dated; and moreover, it is abruptly closed; and it may rightly be presumed that the concluding portion thereof may have been continued on a separate stone which is not forthcoming. It may have contained the description of the temple, wishing
it to stand for ever, the date and the names of the poet and the engraver. 1 However, to judge from the characters and also from the fact that it was set up by a counsellor of the king Bhäjavarmana of the Chandelas, the record may be assigned to the short period between 1286 and 1289 A.C. when this king was occupying the throne, and thus it belongs almost to the same time as of the one dealt with here, immediately before.

After the customary salutation to (the god) Kēlidhara and a verse paying obeisance to the same deity, the inscription introduces the Kāyastha chieftain Vāsīyava which is here said to have originated from Vāstu himself, who was residing at Takkāraka, the foremost among the thirty-six towns, where dwelt the people of the writers' caste, and which, by the crowds of its residents, was made to resound with the chants of the Vēdas (vv. 2-4). One of the descendants of Vāstu was Jājikā, who was proficient in all the sciences and arts, and was endowed with the title of Thakkura; and he was entrusted by the invincible king Ganda with the work of superintending all the affairs of the State and (for this service), to enjoy the village of Dugadvā, granted to him by means of a copper-plate (v. 7). The record further informs us that one of Jājikā's descendants was Mahēśvara, 2 who assisted Kiritvarman, the crest-jewel of the princes, in the Yellow-Mountain districts, and in recognition of this service, he was appointed an officer to guard the niśkhā (high-road) of Kānjarājura and also enjoyed the donation of the village Pitalākhā (vv. 7-9). Mahēśvara spoken of here is evidently identical with his namesake who is mentioned, along with Jājikā, in the undated Ajayagad inscription of the time of Kiritvarman; and the details about both these persons are all recorded in the same inscription, as seen above. 3

The inscription proceeds to state that in course of time one Gāngādhara was born in that family; he was a favourite counsellor of the king ParamārDN who entrusted him with the high office of a chamberlain (v. 10). Gāngādhara's younger brother was Jambādērā, who took delight in deeds of war (v. 11). They had a younger brother named Jālādērā who too was a great hero (v. 12). In course of time was born in that family one Allūh; he was full of energy and was entrusted with the administration of (guarding) the streets (pratōlī). He lived happily in the fort (v. 13). Allūh's son was Subhāra, whose son again was Vēdana, who was a store-house of knowledge; he was entrusted by the king whose name is not mentioned, with the affairs of the realm (vv. 14-15). Vēdana's son was Vāsē, who possessed excellent qualities of influencing people, and the king Trañākāvarman appointed him to the high office of guarding the fort with command of the village of Vārabhāvari (vv. 16-17). This officer is described as having established Trañākāvarman's kingdom by killing in a battle the irresistible Bhōjikā, who, seized with the frenzy of war, was rendering the kingdom into two (vv. 19-20). This Bhōjikā, as suggested by Kielhorn, may have been identical with the Thakkura Bhōjikā, father of Abhaya-bhayecy of the Ajayagad stone inscription of the time of Viravarman, dated 1286 A.C. 4 But there is no definite evidence to prove this identity. However, the expression that "Bhōjikā was rendering the kingdom into two" goes to suggest that he was an internal enemy who had gained considerable importance at that time.

Vēsēka's younger brother was Ananda, who was then an officer in charge of the fort of Ajayagad (Jayadvarga) and who had brought under control the Bhillas, the Sabaras and the Pulindas who were then residing there (vv. 21-22). He was a great warrior and a zealous devotee of Durgā; and he is also said to have been liberal, righteous and skilled in the use of weapons (vv. 23-25). His sons were Gopati, Mahābhabha and Subhāra. The last-named person is stated to have been virtuous, a lord of the eloquent and possessed praiseworthy character; and was

---

1 Here we may cite the instance of the Udaipur Patali (No. 24); the latter portion of which was engraved on a separate stone discovered later on.
2 The word vikā means the site of a house or a building and here it probably denotes Visvavārman, the architect of gods. Vāsīyava originally means a resident, for which, cf. vāṣīyava vāsīyavakajumāhidhā yeyuḥ, śilāvālamitra, I. 66.
3 The vowel of the first syllable being lengthened here evidently for metrical purposes. The name occurs as Mahēśvara, above, in No. 112, v. 7, and Jājikā in ibid., v. 5.
4 Here the reading is Kānjarājura vikāb̄hikābharan and in No. 112 bāavrāhāvaran (v. 8). Evidently both these expressions mean the same thing, particularly in view of the fact that the main gate of the fort along with its adjoining streets had to be carefully guarded by a strong guard, because of its strategic importance. Thus the word has to be read as vikāb̄hā and not vikāb̄hā as read by Kielhorn who was unable to explain it. However, vikābharan appears to denote the commander of the fort.
the chief Superintendent of the treasury and a counsellor of the illustrious king Bhōjavarm-
man (vv. 26-29).

The next four verses are devoted to eulogise Subhāta, but the description is all conventional. Verse 31, which is now partially lost, states that ‘considering the world to be a resort of three kinds of pain, and wealth to be as unsteady as the motion of a swing, and also that it is religious merit which alone accompanies a man when he enters another body, and that fickle is the life of man’, he ordered a temple to be built.

The inscription is silent as to the place where the temple referred to here was built; but there is no doubt that it was Ajayagdīthi itself where the inscribed stone was discovered. That the temple was dedicated to Kēdāra is evident from the opening stanza and the verse following it, as we have already seen.

The next verse (32), where we naturally expect something more about the temple, leaves the purpose in hand and states that Subhāta had three sons, two of whom were Kṛitrīrṣa and Kumāra, and the name of the third was Hārīṣa, as I see in the next line which is shorter and in smaller letters and which looks more like a continuation. This line cannot be completely deciphered, as stated above, and in what connection these three sons of Subhāta are mentioned is also not known. It is however possible that this portion, which may have said something more about the temple and may also have furnished the names of the poet and the scribe, was perhaps continued on another slab which is not forthcoming, as we have already remarked.

The Chandella kings mentioned in the present inscription without speaking about their mutual relationship, are Ganda, who is eulogised in v. 6, (his great-grandson) Kṛitrivarman in v. 9, (his seventh descendant) Pratāpyavarman in v. 10, (his son) Trāleśkaravarman in v. 19, and lastly, (his grandson) Bhōjavarmman in v. 29. The description, though written in an artistic style, is merely conventional and provides no historical information which is new, except in the case of the wise Vāsē or Vāsēkā, who is stated to have killed in a battle the irresistible Bhōjūaka, as seen above; and about his younger brother Ananda who was the governor of the fort and subjugated the wild tribes (v. 22).

As for the localities mentioned in the present inscription, Tākkārika the original home of the Vāsāvyā family of the kāyasthas (v. 2) cannot be definitely located as there are several places mentioned by this name, as seen already. However, in view of its being in the neighbourhood of the place of the inscription, it may probably be the same as situated either in Bihār, near Gāyā, or in the modern Uttar Pradesh. Jayadurga (v. 17 and 24) is evidently the fort of Ajayagdīthi in the Pannā District of Madhya Pradesh, where the stone was discovered, while Kālanjara (v. 11) has already been shown to be the place of that name in the Bāndā District of Uttar Pradesh. The village Daganḍa (v. 7) is perhaps identical with Dīgārā, as already remarked, and Pitaśālī is the same as the hills known as Pīthārī or Pārī hills in the Tikamgadh District of Madhya Pradesh. The rest of the places, viz. Pipālābhīka (v. 9) and Varbhavāri (v. 17) cannot be identified. The first of these names occurs also in No. 112 above, in its last verse, and the second is probably the same as Vādavāri, mentioned in No. 126, 1. 8.

1 See above, No. 51 (p. 179).
2 Ibid. It may also be noted that the Kāla-Buddhāk grant of Bhidlama III of the Vādava house men-
tions this place as situated in Mathyadēsa (Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, p. 12) which roughly corresponds to the modern Uttar Pradesh.
3 See above, No. 112.
6 कारनामे युयुश्चुविचिन्तिनायकः ॥११॥ तथेऽव माहात्म्यनामविवरण्य स्वालोकानिन वीरमुखः । युयुश्
समय कर्मावलिकायकः वा समयु कर्मः ॥१२॥ करणार्य आधममयानि ध्याने आयु अनुप्रयत्निनादिरकारः । 
करणार्य करणार्य वैष्णव सवर्ग रसेव रसेव रसेव नामः ॥१३॥ तत्त्वावलिकानिन
वातैत्तिरीयाय रस्मेव रस्मेव रस्मेव ॥१४॥
7 नामावलः। चिन्तिनायकः कर्मानि मुहानि विविधवानानि नुवुषु किलकुस्ति ॥१५॥ विविधवानानि
तत्त्वावलिकाय तथ्याय विविधवानानि नुवुषु किलकुस्ति ॥१५॥ कर्मानि मुहानि विविधवानानि ॥१६॥ चिन्तिनायकः चिन्तिनायकः [पाठा] । 
इतिवाचार्यफलितत् । [पाठ] ॥१७॥ इतिवाचार्यफलितत् विविधवानानि नुवुषु किलकुस्ति ॥१८॥
8 नामावलः। राज्यायकः [नुवुषु किलकुस्ति] ॥१९॥ विविधवानानि ॥
विविधवानानि विविधवानानि नुवुषु किलकुस्ति ॥१८॥ तत्त्वावलिकानिन विविधवानानि ॥
विविधवानानि नुवुषु किलकुस्ति ॥१८॥ तत्त्वावलिकानिन विविधवानानि ॥
9 वशवनामावलः। वशवनामावलः ॥
ोरकुमारुषः युयुश्चुविचिन्तिनायकः वशवनामावलः ॥
राजा युयुश्चुविचिन्तिनायकः वशवनामावलः ॥
10 वशवनामावलः। वशवनामावलः ॥
11 वशवनामावलः। वशवनामावलः ॥
12 वशवनामावलः। वशवनामावलः ॥

1 Kielhorn doubtfully read -kusāṇa and stated that the construction is wrong. But the bracketed aksbara appears to be chha, as was also guessed by him. The lower parts of both the consonants are joined, and thus it is not ku. The expression means viṣṭākṣṭā (on the highway) or viṣṭākṣṭā (with arrows). For this use of chhaṇa cf. pariṣṭā-vataya-chhaṇa and pariṣṭā-kapata- in the Naṣadhānya-Charta, II, 95 and 79, respectively.
2 Read -nāmadhyē. The correction appears to have been made in the original, as also noted by Kielhorn.
3 Originally aś, with the second vertical scored off by two horizontal strokes. The idea of connecting vale with the name tāl is peculiar. Aria in this verse is also unnecessary.
4 A kāhā-pada symbol appears here and also at the end of the next line.
5 The construction in this verse is faulty, as the verb which is used in the active voice in its first three quarters is suddenly changed to the passive in the fourth.
6 As also noted by Kielhorn, the verse does not admit of a proper construction. Besides, the redundant use of words may be noted in the second quarter and in Kāliai-vaśpati, which means only Kāliaśa. Here ari is misplaced.
7 Possibly it is changed to a in the original, as also noted by Kielhorn.
8 The consonant of this letter is deformed and a part of it is lost in a scratch on the stone. It is definitely lingual and not dental as read by Kielhorn. Compare the form of this letter in -ajhantāku and -maṃkhit, which is unlike that of a occurring in tattvabahū kalāni in the same line. Ashau appears to be the name of his son.
9 Read -nāmadhyē. Roshchha is altered to rōchchha and so to if in the original, as also noted by Kielhorn.
10 A Kāhā-pada sign is engraved here.
11 The sign as above. The name Mahipāla is changed to Mahipāla in the first foot of this verse is probably for metrical exigency.
CHARKHĀRĪ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF HAMMYARAVARMAN

No. 151; Plate CXXXVIII

CHARKHĀRĪ COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF HAMMYARAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1346

The inscription is incised on one side only, of a single copper-plate, measuring 29 cms. broad and 21.5 cms. high. All round the plate there is a flat rim, about 1.2 cm. broad, fastened on very tightly by twenty rivets (five on each side). The weight of the plate is recorded to be 48 tolas, i.e., 550.86 grams. From the impression the plate does not appear to be well preserved. Its surface has been corroded here and there, resulting in the loss or damage of a few aksharas making their forms indistinct. The inscription consists of twenty lines of writing, the last of which is only 6 cms. long. In the middle of the first four lines is engraved the figure of the

1. The suffix of the letter is perhaps struck off in the original.
2. The prefix अ is akṣara is redundant.
3. Either of these words would have denoted the intended sense and one of them is superfluous.
4. The reading of the brakṣālak akṣara is doubtful.
5. The impression shows that the first two of these akṣaras may have been altered to kārya in the original. But kārya is equally wrong as kṛiyā.
6. Here the inscription ends abruptly and the next line which is in smaller letters reads कारो-कारो—(आ) विनाशकर्म (क्षय) नागरी; [कृति (के) नव: कु:]
7. It is his No. A-48 of 1906-77. The impression from which Hiratal edited the inscription must evidently have been taken some time before 1929-30 when his article appears in the Vol. of Ep. Ind. for that year.
8. The rivets appear to be thick as can be judged from their marks on the impression, and the one in the middle of the top of the plate appears to have been lost probably making Hiratal conjecture the vacant place for a ring-hole.
four-armed goddess Lakshmi, seated on a lotus and holding lotus-flowers in both of her upper hands which are raised, and a water-pot on the palm of each of the remaining two.

The characters are Nāgarī, but, to judge from the impression, there are cases where the exact forms of the letters cannot be clearly made out. For example, besides the fact that ch is almost similar to v, the form of this letter is often confounded with that of r, as in vīrā, l. 2, that of d with h, as in vadh, l. 13, and that of the dental s with the palatal ś, as in Visvāsūra, l. 1, and occasionally also with that of t, e.g., in II. 3 and 6 where the two letters appear as tyādi, as they may have been intended to be, but the same also appear as sāhī in l. 9. This sort of confusion here and there is also responsible for the fact that some of the letters cannot satisfactorily be deciphered in l. 14 and l. 15, as to be seen in the transcript.

Nor is the mechanical execution satisfactory. The interiors of most of the letters show marks of the working of the tool of the engraver, who has also defaced some of the aksharas, e.g., bhūrīṣhku in l. 2 is engraved as -pnu, by omitting the slanting stroke which distinguishes sh from p, and vājā in l. 4 has become sājā by a redundant stroke between the letter r and the vertical following it, matparā in l. 4 is engraved as masana, and sahaśā in l. 17, as mahāpā. Occasionally the upper curve of the medial s is omitted, as also the sign of the vsarga, as in II. 11-12.

The writer too is equally responsible for commissions and omissions; for example, he wrote paryantān as prajāntān in l. 10, Bhāravāja for Bhāravadāja in l. 13, and has made confusion between r as a superscript and a subscript, e.g., by writing tattta for tatta in l. 2 and svara for vsarga in ll. 17 and 19, by omitting some words from the draft, as in l. 12, by putting unnecessary punctuation marks as in ll. 3-7, and occasionally marking the same as to appear signs of prishha-mātrās or of the secondary ā. Mistakes of the writer who possessed only a smattering of Sanskrit, and also of the engraver who appears to have been a novice, are to be noted throughout the record, as pointed out in the notes to the text.

The language is Sanskrit, full of errors as stated above; and with the exception of the first verse which generally occurs at the beginning of the Chandīlā grants and four customary and benedictory verses at the end, the record is in prose. The first verse is not numbered and the last four are numbered from one to four. With respect to orthography, we note (1) the use of the dental s for the palatal ś in many places, and vice versa, occasionally, e.g., in subha, l. 13 and stakala (for sakala), l. 8; (2) the doubling of a class-consonant, e.g., in karmma, l. 19; (3) denoting b throughout the sign for v, e.g., in brāhmaṇa, l. 9; (4) showing the medial diphthongs by the prishha-mātrā here and there; (5) the use of the dental nasal for the lingual in punya, l. 19, and vice versa in savikalpēna, l. 15, and writing sippula with a single j in l. 1, krami as krami in l. 18; (6) not marking the consonant t in samvit, l. 15, but on the other hand, wrongly marking it in anusvāya in ll. 4-6. And lastly, it is interesting to note that the vsarga after bhi in rājābhī, l. 16 and pitrībhī, l. 18 is changed to a before the same letter.

It is a royal charter issued by the illustrious Mahārāja Hammira-varma-madeva of the Chandellā house; and its object is to record the donation of the village Kōkada or Kikada (?) in the Vedesaita (nya?i?) vishaya. The donors were two Brāhmaṇas, who appeared to have been brothers, viz., the Pandita Śrīdhara and the Pandita Abhī of the Bhāravāja gōtra, and the sons of Sahila, grandsons of the Śhakkha Ś(S)bhārāja and great-grandsons of the Śhakkha Viśyādharā. The grant was made on Sunday, the twelfth tithi of the dark fort-night of Brāhrapada of the Vikrama year 1346, when the nakshatra was Pushya. The titli and the year are expressed in numerical symbols only, and the day has been calculated by Hirala to regularly correspond to Sunday, the 11th September, 1289 A.C. The charter was written by the Pandita Raum (Rām) pāla. It does not contain the sculptor’s name.

After an auspicious symbol followed by the verse eulogising the Chandrārāya (Chandella) dynasty of kings, the document mentions the names of Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti who were the earliest rulers belonging to it. This portion has been copied verbatim from the earlier records of the house. The document then proceeds to trace the pedigree of the ruling king, Hamm-
ravarman, the first person named here being Paramardin, who was succeeded by Traiśīkāvarman, he by Virarvarman, and he again by Hammīravarman. The names of the three predecessors of Hammīravarman are known to us from the Charkhārī grant of Vīravarman, of V.S. 1311; but curiously enough, we note here the omission of the name of Bhājāvarman who was the immediate predecessor of Hammīravarman, as we know from the two inscriptions from Ajayagāth, one of which bears the date V.S. 1345 or 1288 a.c. and was inscribed only a year prior to the present record. And the only reason that can be inferred for this deliberate omission, as it would appear, is that Bhājāvarman may have been either an elder brother of Hammīravarman, and thus being a collateral, his name was omitted, or he was a rival, the definite relationship being unknown from any other record discovered so far.

Attention may also be drawn to the titles attached here to all the names of the predecessors of Hammīravarman and to those attached to his own name. Each one of his predecessors is called the most worshipful (pārśma-bhājīsaka), the supreme king of Mahārājā and the supreme lord. The two aśeṣaṇas following the last of the titles were read as sāhi by Hirala, who remarked that "the title Sāhi against the names of all these kings indicates the growing Muhammadan influence." But in the text below I have pointed out that the reading in all these cases appears more likely to be tāyadi, i.e., ityadi, the vowel i being changed to the medial e along with the previous a and attached to the previous letter, by gama-saundhi. No Indian ruler who is proud of his own heritage and his hereditary titles would of his own accord like to attach a Mohammedan title to himself or to his predecessors' names. I am also unable to agree with Hirala in his observation that in his own case Hammīravarman has left the grandiloquous title of the Mahārājās of Paramēśvaro, which he duly attached to his predecessors; and inferring therefrom that he was fully conscious of his reduced position, since the expression rāj-svāt-tray-śetā in l. 7 would point to the same, i.e., the two great titles stated to have been left by Hammīravarman in his own case.

This is the only known grant of Hammīravarman, the last known ruler of the Chandella house, and issued in the same year V.S. 1346 which is also the known year of his predecessor Bhājāvarman, indicating that Hammīravarman's accession took place in the same year. This ruler also seems to have retained his hold over the fort of Kālaśāra when this grant was issued. This hold continued for about twenty years, i.e., up to 1309 a.c. when we find the neighbouring region under the sway of the Muhammadans, as we are informed by a Sat record found in the Damūh District and mentioning the name of (the Sultān) Alauddin as the reigning king.

Of the geographical places mentioned in the inscription, Kālaśāra (l. 7) is evidently the same as the modern fort of the name occurring in the several grants of the Chandellas, as we have often seen. The other places I am unable to identify.

TEXT

[Metre: Verses 1-3. Anuśūlaḥ.]

1 श्रीनिवासः (क्रियात्मक) शरीरकृष्ण विक्षुकशिक्रेशिक्रेश्वरीश्वरं च रविश्रृंधवं।

---

1 Above No. 144.
2 Above, Nos. 149-150.
3 As presumed by Hirala, which may be plausible but there is no definite evidence to confirm this presumption. In this connection, also see our remarks above, on p. u., that Bhājāvarman was possibly a younger brother of Virarvarman, and thus also his name may have been omitted in this grant.
5 Ibd., Hirala also guessed that the Hamūrāpur District in which Mahōbā, the civil capital of the Chandellas, is included, derived its name from this ruler. This appears plausible; and in view of it we may also hold that the Chandella Kingdom at that time was bounded on the north by the Yamunā in the region where the Bētāwā meets it and where Hamūrāpur is situated.
6 Above, No. 149.
7 As known from the title.
9 From an impression.
10 Expressed by a variant of the symbol.
11 Here, as also in several cases below, it is difficult to distinguish between the signs of s and l.
2 इयोजय(व्यक्ति)। [वृहद् ॥] नाय(भ्र) प्रवेधान्ते विरोधविवज्ञानां जुगुपव्यवहितिविज्ञान(व) लघुवाचित्र- (ब्रह्मवर्ग(भ्र))।
3 अभी(भ्र)समाधर्म(क्रप्त)। प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त) कक्ष(हर)मानवाधिकरणस्वामि(व) शर(भ्र)माहेश्वर(व)र(लघुवर्ग)।
4 महाराज(भ्र)समाधर्म(क्रप्त) मानव(क्रप्त) मानव(क्रप्त) भ्र माहेश्वर(व)प(लघुवर्ग)। प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त) महाराज(भ्र)।
5 शेष(व्यक्ति) प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त) माहेश्वर(व)र(लघुवर्ग) महाराज(भ्र)मानव(क्रप्त) मानव(क्रप्त) माहेश्वर(व)प(लघुवर्ग)। प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त) महाराज(भ्र)।
6 जय(भ्र)वाचित्र(व्यक्ति) प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त) महाराज(भ्र)मानव(क्रप्त) मानव(क्रप्त) प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त)। प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त)।
7 क्ष्य(व्यक्ति) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र) राजा(भ्र)। शर(भ्र)माहेश्वर(व) शर(भ्र)माहेश्वर(व) शर(भ्र)माहेश्वर(व) शर(भ्र)माहेश्वर(व)।
8 संयोग(भ्र) भण्ड(क्रप्त) के। क्ष्य(व्यक्ति) प्रवेधान्ते(क्रप्त)।
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BAMHNI SATĪ STONE INSCRIPTION OF HAMMIRAVARMA, VIKRAMA 1365
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BAMHĪṆI SATĪ STONE INSCRIPTION

[ Vikramā ] Year 1865

This inscription was first brought to notice in 1923-24, by Rai Bahadur Hiralal in his edition of the Mahābāha grant of the Chandelā king Paramardin, which was published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XVI, pp. 9 ff. He published a rough transcript of the text of the record in a footnote on p. 10 of it, and subsequently, also noticed its contents, in brief, in his Inscriptions in the Central Provinces and Berar. The record is edited here for the first time from inked impressions kindly supplied to me, at my request, by the Superintendent Archaeologist, Central Circle, Bhāulpur, who got them prepared recently by his technical assistant.

The inscription is incised on a slab discovered in the village Bambūni situated about 35 kms. north-northwest of Haṭṭa, the headquarters of a tehsīl in the Damōh District of Madiya Pradesh.

1 Hiralal is perhaps right in proposing the omission of the prefix pro. The text is corrupt here. The name that follows was read by him as Sāhāla, but the second letter thereof looks more as resembling bi, the upper curve of the mīnd being not marked as in many other cases.
2 Hiralal suggests the addition of abhaḥhāyāḥ here and it may be adopted.
3 Seven akṣaras are illegible here. Hiralal read the last three as gaṁgaṁgaṁgaṁ (maṁgaṁ); but the traces show them to be maṁgaṁgaṁgaṁ.
4 The reading is only tentative. The second, fourth, sixth and eighth akṣaras of this line cannot be clearly made out and possibly some villages marking the boundaries are mentioned here.
5 The repetition of iti is unnecessary here. The vowel i is shown here by two horizontal strokes.
6 As to be read from the traces left.
7 The vertical strokes are probably hidden below the strap fastened to the end of the plate.
8 Both the bracketed letters are highly corroded. Consequently the writer’s name is not completely known.

Second edn., p. 57. It is also stated here that the inscription is also noticed or referred to in the Proceedings of the 4th Oriental Conference held at Allahabad, Vol. I; but I was unable to find this reference in this Vol. Similarly, I failed to find the record edited in the Ep. Indi., Vol. XIX, p. 30, as stated by Dr. S. K. Mitra in his Early Rulers of Khajurāh (1985), p. 259, No. 64.

Shri L. P. Jain. Tehsildar at Haṭṭa, informs me that the village Bambūni is about 10 kms. by country track, either from Sāgon or from Ghaṭṭāra, both stations on the Būh-Kanṭi line of the Central Railway. It is interesting to note here that the place is about 15 kms. south of Dāhil and almost double the distance due east of Sēmāra, the find-place of the other two Chandelā grants.

No. 152; PLATE CXXXIX
It consists of seven lines, covering a space 54 cms. broad by 33 cms. high, and has suffered considerably from exposure to weather and also due to human frivolities. Two aksharas in l. 3 and one in the next line, which were read by Hiralal when he prepared his transcript, as stated above, have now totally disappeared, and two or three in 1.5 have been either wholly or partly damaged. The letters are sparsely written and their size ranges between 3 and 3.5 cms.

The characters are Nagari. They are not well formed, but except the three letters which are now lost, as stated above, they are legible throughout. The only palaeographical peculiarities are that the letter र resembles ल without the vertical stroke, e.g., see Patumana- and Jajjalā, both in l. 7, and त is denoted by a vertical bar with a horizontal stroke attached either to its middle on the left, as bhīṭṭāke, or with a slanting stroke at its top, as Mahārāja, both in l. 8.

The language is corrupt Sanskrit; and the record is all in prose. The orthography does not call for any special remark except that the consonants न and त are doubled after त in varmma- and varjīma-, respectively in ll. 2 and 4, and that ज is used for च in bhājā in l. 6. Some local words are put in the last line.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Hammiravarmanāvē, who is described with his imperial title Pavarnaḥḥattāraka (Lord paramount) and is also mentioned as a lord of Kālaṁjara, which indicates that he was no doubt the Chandella king bearing this name. It is a Salt record, dated in the year 1365 (in numerical figures only), without further particulars; and taking the year to be Chaitrādi expired, of the Vikrama era, the corresponding Christian year would be 1308 A.C.

The purport of the record is that the overlordship of Hammiravarmanē is when the Mahāraja Rājputra Vaghdāva was enjoying the village V(Bjāhāman, Bhāmīputra (?) Pillāra's wife Malhāai immolated herself on his funeral pyre, and in memory of her (or due to devotion to her), the stone was erected by her son Jāmē (?). The inscription was written by Pan, i.e., Paṇḍita, Jājpālā.

The way in which Vaghādēva is mentioned in this inscription denotes his feudatory rank, and it is obvious that he owed allegiance to the Chandella king Hammiravarman who is styled here as an imperial lord. This is also known from an inscription discovered at Hindorā, mentioning him as a feudatory of Bhājavarman, who was Hammiravarman's predecessor on the Chandella throne. The name of this local ruler figures in as many as three stone inscriptions, one found at Pājan, about 80 kms. south-east of Dāmōh and dated V.S. 1561 (1503 A.C.), another discovered at Salaiyā, about 5 kms. south of Bāmnī and dated V.S. 1362 (1304 A.C.), and the third at Śingorgadā, about 48 kms. south-east of Dāmōh, dated V.S. 1366 (1308 A.C.); and that he was a Pratihāra chief is known, as has been drawn attention to by Hiralal; from the tradition recorded by General Cunningham to the effect that the Pratihāra kings ruled at Śingorgadā itself, with portions of the Dāmōh and Jalālpur Districts under their sway. The hold of the Chandellas in this region, however, appears to have ended soon; for we find that the neighbouring country went under the Muslim rule, as we are informed by a record of V.S. 1566 (1308 A.C.) discovered at a deserted village Arpāyā Khādā in the same region and stating that it was under Alāvdīna, i.e., Alā-ud-dīn (Khuljī), who was then extending his sway in all the surrounding region.

The importance of the present record lies in furnishing the information that Hammiravarman, whose earliest date is supplied to be V.S. 1346, or 1289 A.C. by his preceding grant, continued to occupy the Chandella throne at least up to 1309 A.C. and also, as we know from the Salaiyā inscription, that some time about this year portions of the Dāmōh-Jalālpur region, which were included in the Chandella kingdom at the time of his predecessor Bhājāvarman, slipped out of his hands because of the penetration of the Muslim power in this region.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) I.C. P. B., (second edn.), p. 50.

\(^2\) Ibid. All these have been referred to by Hiralal in his article in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, pp. 9 ff., which is mentioned above.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Above, No. 151.

\(^5\) As also known from an inscription of Jaffāl Khājīj, who was then in charge of the country now comprised in the Dāmōh District and dated V.S. 1583 (1526 A.C.), found at Bavānīgadā, about 35 kms. north-west of Dāmōh and in the same region as Bāmnī. See I.C. P. B., p. 58.
The only geographical name mentioned in the inscription is that of V(B)rāhmaṇī-grāma, in l. 5, which is, evidently the village Bhamni where the record was found.

TEXT:
2 रा[विजयवर्धनमहर्षिकमनदेवविलयर्य]
3 तालि १३५ समय महरजुलो(व्र)वर[२]
4 धेवरनम्माण अवक्षम(व) काळे वर्त
5 मले(व्र) व्राहणपपणी म[१३] निम्न[४]
6 प्रक्षणममर्य(व) मले तमाह[ष]सामी[१०]
7 पुनर्जन पुरुष[म]पत्र यात्र[११] व[१२] जेरशित[तो]सत्त[१२] [२०]

No. 158; Plate CXXX

AJAYAGADH SATI STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF HAMMLRVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1868

This inscription was discovered by R. B. Hiralal in his visit to the fort of Ajayagadh in the Panna District of the Vindhy region of Madhya Pradesh. He also transcribed the record in a foot-note to his edition of the Charkhārī copper-plate grant of Hammiravarman, published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XX, pp. 125 ff. The exact spot where he found the inscription is not mentioned; nor is it now possible to know it so as to prepare an impression of the record. It is therefore edited here from Hiralal's transcription referred to above.

The record consists of four lines of writing. The last line consists of only four aksharas. The dimensions of the writing and the palaeographical and orthographical peculiarities are not recorded.

The inscription refers itself to the Mahārāja, the illustrious Hammiravarmadēvā, but it does not mention any of his predecessors or even the royal family to which he belonged. The provenance of the record, however, shows that it undoubtedly belongs to the time of the Chandēla ruler bearing this name.

1 From impressions.
2 Denoted by a variant of the symbol.
3 Hiralal read dhē; but what he took to be the sign of the medial d may have been an original fault of the stone.
4 Hiralal read this and the preceding akṣaras as given here, but while editing the Charkhārī grant of Hammiravarman he stated that the correct reading of these letters is sāhi (Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 134, n. 4). The bracketed akṣara is now totally lost, leaving only a trace; but from the sign of the medial d attached to its preceding akṣara, what appears to have been incised is adhi.
5 Hiralal read this akṣara as jya. Read kaṅkṣa-ra.
6 The vertical is joined to the letter by a horizontal stroke as in the case of dhē.
7 Read श्रीकंक्षा.
8 This akṣara in rectangular brackets has now disappeared.
9 The reading of the bracketed akṣara is not certain. It appears somewhat like śī also. I am unable to explain the meaning of bhūmi-patra which signifies the planet Mars. Here it may have been a title, or the first two akṣaras may have constituted a name. It may also be observed that the consonant of the bracketed akṣara may have been a s as well.
10 The reading of the consonant of the first akṣara is doubtful. It may have been a p as well.
11 The portion from vanarama- in the preceding line up to here is unintelligible to me. It may perhaps denote some names ending with pārjya, as the reading of keśa is uncertain.
12 Read निर्क्षाधित. The bracketed akṣara is damaged.
It consists of seven lines, covering a space 54 cms. broad by 33 cms. high, and has suffered considerably from exposure to weather and also due to human frivolities. Two akṣaras in l. 8 and one in the next line, which were read by Hiralal when he prepared his transcript, as stated above, have now totally disappeared, and two or three in l. 15 have been either wholly or partly damaged. The letters are sparsely written and their size ranges between 3 and 5.5 cms.

The characters are Nāgari. They are not well formed; but except the three letters which are now lost, as stated above, they are legible throughout. The only palaeographical peculiarities are that the letter n resembles t without the vertical stroke, e.g., see Pajumana- and Jaiplā, both in l. 17, and r is denoted by a vertical bar with a horizontal stroke attached either to its middle on the left, as in bhāṭṭāraka, or with a slanting stroke at its top, as in Mahārāja, both in l. 3.

The language is corrupted Sanskrit; and the record is all in prose. The orthography does not call for any special remark except that the consonants m and n are doubled after r in -varamma- and -avartāma-, respectively in ll. 2 and 4, and that j is used for y in bhārījā in l. 6. Some local words are put in the last line.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Hammiravarmadēva, who is described with his imperial title Paramabhaṭṭāraka (Lord paramount) and is also mentioned as a lord of Kālañjara, which indicates that he was no doubt the Chandella king bearing this name. It is a Satt record, dated in the year 1365 (in numerical figures only), without further particulars; and taking the year to be Chaitrādi expired, of the Vikrama era, the corresponding Christian year would be 1308 A.C.

The purport of the record is that in the overlordship of Hammiravarmadēva when the Mahārājapurāṇa Vaghadēva was enjoying the village V(B)āhmanī, Bhūmīpurāṇa (? Pāliça) s wife Mālhāi immolated herself on his funeral pyre, and in memory of her (or due to devotion to her), the stone was erected by her son Jāmē (?). The inscription was written by Pāthi, i.e., Pāṭhārī, Jaiplā.

The way in which Vaghadēva is mentioned in this inscription denotes his feudatory rank and it is obvious that he owed allegiance to the Chandella king Hammiravarman who is styled here as an imperial lord. This is also known from an inscription discovered at Hūndorā, mentioning him as a feudatory of Bhōja-varman, who was Hammiravarman’s predecessor on the Chandella throne. The name of this local ruler figures in as many as three stone inscriptions, one found at Pāṭan, about 80 kms. south-east of Damōh and dated V.S. 1361 (1303 A.C.), another discovered at Salāyā, about 5 kms. south of Bāhmī and dated V.S. 1362 (1304 A.C.), and the third at Sinjorgadh, about 48 kms. south-east of Damōh, dated V.S. 1366 (1308 A.C.): and that he was a Pratihāra chief is known, as has been drawn attention to by Hiralal, from the tradition recorded by General Cunningham to the effect that the Pratihāra kings ruled at Sinjorgadh itself, with portions of the Damōh and Jabalpur Districts under their sway. The hold of the Chandellas in this region, however, appears to have ended soon; for we find that the neighbouring country went under the Muslim rule, as we are informed by a record of V.S. 1566 (1308 A.C.) discovered at a deserted village Arjāyā Khōḍā in the same region and stating that it was under Alavadinā, i.e., Alī-ud-dīn (Khilji), who was then extending his sway in all the surrounding region.

The importance of the present record lies in furnishing the information that Hammiravarman, whose earliest date is supplied to be V.S. 1446, or 1289 A.C. by his preceding grant, continued to occupy the Chandella throne at least up to 1309 A.C. and also, as we know from the Salāyā inscription, that some time about this year portions of the Damōh-Jabalpur region, which were included in the Chandella kingdom at the time of his predecessor Bhōja-varman, slipped out of his hands because of the penetration of the Muslim power in this region.

---

1. J.C.P.B. (second edn.), p. 56.
2. Ibid. All these have been referred to by Hiradāl in his article in the Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, pp. 9 ff., which is mentioned above.
3. Ibid.
4. Above, No. 151.
5. Also known from an inscription of Jallāl Khōjā, who was then in charge of the country now comprised in the Damōh District and dated V.S. 1383 (1326 A.C.), found at Balīgadh, about 35 kms. north-west of Damōh and in the same region as Bāhmī. See J.C.P.B., p. 58.
The only geographical name mentioned in the inscription is that of V(B)rahmani-grâma, in 1.5, which is, evidently the village Bambîa where the record was found.

TEXT

1 śîrâsū[1''] परन्तु[2'] रेखण[3'] राजाकेतीविणवेदपातालिन[4']
2 "[5'] तितीसालम[6'] तीव्यवियवियवर[7']
3 तृवत् १३१५ समव[8'] महाराजपुरान[9'] वा
4 तदेवचुन्याये अवयन[10'] काते कर्तः
5 मार्गे[11'] ता[12'] दुर्गायाये[13'] स्व[14'] सिंहुः
6 प्रेस्तसार्य[15'] ति[16'] संतवभु[17'] सीमिः
7 यं[18'] (क्ष)र[19'] या।[20'] पृ[21'] ज्ञेयालिह[22'] हृति[23'] [11']

No. 153; Plate CXXX

AJAYAGADH SATĪ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF HAMMIRAVARMAN

[ Vikrama ] Year 1368

This inscription was discovered by R. B. Hiralal in his visit to the fort of Ajayagadh in the Panna District of the Vindhya region of Madhya Pradesh. He also transcribed the record in a foot-note to his edition of the Charkhârî copper-plate grant of Hammiravarman, published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XX, pp. 125 ff. The exact spot where he found the inscription is not mentioned; nor is it now possible to know it so as to prepare an impression of the record. It is therefore edited here from Hiralal's transcript referred to above.

The record consists of four lines of writing. The last line consists of only four aksharas. The dimensions of the writing and the palaeographical and orthographical peculiarities are not recorded.

The inscription refers itself to the Mahârajâ, the illustrious Hammiravarmanâdeva, but it does not mention any of his predecessors or even the royal family to which he belonged. The provenance of the record, however, shows that it undoubtedly belongs to the time of the Chandella ruler bearing this name.

1 From impressions.
2 Denoted by a variant of the symbol.
3 Hiralal read bha; but what he took to be the sign of the medial o may have been an original fault of the stone.
4 Hiralal read this and the preceding aksharas as given here, but while editing the Charkhârî grant of Hammiravarman he stated that the correct reading of these letters is sâti (Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, p. 134, n. 4). The bracketed akshara is now totally lost, leaving only a trace; but from the sign of the medial o attached to its preceding akshara, what appears to have been incised is adhi.
5 Hiralal read this akshara as jya. Read ज्ञेयालिहः.
6 The vertical is joined to the letter by a horizontal stroke as in the case of dha.
7 Read शष्णसीमिः.
8 This akshara in rectangular brackets has now disappeared.
9 The reading of the bracketed akshara is not certain. It appears somewhat like sâ also. I am unable to explain the meaning of bhūmi-pitru which signifies the planet Mars. Here it may have been a title, or the first two aksharas may have constituted a name. It may also be observed that the consonant of the bracketed akshara may have been a s as well.
10 The reading of the consonant of the first akshara in doubtful. It may have been a p as well.
11 The portion from sântams- in the preceding line up to here is unintelligible to me. It may perhaps denote some names ending with putraḥ, as the reading of kva is uncertain.
12 Read बनितातितिं. The bracketed akshara is damaged.
The inscription is dated on the sixth day of the bright half of Sravana, on Wednesday, of the (Vikrama) year 1368. Calculating the details of the date, we find that its Christian equivalents are:

For the Chaitrādi Vikrama current = 1st August, 1310 A.C.: Saturday.
For the 22nd July, 1311 A.C.: Thursday.
For the 10th July, 1312 A.C.: Monday.

None of these equivalents shows the week-day to be a Wednesday, as given in the record; however, taking the second of them, we find that the sixth līthi (or day) actually commenced on 17 moments of the day (4 h. 5 m.) after mean sunrise when the fifth līthi ended; and according to this calculation, the date of the record would correspond to 21st July, 1311 A.C., which may really have been intended.

Citing some evidences we have noted in the preceding inscription that the reign of Hammirāvarman terminated either in the latter half of 1308 or the earlier half of 1309 A.C. The present inscription, however, which is dated at least a year and a few months later, evidently shows that though Aḥāmed-dīn annexed the region round about Damōri in 1309 A.C., Hammirāvarman continued to hold under his sway the fort of Ajayagadh at least up to July 1311 A.C., the date of the present inscription.

Text:

1. संवत् (०) १३४७ जैत्री अश्वमुखिसंवत् ६ अग्नि
2. सन्ती नागरकर्तमवर गेरे सा सुमे श्रीमहानाथि
3. राजपीतरसीवरवालये सुरुः संगवरानप्रति
4. न फरीतिُ

No. 154: Plate CXXXI

DUBKUND STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VIKRAMASIMHA

[Vikrama] Year 1145

THIS inscription was discovered by Captain W. R. Melville who was in charge of Gwāliōr Survey, in 1866, at Dubkund, also known as Dubkund, in the Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh. He sent two copies of the record to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, but the inscription was not published probably because both the copies were too imperfect for editing it. A brief and somewhat imperfect notice of it appeared subsequently in the Journal of the same Society, Volume XXV, p. 168; it was made by General Cunningham’s draftsman, Babu Jwāla Prasad, who accompanied Melville in his visit to Dubkund. An account of the record, together with a small photolithograph from one of Cunningham’s rubbings, appeared in his Archæological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XX, (1882-83), p. 99 (with pl.), and Preface, p. 5. And in 1894 the inscription was edited by F. Kielhorn in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II (1894), pp. 282 ff., from one of Cunningham’s rubbings, apparently the same from which the photolithograph published by the latter scholar was prepared. The inscription is edited here from the original.

2. This appears to be the name of the woman and the preceding one, of her husband.
3. Note the subordinate title given to Hammirāvarman, though it is not a sure sign that he was reduced to subordination. We have also to bear in mind that it is after all a private record.
4. Probably to read वसि
5. Supply a danda here.
6. This article of Kielhorn is not illustrated.
stone which is now preserved in the Central Museum, Gwâlior, and two impressions, one of which was supplied to me by the Curator of the Museum and the other by the Superintending Archaeologist at Bhopal.

The place, where the inscribed stone was found, lies in a dense forest and is situated about 70 kms. west-northwest of Shivpuri, on the top of a table-land, 122 kms. due south-west of Gwâlior, the actual distance by road being about 160 kms. It is on the left bank of Kumâ, a tributary of the Chambal. The inscription was seen by Cunningham's draftsman, on one of the pilgrists in the south cloister of an old temple standing in the midst of an enclosure surrounded by the remains of several small temples.

The total height of the pilaster is 112 cms., and it is 477 cms. broad. The inscription contains 61 lines of writing which covers a space 422.6 cms. broad by 100 cms. high. It is in a state of fair preservation, with the exception of a few aksharas in the first two lines where parts of the surface of the stone have peeled off. Some of the aksharas are here and there damaged, but they can be made out from the context, with the exception of two at the commencement of l. 7 and one in l. 15. Nothing of historical interest, however, is lost. The size of the letters is between 1-1 and 2-5 cms.

The characters are गञ्जि of the eleventh century A.C. Attention may be drawn to the formation of some of the letters. The initial त is written in two different ways; cf. e.g., आध्याय, l. 9 and आज्ञी, l. 21; in a singular instance in दूर, l. 16, the medial short u appears in the middle in right as attached to r in दूर in l. 40 and 45; the medial long o is indicated by a curve attached to the middle of the vertical on the left and turned downwards as to appear as a subscript: see पुंच, l. 7; the rare initial य occurs in रिथाह्या, l. 2, and the initial च resembles a triangle with its vertical point below, as in चवा, l. 21. Of the consonants, k, when the first member of a conjunct and when the मुद्रार of इ is attached to it, loses its scope, as in किषय, l. 5 and निषच्छ, l. 6; the conjunct consonant gh occasionally appears as gn and ज ज as न, for which respectively विनिपाता, l. 32 and मार्गाण, l. 16, and वार्गाण, l. 19; the lowest extremity of ग is not turned up as a tail; see निध्रा, l. 13; थ and एक as subscript are laid flat and appear almost alike; cf., e.g., प्राथहानि and नेगुच्छ, both in l. 14; म is in a transitional stage, appearing both as with and without the horn on its left limb and also with, or without the top-stroke, and occasionally the vertical of म is joined by a horizontal stroke; see prâṣṭhita, l. 8, धारा, l. 16 and धोधा and गाम्भ, both in l. 9, for all these examples. Occasionally it is difficult to distinguish between त and न, ध and व, म and the palatal and the dental abilants.

The language is Sanskrit, and except for the introductory obeisance, a portion in lines 54-58, and the date etc., in the end, the record is metrically composed throughout. It has 37 verses, which are not numbered.

As regards orthography we may note (1) the use of the sign for उ to denote b as well, as in वोध भोध in l. 9; (2) the occasional use of the danda for the palatal abilant and vice versa; see सङ्ख्या, l. 37 and सत्ताच, l. 45; (3) the reduplication of a consonant following r (with a few exceptions like दार्मिकता, l. 49; (4) the use of the prâṣṭhâ-mâtrâ; and (5) the general tendency to use an anusâra in place of a nasal, except in a very few instances, as in कलिन्ता, l. 54, as opposed to चन्द्रा in l. 6 and गाम्भ, l. 9. This remark does not apply to a nasal when it ends a verse or a hemistich.

In spite of the fact that the letters are well formed and carefully engraved and also that the language is generally correct, a few grammatical errors have crept in: they are उपवा for उज्जवल, l. 13; चचहत्रा for चचहत्रा, l. 18 and ऊष्पर्याय for ऊष्पर्याय, l. 28.

1 The stone was removed to the Museum some time about 1916 A.C. See Gaulois Arch. Rep. for V.S. 1925, No. 46 which is in manuscript form.
2 Neither of the impressions alone is perfect for editing the record on its basis, but they supplement each other. And my transcript of the record, which was prepared from them both, was also revised from the original, subsequently.
3 Cunningham's A.S.I.R., Vol. XX, pp. 99 ff. For Dubkund, see Ind. Atlas, Quarter-Sheet 51; Long. 77° 33'E, 23° 43'N. as mentioned by Kielhorn, in Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 232. However, in the map of the C.I. Agency, published by the Survey of India Office, Calcutta, in 1886, the place is shown situated on the west bank of Parang (Pâra) which too is a tributary of the Chambal and flows about 15 kms. west of Kumâ, almost parallel to it.
The inscription belongs to the reign of Vikramasinhha, who was a member of the Dhiksund branch of the Kachchhapaghata Dynasty. The object of it is to record the construction of a Jain temple, evidently the same at which the stone bearing the record was found, by some private persons (vv. 31-35), and some grants made in favour of it by the illustrious Mahārājadhiraja Vikramasinhha (ll. 54-57). The date of the record, as given in the last line, in figures, is Monday, the third of the bright half of Bhadrapada of the (Vikrama) year 1145, which, taking the year to be Chaitra expired, regularly corresponds to Monday, 21st August, 1088 A.C.1

The inscription falls into four parts as marked by the engraver himself with a sign somewhat resembling the Nāgari aksara chha at the end of each. The first of these parts (vv. 7-19) mentions the genealogy of Vikramasinhha and his ancestors; the second (vv. 20-24) gives an account of the builder of the temple; the third (vv. 25-35) names some sages; and the fourth (prose 11-54-60) records the donations made by the king.

To note the contents of the record, it begins with six introductory verses which either invoke the blessings of or praise (the Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras) Rishabhavāmin, Śāntinātha, Chandraprabha and Jina (Mahāvīra), and the sage Gōtama and last of all, Śrutadēvi, i.e., the goddess of eloquence or learning, as the persons who put up the inscription were devoted to Jainism.

With verse 7, begins the description of the pedigree of the ancestors of the ruling king Vikramasinhha. The first name introduced here is that of Yuvarāja, who was the originator of the Kachchhapaghata house (vv. 7-9). Yuvarāja's son was Arjuna2, and his son was Abhimanyu, (vv. 10-13), whose son again was Vijayarāja (v. 14). Vijayarāja had a son of the name of Vikramasinhha whose stronghold (ṭhūra) was known as Dōhā,3 which was then a flourishing place noted for its trade (vv. 15-20). The whole of the description of these princes is conventional and devoid of historical interest, except what is stated in v. 8, that Arjuna, as an ally or feudatory of Vidyādharā, killed Rājyapāla "by a shower of arrows piercing his neck-bones", and in v. 11 that his son Abhimanyu's skill "in the marvellous management of horses and chariots and in the use of powerful weapons was highly spoken of by the highly intelligent and illustrious king Bhōja".

To take up the first of these statements, we find that Vidyādharā, whose ally Arjuna is mentioned in the record, was evidently the homonymous Chandella king; and Rājyapāla is no other than the Gaurjara king of Kanauj, as we well know; and thus the Kachchhapaghata Arjuna was a contemporary of both these rulers who flourished in the first quarter of the eleventh century A.C. The Mohammadan sources go to tell us that when Sultan Mahmūd, after his victory of Kanauj in 409 A.H., i.e., in 1018 A.C., returned to his country, Vidyādharā killed Rājyapāla in a battle which resulted in the latter's flight and surrender of his territory to the Muselmans.4 Thus the statement of our inscription is corroborated by the Muslim account, adding to our knowledge that it was Arjuna who actually killed Rājyapāla of Kanauj, as a feudatory of the Chandella king.

With reference to the other statement of our inscription which alludes to Arjuna's son Abhimanyu's military skill as highly spoken of by Bhōjadeva, Dr. D. C. Ganguly suggests that Abhimanyu entered into the alliance with the Parmāra Bhōja on the eve of the latter's northern expedition,5 whereas Dr. H. C. Ray takes the statement to interpret that after the death of

---

1 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 461, No. 170. According to Kielhorn, the date is one of those in which the tithi is joined with the week day on which it commenced, 3 h. 28 m. after mean sunrise. Also see I.N.D., No. 153. Generally, the tithi current at mean sunrise is mentioned in the inscriptions; but the ceremonies connected with the construction of the temple may have been performed or continued late in the afternoon of that day, and hence the day seems to have been joined with the tithi which commenced on it.
2 Kielhorn also remarks that "The expression Bhimaśena-danga suggests that Arjuna had an elder brother of the name of Bhimāsena; but he is otherwise unknown".
3 For the interpretation of the expression containing the name of the capital, see n. 2. In the corresponding portion of the text, below. Moreover, as this branch of the Kachchhapaghata family had a common capital, we cannot hold with D. R. Bhandarkar that stated that "these were two divisions of one ruling family with a common capital (at Guţāl)". See his List of Inscriptions (Genealogical Table) in Ep. Ind. Vol. XXII, oppz., p. 992, n. 1.
5 H.F.D., pp. 108 ff.
Vidyādharā (in c. 1022 A.C.) the Chandellā throne was occupied by rulers of lesser calibre. Bhōja, who outrivalled Vidyādharā, exerted his influence in the north as far as Dubkund and Ahbintanvī became subservient to him. And though this is plausible, we have no definite statement in support of either of the theories and the simple praise as recorded in the present inscription cannot be taken so far as to support either of them.

It is interesting to note that Vikramasimha is called a Mahārājaḍhirāja in l. 55 of our inscription, which reports nothing else of historical importance about him. This statement, taken in its true sense, would go to indicate that he was then enjoying the status of an independent ruler. And in view of this statement it appears possible that during the time when the Chandellā Kirtivarman was busy restoring the fame of his house, which had been temporarily eclipsed by the Kalachuris of Tripuri, as seen above, Vikramasimha may have succeeded in throwing off the Chandellā yoke to whom his house had been paying obeisance. From the Deogadh inscription of Vatsaraśa, which is dated in 1098 A.C. and in the same year as of the present inscription, we know that some time previously the Chandellā ruler's all attention was occupied towards the Betva valley; and this may have given an opportunity to Vikramasimha to declare independence. It is not definitely known whether he became an ally of Bhōja, as Dr. Ganguly holds, and the very imperial title with which he is credited in our record, goes against the view of Dr. Ray who thinks that on this occasion this ruler became a feudatory of the Paramāra king.

To resume the story of the contents of the inscription, its second part (vv. 20-24) introduce two Jain merchant of the names of Rishi and his brother Dāhada, on whom the renowned Vikramasimha had conferred the rank of śrīśāhīm in his town. They were sons of Jayadeva by his wife Yasomātī and grandsons of Jātika, a devout Jaina, who is stated to have been the head of a family or guild of merchants, migrated from the city of Jāyasa (v. 20), which cannot be identified for want of details.

The third part of the inscription (vv. 25-35) begins with an account of some Jaina sages, the first of whom was Gūrū Dēvāśēna, an ornament of the Lāṭa-Vāgāra-gara (v. 25). His son (disciple?) was Kulaḥārīśa (v. 26), and his son again was Durabhasēna (v. 27), from whom sprang Sāntishēga, who, in an assembly held before the king Bhōjadēva, defeated hundreds of disputants who had assailed Ambarasēna and other learned persons (v. 28). Sāntishēga's son was Vijayakrti, who composed the present prāṣasti (v. 29) and who also induced Dāhada and some other persons, by his religious teachings, to build the temple where the inscription was engraved (v. 30). Then the record proceeds to mention the names of those who contributed towards the construction of the temple. They are: the good Dāhada (the same as mentioned above), Kītkēka, Sālpata, Dēvaladhara, Malāchandra, Lakshīmaṇa, and some others who are not named (vv. 31-34), probably because their contributions were insignificant. Then we have a verse (35) which extols the temple in a poetic way.

The inscription then mentions the donations made to the temple and the sages by the Mahārājaḍhirāja Vikramasimha (II. 54-60). He assigned (the tax of) one vamsāpaka (a coin) on each goṇī (a measure of grain) which passed that side, donated a tract of land, situated in the village of Mahāchakra and capable of being sown with four goṇīs of wheat, a garden with a well existing in the east of Rajakadraha, for the purpose of performing worship and for carrying on repairs to the temple whenever necessary, and providing oil[4] for the lamps and also for anointing the bodies of holy men (muni-jana).

The inscription lastly makes the usual appeal to future rulers to continue the gifts made so long as the Sun and the moon shine; and the last two lines (60-61), which are again separated by an inter-punctuation, as before, have a verse in anushtub, stating that the prāṣasti was written on the stone by Udayarāja and was engraved by the mason (ālāhūta) Tilhana. And the docu-

---

2. See No. 154, above.
3. Since Jaina sages do not generally marry, I prefer to take the relation of guru and lībhya in all cases here.
4. The expression used here is “kara-gaṇjīśa-dronyami” (text. 1. 57); and while editing the inscription Kielhorn remarks on p. 294, n. 16 that the first word of this he is unable to explain. To me it seems to be 'a pair of machines to be turned up by hand, i.e., human force.'
ment then closes with the date as we have seen above, and with the expressions indicating 'auspiciousness and great fortune'.

Of the geographical places mentioned in the inscription, Dobha (v. 19) is no other than Dubkund or Dobkund, as we have seen above; and the other names, viz., Jāyasadana (v. 20), Mahāchakra and Rajakadra (l. 56) I am unable to identify. Both the latter places appear to be somewhere in the vicinity of Dubkund; but in the maps at my disposal I could not trace out any place with its name similar to either of these. However, taking all these places to have been then situated in the vicinity of the find-spot of the inscription, I am tempted to suggest that Jāyasadana may perhaps be identical with the modern town of Jasarāpura; and Mahāchakra-grāma may have been the same as either the modern Mākrēra or Māhurā, all of which are now included in the Shivpurī tehsīl in the district of the same name. Rajakadra may have been either the modern Bājpurā or Rājor, both of which are also situated in the same district. Lāta has already been identified; and Vāgāta is obviously the same as Vāgāta, which too is well known.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1-4, 7-8, 10-11, 13-16, 20, 24, 26, 28 and 33 Śālĕṣhaḷḷ; vv. 5, 6, 8-14, and 36-37 Anuṣṭhāva; vv. 6, 19-19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 30 Varanatīlaḥ; vv. 9 and 17 Sraṅgharā; vv. 18-19 and 29 Mālāni; v. 14 Sīkharcin; v. 22 Upajīta.]

1. Siddhām | Ash | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
2. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
3. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
4. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
5. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
6. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
7. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
8. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
9. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]
10. [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ]

---

1 Also see n. on line 51 of the text below.
2 From the original and impression.
3 Both denoted by symbols.
4 Both the bracketed letters are now lost and I have read them from the photolithograph in *Asi*., *New*., Vol. XX. The upper curve of the mūtra of *f* and the sign of avasāra on *ta* are also lost.
5 The kākāpadasign is engraved at the end of this and some other lines below, which is not noted separately. Again, in this line, some of the consonants are lost, leaving their mūtra, as shown here.
6 Kielhorn read the first akṣara as [va] but on the stone it is clear as taken here.
7 Kielhorn could not make out the first of these two letters, but the traces show them to be as taken here. Both the letters are almost lost.
DUBKUND STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VIKRAMASIMHA, VIKRAMA 1145

Scale: One-fourth
32. व्यवस्थमानतिशिलिक्षवारसारम् \[॥११२॥\] ॥ ॥ अग्रिमात्यवादिविद्विद्रितविवाचार(ब)रामायणां ॥

33. पैदाकरश्रीसदां श्रीपिशिनिषिदः। सम्प्रभुविदनिषदभवतिने यो बदो पालविवाद हुविषविब[स][प][ब] नन्दा पशु ॥[१२१॥] ॥ श्रीमलिखाबिचारवाद(ब)संहितारोग्यो विकाशगतीनिषिदः[र]विकोटवतिविवाचार्ये गुणोऽयसः वेदम्।

35. वंद वंददेवत्वा नीमायार्यनिरोपः समजनागमप् \[॥१२२॥\] ॥ होषण दी(श)लन कुलेन संहारेश्वराः

36. वर्नम्, वंद वंदनक्षत्रव व (५) भुवं भारवं यायोत्तितिः प्रक्षिता पुष्पिहर्वम् \[॥२४॥\] तस्माय्यायकिशनंदसुशिवः रा१. खूलपीया पुरी विश्वा वर्णम्।

37. वल्लभरवक्षसुमृतै॥। श्रीमानमालिकश्वरीषी साधः सबकलसंपन्नमकलस्यष्टदृश्येः[स] आलोकः

38. रिवेणिरोगिरीवर्णद्विश्वरामकायिकाथिणिरसुशिरः भिन्नमायामार्गाम्यामुः च म्। संप्रभुरक्षसिद्ध।

39. [स]गुर्गोरितिः वक्षः सुप्रभम्। भौगोलिक प्रवृत्ति परसे प्रकाशार्यणम् \[॥२४॥\] ॥ आदीधिवृद्धितवर (गो)वक्षिणिः।

40. [स]विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः

41. \[॥२१॥\] निश्चारोपिष्टोनिष्पूणेश्वरामविवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः विवेचनाः

42. जातः श्रीकृष्णभोगोपालविक्रमादिः गुणायात्रानिष: संयमितवल्लभवेशो(४)वचनः शास्त्राठवाराः ततः \[॥२६॥\]

43. वाराणीभोगोपालविक्रमादिः सुवन्दश人脉रुपारा विवेचनाः संन्यस्यसमिकास्य सहस्र श्रीमानमालिकश्वरीषी साधः सबकलसंपन्नमकलस्यष्टदृश्येः[स] प्रक्षिप्तवतिविवाचार्ये गुणोऽयसः वेदम्।

44. [स]विवेचनाः \[॥२६॥\] आदिधिवृद्धितवर (गो)वक्षिणिः विवेचनाः

45. कार्यः श्वास्तीकार्यः अन्येत् वृद्धिभोगोपालविक्रमादिः श्रीवत्साधृश्वरामविवेचनाः गुणः \[॥२४॥\] गुणरः

46. वाराणीभोगोपालविक्रमादिः सुवन्दश人脉रुपारा विवेचनाः

47. क्रीणा जलः[व]प्रकाशितम् वः प्रकाशितम् वः \[॥२६॥\] तस्माय्यायकिशनं वर्षामस्यसूदम् सम्पूर्णविवाचार्योपि काशिगाल।

---

1. *Santhi* is not made here. The reading of the five *aksaras* following the name is clear; they were read by Kielhorn as *prakāra[aksharatā]*, but they give no suitable sense.

2. Only the *māṇi* of this *aksara* now survives. Similarly the first two *aksaras* of the next line have also peeled off completely and they have been restored here from Kielhorn's reading. This shows that the stone was in a better condition when Cunningham took the impression.

3. This is *yādhyāṇa*, which would not suit the metre. The first and the third letters are not distinct.

4. The consonant of the bracketed *aksara* has now peeled off.

5. *Santhi* is now made here.
THIS inscription is engraved on two long stone slabs which were found inside the portico of the larger of the two neighbouring temples locally known by the name of Śābhūṭa and situated on a projecting point near the middle of the eastern wall of the fortress of Gwālīor, the headquarters of a district in Mādhyāa Pradesh. The record was noticed by General Alexander Cunningham in his *Archaeological Survey of India Reports*, Volume II (1862-1865), pp. 357 ff., and from a facsimile supplied by him, it was edited by Rajendralal Mitra, with transcript and an abstract of its contents, in the *Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XXXI (1862), pp. 400 and 411 ff. It was re-edited, with translation and a facsimile, by F. Kielhorn in 1

1 *Sandhi* is not made here.
2 The reading is certain, though the last letter is mutilated. But the name appears to be rather long and peculiar.
3 *This aśkara* was totally lost even in Kielhorn's time. From the context it appears to have been *di*.
4 At the end of the line there are two redundant curves, as also at the end of the next line, *Gāthāḥika* is a member of the numismatic committee.
5 After *of* there are six redundant curves, as also after *slān* in the next line.
6 It is a coin, for which see *G.I.T.* Vol. IV, p. 195, n.
7 *The danda* is intended to show a parenthesis that follows. The grammar requires *nityākā*.
8 *Sandhi* is not made here.
the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XV (1886), pp. 33 ff.1 The inscription is edited here from the original stones and ink-impressions kindly supplied to me by the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.2

The two temples, inside the portico of one of which the inscription exists, are known, as stated above, by the name of Śīlāta, i.e. of the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law. Both these names appear to be rather peculiar; but we have a number of instances to show that these two names are given to temples and other monuments in this part of the country, in consequence of which the real name being forgotten in course of time.3 These shrines are also associated with the mythical name Sahasrabāhu, the thousand-armed, which is obviously a further attempt to Sanskritise the name Śīlāta. Furthermore, both these temples are also locally known as Jaina temples; and this seems to have misled Rajendralal Mitra to associate them with Jainism. He goes so far as to take the word Padmanātha occurring at the commencement of the present inscription as a short form of Padmaparbhanātha, the sixth of the Jaina Tirthankaras. But this argument cannot hold ground in view of the fact that the inscription itself again and again states that the temple was constructed for the worship of Vishnu. In this connection Cunningham's remarks too are noteworthy. He writes: "But as the sculptures, which can be recognised both inside and outside of the large temple are chiefly confined to the members of the Hindu triad and their consorts, I conclude that the temple must belong to the Brāhmaṇical worship."4

As stated above, the inscription is engraved on two slabs, the writing on the first of them covering a space about 156-2 cms. broad by 47-7 cms. high, and on the second 162-7 cms. broad by 45-7 cms. high. Each of the slabs contains twenty-one lines. In the last line of the second slab the writing covers only about one-third of the length of the whole line. The inscription is tolerably in a good state of preservation, with the exception of a few letters where the stone is worn. The letters are carefully written and beautifully engraved, though occasionally their forms are indistinguishable, as will be shown below. The size of the letters varies from 1/2 to 2 cms., and in the first 3 or 4 lines they are bigger and sparsely written.

The characters are Nāgarī, regular for the period to which the inscription belongs, i.e., the eleventh century A.C. The initial form of the short i is marked by two loops with a curved or hooked end turned in opposite direction and placed one below the other: see ibha, I. 13; and the initial long i, which occurs only once in kṣaṇa, I. 5, is denoted by an additional stroke above the loop, as the sign for medial ē. The initial ē has its forelimb suddenly turned to the right and its end joined to the middle of the vertical, e.g., in ērē, I. 20; and in a few instances, e.g., in ērēs, I. 38, it cannot be distinguished from p. The letter k when an initial member of a conjunct consonant, occasionally changes its loop to a horizontal stroke as in kāhī, I. 2, but not in the same word in I. 12. The conjunct consonant gg appears as gn, e.g., in dhṛgī, I. 4, and ā continues to be without a dot. Letters like u, ݍ and h have not developed the upward curve of their end: cf. bhāmaṇmaṇḍa, I. 13, contrary to the fact h in Mahābāla, I. 14, has a fine curve of its end. Sometimes there is no distinction between g, m and bh, between š, v and h and between gh and g; and the superscripts t and n in a conjunct consonant often assume the form of a horizontal stroke, as in chitta, I. 21 and gudamī, I. 20. The verticals of dhā continue to be joined by a horizontal stroke, as in dūdāhū, I. 17. The two different forms of ph can be noted in haraḥ-ośphulla, I. 1 and phalam, I. 11, and of bh in bhagavān and

---

1 In this article Kielhorn gives the text transcribed by him from an extant supply sent to him by Hultzsch and revised from a photolithograph prepared by Cunningham from an ink-impression. Kielhorn also points out that 'the text prepared by Rajendralal Mitra is so full of errors and omissions that it may be considered almost valueless and his abstract of the text of the inscription cannot be made to agree with the Sanskrit text published by him'. See Ind. Ant. Vol. XV, p. 33, n. 2.
2 In the meantime a fresh rubbing was supplied to me, at my request, by the Superintending Archaeologist, Central Circle, Bhopal; this rubbing was also consulted by me at times and to him my indebtedness is due. In my personal examination I noticed that the record is engraved on the same panels of the stone-slabs and also that each of the slabs has a protruded base below and a projected portion above, somewhat resembling a shade, and carved with row of geometrical figures representing diamonds and beads alternately placed.
3 E.g., temples with this name exist at Kōlhā (Mandsaur District), for which see A.S.I. R., W.C., 1912-13, p. 57 and ibid., 1919-20, p. 86.
subhaga, both in l. 5. The left limb of bh sometimes ends in a long tail; see gabhira, l. 28. Y is occasionally ornamental and sometimes it cannot be distinguished from p; cf. yadatmané, l. 1, and račiṣyāyam, l. 10 respectively. The letter r is formed at least in three different ways, viz., by a vertical to which a horizontal stroke is attached at the left, with a loop, and with a wedge, as respectively to be seen in Prashālālma, vara and visnaya-hāri, all in l. 17. And lastly, the subscript form of this letter is represented either by its full form, with the preceding letter half drawn, as in chakrīr, l. 6, or by a scrip attached to the lowest extremity of its superscript, as in sahasra, l. 9. The loops representing the sign of visarga have a triangular notch between them.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the introductory Oṁ oṁ namah Padmanāthaya and the expressions showing the date in l. 40, the entire inscription is in verse. The total number of verses is 112; they are not numbered. The language is correct and fluent, containing elegant and florid expressions as in the best Kāvya style using figures of speech like upamū, rūpa, śūla, sādha, apakṣu, vyatirikta and also parinakṣyā which is of rare occurrence.1

In respect of orthography, we have to note (1) the use of the sign for r to indicate b as well, except in śāyānābhājita, l. 5 where it is correctly used, but also in baḥaḥ, l. 1 where it is wrong; (2) putting the dental for the palatal sibilant in a large number of instances as in ahaṣu, l. 8 but the use of auṣa also to be seen in l. 29; on the other hand, the use of the palatal for the dental sibilant, e.g., in śākṣarādita, l. 34. Here it may be pointed out that the word saṅka occurring three times in the inscription is spelt as saṅkā twice in ll. 12 and 25 but as saṅga in l. 19; (3) the reduplication of a consonant, more often, following r and occasionally, also preceding it; see, e.g., guruvanmastritrīva ina, l. 41; (4) writing gh frequently as cbi, see vānchhibhā, l. 22; (5) the use of the jivaṁśāya instead of the lingual sibilant in four instances all of which occur in l. 36; (6) the general tendency to put the paraśavāra which is sometimes so strong that the final m is wrongly used in instances like tvaṁ = viṣuddha, l. 25 and in combining the expressions tvaṁ and kō = sī as tvaṁko = sī, which though grammatically correct, gives an idea of clumsiness, in ll. 20 and 25; (7) the change of a final m occasionally to an amavīra at the end of a stich, e.g., in l. 37; and (8) a few instances of putting the danda so close to the preceding letter as to appear as a medial d attached to it, as after bhaguśīna in l. 3. Some of the lines have the kāho-pādī sign as the end.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Mahipāla who belonged to the Kachchhapa-ghāta dynasty of Gwalior. The object of it is to record the completion of the temple of Padmanātha, begun by his cousin Padmapāla and the grants made by the king in honour of the deity installed therein and in favour of some Brāhmanas. The date of the record is expressed in l. 40, in words, to be the expired Vikrama year 1149, and it is repeated in figures in the same line, as the current year 1150, the day being the fifth of the dark half of Asvina. The date does not admit of verification, though it is one of the few dates mentioning both the current and the expired era. The year corresponds to 1092 A.C., taken as Northern.

The inscription falls into three parts, the first of which (vv. 3-33) gives an account of the king Mahipāla and his ancestors, the second (vv. 34-67) glorifies him in bardic expressions, and the third (vv. 68-103) records the construction of the temple and the establishment of a Brāhmaṇa colony in its vicinity and the endowments made to them.

Opening with a short sentence paying obeisance to Padmanātha and after four maṅgala-dōkha in praise of Aniruddha, Hari and Uṣā's husband installed in the temple, in 26 verses it describes the genealogy of the Kachchhapa-ghāta (kachchhapatī, as mentioned in verse 5-7) family to which Mahipāla, who completed the temple belonged. Here we are told that the originator of the house was Lakshmanā (v. 5). His son was Vajrajāna who by honest means put down the value of the ruler of Gadhingar (Kanyakubja) and performed tūla-dāna a number of times (vv. 6-7). He was succeeded by Maṅgarāja, who was a Śrīva (v. 8), and the

---

1 These remarks are with reference only to verses 1-68 forming the first two parts of the inscription. With the exception of a few verses, the rest of the record, which merely gives names and lists of articles is in the poetic form but not of the same high rank. With reference to the language it is interesting to note that in three instances, in l. 14, 29 and 33, the change followed by a is dropped, which is against Pāñcarātra VIII. 3, 56 but quite in accordance with the śirhaka on the same.
latter by Kirtiraja, who vanquished the countless army of the king of Mālav and also built a Śiva temple at Sūhāṇpiṇī which is the modern town of Subhāṇī in the Mūreṇa District near Gwalior (vv. 8-11). Kirtiraja’s son was Mālādeva, who was also known as Bhuvanapāla and bore the title of Tvaḷākṣamalla. His wife was Dévavatī (vv. 12-13), and the son of this union was Dévapāla (v. 14). Dévapāla’s son was Padmapāla who, in a poetic language, is described as valorous, munificent and an able ruler (vv. 14-24). Then we are told that “considering fortune and life unsteadily as the flood of a river and setting his mind on the performance of pious deeds, Padmapāla, the supporter of the subjects caused the temple of Hari to be built.”

The temple is further described to be “sky-kissing,” and it is also stated that “its white banner suspended from the staff and fluttering on its golden egg-shaped kalava resembled the Ganges descending from the sky on the tawny matted hair of Sambhu, whose body is smeared with ash” (vv. 25-29). The next two verses state that through the adversity of fortune Padmapāla deceased, and his brother Mahipāla who was the son of Sūrīpāla, occupied the throne at Gopāḍaṇī.

Here ends the first part of the inscription, and the only historical information that can be gathered from it is that Mahipāla’s great-grandfather Kirtiraja achieved a crushing victory over the king of Mālav, who has been identified with the Paramāra Bhōjadeva.1 This statement appears to have a reference to Bhōja’s defeat in his expedition of the Chandella kingdom when the Chandella ruler Vidyādharavoild his attempts, as recorded in the Mahābhārata inscription stating that “Bhōjadeva, together with the moon of the Kalachuris, worshipped, full of fear like a pupil (this master of warfare i.e., Vidyādharā).”2 And it is possible that Kirtiraja who was then a feudatory of the Chandella Vidyādharā, may have inflicted a crushing defeat on the Paramāra army.3 The gravity of the reverse sustained by Bhōja on this occasion is graphically described in v. 10 of the present record, telling us that “when the Mālav army had dispersed, the villagers thatched their houses with multitudes of spears which through fear had fallen from the hands (of the soldiers) in every direction.” And if this account be not a poetic panegyric, it hardly be believed that such a crushing defeat on the Paramāra army would have been inflicted by the Kachchhaphāghāt ruler unilaterally.

The second part of the inscription refers to the coronation of Mahipāla and states that he was panegyised by bards in their lofty strain when his coronation was performed and when he was seated on the throne. This long panegyric, to which as many as thirty-three stanzas (vv. 35-67) are devoted, describes his valour, fame, glory, benefactions and religious merit, instituting his comparison with deities like Brahmā, Vīshnu, Śaṅkara and their various incarnations, with Indra, Kuveśa, the Sun and the moon, with legendary kings and sages like Vīdhīshthira, Bhagiratha, Māndhātā and the Pāṇḍavas, and with objects like the ocean, lotus and the sandal tree etc. This account is all void of historical interest, except that it shows that Mahipāla was the son of king Sūrya, i.e., Sūrīpāla (vv. 51 and 58) that he belonged to the family of the Kachchhaphāghātas (v. 57), his title was Bhuvanakomalla (vv. 49 and 63), and that he vanquished an army of the Gaṇḍharvas (v. 56) about which nothing is so far known.

Following this long barded account is a mention of Mahipāla’s religious and charitable works: and here it is also stated that he completed the construction of the temple which was begun by his brother Padmapāla and which was an “imperishable embodiment of his fame” (vv. 68-70). He also established a Brahmāpuri, i.e., a settlement for Brahmans, and selected the other (in addition to those already settled there by Padmapāla) occupants. He also established a sāṭra (charitable feeding hall) where dainty food and drink were distributed (vv. 70-71). He made donations for the cooking of the maṇḍavya of the glorious Padmanātha and for lights, and divided the sanctuary of the temple into two parts, assigning one-half to the glorious Padmanātha and the other half to Vaikuṇṭha (vv. 72-73), and also arranged suitably for the maintenance of dancing-girls, musicians, singers and the rest for public performances (v. 74).

1 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 324.
2 See No. 113, n. 22.
3 Also see S. K. Mitra, F. R. K., pp. 83-84.
The inscription proceeds to record that for the maintenance of all this establishment, the king properly divided (the village of) Pashānapalli, and allotted five shares and a half to the god and twenty-four shares and a half to the most excellent Brāhmanas to whom he made gifts (vv. 75-76); and to look after this, he kept a Brāhmana, the renowned son of Vṛgēśvara and Saḻakṣhāna by name, who was himself a sage, a seat of learning and possessing other good qualities and enjoyed the confidence of the king (vv. 77-78). The following seven verses (79-85) embody the names of donors (see App. A) and verses 86-100 mention the implements for the gifts, such as ornaments, dresses, pots for worship etc., which were donated by the king on this occasion (see App. B).

Then we are told that the king also made arrangements for stone-cutters, carpenters, engineers, car-men and other persons and also for excavating and building reservoirs, wells, tanks and so forth, by donating the tenth part (of the revenue) in his whole dominions, also giving the twentieth part to Aniruddha, to keep up the charitable distribution of food etc. (vv. 101-102). The next stanza expresses the hope that the temple of Padma, i.e., of Padmanātha built by the king of that name, may be ever-lasting.

The following two stanzas (104-105) state that the prādāsti was composed, by the order of the king, by the poet Maṇikeṇṭha, an eminent Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāravadāga gātra, the son of the poet Gūrindu and the grandson of the chief of the poet Rāma, and whose "intellect was polished by (the study of) Māṇikṣa and Nyāya, and who took delight in eloquent sayings," and that it was written by his friend Yasōdeva Digambārīkara who was a poet in all the languages. Then is given the date in vv. 107-08, which we have seen above.

The next two verses (109-110) introduce the king's Minister Gauri, who is said to have resembled Vasishṭha and Bṛhaspati in intelligence and due to whose power in the form of a blazing fire, the king's adversaries perished as moths, in a battle. The inscription closes with two stanzas which state that the record was engraved in excellent letters, in the temple of the glorious Padmanātha, by the artisan Padma, the son of Dēvasvāmin and also by the artisans Śūṇhāvāja and Mālaka, and expressing hope, in the end that "may the letters engraved (here) serve the purpose."

As for the localities mentioned in the inscription, Gopāḍri which figures twice in v. 6 and again in v. 31 is evidently the city of Gvāliler where the inscription was found. Gauḍhinagara (v. 6) is Kānyakūṭa: and Mālava (v. 10) roughly corresponds to the present Mālāvī region of Madhya Pradesh. Simhapaniya, where a temple is said to have been built by Kṛrutīrāja (v. 11) is, as stated above, the modern town of Sūhānīyā in the Mōrēna District and lying about 50 kilometres due north-east of Gvāliler. It is well known for a large and fine temple of Śiva still existing at that place, and possibly it appears to be the same temple as built by Kṛrutīrāja. Pashānapalli (v. 75) reminds us of the name of the modern village of Pāhārdāgh which is situated about 59 kilometres due west of Gvāliler and thus appears to have been then included in the kingdom of the Kachchhāpaghātas.\[1\]

---

1 The reading is śūṇhāvājā and Kielhorn translates it as "endowed with the characteristic of a sage". But in view of his name not appearing in the whole verse when his father's name is given, I am inclined to take Saḻakṣhāna as his name.

2 He is the composer of the following inscription where he is stated to be a poet in six languages.

3 If we take Śūṇhāvāja as the title of Mālaka or vice versa, then instead of three we have only two engravers. But nothing can be said to be certain in this respect.


5 We have nothing to verify this identification. It may also be stated here, however, that there is one more place of the name of Padhvāll which lies about 30 kilometres due northeast of Gvāliler and contains remains of a tenth century temple (Cunningham, A.S.I.R., Vol. XX, p. 107). And in view of the latter half of its name is the same as of the Pashānapalli and also in view of its proximity from Gvāliler where the temple described in the present inscription stands, one may be tempted to identify both these places with each other. But this is only a surmise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Names of Brāhmaṇas</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Verse No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Devalabdhi Sudhāra</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Srijhara Dikshita</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kiritratha sueti</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gangādhara</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Malaka</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gay(?)ādhara</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Devanāga</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Vasishtha</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Devakīrmpan</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Yasakara</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Varāhasvāmin</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Gṛihadāsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Prabhākara</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ichchhādhara</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Madhu</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Tīhēka</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Purushottama</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Rāmāśvara</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Dāmādara</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Shatjahbhāha</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>82-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Rama</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tīhēka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of shares distributed are \((3 \times \frac{1}{2}) + (18 \times 1) + \frac{1}{2} + (2 \times \frac{1}{2}) = 23\frac{1}{2} \).\(^1\)

\(^1\) In his article in op. cit., p. 12, n. 133, Kielhorn shows the total of all the distributed shares to be 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); but according to my calculations it comes to be 24. The expression in v. 84 I interpret to mean that both the worshipers, i.e., Rama and Tīhēka obtained half-a-share together and not each as Kielhorn takes it. But the actual number of shares mentioned above in v. 75 is 24\(\frac{1}{2}\), and we may presume that the land constituting half-a-share may have been let fallow to mark the boundaries between the different shares.
SHOWING THE ARTICLES DONATED BY THE KING

N.B. — The numbers in brackets denote the verse in which the article is mentioned.

A. Ornments for the god Hari:

Gold diadem covered with precious stones; with a very large jewel shining in its midst; frontal ornament made of emeralds (86); gold necklace blazing with precious stones; pair of arm-rings set with precious stones (87); four bracelets ornamented with jewels (88).

The same set solely of gold for Aniruddha.

For Achyuta, in addition to these—Four bracelets, a pair of tālapattas, krittidaṇa with a golden handle (ornament for the fist (?)), waist-coat of silver and four kanchōlas (?), 90-1.

B. For holding the naivedya—four plates of brass (91).

C. For decoration of the attendants of the gods:

Three oval globes (śawarvāndas); gold-lotus made into an umbrella (92).

D. For bathing the gods:

Two copper-basins and a pair of copper-vessels (for the oblation of arghya) (96).

E. For waving the light:

Seven bells with incense burners; vessels for waving lights and seven conch-shells with four copper-pots (97). Tāthāghata of brass, two kāhalas, a chowrie and a pair of staves made of bell-metal and crystal (98).

F. For cooking food:

Two large kettles of copper, two pitchers, five pails and a spoon—all of copper (99).
1 अंि 2 आग् नामम्। \textit{वर्णीत्वेन। अन्तोत्तमिवं यस्मिन्नाम्। धर्मेऽन्तरम्। वर्णा ज्ञाते। निरेऽपि। वर्त्तित्वेन।\textit{[11]}}। मौनसृष्टि‌स्मां। अः। \textit{अग्नि।} \textit{अर्थस्य।}\textit{[2]।} ईतिहासिक‌वा।} जीवना । \textit{एति।} \textit{उपवृत्तानि‌सौभाग्यम्।} \textit{नीलज्ञ।} \textit{हस्य‌यापाय।} \textit{वर्त्तित्‌स्मां। निरेऽपि। अन्तोत्तमिवं।} \textit{[3]।} \textit{क्षेत्र।} \textit{न} \textit{[3]।} \textit{स्मां‌स्मां।} \textit{स्मां‌स्मां।} \textit{स्मां‌स्मां‌स्मां।} \textit{स्मां‌s

From impressions and the original.
Expressed by a symbol.
Kielhorn translates this word correctly as ‘pearlstone’ but he says that he is doubtful about the meaning. This appears to have been due to the use of ‘सिद्ध’ used here and in the following line to denote the hri
dness of the image.
\textit{31}\textit{हि} is engraved as \textit{k}.
\textit{32} \textit{इद्वता}=	extit{श्रिया}
\textit{33} The plural used here denotes frequency and not number.
\textit{34} This is an example of \textit{वृद्धिकृतस्त्रिश्च} and the apparent contradiction disappears by taking the word \textit{मिता} to denote the Sun.
\textit{35} Here and at the end of some other lines below, is engraved the \textit{मुक्ता-पाल} symbol which is not noted every time. The word \textit{दन्द} in this verse means ‘army’. 
There is a play on the word *kara* which means (1) a ray and (2) a tax.

* As suggested by Kielhorn. *Śrī* (majesty) and *Gaurī* (the earth) are represented as the wives of the king.

* Read

* This letter is damaged and the reading is conjectural. In the following verse the figure of speech is *Pariśākhya*, examples of which are often found in the *Kālamarī*. *Nagā* in the present case means 'a charioteer'.

* This verse has the double entendre with a play on the use of gloss meaning (1) virtue and (2) bow-string; and *nirjñāna* meaning (1) merciless and (2) sword.


* For Kielhorn's translation of this verse, see *op. cit.* 43 and n. 122. Differing from him, I take it to mean that 'the wives of his enemies residing in the bees looking to their faces, could not decide whether the forest take one night of the Hāmakāsa season as many (hāmakāsa-rojānti-chāyā); and consequently, they were really gold lotuses (as the faces were pale in consequence of the separation from their husbands).

* Kielhorn translates this as "from the top of the golden staff..." But a n is dear enough before the following da, and thus the expression would mean "falling on the golden car from the tip of the staff". Kielhorn also takes *nāgā* in the sense of 'ornamental'; but in that case the simile would not be complete and where the banner was falling is also not known. My interpretation of the expression (with the reading *ajāna*) compares the banner to the Ganges, falling from the staff (as from the sky) on the minted hair of Sambh. This word *ajāna* here to be taken in the sense of *ajākāra-kulata*. cf. *śravatārīṇam* *nigullataṁ* *Agni-Purāṇa*, 81, v. 23.
सिमास्तम्([पिय]||२५७१२) तुञ्जाम्प्रकरणः सुभुम्बरचारान्तिस्वतः श्रवण विदित (श्रिय)प्राणो विदितसमयाँसंभूवणर्म्यिः। निमातंह(श्य) बृहत: समस्तश्रवण(श्री)विदितस्तः। प्राविचारकः।

१४ भरतेषु समाहितं कर्त्तजणं प्रत्येकंशं प्रत्येकंब्रह्मणं प्रत्येकंसतत्रस्तम्॥२५७१॥ ब्रह्मणविद् विदितस्तंदयुज्यते परिक्रियाभद्रभीववचनोऽपि। युक्तेऽस्तम् यद्यात् युक्तेऽगहमानोऽपि। तत्त्वं भाता तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम् तत्त्वं जग्नायकावार्ताय। यथायौ काय कायायम्यायसं तत्त्वं भाता तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम् तत्त्वं जग्नायकावार्ताय।

१५ श्रवणं सुन्तं स्थितिस्तम्। प्रायम् विदितम्[मा]सूचय(श्री)विदितस्तंदयुज्यते।॥२५७२॥ यथायौ श्रवणं स्थितिस्तम्। न मात्रभावाकावार्ताय। न जग्नायभव्यायम्॥२५७२॥ यथायौ काय कायायम्यायसं तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम् तत्त्वं जग्नायकावार्ताय।

१६ चारयात्रायि तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम्॥२५७३॥ यथायौ प्रत्येकंशं प्रत्येकंसतत्रस्तम्॥२५७३॥ यथायौ श्रवणं स्थितिस्तम्॥२५७३॥ यथायौ काय कायायम्यायसं तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम् तत्त्वं जग्नायकावार्ताय।

१७ यथायौ चारयात्रायि तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम्॥२५७४॥ यथायौ प्रत्येकंशं प्रत्येकंसतत्रस्तम्॥२५७४॥ यथायौ श्रवणं स्थितिस्तम्॥२५७४॥ यथायौ काय कायायम्यायसं तत्त्वं जग्नायभव्यायम् तत्त्वं जग्नायकावार्ताय।

१८ श्लोकः (३५) लोकोपयोगम् कर्तव्यं नित्यान्तिक्रियाम्॥३५०२॥ लोकोपयोगम् कर्तव्यं नित्यान्तिक्रियाम्॥३५०२॥ लोकोपयोगम् कर्तव्यं नित्यान्तिक्रियाम्॥३५०२॥ लोकोपयोगम् कर्तव्यं नित्यान्तिक्रियाम्॥३५०२॥

१९ नासिकः॥४६२॥ नासिकः॥४६२॥ नासिकः॥४६२॥ नासिकः॥४६२॥
20. गद्विन्त मुखुद्विदीशा व्यामासिकस्तत्तर्तवन्नस्यस्योऽस्यवः।
Pustakā nāthaśīrdhānāvāśैःव्यामध्येकादित्वेति

classic.

21. विद्यमणि प्रकटत्वादेव।

22. पहले सप्तव्युष्मनः

23. नवाद्विन्दुः

24. व्युधातिरिक्तः

25. समवेदेऽवच्छन्यां

26. तथा ज्ञातं न अभवेऽहं जस्तित्वादेव गि

1. Vyasū, whose complexion was dark.
2. The word aśādaka here means (1) a striker and (2) relieved of Tājalakṣa; and Hari has the double meaning of (1) a horse and (2) a monkey.
3. That following his brother’s mention Bhima disguised himself as a cook at the time of ajjāla-vāda is well known.
4. The reference is to Arjuna who vanquished the army of Chītraratha.
5. Here is an allusion to Karna (born of the Sun) who removed the pride of the enemies of Duryodhana (strong in context), who made an attempt to check the fame of the enemy Arjuna (check the white fame of the enemies) and who removed the misfortune of the supplicants.
6. Simhatāk-bhā is Rāhu (Śahākhyā) who causes an eclipse by descending the Sun. The king is here described as overcoming the Sun in the form of his powerful adversaries and killing their elephants. For un-bhāta-sāvatvargeśa, c. Rājagrihāśa, II, 38.
7. Here is a play on the following words: dasa means (1) a gift and (2) ichchā; kurudā means (1) a sword and (2) turn of the trunk of an elephant; Dānapālī is a kind of weapon.
8. Mitra means (1) the sun and (2) a friend; and jeda means dull (the same as jeda, meaning ‘water’).
9. This verse mentions the actions of Vīshū, Parāśurāma, Vāmana, Kṛṣṇa and Nārāyaṇa, respectively. The word jeda is used here in its double meaning: (water) and (stupid), as above.
27 स्य विधिते वायुनी कुल्म हित [**1**]कालस्यकारति[ *[**1**]ार्स्य करति पुनः श्रीमहागुल्ल नख्वालासैद्ध सुहोरो मित्रुष (अ) स निकालेक रा [**2**]। [**3**] क बुठ (क) मोक्षिक[ *[**3**]ास्य दीर्घा भक्तस्य मौलितर्णम् परं] दुःखात्य ब्रह्मानात्मानः प्रियस्य मर्यादार्थ[ नति म] हि हित[ *[**4**] हुशी[ *[**4**] र जातु श्रीराम [**5**]।] क पितामहम् विद्यापि

28 द्वागीत्वे मर्यादाज्ञाताम् भगवानुपन्नचन्द्रार्थिन्यानिं महिमः। असुन्नमयुत्क्रांते पंडितो निर्माणभागी- 
मन्दललोकः[ *[**7**] कृतिरार्थिन्यानिं मन्दललोकः] चर्चा देव प्रय्योगानिं मार्गविशेषं यथाप्रसादम्। कृताधिकरः[ *[**8**] प्रमुखः]
हस्तसाधकसंबन्धाः ज्ञेयसंबन्धाः संबंधानाः । भेष[ *[**10**] न संबंधाः संबंधाः संबंधाः

29 तन्न गायत्रिकहूः। [**5**]।] अवरेणु (क) विधिं मन्नात्वमाविनिः भक्तिः। अतििधिः भक्तिः[ *[**12**] विधिः कवित्वहृत्]
के केवल अवरेनु (क) इत्यादि [ *[**12**] अवरेनु (क) इत्यादि] अवरेनु (क) इत्यादि [ *[**12**] अवरेनु (क) इत्यादि]

30 वेष्कारीकोर्थ्यमाबनर्तेच यत्तिसितांनृपकामी। 

31 मस्ति (म) हृदयुर्वि तथे माया[ *[**9**] ऋषियविद्यामूलानु]। 

32 हिरीवाराक्रमं[ *[**9**] हिरीवाराक्रमं] अन्यस्यायायहि। 

1 Here is a reference to Pārtha's putting to flight the enemies capturing Uttara's cows, for which see Mbh., Virātī Parā.
2 For the utaṅga dropped here, see n. 20, above.
3 A kalpa is a day of Brahmā, extending over one thousand yugas. Here it is suggested that the king may live long for a kalpa and even longer that the Sun, the moon and the stars taking their birth and coming to an end many time in one kalpa.
4 Kielhorn observes that this letter might be read as mṛi. It seems to me, however, that the reading is intended to be tiṣkha—ṣudhāya meaning that having made the remaining of (the Brahma's) tiṣkha, i.e., tiṣkha atiṣkha tiṣkha, indicating their stay to be permanent. The word tiṣkha is used here in a double sense.
5 Read chakrē deyāṁ.
6 Kielhorn explained it to mean "the sanctuary of the temple rising from the small hall". But the context shows that here the word denotes the share which was due to the Brahmaṇa, out of that collected in the customs house (māṇḍapi). Compare devastāna, meaning rent-free holding in the possession of a god.
7 Kielhorn translated this work as 'the tribe of attendants', and admitted that he could not quote any authority for this. Pūda here means free (of the gods), and kula denotes abode, i.e. the temple. The word thus appears to mean 'a group of worshippers'. A worshipper is called pūdamālā in the Sirpur inscription (E. I., XI, p. 192) and is probably connected with it. Pūdamālā is of course primarily the foot-print (Pūdakā). Cf. Rāmāngra-vasanākā pūdamālā in the Rādhāpur plates of Prabhāvatī Gupta, for which, see C. I. I., Vol. V. p. 55. Text-line 1, translated as 'foot-prints'.
8 The word is unknown to the dictionaries and Kielhorn also noted his inability to explain it.
33 पक्तो योजेश्वरोपक्षेऽवः राजात्: दृष्टिस्तित्वः सूर्योपक्षः सूर्यिको: सर्वेऽवस्तिकः। \[॥[१]॥\] आदित्यसि तिर्यंत्र: जलाभिन्यः।

34 हस्ताक्षरो विघेरसस्तिः मात्र निर्भर। दृष्टिस्तित्वः सूर्योपक्षः। \[॥[२]॥\]

35 भि: \[॥[३]॥\] रामेश्वरो दिनान्तः दासेरो दिनः। आदित्यसि विघेरसस्तिः। पत्रविशेषः सूर्याव्यायः।

36 काल्युक्तसप्त्वं दिनान्तः दृष्टिस्तित्वः। \[॥[४]॥\]

37 \[॥[५]॥\] दृष्टिस्तित्वः देवकिनीविवृत्तिः। ग्रंथिर्मयः। \[॥[६]॥\]

38 \[॥[७]॥\] दृष्टिस्तित्वः। देवकिनीविवृत्तिः। \[॥[८]॥\]

39 \[॥[९]॥\] दृष्टिस्तित्वः। देवकिनीविवृत्तिः। \[॥[१०]॥\]

1. There two aksharas may also be read as \textit{le ki}.
2. Probably \textit{tālapatra}, i.e., ear-ornament. The word \textit{kritiddra} is also not known to the dictionaries.
3. A bodice. \textit{Kūchāla} is probably \textit{kūchuka}.
4. Kielhorn remarked that he does not understand this word. To me, however, it appears to denote the egg-shaped object attached to the \textit{chhatra}, below, for ornamentation.
5. The first of these objects is a precious stone and the second, bell-metal.
6. A drum. The word \textit{vādāhkhāt} is again unknown.
7. Both these strokes are ornamental and one of them is superfluous.
THIS inscription is incised on a long slab of yellow sandstone discovered by General Alexander Cunningham in the fortress of Gwalior, which is now the chief city of a district in Madhya Pradesh, and was brought to notice by him in his *Archaeological Survey of India. Reports*, Volume II (1862-1865), p. 554. The record was also transcribed and translated by Rajendralal Mitra in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Volume XXXI (1862), pp. 418 ff., but his article is not illustrated. His transcript too is inaccurate in a number of places, particularly in the historical portion thereof; as rightly pointed out by E. Hultzsch, who subsequently edited the record in the *Indian Antiquary*, Volume XV (1886), pp. 291 ff. E. Hultzsch succeeded in recognising in it three names of the royal personages and also in correcting the genealogy given by Mitra; but his article too, which contains his reading of the text, is not accompanied by a facsimile, and he has not given some other details, e.g., the dimensions of the writing, language, and orthography, etc. The inscription is edited here from an excellent inked impression kindly prepared and supplied to me, at my request, by the Director of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, where the stone is now preserved.

The writing consists of nine lines, and originally it covered a space about 154 cms. broad by 25 cms. high. The last of the lines is about 2 cms. longer than the others, to accommodate two more letters completing the inscription. But the record is fragmentary, as a part of the stone from top to bottom on the proper right side and containing about twenty aksharas at the commencement of each of the lines, is broken and lost, as can be made out by the number of verses in the inscription. A small portion of the upper proper right corner and the top portion covering a major part of the first line have also broken away. The extant portion, however, is

1 Kielhorn was somewhat doubtful about the reading of the bracketed aksharas, but they are clear enough on the stone, though somewhat rubbed.
in a good state of preservation and indicates that the letters were beautifully formed and carefully engraved. Their average size with the mātra is between 1.2 and 1.5 cms.

The characters are Nāgarī of the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. and show a sort of affinity with those of the preceding inscription which too is from the same place; but some of the forms of letters of the present inscription are rather archaic. To note some of their pecularities, we find that g and th, when subscript of a conjunct consonant, lose their vertical; see respectively, aniga, l. 1 and kṣaptava and adhishāya, both in l. 2, but there are exceptions, e.g., the akṣara g retains its vertical in anudīva, l. 5. Th is represented by two hollow circles placed vertically and sometimes assuming the form of the modern sh, as in patha and Mahāratha, both in l. 4. The letter ṣn appears as ṣ, for which see asmuma, l. 5. N is by mistake often engraved as t; cf. Manohara and vīpīnāyau, both in l. 4. The slightly different varieties of the form of r, as noted while editing the preceding inscription, may be illustrated in abhrirñ, l. 2, where the letter shows a wedge, in kurut, l. 3, where a horizontal stroke is attached to the left of the vertical, and in khabriya, l. 2, where it appears almost as modern. This very letter, when the latter member of a conjunct consonant, is sometimes complete with the preceding letter half-drawn, as in khabriya, and is sometimes shown by a serif, as in pratāpa, both these words to be found in l. 2.

The language is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the concluding portion containing the date, the record in its preserved portion is composed in verses. In all there are 24 stanzas, composed in different metres; and the rare metres like Bhujungayādā and Prithū, and Aitiṭīṣa, which is still seldom, but is seen. The poet's skill in versification. The verses are not numbered, but are marked in the end by two vertical strokes and their first halves are marked by one vertical stroke, as usual.

With respect to orthography, we notice (1) the use of the sign of v to denote b, as well, e.g., in valihau, l. 2; (2) reduplication of a consonant following r, as in vārītā, l. 3; (3) the use of the dental sibilant in place of the palatal t to be found only five times in the extant portion of the record, mā, in anuvama, l. 5, visadi, l. 6, and kawar, occurring twice in l. 7; (4) the sporadic use of the prithā and the śūrdhω-mātrās; (5) the tendency to use a para-svarna more often than an austāra; (6) the use of b for gh in anīghi, l. 2; and (7) the marking of final consonants regularly, including m, which is rightly used at the end of a word, excepting only two instances showing its wrong use by its change to an austāra at the end of both the hemistiches in verse 21.

The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a temple dedicated to Hara (Siva), by Aschandra, who is said to have been a younger brother of Madhusudana, a son of Manjendra and a grandson of Manvratā of the Māhāra Kāyasha clan, who was in charge of recording the income and expenditure of King Bhuvanapāla. The date of the pratiskēha of the temple when the king was set up in it, is recorded in words in the last line; it was the sixth day of the bright half of the month of Māgha when eleven hundred and sixty-one years had elapsed from the time of the king Vikrama. The date cannot be verified; but taking the year to be the Chaṭrāḍi Vikrama expired (attā), it corresponds to Tuesday, 5th January, 1104 A.C., when the tithi ended at 45 after mean sunrise, and for the Kārtiṭkādi, to Monday, 23rd January, 1105 A.C., when the tithi ended at 55 after mean sunrise.

As stated above, the inscription is fragmentary. Its contents, as can be known from the extant portion thereof, may now be reviewed briefly. The first stanza, of which only the third quarter is preserved, introduces a king of the name of Bhuvanapāla, and the second, which too is fragmentary, mentions his son whose name is unfortunately lost.1 Stanza 3 is rather better preserved; it gives the name of Padmapāla and states that he was a grandson of Bhuvanapāla and a son of Dēvapāla, thus supplying the name which has been lost in the second stanza.2 This

---

1 The beginning too may have contained a sentence in prose paying obedience to Siva: this portion too is now lost.
2 Verse 2 has the reading "aparajita" at the end of each of the hemistiches; and, as observed by D. R. Bhandarkar, it is possible to take Aparajita as an elder brother of Dēvapāla, or, as the Vamanika shows a bhrīda of Dēvapāla himself, whose name occurs in stanza 3. See his List of Inscriptions, No. 109, s. Bhuvanapāla is the same as Mālādeva of the preceding record, as said in its verse 12.
The very name Padmapala may have given our poet an idea to utilise this verse in his composition.

4 See text, below, fn. 9. Hultsch suggested that stanzas 7-9 of this record seems to refer to the death of Mahipala, and must have recorded the name of his successor, which, however, is not certain. See Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 282. Following this view, it is possible to hold that some time before this record was put up, the throne was occupied by Mahipala's successor and the temple was built in his reign. But this view is not certain.

5 It is very probable that the very name of the house is lost in 1.1. See text, below, fn. 9.

6 As noted by Hultsch in Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 202, n. 8, this temple may be the smaller Śiva-Bahū temple at Gwalior.

7 In verse 16 the reading is Jami-rājagati-; and the name may be taken either to be Asagat or Rājasatī.

8 According to Hultsch, the probable site of this temple is the same as in Cunningham's A.S.J.R., II, p. 364 and Plate lxxxviii.

9 He is the same person who is called in the preceding inscription as Yaśodēva Digambarakāra who wrote it (on stone). In the present record he is called 'a poet in six languages', which are, as Hultsch observes, Sanskrit, Prākrit, Saurāsaṭī, Māgadhī, Paśchāth and Dēśāja (see Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 202, n. 10). In the preceding inscription he is called 'a poet in all languages' (āśtha-bhāṣādau haviti).
Gwalior Stone Inscription of the Time of Mahipala, Vikrama 1161

Left half

Right half

Scale: Two-fifth
1. [From inked stumpsages.]
2. Parts of, 'कालस्य', as of some other 'aksaras' in this line, are visible in the impression, but the sense cannot be made out.
3. Here the missing letters may have been नो(विशिष्ट)क्रमशःकालस्य.
4. Here and below, the dots represent the numbers of the 'aksaras' which are lost.
5. It may here be noted that whereas the stanzas in the 'Kulanubhava' (L. 45) describes the face of Pārvatī, it is utilised here to glorify a male face.
6. Though correct according to the 'samsārīśekha', the metre requires this word to be read as in the brackets.
7. Read — दीर्घ।
8. This word is redundant.
9. This verse compares the king to the Sun, by the double meanings of दीर्घ—(i) a foot and (ii) a ray; दीर्घष्ठु—(i) a king and (ii) a mountain; दीर्घष्ठु—(i) a foot and (ii) the Sun.
10. Here is an eight-spoked wheel between double 'danday'. Somewhat similar signs of inter-punctuation also occur in the Dhukṣkṣu inscription and, as noted by Hultsch, at the end of the Kōṭā Buddhist inscription of the Śāntika Dēṣadatta (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV, p. 46) and in a Guwārī inscription of Bhūjādeva (Journ. of the German. Ori. Soc., Vol. XL, p. 53).
11. This word goes with the word that follows, and hence in plural.
12. This is, even. Dyhsapati is laghu, i.e., unable.
No. 157: PLATE CXXXIV

NARWAR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF VIRASIMHADÉVA
[Vikrama] Year 1177

This inscription was transcribed and translated by Fritz Edward Hall, without a facsimile, in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. VI (1858-60), pp. 542 ff., where he also states that "a negative facsimile" of it "has been lithographed in the *Journal of the Archaeological Society of Delhi*, for January, 1853." Nothing is now known about the journal mentioned by Hall; and in his writing he did not state anything as to how, when and where the plate was actually found. The present whereabouts thereof are also unknown, and as even an impression too of it is not now forthcoming, I have copied here Hall's transcript and added my notes to it.

1 Read तपशू. There may originally have been the तेपha on the following akshara.

2 A नक्स-पदा sign is engraved at the end of this line. This quarter also shows a wrong pause-fall.

3 Here, as often elsewhere, ए is engraved as ए.

4 The word प्रसाद means प्रसाद; and while editing this inscription, Hultsch failed to see this when he remarks that "the word प्रसाद has to be supplied with प्रस्न" (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XV, p. 202, n.).

5 There is no punctuation mark to close the inscription.
As stated above, the provenance of the plate is not known, but it must have been discovered somewhere in the region around Narwar in the Shivpuri District of Madhya Pradesh. The preservation of the plate seems to have been satisfactory, as Hall found it completely legible. Its size and that of the letters incised on it, and also its weight, have not been recorded. The exact number of the lines too is not known, for Hall does not appear to have transcribed the record line by line. Judging from the specimens of letters published by him, the characters belong to the Nagari alphabet. The language is Sanskrit, and except for seven imprecatory verses towards the end, the record is all in prose. With reference to orthography, what we can be sure about is that ja is employed in place of ya at the end of 1-8 in the text given below, and that in the formal portion some of the names appear in their Prakrit form and also without proper case-endings.

The inscription is one of the victorious, the illustrious Virasimhadēva who belonged to the Kachchhapaghāta house of Narwar, and its object is to record the donation of the village Babādō to certain Brāhmaṇas, by the king himself. The date of the grant is given in words only; it is amarkhīra of Kārtika in the year 1177 of an unspecified era, which, from the practice current in the age, has to be taken as that of the Vikrama era. The weekday was Sunday. Accordingly, the date regularly corresponds to 24th October, 1120 A.C., when there was a Sunday, as mentioned in the record and also a solar eclipse visible in India, which, though not mentioned in it, appears to have been intended.1

After a small sentence paying obeisance to Nārāyaṇa and the date as stated above, the inscription introduces Gaganasimhadēva of the Kachchhapaghāta house, who bore the titles of Mahārajaīdhirajā and Paramēśvara and ruled from the great fort of Nalapura. Gaganasimha's successor was Saradasimhadēva (probably his son though not explicitly mentioned), with the additional title Paramahāṭṭēruka; and his chief queen was Lasha(kha)mādhēvi, who gave birth to Virasimhadēva who bore the same title as his father whom he succeeded. Virasimhadēva is stated to have been a zealous devotee of Viṣṇu and also compassionate to the indigent, helpless and poor, possessing a collection of virtues, devoted to his parents. He resembled Yudhishtīrā in truth-speaking, possessing supernatural strength as Bhitāśena, foremost among the archers as Arjuna, resembling Kariṣṭa in earning fame by liberality, possessed of self-respect as Duryodhana, of matchless valour as a lion, and also one who had earned fame by controlling hostile elephants on the battle-field.

This account is followed by the formal portion of the record. Among the dignitaries to whom the royal order was addressed, there were the Brāhmaṇas, mahāntas (mahāattras?) and the (residents of the janapadas). The donation was made in order to increase the religious merit of the king's parents and of himself. The village named Babādō, as stated above, was split up into eighteen parts which were donated. The following table is intended to show the details of the donors and the share obtained by each of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of donor</th>
<th>gotra</th>
<th>surname</th>
<th>share obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gōvinda</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>avasathika</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Padmanābha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 brother of No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kēśava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rāma</td>
<td>Upamanyā</td>
<td>Chaturvēdin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kēśava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Nārasiṁha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lashamāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As calculated by Kiëthorn in Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 167, No. 84. The same scholar also pointed out that the year was expired and the month pūrṇimānta, when the new moon tīthi ended 4 h. 58 m. after mean sunrise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sathe</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dāmodara</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kēśava</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pañchāhinīhāla</td>
<td>Kṛishṇātreyā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Gōpati</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>Pañ (Pañḍita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mahasōna</td>
<td>Arri</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Śilē</td>
<td>Bhārgava</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Nāṇū</td>
<td>Kṛishṇātreyā</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mālyē</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Chāmara</td>
<td>Kapila</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Thaā (Tāā?)</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of shares = 18

It will be seen that in a few cases (Nos. 3, 5, 7, and 10), only the names of the donees are mentioned without any further details, and in three of the instances (Nos. 1, 4, and 12), the surnames are also mentioned along with the gōtrīs.

The record is of considerable historical interest as it reveals the existence of an altogether new Kachchhapatapāta state reigning at Narwar which was its capital, as a paramount sovereign. Of the geographical names figuring in the inscription, Nalapura, the capital of the house, is evidently identical with Narwar in the Shippur District of Madiya, Pradesh. Bahādū, the donated village, cannot be identified for want of the required data. It is not known if it is represented by the modern village Barod, the name of which sounds somewhat similar to it and which is situated about 28 kms. south of Narwar.

TEXT

[Akkosha: Verses 1-7 Anuśīṭabh]

1 From Hall's transcript in J.A.O.S., Vol. VI (1558-60), pp. 542/1. The lines here are as given by Hall, who does not appear to have followed the lines of the original.

2 It is not known whether this sign of singhara, as some others below, is actually engraved in the original or inserted by Hall in the transcript. The same remark may be made here about the use of the avanata and parasastra, about doubling the consonant after r and about the correct use of shillams, etc. While calculating the corresponding Christian date in the Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, Kielhorn also remarked that Hall has changed the original anusāṣṭhāna to anuśāṣṭhāna unnecessarily (p. 167, n). It is true that we get the loc. sing. form anuśāṣṭhāna from the word anuśāṣṭhāna, but in the absence of an impression we cannot be definite about the original reading.

3 The use of the word śītri before māri may be justified by Pāṇini yūta Alpācchidraum (II, ii, 34).

4 As Hall remarked, the letters भिप्प are repeated in the original and are left uncased.

5 In the original, शि appears instead of शि as stated by Hall.
The correct form of this name is सरससिंहा. Also read बादामकुंडः.
2 The Sanskrit form of this name is Laks̄amī.
3 Insert a दाँड़ा after this word.
4 In fact, the name of the village occurs below in the text.
5 Mahāmīśī appears to be wrongly read for mahaśī in the original.
6 This word is not known to the dictionaries. Hall translates it by ‘class’.
7 Read जित or better. –कित. Some of the names occurring in the list are not Sanskrit and some without the proper case-endings, as already noted by Hall.
8 The sign of zero is redundant, and what follows has to be read as ‘a half’, and not दूसरा.
9 The reading of the preceding akṣara appears to be doubtful.
10 The correct word to be used here is kilamālayam.
AN INSCRIPTION OF THE DYNASTY OF VIJAYAPĀLA

No. 158; Plate CXXXV

ĬNGNŌDĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF VIJAYAPĀLADEVĀ

[Vikrama] Year 1190

This inscription was brought to notice by Nilakantha Janardana Kirtane who transcribed and translated it in his article "On three Inscriptions from Mālāvā", all published with facsimiles thereof in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. VI, pp. 46 ff. In his introduction to the article, Kirtane observed that the present record is engraved "on a slablet into the wall of a newly built temple at Īṅgūnāḍā a large village included in the territories of the junior branch of the Dēwās State in Central India." Some time subsequently, the slab was removed to Dēwās, the chief town of the (former) State, and was deposited there in the local Victoria High School. The historical importance of the record is often discussed, but it remained to be systematically edited. In my recent visit to Dēwās, in order to study the document from the original stone, I found that the slab is now missing; nor could I succeed in tracing it at Rīṅgūṇāḍā where it was originally found. Under the circumstances, the record is edited here from a photograph which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist.

In his article Kirtane has stated that the stone on which the record is engraved measured about 20" by 14", which are respectively equivalent to 50.80 cms. and 35.56 cms. The inscription consists of fifteen lines of writing which is carefully engraved and is well preserved. The last line is a little smaller in length than the others.

The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet of the twelfth century. The initial ī which occurs thrice in ll. 1, 5 and 7, shows in the latter two examples its old form consisting of two circles horizontally placed and subscribed by the medial short ī, but an advanced form in the first. T and n are occasionally alike as in āṭṭārī, l. 10 and āṭṭārī ~ādārī, l. 11; th is formed of two hollow circles placed vertically: see -pathakē, l. 7; the fore-limb of dh has a horn above for which see vasudhā, l. 11, where the verticals of dhā are joined by a horizontal stroke. The consonant k as the first member of a conjunct loses its loop, as in pūṭkā and dāṅkāra, both in l. 7; and lastly, the form of bh in bhavṭaṅ - l. 2 is different from that as appearing in the other instances.

The language of the record is Sanskrit; and except for the five imprecatory verses in ll. 10-14, it is all in prose. The orthographical peculiarities that call for notice are (1) the use of the sign for v to denote b, as well, e.g., in vṛahma, l. 5; (2) writing the dental for the palatal sibilant about half-a-dozen times, as in siviya, l. 1 and Asīthāra, l. 14; (3) the reduplication of a class-consonant, e.g., in samāhyarēchchya, l. 4; (4) the general use of an antuvāra for a class-nasal even at the end of a hemistich and even before a vowel, though wrongly; cf. phalām and vasuṁdhūrām, both in l. 12, and somētam udatū in l. 8. In addition to these, the medial diphthongs are indicated both by the pūśthā and the ardha-mātiśā; the dental and the labial nasal are wrongly changed to an antuvāra, e.g., in mahāṁ, l. 5 and samētam, l. 8 respectively; wrong spellings and grammatical errors are also to be seen, e.g., in pariśāra and svāṁīh, both in l. 5, yasahārā, in l. 11 and bhāmī and vudādārā, both in l. 12. The local element is to be noticed in the name Lātāmāna, and in those in l. 6 and in the end, which are all indicated without the vibhakti. And lastly, the kākā-pulā sign is used at the end of ll. 2, 5, 8 and 15, and a danda in ll. 6 and 12, to show that the word is completed in the next line.

1 Op. cit., p. 49. The village is known also as Rīṅgūṇāḍā, Īṅgūnāḍā, Īṅgūnāḍa, etc.
2 Central India Gazetteers, Western States (1907), Vol. V, Pt. A, pp. 74 and 78. The School is now known as the Nārāyaṇa Vidya Māndira.
3 For example, in D. R. Bhandarkar's List of Ins., No. 229; and D. C. Ganguly, H.P.D., p. 165.
The inscription refers itself to the king Vijayaپaladeva, who is styled Mahārāja�īrāja, with two of his predecessors mentioned therein; but it is silent about his dynastic name, which we shall consider below. The object of the inscription is to record the grant, by the said Vijayaپaladeva, of the village of Agasiyaka, for defraying the expenses of the worship of Gōsha�evāra, which is evidently a local name of Śiva, in the Iyogapanḍara dakṣiṇapāthaka. The donation was made, as recorded in figures in l. 1 and repeated in words in l. 7, on the eleventh of the bright half of Āśādhāra of the (Vikrama) year 1190, which, for the Northern Vikrama-current, would correspond to Sunday, the 26th June, 1132, A.C., and for the expired, to Thursday, the 15th June, 1133 A.C.1 The date cannot be verified.

As stated above, the donor of the grant is the Mahārāja�īrāja, Paramēṣvara, the illustrious Vijayaپaladeva. He is said to be the successor of the Paramabhatēra, Mahārāja�īrāja, Paramēṣvara, the illustrious Tilunapādeva, who again was the successor of the M.P., the illustrious Prithvipādeva alas Bhartripada (II. 23).2 The record does not specify the name of the family to which these princes belonged, but all the three names are to be found in the same order in another inscription dated in Sanvats 1212 (1155 A.C.), which was discovered by G. H. Ojha in the former Dūngarpur State (now a district of the same name) in Central Rājasthān.3 The only difference shown by both these inscriptions is that whereas the latter one gives the name Prithvivamanapāla in its Sanskrit form, the former gives the name in its Prakrit form as Tilunapāla. Dungarpur is about hundred miles or 160 kms. due west of the find-spot of the present inscription, and the two inscriptions taken together indicate that the kings mentioned in the present inscription ruled independently, as shown by their titles, over the central parts of Mālwa and Rājasthān in the middle of the twelfth century A.C., or, to be more precise, in the second quarter of that century.

The grant of a village in the locality which formed a part of the Paramāra kingdom at that time by a king who styles himself as a Mahārāja�īrāja clearly indicates that he may have wrested a part of the Paramāra kingdom in the last days of Naravarman whose last year is known to be 1133 A.C.,4 which is, curiously enough, also the year of the present grant. We know that Naravarman had to sustain a reverse in his last days at the hands of the Chandellā Sallaksha�arman in the east and the Chaulukya Jayasimha Siddhārāja on the west of his territories; and an unpublished inscription from Ujjain also shows that Mālwa was annexed to the Chaulukya kingdom in V.S. 1193 or 1136 A.C.5 From all these evidences, we may conclude that Vijayaپaladeva, who may presumedly be taken to have entered the service of the royal Paramāra house as governor in the region around Iyogānā, declared himself independent when the Paramāra kingdom was on its wane during the last years of Naravarman. It is significant to note here that after the Kadambapadraka grant of Naravarman which was issued in V.S. 1167, or 1110 A.C.,6 we have no epigraphical record of the king till his death; and it is also worth noting that the princes of Vāgḍa, which was then governed by one of the junior branches of the Paramāras, also suffered with them, giving an opportunity to Vijayaپaladeva to include that part too in his kingdom, as shown by the record found in the Dūngarpur region.

But the Thākurdā inscription too is equally silent as to the name of the house to which these kings belonged; and G. H. Ojha, in his notice thereof in the Report of the Rājputānā Museum, suggests that possibly they may have been the descendants of the Pratihāra kings of Kanauj.7 But we have no evidence in support of this conjecture, and I am inclined to agree with D. R. Bhandarkar who took them to belong to the Kachchhapaghāṭa house of Gwalior, taking the name Prithvipāla of both these inscriptions as synonyms with Mahāpāla mentioned

---

1 For the southern V. expired, it would correspond to Tuesday, 3rd July, 1134 A.C.
2 See text, n. 8. It appears to be synonymous with the title Paramabhatēra of the inscriptions. It may also be noted that this epithet is again missing before the name of Tilunapāla.
4 His anniversary was performed by his son Vāhārvarman in V. 1192=1134 A.D. See No. 39, above.
5 See No. 145, v. 4, above. Also see H. P. D., pp. 162-63.
6 P. C. M., pp. 85 ff.; H. P. D., pp. 162-63. For the inscription from Ujjain stating that Mālwa was annexed to the Chaulukya kingdom in V.S. 1193 or 1136 A.C., see A. S. I., R., W. C., 1912-13, pp. 54-55.
7 It is still not edited.
8 See No. 34, above.
9 See n. 6 above.
in two of the records edited above. In this connection the similarity of the names is again noteworthy. For the name of Mahāpāla's grandfather, which is mentioned in both the Gwalior inscriptions as Bhuvanapāla, occurs with a slight change as Tihunapāla and Tribhuvanapāla, respectively, in the present and the Thākārā inscriptions; and this person is also said to have been the son of Prithvijīpāla, showing similar names in that house. And if this view is accepted, the present record carries the genealogy of the royal Kachhchipaghāta house to two reigns further; and the Thākārā record which mentions Śrūpālā as a son of Vijayapālā whose son Anayapālā is mentioned as making a donation of a village, may be taken to carry the genealogy still further by one generation.

The view that Vijayapālā, the donor of the present grant, was a son of the royal Kachhchipaghāta house also gets support from chronological considerations. Both the Gwalior inscriptions referred to above show that the Kachchhipaghāta Mahāpāla was on the throne in V.S. 1150 (1098 A.C.) and V.S. 1161 (1104 A.C.); and calculating for him a period of c. 1090 to 1110 A.C., we may take his son Tihunapālā to reign from c. 1110 to 1130 A.C., and the latter's son Vijayapālā from c. 1130 to 1150 A.C., giving each of them an approximate period of twenty years. The year of the present grant thus falls during his reign. His son Śrūpālā, accordingly, may be taken to have been on the throne from c. 1150 onwards; and thus the year 1155 A.C., when Śrūpālā's son Anayapālā, who was then a prince who issued the Thākārā grant, can well be justified.

Lines 46-60 of the inscription state that Vijayapālādeva made the grant of the village, in order to increase the religious merit and fame of his parents as well as of himself, in the presence of his councilor (or councillors), the family-priest, the astrologer, all his dependents and the Brahmāna Indasvāmin, Śūmadēva, and Koka Gadelaka who were all residents of the Brahmapurī at that place, and also in the presence of the Śresthītīn Lāha, Sādhī and Lāshīna (Lāshīnam). Lines 10-14 reproduce four of the customary imprecatory verses; and the inscription closes with the statement that it was written by Kelhanā, the son of Āśāchara and grandson of Rājapāla, a Kāyastha from Valabhī, and engraved by Śājana who was the son of Haraseṇa and grandson of the artisan Mahāvala (Mahāvala ?) who belonged to Kukāsakya (? family.

As for the localities mentioned in the inscription, Inganapādra, which is mentioned here as daksīna-pāthaka in l. 7, has already been identified with the modern village Ignūdā or Ignūdā, also called Rīṅgōdā. The temple of Gōhadēsvara in favour of which the grant was made (l. 7) may have existed on the Sīprā about ten Kms. east of Rīṅgōdā, as suggested by Kīrtane. In my personal visit to that place about ten years back, I noticed extensive remains of a Śaiva temple on this site which is on the confluence of the river Pītāla with the Mālīnī; and the temple-still, goes by the name Godēsvara. About 2-3 Kms. east of this spot is a modern village of the name of Bānapūrī, suggesting its identification with the Brahmapuriśā of the inscription (l. 5). Agastya, the donated village cannot be definitely identified. In his edition of the inscription Kīrtane has stated that it may have been no longer in existence, and I could not succeed in finding any village in the locality. A conjecture, however, may be hazarded in this respect, viz., that it may be a compound name formed of two villages Āgā and Śīyaka. The first of these is probably to be identified with the modern village Agyā or Akā, lying on the Ratām-Mandsaur metalled road, about 35 kms. north of Ratām and 10 kms. south of Rīṅgōdā, the find-spot of the inscription. If this is to be taken as the first element, the second one of the name appears to be Śīyaka, which too is situated in the same region, about 25 kms. south of Rīṅgōdā and almost equidistant to the south of Akyā. This conjecture gains ground in view of the consideration that we have a number of villages named after kings, and to cite an example from the same locality, we may point out the village called Muṇja, probably named after Muṇja and situated about 3 kms. north-west of Ālōt, a station not very far from Ratām on the Ratām-Kotā branch of the Western Railway.

---

1 Nos. 130 and 136, above.
2 This passage which contains some names presents difficulty of interpretation, for which see n. on the corresponding portion of the text. Besides, it is not known whether Indasvāmin is really one name or two, and so the following expression. Kīrtane also takes Mahākōkala as one name but the word mahā may also have been put as an adjective showing reverence.
1. सिद्धम्॥ वे नामः सिद्धम्॥ संस्कारानवकासमु नवकासनिकु अधिमकास्युः सल्केकास्यं संकृतं १२०। आवाथवृद्धि १२ सवर्हूः इम्। युण्डूः। समस्तप्राप्तचक्रितमिति तृतीय विवाहसमस्तप्राप्तचक्रितमिति व्यवस्थानसमस्तप्राप्तचक्रितमिति व्यवस्थानसमस्तप्राप्तचक्रितमिति।
2. हराजापिराजपुरस्मिन्वर्गोन्नतीपावस्तुपावस्तुवाक्यम् अक्षादेकस्मारामिभविष्येत्। समस्तवृत्तिकस्मारामिभविष्येत्।
3. तपस्या समस्तवृत्तिकस्मारामिभविष्येत्। निर्धारितमिति समस्तवृत्तिकस्मारामिभविष्येत्।
4. कोजस्। तथा राजाः तथा श्रीः। लाला तथा श्रीः। लाला तथा श्रीः। लाला तथा श्रीः।
5. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
6. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
7. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
8. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
9. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
10. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
11. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
12. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
13. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
14. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
15. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
16. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।
17. श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः। श्रीः।

1. From a photograph.
2. Denoted by a symbol.
3. Kirtane omitted these three akṣaras in his transcript.
4. Kirtane read – न्द्रते, here, and also in 1. 7, but the reading as taken above is quite certain. This name occurs also in No. 30, 1. 6, above.
5. The curve stroke at the bottom shows this letter to be a dda, probably intended for da, as also read by Kirtane. It is in the sense of rank or dignity. In his List of Inscriptions, No. 229, D. R. Bhandarkar took the whole word bhātṛi-patja to denote a title. He evidently followed G. H. Ojha who read the same in an inscription noticed by him in A. R. Rājānandnā Mahāsāstrī, 1915-16, p. 3.
6. An arrow-mark appears here to indicate that the word is continued in the next line.
7. Kirtane read the five letters in this line as विलंभितवः and took the expression to mean an ‘officer who keeps time’. The consonant of the first of these letters can also be taken as th, but that of the third is definitely as taken here, for which, cf. Gadhēkā in the same line and Dīgha in 1. 1, above, and 7, below. The akṣara n in the fourth one appears as it omitted at first and inserted later on, by a small scratch. Thus here we have the name of the royal preceptor whose presence is shown while making a grant, which is not the case with the time-keeper.
8. Kirtane read the first akṣara of the name as य, but in the transcription as ग. The following daṇḍa is superfluous.
9. This is a contraction of śrēkṣitha. The names appearing in 11. 56 are all without any case-ending and often the adhi-rules also are not observed.
10. Read सचित्तामः.
11. On sāha there is a redundant anusvāra or a fault of the stone.
12. Perhaps originally mā, with the sign of mādī erased later on. The dāḍī appears to have been wrongly engraved for dāṭi, which means a gift. See C. I. I., Vol. IV., p. 617, n. 5.
13. Read – वस्. Kirtane took the following dāṇḍa as a medial s, which is evidently wrong.
14. Read – वस्. The following two akṣaras are redundant.
15. Read न्द्रते.
16. The akṣara stands for व. Or better read न्द्रते.
12 स्य यस्य यदा सुनीति तस्मात् तस्मात् फल्स (तस्) ॥[१३] ॥

13 तैल[१३] ताता महाकविस्मितां बुध(सं)द्वारिकां ॥ अपस्तातस्मातिं विशेषानीम् ॥ प्राणायामोऽवलोकिते

14 सत्य परमात्मा परलोकाति(च) ॥[१४] ॥ वात्स्यायानीकामविराजकालयं ॥ सुमुका तैल(श) अतिक्रियातिं वरुणेऽत्थाय

15 कुफास[स्त्रा] ॥[१५] ॥ स्यामुःवामहम्याव(च)स्य सुमुका(ना) हरसेण सुशराज्ञेन ॥ लेखितः ॥

---

1. Read मात्रा. The मात्रा on the first of these letters was first formed as of medial long, and later on corrected.
2. Drop the दोंपा and read the whole as अर्जिन.
3. Read रामा.
4. Here too is an arrow mark.
5. Read वाद्यान्— in the sense of a family coming from Valabhi. The मात्रा of छै that follows is separated from the letter.
6. Read सिद्धा; but it does not suit the metre.
7. I am not certain about the reading of the akshara in the brackets and it is taken here as read by Kirtane, which appears to be possible.
8. The word सुन्ना used here probably denotes a grandson, as it also means in Sanskrit, because the word सुता is also used along with it.
9. Read सिद्धा, or rather अत्यान्त, to avoid repetition. The signs of both, the aruṣṭāra and the विशार्ग, are inadvertently put together. The whole line reads like a verse, though metrically defective,
INSCHRIFTEN DER YAJVAPĀLAS VON NARWAR

NO. 159 : PLATE CXXXVII

BHĪMPUR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF ĀŚALIADĪVA

[Vikrama] Year 1319

The stone which bears this inscription was found in a ruined Jaina temple in the village Bhīmpur which lies about 5 kms. almost due south of Narwar in the Karērā pargānā of the Sīptī (Shivpurī) District of Madhya Prades. It was discovered in the early years of the present century by M. B. Garde, the Superintendent of Archaeology in the former State of Gwalior, and was noticed by him in the Annual Report of the department for V.S. 1911 (1914 A.C.), and again referred to in his note on "the Yajvapālas or Jayapellas of Narwar" in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVII (1918), pp. 241-244, pointing out for the first time that the name of the house was really Jayapella which was Sanskritised as Yajvapāla and was also associated with a mythical progenitor named Jayapāla. The inscription was also included by D. R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, as No. 562. It is edited here for the first time from my transcript, prepared from the original stone which is now preserved in the Archaeological Museum at Gwalior.

The inscription is engraved on a rectangular sunk panel surrounded by a plain border of a massive stone, which measures 109.5 cms. broad and 94 cms. high. It consists of 40 lines, each of which is 87.5 cms. long, except the last one which is about three-fourth of the others in length. The size of the letters, which varies from 1.5 to 1.8 cms. in the first fourteen lines, gradually decreases till it is about 1 cm. in the last 10 or 11 lines. The writing is well preserved, except that a letter here and another there have wholly or partially disappeared due to the effects of weather. The letters are not systematically formed; and both in writing and engraving, there are mistakes of subsequent corrections, erasing or scratching off their parts, as noted in the transcript that follows. What is particularly to be noted in this respect is that three letters in l. 30 and an equal number of them in l. 34 are left unengraved, keeping a blank space of 3.5 cms. in the former and 4.5 cms. in the latter, so as to accommodate them.

The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet. The slightly varying forms of some of them show that they were then in a transitional stage, e.g., the two varying forms of the vowel i, one in iit, ll. 4 and 22, and the other in ājādi in l. 19: those of the conjunct nh, the subscript of which is marked by a slanting stroke across the letter, as in oṣvānā, l. 25, whereas in the same word in l. 4, it appears as i; those of bh appearing side by side in bhābhāti in l. 8: and those of l, the varying forms of which are to be seen in the word śrīngāra, appearing twice in l. 17. R which is written mostly in its modern Nagari form as in pūrṣa, l. 12, is wedged in rupālā in the same line, and it is occasionally also denoted by a vertical marked by a horizontal stroke on the left of its middle, e.g., in guru, l. 25. The subscript form of this letter is often drawn complete with its superscript marked half, cf. atum, l. 25. The vowel ṣ has a form similar to that of pū, a triangle with the base above and a tail below, e.g., in ṣiva, l. 9, and p often resembles y: see paramas, l. 5; the conjunct gg figures as gu; cf. suvaḍga, l. 7; ḍh, which has developed a horn on its left limb, is devoid of the top-stroke, and the verticals of dha are joined in the middle by a horizontal bar, e.g., in dhātra, l. 17. And lastly, the superscript forms of t and n are occasionally denoted by a horizontal stroke; e.g., in ḍhrīti in ll. 4 and 5, and in ṭru in l. 26 but not in ḍhrīti in l. 26 and in ḍhanta, in l. 4.

The language is Sanskrit, with a few grammatical errors appearing here and there, which are all pointed out and corrected in the text given below. And except for the word svasti in the beginning, itāk-ṛta in l. 4, attho ṛta in l. 10 and the portion giving the date in the end, the
entire record is in verse, consisting of 70 verses composed in the Kāvya style, all of which are numbered.

With reference to orthography, we note that (1)  is everywhere denoted by the sign for v, as in subhāva, l. 25; (2) a class-consonant as a subscript of r is generally doubled, e.g., in sarvam, l. 5, and r as a superscript of r is occasionally doubled, as in chhattrā, l. 5 but not in tattra, l. 6; (3) in a very few instances the dental sibilant is employed for the palatal, e.g., in prastātī, l. 39, and vṛc ṣ is the case in vṛtā (for vṛtā) in l. 38; (4) prthva-mātrā is used with a few exceptions as pratishṭhā, l. 21; and in a few instances the vertical of it cannot be distinguished from a danda and the ś-mātrā of the preceding letter; (5) omitting a few instances, e.g., in vy. 13 and 26, the final m is wrongly changed to mūra; and finally, (6) uṣā in l. 12 is spelt as usā. angū in l. 14 as anhū, arṇuva in l. 40, with dental r, parjanya as parjanya in l. 33; and kh is substituted by sh in instances like uṣṭhū, l. 23, śhā, l. 27 and śadvī, l. 32. The word tānuṣṭhā, which generally denotes a 'hair' is used in the sense of 'a son' in l. 26. Errors in composition are pointed out in the transcript below.

The inscription belongs to the reign of Asalarāja or Asaliadeva of the Yavapāla dynasty of Narwar (Nalapura), and its object is to record the construction of a temple by the royal officer Jairisāhā (vy. 36) and its consecration by Nāgadeva, in the year which is mentioned in 404 AD in word numerals as mithi (9), indī (1), agni (3) and again indī (1), i.e., 1319, which is evidently to be taken as of the Vikrama era. The year is repeated in figures in the end, where the unit figure is partly engraved and the decimal figure is altogether omitted, leaving its place vacant. The month is mentioned as senapati and such other details are not mentioned; and taking the year as Chaitrādi current, it is equivalent to 1261 A.C., and as expired, to 1262 A.C.

The inscription is a sectarian record, and a prānāti, as the word is used in 67 and also in each of the following two verses. It may be split up into three sections. The first of these sections, which comprises vv. 1-14, begins with paying homage to Adideva (Kishabhadeva), Pārvanāthā, Mahāvīra, Śrādā and the (Jaina) saints, devoting one verse to each of them. It then mentions the ruling family of the Yavapālas, 'which was glorious in bringing the earth (i.e., the particular region) under one sovereignty', and the first person introduced here is Y(Paramādi)rāja, who is stated to have excelled Skanda, the destroyer of the demon Tāraka (vy. 7). Nothing can be gleaned from this poetic description. He was succeeded by Chāhāda, who is stated to have been 'a conflagration to scorch the forest of hostile kings'; and though none of his adversaries is specified here, one of them appears to have been, as we are informed by Mīnājuddin, Malik Nusratuddin Tayyār, a general of Sultan Iltumish, defeated by him on the bank of the Kālt Sindh in 1234 A.C.1 He is no doubt the Chāhār-i-Ajar of Mīnājuddin who calls him the 'greatest of races' in tract comprising Gwārī, Chandī, Nurwur and Malwah and as having 5,000 horsemen and 200,000 footmen under his command and also the same as Jāhīr Deo of Firshāt.2 We have no inscription of Chāhāda himself or of his time, but on the basis of coins issued by him,3 we know him to have been on the throne at least from V.S. 1294 (7) to 1311 (1287-1294 A.C.). The first of these dates, as tightly observed by Dr. D. C. Sircar, may be taken at least three years earlier when this king is stated to have gained victory over the Muslim general, as just seen. He was a contemporary of Sultan Nāsiruddin (1246-66 A.C.) of Delhi.

The record mentions nothing particular about Paramādi-rāja; and this is the only record where his name figures. He may have been an ancestor of Chāhāda, and perhaps his father, as can be known from the way in which he is introduced here as any other ruler.4 We have no evidence to show that this person actually occupied the throne; and it is evident that in the confusion that followed the death of Iltumish in 1233 A.C. Chāhāda, who was then watching

1 Tabāqāt-i-Hashrī, Rawnty’s Translation, Vol. II. p. 175.
2 Ibid., pp. 690-91; and Tāḥkāt-i-Firsh Shīt, Briggs’ Translation, Vol. I, p. 280 respectively.
4 Verse 8 introduces Chāhāda by the expression tānuṣṭhā (after him), and similar expressions occur in vv. 9 and 11 while introducing Nīvarman and Asalla, who were respectively his son and grandson, as we know from the other records of the house.
an opportunity, captured the hill-fort of Narwar, as stated in the inscription of the time of Gopāladeva of V.S. 1349, and establishing himself there, began to raid the surrounding region and also to extend his kingdom. Thus he was the first ruler of the Yajavālaka house of Narwar.

Verses 9-10 of the inscription state that Chāhāda was succeeded by Nyīrvarman, who 'knew the vulnerable points of his adversaries,' and he by Āsallārāja 'who closed the lotuses which were the faces of his enemies.' Here the relationship that either of those princes bore to his predecessor is not stated, but we know from the other records pertaining to the house that they were Chāhāda's son and grandson, respectively. The description of both these titles is too vague. It is, however, worth noting here that the last year when Chāhāda issued his coins is recorded to be V.S. 1311 or 1254 A.C., as seen above, which is also the first known year of the coins of Āsallādēva⁴ and presuming this record to be correct, we have to conclude that Chāhāda was succeeded by his grandson Āsallā and also that Nyīrvarman predeceased him. It is possible, however, that Nyīrvarman may have been a governor of some part of the kingdom under his father when he also participated in his warfare, as we learn from the following inscription, which states that he vanquished the haughty ruler of Mālava and exacted a tribute from him.¹

Verses 12-13 describe Āsallā as a 'great warrior and a daring prince vanquishing his enemies; but this description is all poetic, supplying no historical information. The verse that follows mentions his capital Nalapura (i.e., Narwar), situated in a vishaya (territorial division) known as Pāddomalkha, i.e., comprising 75,000 (villages).

The second part of the prāsasti, which comprises vv. 15-64, contains the description of a family known as Jāyavāla (perhaps Jāyasvill of the modern days), in which Jaitrasinīha, who built the temple, was born. The first of his ancestors mentioned here is Sādhadēva, whose son was Kumāra, who, again, had a son named Nīgana, who married Rājjaladēvi and from her had a son named Jaitrasinīha. This person is described here as 'an ornament of the royal assembly,' obviously that of Āsallādēva (vv. 16-20). He was a zealous devotee of Jainism. His wife was Sī, who was a daughter of one Kēśava (about whom nothing is known) and who bore him seven sons of the names of Udayasinīha, Sṛngārasinīha, Rājjasinīha, Vītrasinīha, Lakṣminarasimha, Ramsinīha and lastly, Nayanasinīha, successive in age (vv. 22-29). Incidentally some other members of the house are also mentioned here. Thus, the record states that Udayasinīha, the eldest of the brothers, married Aṇājī, who bore him four sons, viz., Karṇasimha, Dēvasinīha, Padmasimha and Dharmasinhā; and the wives of the three of his successive younger brothers were Laduādā, Padmā and Vījayadēvi, respectively. Vījayadēvi's son was Kāhēmasinīha (vv. 24-33).

Verses 34-36 inform us that following the example of his ancestors, viz., Vilha, Agānē (?) and Kāhēmasinīha, the last of whom was honoured by the lord of Śīkamḥārī, whose name is not mentioned, and realising that some of them consecrated one Jāna lord every day, the blessed Jaitrasinīha, whose mind had been purified by the doctrine of Jainism, erected a temple for Jīna (name not mentioned) at Palāsvāhā. The next verse describes the temple in a poetic way, using varieties of the figure known as utprakrṣā.

In the following four verses (37-40) it is stated that Nāgadeva, the foremost among the Jaina society, performed the consecration ceremony. He was the son of the brother of Śrīdhara.² He had two brothers Chāhāda and Gaṅgadeva and two sons, Amrādēva and Sōmadeva by name. We are further informed that the consecration was supervised by Vasanādēva, who was 'the moon sprung from the ocean of nectar in the form of enlightenment' and by Amarākṛttīdēva, who was 'a thunderbolt for (to shatter) the mountains of false reasoning and was of chaste fame' (v. 41).

The next twenty-three verses (42-64) record the names of those who were on the managing committee (gōshihākas)³ for the construction and consecration of the temple. In all they were 21; and this portion being historically worthless, only their list is given below. It may, however, be observed here that some and not all are mentioned here with their family names and

¹ Below, No. 175.
² Below, No. 160.
³ Cunningham, C. M. L., p. 80.
⁴ Here the text is Śrīdhara-vishayabandhu-sūnumah, which literally means as taken here. It is not known if Śrīdhara-bandhu is vaguely used to denote his father's name (the son of the bandhu of Śrīdhara).
⁵ For this word, see n. in text, above, No. 154, v. 54.
some with surnames, whereas in the case of some of them the names of their dependents are also given.

1. Śrēṣṭhitin Mādhava of the Jēsāvāla (Jāyaswāl) family, whose son was Dēvasīmha and whose wife Vīrā had two sons, Salakshaṇasīmha and Kṛityasīmha, and a daughter of the name of Dīhṛā (vv. 42-44).

2. Śāduhu Jajeś son Śāduhu Vijayadeva, whose wife was Śrīngārādēvi and who had two sons, named Shi Śahadēva and Amrādēva (vv. 43-46).

3. Śrēṣṭhitin Jaśe of the Paravāda family (v. 47).

4. Sahadēva (v. 48).

5. Śāduhu Dhanīkā (v. 49).

6. Abhū (v. 50).

7. Chāhāda (v. 51).

8. Abhū (v. 54).

9-10. Maradu and Chāhā (v. 55).

11. V(B)hulī, the village headman (v. 56).

12. Nārīyaṇa (or Satyanārīyaṇa?) of the Mādhura family (v. 57).


14-18. Jaupāpāla and Gunapāla, who worshipped the Jina, Śāduhu Mādhava, Nāsala and Tājū (v. 59).

19-20. Sīhula and Vihula, the sons of Śāduhu Mālū (vv. 60-62).

21. Mardura of the Parapāpa family (v. 63).

The last section, which commences with v. 65, expresses the hope that as long as the splendour of the sky is adorned by the moon, the Sun and the stars resembling a string of pearls, even so long may the temple last.

The next two verses furnish the details about the poet who composed the prālasī. He was the illustrious Dēvachandra, a disciple of Vṛtendrā, or Vīrāchandra, who was known as the moving goddess of Learning and who again was a disciple of Dēvagupta of the Śvētāmbara clan who is stated to have delighted the king or kings (whose name or names is/are not mentioned). Lastly, we are informed that the prālasī was written by Vēdē, the son of Śaradā, a Kāvastha of the Vāstavāya clan, and was engraved by Amadēva, the son of the artizan Pāpakha of the Kāśyapa gōtra.

In the last line we read the names of Udāi, the son of Lakṣhmi, who belonged to the Mādhura clan (of the Kāvastha); but the connection in which this name appears here is not stated in the inscription.

Of the localities mentioned in the present inscription, Nalapura (I. 10), the capital of the royal house of the Yajiyapālas, is evidently the modern town of Narwar in the Shivpūr District of Madhya Pradesh: and the viśaya of Pārānālakṣa, in which it is stated to have been situated (I. 9), is obviously the surrounding region. Palāsāvāha, where the temple was erected (I. 22), cannot be identified; but from the provenance of the inscription, it is possible to suggest that this may have been the ancient name of Bhimpur itself, the details of which have already been mentioned above.

TEXT

[Notes: Verses: 1-4, 10, 14, 25, 41, 49 and 70 Pasamālakā; v. 8 Indraśaṅkha; vv. 6 and 50 Sūgata; vv. 7, 17, 19, 22-23, 27-28, 30, 38-39, 42, 54 and 63 Upāsā; vv. 8, 18 and 65 Dvaitāvahā; vv. 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29-34, 40, 43-48, 51, 54-62, 64 and 68-69 Anuṣṭubh; vv. 12, 26 and 66-67 Śvetāmbrakṛṣṭa; v. 15 Mālī; vv. 21 and 57 Māṇiśvarā; v. 35 Indraśaṅkha; v. 52 Sūgata].

[[विष्णु]] || [[स्वर्ण]] || [[भामक्कयस्विन]] || [[सिन्दुर]] || [[जल]] || [[सिन्दुर]] || [[बिंब]] || [[खाल]] || [[मिया]] || [[उद्घाट्या||]] || [[उद्घाट्या]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]] || [[सारदा||]}
The document contains Sanskrit text with 数字 inserted throughout. The text appears to be a historical inscription, possibly related to the Bhimpur stone inscription of the Time of Asalladēva. The text includes references and inscriptions in Sanskrit, which are typical of historical records or epigraphs.

**Translation Note:**
1. The text is in Sanskrit, a classical Indian language, and likely contains historical or religious inscriptions.
2. The numerical placeholders (such as "11" and "12") indicate specific sections or parts of the inscription.
3. The text includes references to historical figures and events, possibly from the time of Asalladēva.
4. This inscription is a valuable source for understanding historical events and the cultural context of the period.

**Historical Note:**
As alladēva, a historical figure, is mentioned, suggesting the inscription is from his time or related to an event associated with him. The text may provide insights into the political or social conditions of that era.
The first letter in this line was originally engraved as given here but subsequently it was changed to hma.

This family is the same as Paurapata appearing in line 23 above.

Read kalāvatākaṃ.

A danda at the end of this line, as also at the end of some others below, is only to fill in the gap.

Read dhāraṇay but it would not suit the metre.

The reading is certain but what is intended is not precisely known. Moreover, the number of the verse is followed by a vacant space for three aksharas which began the verse in Sāhini, as is evident from what follows. The preceding name Chīhāda is engraved in comparatively smaller letters.

Sarvajña, which is a synonym of Buddha, is here to denote Jīva. Moreover, a participle from the adjective smṛta is formed here. The flaw can be removed by reading smṛta pathāja. The first three aksharas of this verse are lost. Conjecturally they may have been bhāvaddhā.

Originally chāk with the sign of mārti erased later on.

Both these letters are transposed into each other.

The reading of these letters is certain, but the meaning is not clear.

The decimal figure of this number was at first carved as two horizontal strokes and subsequently corrected.

The bracketed letter is not well formed and therefore the reading is not certain.

The three letters were not engraved on the original stone and the space for them was left vacant.

The bracketed akṣhara may also be read as hsa both at the beginning.

The reading of this and the preceding akṣhara is not certain as one of them is overwritten, after tampering the original.

This letter is deformed and the sign of usarga, which was first put, was subsequently rubbed off.

Read khaṃ.

There are two redundant horizontal strokes here.
THE stone bearing this inscription was discovered by M. B. Garde, the then Director of Archaeology in the (former) Gwalior State, in 1925 A.C. It was found by him in a vegetable vendor’s house, at Narwar, an ancient town in the Khera tahsil of the Sipri (Shivpuri) District of Madhya Pradesh. Garde, who removed the stone to the Archaeological Museum at Gwalior, briefly summarised the contents of the record in the Annual Report of the Department for the same year, where it is stated that the inscription was engraved during the reign of Asalladeva of the Yajwapala dynasty. Subsequently, the record was edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXII, pp. 65 ff., and Plate. He has rightly shown that the epigraph did not belong to the time of Asalladeva but to that of his son Gopaldadeva, as to be seen below. The inscription is edited here from the original stone, which I examined in the Museum, and an inked impression supplied by the Chief Epigraphist, to whom my thanks are due.

The record is inscribed on the countersunk surface of a dark pinkish stone surrounded by a plain border, and measures 64.5 cms. broad by 61 cms. high. It consists of eighteen lines of writing, covering a space 48.3 cms. broad by 34.5 cms. high. But a noteworthy feature of it is that it is incomplete. In its last line, which contains the concluding part of verse 22, ends with the first six syllables of a new stanza, but the rest of the verse was not incised, even though there is enough space below (about 10 cms. high).

---

1 There is a redundant vertical stroke here also.
2 Originally khā with the mārā scored later on.
3 These letters are partly lost and hence cannot be distinctly made out.
4 Originally sā with the mārā scored on subsequently.
5 These letters too are partly preserved and cannot be made out.
6 The fourth foot does not appear to be metrical.
7 The decimal figure is only a dot and the tail of the unit figure appears to have been left while engraving. It may have been 9.
The letters are carefully drawn and incised, but the surface of the stone on the proper right side has irregularly peeled off or worn here and there, resulting in the loss of a number of the aksharas in each of the lines, the loss being greater in ll. 7-10 where almost the first half in each has disappeared. Nothing, however, is lost on the proper left side. The average height of the letters is about 15 cms.

The characters are Nagari, bearing a general resemblance to those of the preceding record but showing angular bends. Worth noting is the fully developed form of ch, e.g., in chaṭṭhāra, ll. 5, and that of dh, with its horn bent in some instances as in Dhārā, l. 11, but not in the same word in l. 5; that of the slightly different forms of bh, as in -akṣhata- and bhata, both in l. 4; the slightly different forms of sh in śūkhi and śūrṇa, both in l. 10; and lastly, that of s, which is devoid of the tail on the left limb, as in asti, l. 9.

The language of the record is Sanskrit, which is generally correct, and except a small sentence in the beginning which invokes the blessings of Gopāl, the whole of the extant portion of the inscription is in verse, containing 22 verses and a part of the next verse, as stated above. The verses are all numbered though we find that some of the numerical figures are lost with the aksharas which have now peeled off. In spite of the fact that the engraver has done his work with care, arbitrary strokes of the chisel have in some instances changed the forms of letters, e.g., in pravāt, l. 1, the third letter appears as dvā, and in kurvanta, l. 8, the second letter has become dvā.

The orthography shows the usual peculiarities, e.g., (1) throughout v is written for b also, as in vada and vadaśā, both in l. 12; (2) the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sibilant as in śūlaya-śādśātā, l. 2, in which only the second of the sibilants wrongly takes the place of the palatal; (3) the doubling of a consonant following r, e.g., in dvegu, l. 9; (4) the use of the prasītha-ṭaćā; (5) the amusāra generally serving the purpose of a nasal, except in a few cases, e.g., in nālārā, l. 1 and khaṇḍa, l. 2; and lastly, the spelling of the word ujjaiva in l. 2, with a single j, is noteworthy. The kāka-pada sign is put at the end of some of the lines, to show that the word is completed in the next line.

The inscription, in its present form, contains no date; and since it is incomplete, its object cannot be definitely known, though it may be surmised that it was to record some meritorious work like the excavation of a step-well, as to be found in some other inscriptions of the time of the Vaiyapāla kings.1 The first two verses of it invoke the blessings of the gods Murāri (Krishna) and Vāni (Sarasvatī), as we find also of verse 2 of inscription No. 175, below; and the expression sūrya-bhāṣa in its verse 9 is also used in a similar context in one of the inscriptions of the house (No. 161). This fact led Dr. Sircar to suggest that the record, like both of them, belongs to the reign of Āśa's son Gopāla, and was probably composed by Sivanāha, the same poet who drafted the other two records just referred to. Following this suggestion, we may also conjecture that the name of Gopāla may have been mentioned (in its short form Gopa) in verse 7.

Beginning with the customary obeisance to Gaṇapati, in a small sentence as said above, the inscription invokes the blessings of Murāri (Krishna) and Vāni, respectively in the first two of its verses. The third verse mentions a viśāya (territorial division), the name of which is lost but can be made out on the basis of the preceding record as Pādonaḷakha. The next five verses are devoted to tracing the genealogy of the ruling house. The name of the first of the kings is lost in verse 4, but he was undoubtedly Chāhāda since the following verse mentions his son Nṛvarman, who is known from the preceding record. Verse 5 of the inscription is historically important. It states that Nṛvarman vanquished the proud king of Dhārā and exacted tribute from him. This statement cannot be verified, and therefore the details thereof can only be conjectured. The Balyan inscription of the Chāhāmāna Hammira, dated V.S. 1345, tells us that his father Jairāsinha harassed a king named Jayasinhā in Mandapa;2 and we have seen above that this Jayasinhā was no other than the king Jayavarman II of Dhārā, whose earliest inscription is dated V.S. 1312 or 1256 A.C.3

1 See below, Nos. 161, 175 and 179. They were all composed by the poet Sivanāha, suggesting that like them all, the present inscription too may have been composed by the same poet, as held by Dr. Sircar.
3 The Rāhaugāndhi Stone Inscription. See above, No. 54.
And though there is nothing to verify the suggestion, it is possible to hold, in view of the close proximity of both the places, namely Narwar and Ranathambhôr, that Nîrvârman (the Yajvapâla prince), who was the eastern neighbour of Himâlirâvâ, may have sided Himâla in the latter’s expedition over Mûhâ. But while making this suggestion, we have to presume that Nîrvârman, who predeceased his father Châhâda, may have participated in the struggle, referred to above, as a prince, during the reign of his father.

The letter half of verse five gives the names of three persons, namely, Skanda, Chandra and Parna, who may have been, as pointed out by Sircar, while editing the inscription, the Yajvapâla generals who helped Nîrvârman in his encounter with the king of Dhárâ.

The next verse introduces Nîrvârman’s son, Asalladêva, the first akshara of whose name is mutilated. Verse 9 of the record informs us that Asalla’s queen was Savandal.

The remaining portion of the inscription is devoted to the description of a family of the Mâthura Kayasthas, hailing from Gopagiri, i.e., Gwalior. The first of the names introduced here is Syôma, who is stated to have been meritorious and resembling a banyan tree (of course, in giving shade and protection). The next member in this family was Bhuvanapâla; his relationship with his predecessor is lost in verse 12, but he appears to have been a son of Syôma. Verse 13, which is fortunately preserved with the exception of a few letters towards the end, mentions Bhuvanapâla’s contact with Bhôja, the king of Dhárâ, the half of whose throne he is said to have occupied; but, because of the loss of a portion which may have said something definitely in this respect, we can hardly be definite on the point, though the expression mantra-balad, used in this verse, indicates that he was Bhôja’s minister, and probably the Chief minister, as also suggested by the word mukhya used along with it. Bhuvanapâla’s son was Vûsudêva, who is said to have curbed all his enemies, who are not mentioned by names; and his son was Dâmôdara, who was the Treasury Officer of the king Châhâda.

Taking Dâmôdara as a contemporary of Châhâda (1231-1254 A.C.), and the former’s grandfather as a contemporary of Bhôjadeva of Dhárâ, as mentioned in the record, we find an interval of nearly two centuries between the Paramâra Bhôja and the Yajvapâla king, which appears to be rather great, though Sircar has observed that it is not altogether impossible.

Reverting to the main theme, we are told that Vûsudêva’s wife was Dharmâ, who gave birth to five sons, all of whom were intelligent (vv. 11-19). The name of the first of these sons is again lost in verse 20; he is stated to have acquired proficiency in all the branches of learning and was also expert in describing families (kandâ-varana). He was helpful to the kings of Gwalior, in the work of administration, and he was a warrior too. Here the expression Gopa-bhûpa appears to signify Gopala, the Yajvapâla king, in its shorter form.

A portion of the next verse only states that “I am his younger brother”; and here the inscription abruptly ends. It however appears that the following portion may have been desired to be devoted to the description of this younger brother whose name and the other details we do not know. And it may also be apparently presumed that the remaining portion of the epigraph was devoted to mention the object of the record and the date, probably also with the name of the composer and the year at the end.

Pithana, mentioned in line 15 cannot be identified. He may or may not have been the homonymous person mentioned in verse 15 of the next inscription.

As for the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Kâshi and Gayâ (v. 17) are the well known holy places; and Padômalaksha (v. 8) may have been applied to the dominion of the Yajvapâlas. Dhárâ (vv. 5 and 13) is evidently the Paramâra capital Dhâr, and Gopagiri (v. 10) is the well-known Gwalior.

---

1 Here the reading is Savand, with a portion lost. It is not known if we should have the pûdachchhêda as sab- vand, which, however, appears to be rather curious.
2 For a similar incomplete inscription, see C.I.L., Vol. IV, p. 637.
NARWAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF ĀŚALLADEVA (FRAGMENTARY, UNDATED)

Scale: Two-fifth
TEXT

1. सिद्धस्व || दित्त || गणपति || भवाता || नीलांकुश(क्र) || दत्त(क्र) || महात्स्वः || कृपे दुःखात्र न निश्चयः || प्रतिष्ठाति || विविः || सत्त्वत्स्रू || सिद्ध सुमाः ॥

2. दि[त्त] || || [वा?] || [सिद्ध] || निश्चयः ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ तस्मादो वा(वा) || शुद्धात्री || [शिक्षितस्वः] || लिनिती || कृपै अस्तित्वात्मकः || निवासनरूपः || शिन(वृ) ॥

3. पा[हवज्ञः] || मित्यययकंपुर्यः || गो || गो नैचर्यसिद्दांचिन्तितका(ल) || हेतुः || यद् भयसन च || विक्रमः च || पायन्नः || गो || हुहु || निश्चयः ॥

4. दित्त || || ॥ ॥ ॥ तस्मादसुनस्वः || स्वाभावलीयः महीनः || श्रुति ॥

5. कृपै || नाहैं || [हवज्ञः] || [लु] || [वा] || [म] || [सिद्ध] || || सत्त्वत्स्रू ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ [शिन] ॥

6. तत् || स || स || गो || सिद्धम् || हरा || || || || [शिन] ॥

7. य || अहो इति || [दि] ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ || ॥ ॥ [दि] ॥

8. दि || || [दि] ॥ [दि] ॥ नीती || नैचर्यस्यां || न बनामानवात्(वात) || लाभः || अलंकृत(क्र) || तिति ॥

9. सौरान्तम || || सौरान्तम || || || [सौरान्तम] || || सौरान्तमः || अस्तु || मद्यगिरिनामः || हुहु || शुद्धात्मकत्वः ॥

10. वंशो भरुतं || [सौरान्तम] || || || [ए] || लेव || हरि || [वी] || [सौरान्तम] [वी] || [ए] ॥

1 From the original stone and an inked impression.
2 Denoted by a symbol.
3 A kātha-pada sign (taken by Sircar as a daṇḍa) is engraved here, as also at the end of lines 8, 11 and 12, below.
4 These three syllables are restored by Sircar as Śāṃbhava, qualifying āvah, as also in the preceding inscription, line 9-10.
5 The reading of the bracketed letters is from the traces left. The name also appears in the preceding inscription, texts 9-10.
6 Conjecturally restored by Sircar as नान्त, भाविभावः. Two letters after गा are also missing; they are probably written above the line, which Sircar took as an unnecessary mark.
7 The bracketed syllables are all damaged and the restoration is conjectural. The name Chāhada is partially preserved.
8 The first lacuna in this line may be conjecturally restored as ēvāyāmānah, and the second as prathitapratipada.
9 The lacuna may be filled in by reading vērīpaṁ. ś.
10 Sircar conjecturally restored these four aksaras as Lāvanta-att, suggesting the name of the queen to be Lāvanyadēvi, as it appears also in verse 6 of the next inscription. Or, the intended reading may have been Lāvandhadēvi, as well, giving the Prakrit form of the name.
11 To read dhin-mukha, as suggested by Sircar, or, the intended reading may have been vishāpa, as well.
12 The reading of the bracketed aksaras is conjectural.
13 The verse is mērīka and hence the short and long syllables cannot be known: and thus this long line, to show that the latter half of the verse is completely lost.
14 The first of the daṇḍa is redundant and the second is a kātha-pada sign, partly visible.
15 All these letters are visible in their lower parts. As Sircar observed, the intended reading may have been kulena cha dhanaṇa cha.
BAÔDÔI STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÔPÀLADÈVÅ
d[VIkåma] Year 1336

The stone bearing this inscription was discovered in 1922, by M. B. Garde, who was then the Superintendent of the Archaeology department in the former State of Gwâlior, now integrated with Madhya Pradesh. It was found lying on a hill near the village of Baôdôì, a petty hamlet not far from Narwar in the Karêå purgâna of the Shâyvarî District, and was removed to the archaeological museum at Gwâlior, where it is now exhibited. The inscription was noticed by Garde himself in the Annual Report of the Department for V.S. 1979 (1922-23 A.C.), as No. 26, and also in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, for the same year, on p. 187. Subsequently, it was edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, with text in the

---

1. There is a play on the words sûhê and sûhô, which, besides their meaning 'pious' and the name 'Sûhô', as applicable here, convey the sense of white and black, and respectively show a contrast. For the mention of sûhô (Sûhô) in literature, see reference given in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII, p. 97, note 2.
2. The akshara in the brackets is conjecturally restored.
3. The intended reading may have been sûhômây. What look like overdraws on some letters in this line are due to scratches on the stone.
4. Probably kûdya-daô is intended.
5. The word appears to denote Gôpâladeva, as mentioned above.
6. Sircar read the last letter as ôri, but on the stone it is clear as taken here. The rest of the prâkåti was not engraved although there is enough space below on the stone.
7. Unfortunately, this report is not available as it was not printed. The reference here is from H. N. Drivedi's Gôvîlôn Råja ê Abooôôilô, a Hindi publication of the same department, No. 132.
Roman characters and a facsimile prepared from impressions under his supervision in 1952, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXIII (1959-60), pp. 51 ff. It is edited here from the original stone and one of the above-mentioned impressions, which was kindly supplied to me by the Chief Epigraphist.1

The slab, on which the record is inscribed in a sunk panel, measures 70 cms. broad by 58 cms. high, including the plain border it has on all the four sides. The writing, which covers a space 55 cms. broad by 46½ cms. high, consists of twenty-nine lines. The size of the individual letters ranges between 1 and 1½ cms. In about the first one-third portion of the inscription, they are slightly bigger and sparsely written than those in the remaining portion, where they are somewhat unsymmetric in form and size. The mechanical execution of the inscription is uneven and subsequent insertions as of the visarga in namah, l. 1 and the danda often, corrections by overwriting, changes of the forms of some of the aksara by redundant chisel strokes, and such other foibles on the part of the engraver are to be noticed here and there, to which attention has been drawn in the transcript that follows or in the foot-notes appended to it.

The characters are Nāgarī. As regards individual letters, attention may be drawn to the form of k, which sometimes loses its loop when a mārā is attached to it below, e.g., in amkura, l. 1, and when it is a superscript of a conjunct consonant, e.g., in vakshā, l. 2; ch, which has already developed its modern Nāgarī form, occasionally shows its reversion to that of v, e.g., in chakrā, l. 4; the superscript forms of t and n are occasionally alike; cf. ekhīnna and tamanta, both in l. 6; the slightly varying forms of bh may be noticed in bhagam, bhāta and bhāv, all in l. 24; r, which generally appears in its modern form, is occasionally wedged as in ravaṇ-ropa, l. 4, and is also sometimes marked as a vertical with a stroke attached to it on the left at the middle, cf. Raviñēva and -rīna, both in l. 9; and lastly, the left limb of the palatal s is often joined to its vertical and that of the dental s begins with a curve so as to show a combination of both these letters; cf., e.g., vilāsā, l. 2, 2, sūta, l. 3 and dhipasya, l. 13. Because of these peculiarities both these consonants cannot occasionally be distinguished from each other.

The language is Sanskrit: and except for a short sentence in the beginning and the portion embodying the date at the end, the whole record is metrically composed. In all there are 29 verses, all of which are numbered; but in the process of marking them, the figure 23 is repeated by inadvertence. Thus the total number of the verses is really 30. The language is fluent and often contains figures of speech like anuśraya, upamā, utprēkṣa, rāpaka and iśa.

As regards orthography, the inscription follows more or less the same system as to be observed in those of the contemporary times, e.g., (1) the use of the sign for n to denote h as in vija, l. 1; (2) the general use of the sign of anuśvara to denote a nasal even at the end of a stich, with a very few exceptions as in l. 2; (3) the occasional doubling of a consonant following r, as in kirti, l. 13 but not in saṁiṣṭapana, l. 13; and (4) an indiscrimination between the use of the palatal and the dental sibilant, e.g., in srī, l. 4, suṣaśa, l. 8 and Puṣpad, l. 17. the dental sibilant is put for the palatal, and in dēta, l. 14, sīva, l. 18 and Śiṇa, l. 25, the reverse is the case. Besides these, the khaṇa-pada sign appears at the end of some of the lines, to indicate that the word which could not be completed there is continued in the next line. There are a few grammatical and scribal errors. e.g., the word ujjyal is written with a single j in l. 25, nistriśa as nistriṣa in l. 8, kirttavatām for kirttmatām in l. 12, and ēkhaṇa for śēkhaṇa in l. 19.

The proper object of the inscription is to commemorate the construction of a step-well (vijaya), by Devadatta, son of Jalabha and the chief officer (Minister) of Āsalladēva. The date given in the end of the record, in numerical figures only, is, Friday, the 6th day of the dark half of Mārgaśirsha of the (Vikrama) year 1336. It regularly corresponds to Friday, 27th October, 1279, for the Chaitra V. expired and the pūrṇima month.

The contents of the record are as follows. Opening with the auspicious word Suṣasi and following it, a short sentence paying obeisance to Śiva, in the first verse, it glorifies the same deity, and in the second it invokes his blessings. Verses 3 and 4 respectively describes Naḷapura (modern Narwar in the Sippar District) and the king Chāhuṇa who was reigning at that place.

1 It is A.R. No. 141 of 1952-53. In my visit to Gwalior in December, 1970, I succeeded in availing myself of a fresh impression taken under my supervision; it helped me to finalize the transcript.
The name of his family is not mentioned in the record, but it is known to be Yajvakapala from the Bhimpur stone inscription. Chahada's son was Nrivarman, who was devoted to Krishna and who also respected Siva by worshipping the earth, which is one of his (eight) images, with lotuses in the form of the heads of his enemies (v. 5). His son was the illustrious Asalladeva, a brave king who was a resort of multitudes of merits, and his consort was Lavanyevedi (vv. 6-7). He had a son whose name was Gopala who succeeded him (v. 8).

The record then introduces a Khatriya family of the lunar race which was as dignified as the Brahmansas (Sraivasatnathara Sree) and belonged to the Vasta gana and of the Gaudahara clan (v. 10). The persons born in this race were devoted to main power, Chamundari, the goddess with her nine forms, and Gaudahara, their family deity known after the clan Gaudahara (vv. 9-12). In that family was born Dambodara, a Minister of the king of Surasena (v. 13). He had a son of the name of Namadeva, who was meritorious, efficient and righteous (vv. 13-14) and who again had three sons—Pithana, Jalhana and Maladara (v. 15). Of these, Jalhana, who was warlike, dexterous, well-versed in politics, a capable administrator and a man of confidence (of the king), was appointed an officer at Gwailor (Gopa-sila) by Hammira himself (v. 16), whereas Pithana, the eldest of the brothers, who was devoted to the worship of Siva (Pashupati) and whose consort was Chandpa, begot a son of the name of Devadhara, who became Chief Minister (chief among the officers) under Asalladeva (v. 20). Devadhara's consort was Niladri (v. 21). He excavated a well at the village of Vasaparda, which had been (previously) donated to some Brahmans by the King Naminda (v. 20), who is otherwise unknown (vv. 22-23). The following two verses describe the well in an ornate style of poetry, containing alaibhara like utprakrasha and lalasa, and it is blessed to be everlasting.

Verse 26 introduces three sons of Devadhara, in an incidental way, viz., Hariraja, Maharaja and Sivaraja; and further we are told that the prakrati was composed by Sivamahfis; a son of the Treasury Officer (kutsabhippa) Lolaha and a grandson of Dambodara who belonged to the writers' clan (lipikritaka) known as Mathura (v. 27), and that it was written (on the stone) by Vikrama, the son of Dhim (v. 28) or Bhungukra (?), who too belonged to the Mathura clan of the Kayasthas (v. 28). It is interesting to note here that the word Kayastha is clearly mentioned in the latter of these statements, though not in the former. The last verse (No. 29) embodies the name of the architect (vitrakara) Bhimadeva, who incised the record, and also states that the whole work was carried on under the supervision of Somaadeva. Here the inscription ends with the date, as already discussed above.

The names of Chahada, his son Nrivarman, and the latter's son Asalladeva, are known from the other records of the house; but the present inscription mentions for the first time the name of Lavanyevar, the queen of Asalladeva, and also the names of some officers under the ruling house of the Yajvakapala. The king of Surasena (or the king named Surasena ?) and Naminda cannot be definitely identified. Himmika of the present record, however, in all probability appears to have been the homonymous Chahamama king of Narasambhò who succeeded his father Jaitsinh in 1282 A.C. We know that he was a brave and warlike prince, who immediately after his succession defeated the Paramara king Bhoda II and also captured parts of Rajasthãn in his military exploit.1 We have no definite evidence on the point, but it is not unlikely that he may have held for some time Gwailor also. In his Himmika-mahdahraja Nayachandra gives this king the credit of conducting a sort of digujinya, during which he vanquished some of the rulers of Rajasthãn and Malwa.3 And the contemporary history also gives some clue to solve this problem. It is well known that Ilutunish recovered

---

1 Above, No. 168, v. 9.
2 These nine forms appear to be those referred to in the Devakavachya of the Markandeya Purana, viz., Sallapuri, Brahmacharni etc. For the other nine forms of the deity, as remarked by Srinar, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII, p. 22. He has also remarked that the word Gaudahara possibly denotes the Gour Rajputs of the modern times.
3 As the name is spelt in the ‘record’. It is, however, not known whether we have to take the name as Jalhana.
4 This No. is in fact 30, for which see above.
Ranthambhór in 1294-35 A.C. and following his death in 1286 A.C., the ruling house of the slave kings was not free from internal troubles and also from the external struggles. This state of affairs continued till about 1266 A.C. when Balhan ascended the throne of Delhi, after ruling de facto for about two decades during the reign of his father-in-law Nasír-ul-dín Mahmúd (1246-1266 A.C.). Balhan’s activities in the Punjab, the rebellion of Bengal against Delhi and in the Doab, and, above all, the incursion of the Mughals in the north-west frontiers of India, continued to occupy his thoughts incessantly; and it is not unlikely that during this period of unrest, Hummarra, after strengthening his position at Ranthambhór, may have endeavoured to extend his dominions in the east and up to Gwalior also, which is only about 180 kms. north-northeast of Ranthambhór. Thus it is not unlikely, though this statement cannot be verified, that he may have appointed Jalhaya to control the region around Gwalior, as stated in our inscription. It has to be admitted, however, that this suggestion, which is purely tentative, cannot be finalised unless and until we have some definite information on the point.

As for the place-names mentioned in the record, Nalapura (I. 3) has already been identified with the modern town of Narwar in the Shivarot District and the capital of the house of the Yajvapāda princes. Gopāsalī (I. 1) is, of course, the mountain at Gwalior and Vatapadra-grāma (I. 22) where the well is said to have been excavated (I. 22) can safely be identified with the modern village of Badod; near Narwar, where the inscribed slab was found on an adjacent hill, as seen above.

TEXT


1 त्विनः [I1'] अः नम: विवाह || बी(ब्र)भाषि क्षामापत्तिकुराणा दीपावलिकोलेर्निग्रावलावकावैत्ती (नाम)। 
2 रजिसः [III[I1']] एदु: मन्ना-मन्नातैंनालोकानातीला किला-किवा: पातु चांगरंविन(जिव)जनममहुः 
3 [ब्र(ब्र)] तवविन्मण कमायनमी विरिश-शालोनुवा तवो(हस्त)। मन: पातु बः ||2[I1'] सौरा[व] भाषु- 
4 तववित्वाः। द्विव्ययकारकरुणपुष्कर् [हस्त] तात् तववित्तिः पराण्य विष्णकोर्प्त [[II[I1']] तस्मान्यालीन्येननदिकोय- 
5 तवविन्ति:। दुरुद्वंदवनवर्तिः कल्पितात्तत्त्वालापितस्विसंविष्णवादतमवक्ताः। [[II[I1']] तस्मादात्त्वस्तवत्तेत्र- 
6 तिरवातिन्त[स्त्र]: अश्रुघन्मा सहिष्मा। गेम न्तिन्म प्रजुएश्वरसाक्षेरचन्डेश्वरः शृष्टि: सभो रण- 

1 As we are informed by Mimhāj-ud-dīn. See Elliot: Vol. II, p. 334. D. C. Sirca took the name Hummarra to denote the Sultan Ilutmish (1216-1236 A.C.).
2 From the original stone and impressions.
3 Denoted by a symbol.
4 As already stated, this letter is often a combination of the palatal and the dental shrdhan.
5 The subscript is devoid of its oblique stroke, as also in some instances below. The bracketed letters perhaps also may have been प्रभा. But read तुषा as read by Sirca.
6 It is doubtful whether this abhāna is kha or kṣaṇa, as also in the preceding instance. Perhaps प्रभा is intended.
7 That is, whose conduct is as pure as that of Bhirsha. For श्रुतिवृत् = स्त्रृष्टि.
8 The danda is redundant. It is perhaps intended to be the kārapāda sign, showing that the word is completed in the next line.
9 This danda is thin and was engraved subsequently.
7. तन्त्रसंस्कृतम्। 
8. सतीस्य लक्ष्यं। 
9. [को०]संस्थितम्। 
10. कोटालामा। 
11. स्मृति शिशुव्य। 
12. ध्यानं। 
13. शुचिरुपयो। 
14. शुचीधर्ममित्रस्य। 
15. श्रीपीवो जस्वस्य। 
16. को०पिशोऽविविष्य। 
17. श्रीभृजोऽविविष्य। 
18. पदकर। 
19. विद्वेद्याग्यरिष्य। 
20. दिति प्रसादः। 
21. भिधिः उत्तिष्ठति। 

This danda is thin and was engraved successively.
The sign of sasanga was inserted subsequently.
The kāka-pada sign is engraved here and also at the end of some of the lines below.
As in 3 above. Mahīdēva means a Bāhimana.
First vase engraved and then altered to rama.
On the original चर later on changed to च and the muṣṭi of the following letter has been scored off. But च remains as before. The following letters were read by Sirca, as चक्र, शिवा, चपोतुस्मान, चालुम्बस्त्र, चास्मात्र, चास्मात्र, चास्मात्र, चास्मात्र, चास्मात्र.
The sign of vārma was first engraved and later on scored off as redundant, by stamming strokes.
The sign of vārma was later on inserted.
The superscript c is clear on the original, though not in the impression.
Sirca read: समासप्रचारवत्ता।
Both the bracketed akṣara are mutilated and the reading is only conjectural. The idea here is that he did not marry again (nirūkṣaya) after the loss (apāya) of his consort, as Rāma did not marry another after that of Śītā. Here Sirca read: श्रीरामचक्रष्टःपीजया।
The letters tishṭha were repeated and later on scored off by vertical strokes above the top-strokes.
Bādōdi Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopāladeva, Vikrama 1336

Scale: Two-fifth
THE pillars which bear these inscriptions were all found on a waste land in the vicinity of a tiny hamlet known as Bangla situated about 8 kms. east of the fort of Narwar in the Shitypur District of Madhya Pradesh. This site, which marks a battle-field, was first discovered in 1934-35 by the late M. B. Garde, who was then the Director of Archaeology in the former State of Gwalior, now integrated with Madhya Pradesh. He noticed the inscriptions in general in his Annual Report of the department for V.S. 1991 (1934-35 A.C.), pp. 8 and 12, and enlisted seven of them in its appendix (Nos. 7-13). The site was also visited subsequently in 1955, by Dr. D. C. Sircar, as the Government Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India, who prepared impressions of fifteen of these inscriptions; and he edited seven of them
(Nos. 1-7) and noticed the remaining eight (Nos. 8-15) in an appendix in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXI, pp. 326 ff. Thirteen of these inscriptions are edited here from the same impressions, kindly placed at my disposal by Dr. G. S. Gai, the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Garde gave the following description of the village and the site where the pillar were found by him:

"... There are traces of fortification wall round the village which is mainly populated by the Rajputs. The piece of waste land, rocky and covered with thorny shrubs, which extends between the village and the river Barua, a small tributary of the Sindh, flowing at a distance of a mile to the east, is studded with a number of memorial pillars. In a day's hurried survey I counted over sixteen such pillars either standing or lying on the ground, entire or broken. But further examination may bring to light some more pillars. They bear panels of sculptures usually depicted on pillars commemorating warriors killed on battle-fields — scenes of warriors, footmen, horse-riders engaged in combat, and of fallen heroes reaching heavens and enjoying the company of heavenly nymphs or worshipping Siva Itaga." 

Almost the same description is given by Dr. Sircar also, in his article referred to above; but Garde's writing is reproduced here in a complete form, since his reports are now rarely obtainable.

Many of the pillars, as also observed by Garde, have their tops moulded into fluted åmalakas crowned with pinnacles.

Four of the inscriptions dealt with here (Nos. 162 and 164-166) are purely in prose and the remaining four (Nos. 163 and 167-169) are partly in prose and partly in verse. The language is Sanskrit, often incorrect. The alphabet of all these inscriptions is Nagari and all are written in different hands, in a slovenly way. The epigraphs, in a majority of cases, have suffered from exposure to weather, so much so that on some of the pillars they have become partially or wholly indecipherable. On some of the pillars even the portions containing the inscriptions were not well dressed before making the incisions.

All the inscriptions, as stated earlier, refer to the death of certain warriors who lost their lives in a battle between the Yajnapala king Gopalahadha (c. 1279-89 A.C.) and the Chandella monarch Viravarman, whose known dates range from 1261 to 1286 A.C. The date of the battle thus falls well between the range of dates known for both the kings. In seven of the records dealt with here (Nos. 164-167, 170 and 173-174), the date is given as the 7th of the bright half of Chaitra of the Vikrama year 1338, the day being Friday. It regularly corresponds to 28th of March, 1281 A.C. Four of the records (Nos. 162, 163, 169 and 171) on the other hand, mention the year as 1337 instead of 1338; and the reference to both these years, i.e., 1337 and 1338, as Dr. Sircar has observed, indicates the year by regarding the latter as expired and the former as कार्तिककाल current.

The mention of the week-day as Friday in all these inscriptions goes to indicate that the battle lasted only for a day. However, Garde has noticed a solitary instance (his No. 8) which mentions the week-day as Saturday. From this he concluded that it is either mistake or it may be that the same tithi covered both the days, i.e., Friday and a part of Saturday, and thus the battle may have been fought on two consecutive days.

The dimensions of writings on these pillars with some other details are as tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Breadth of writing in cms</th>
<th>Ht. of writing in cms</th>
<th>Ht. of letters in cms</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Good; letters sparsely written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Garde, op. cit., p. 12, No. 3. For the unit figure of the number of the year, see n. in the text given below. This record is our No. 164.
Note:—In editing the inscriptions here I have followed the numbers given to them by Dr. D. C. Sircar, but his numbers 13 and 14 are excluded, as I am not sure whether they are connected with the battle. See his note also where he says that "it is not possible to be sure on the point."

None of the heroes whose names are recorded in the inscriptions seems to be historically important, except Brahmādeva who is endowed with the title Mahākumāra and who is mentioned as Gopāladēva's Chief Minister. All the warriors commemorated in the records are stated to have fallen in field while fighting on behalf of the Narwar ruler Gopāladēva, which may perhaps indicate that ultimately he came out victorious. The whole incident appears to have been that the Chandelā forces took the initiative and penetrated into the Yajapālā territories, but soon after they crossed the river, they were defeated and driven back by the army of the Yajapālā king.

Only one geographical name is mentioned in the inscription. It is variously spelt as Valuva, Valukā, Valua, Valūr, Valubā, Valuka and Valkukā, which is no other than the stream mentioned above as the tributary of the Sindh and flowing about a mile to the east of the hamlet of Banglā where the inscriptions were found.

No. 162a

1 सिद्धम् [१७] तस्मात् १३३७ चेव तुर्दि ५ मुटुभुक्तः। अवेह श्रीमन्तेजुरसुदेशः(म)। समस्त[र]जालजः—

2 श्रीमान्तेजुरमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्—

3 श्रीमान्तेजुरमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्—

4 अजेयो(ष)महर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्विमहर्षिनिषद्—

5 महास्तक्ति [६] भारतोर्ती प्रसिद्धं।

For more remarks on the same, see the Dabī plate inscription of the Chandelā, Varavaran, in A.S.I.-R., Vol. XXI, pp. 74ff. Also see Ind. Ant., 1918, p. 241; and I.H.R., XXXII, p. 104f.

1 From photographic illustration accompanying Dr. D. C. Sircar's article in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXI.

2 Expressed by symbol, which, as already noted by Sircar, has not the usual globular sign at the end.

3 This and some other dāṇḍas below are redundant.

4 As suggested by Sircar, read रमणद्वयनमात्तसक्तरे अन्तोप्रियोन्द्ररमणद्वयनमात्तसक्तरे अन्तोप्रियोन्द्र—

5 This may be a contraction of Samrat.

6 Read चर[च]ि। (or चर[च]ि।) पार्वत:—. This clearly shows that the besiegers were repulsed.

7 Read मणि=।—. It cannot be definitely known whether it is one word, as taken by Sircar, or the prefix sar may be taken in the sense of showing faithfulness on the part of the Rākuka, to his sovereign lord.

8 This expression is grammatically incorrect but the meaning is clear, viz., that Dhūmidēva, the chief consort of Vīlāla who died fighting, committed Sati.
No. 162

1 सिद्धम् || सिद्धि: || का[म्] || मोगल-  
2 मृत्यु गांडो रण[चत्]।  
3 किता। फौं: श्रीमोक्षर-  
4 त्रय युज्यो देशामिश्रय  
5 च || [श्च।] देवकसरिकीर्ते  
6 हः[प्र।]भे || वीरस्मिन। || मु-  
7 गृहः[प्र।]भे तुत्ताकृति निधिय सु-  
8 महादेवर्मण॥[११६] सं १४३३-  
9 चैत सुम्बे || श्रुक्षुरारे ॥ अनन्त-  
10 पुरे। महाराजश्रीमोक्षरदेव-  
11 कार्य चिंद्रह महाराजकी-  
12 वीरस्मितःनम्यतिरे। रा-  
13 उपायके श्रीवान राजादेव[।]-  
14 पुरे कार्यरत्नवानवहारारा-  
15 तपांशु || कुञ्जानविद्ये[।।]-  
16 मुद्दे॥

No. 164

1 सन्दी कवः ॥ संक्ति १४३३- [वः] सिद्धि। || श्रीमन्मुद्ग्रामचारिणः ॥  
2 परम(म):ङ्गुरः: परसे[वः]:॥: परम(म):महाद(हे)ङ्ग(ङ्ग):॥  
3 तु[।।] परम: || गृह(हे) परमराजसः[श्री]महादेव[ङ्ग]देव[ङ्ग]॥  
4 महाकुमारः श्री[श्री] [१२] तव[ङ्ग]क्षेत्रे ॥[१२।।] महाभ-  
5 धाना[चत्] रा[वः]। अर्जुकुलः[शे]। एस[ः] कालकिर।

1 From an impression. It is No. 219 of A.R. Ep., 1954-55, Appx. B.  
2 Expressed by symbol.  
3 The left limb of this अक्षर is not joined to the right, and the signs above the top-stroke are ornamentally treated.  
4 Sirar read the bracketed letter as त, which he corrected to ग्रं, but the space with some traces in it goes to show that the letter appears to have been actually cut as ग्रं in the original.  
5 The दण्डम् is redundant, as also some others below.  
6 As also noted by Sirar, this is a variant of Chandella.  
7 The consonants of both these अक्षराः are so formed so as to make the word appear as ग्रं,  
8 This expression also implies that the hero died in fighting. A slanting दण्डम् attached to the letter one indicates the end of the writing.  
9 From an impression which is No. 216 of A.R. Ep., 1954-55, Appx. B.  
10 Denoted by symbol.  
11 Read ग्रंम्बरा. The subscript of the bracketed letter is so formed as to appear as ।।. It is so in ग्रंम्बरा in the next line also.  
12 The sign of दण्डम् has not come out on the impression but from the reverse it appears to have been included.  
13 The sign of मात् may have been included on the original, as shown by a trace left there.  
14 The horizontal stroke, which distinguishes this letter from ग्रं, is not formed. The word ग्रंम् that follows is used here to denote the 'exstremed one', and not a preceptor.  
15 As already noticed by Sirar, the first part of the name appears here and also in No. 174 as जार, in No. 185 as जात्या, and in No. 196 as जायता. The complete name appears to have been Jairavarma, and from the title Mahâkumâra, he appears to have been the son of Gopaélâdeva (2).  
16 All these three अक्षराः are mis-formed. The consonant of the first appears as s, the second may have been w, and that of the third is indefinite. And what follows is intended to denote the family name Vajrapala.
BAṅGLĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GōPALADEVA, VIKRAMA 1337

From Facsimile
BAŃGLA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GOPALADEWA, VIKRAMA 1337

From Facsimile
BAÑGLĂ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GŌPALADĒVA, VIKRAMA 1337

From Facsimile
No. 165

1. सिद्धम "[1]" संक्ष् ६३३४९ चैत्र ७ मृदि ५ दुर्गा को १'९
2. अचेत श्रीमभिन्नकुलाश्रियाधिकारी... महाराज
3. ज्ञानविजयीपापावर्तमानविवाहराज
4. भो तस्मिन्काले हर्दमातने रा[वत
5. अतानेर"नदेवदमामानसेवोत्तीर्थायो
6. परिश्रीदीन्यधिकशेषादर्श
7. राजा भीचारस्त्रावर्तमासंस्मरित\n8. नेष(को) महामातिकुल(भ) राजकुम\[1']
9. असोहाय अंत्य पुनः[1'] धरणीहुः सा
10. ज्ञुसीहुः देवानाधिष्ठितम् [स]
11. श[भृ] [12] सलिः

No. 1667

1. सिद्धम "[1]" संक्ष् [१३]३२९ चैत्र मुदि ६ मृदि ५ दुर्गा को २'१३
2. अचेत श्रीमभिन्नकुलाश्रियाधिकारी... महाराज
3. ज्ञानविजयीपापावर्तमानविवाहराज
4. अवराये तस्मिन्काले करत(रत्)मार-

---

1. As Sircar has already observed, it is difficult to determine whether the first three aksharas denote the family name Chauhāna here.
2. The danda which was first put appears to have been struck off by two horizontal strokes.
3. I agree with Sircar's suggestion that here we should read प्र(रत्र)पुपरसादः.
4. The akshara in the rectangular brackets is damaged and I am not certain about its reading, though here it is adopted as read by Sircar.
5. I am not certain about the reading of this expression. Sircar takes it as pachaka-pabārthakaḥ, with some hesitation; but I think it is perhaps intended to be the same as pachakavam-upayālavah.
6. Sircar read this number as 2 but to me it appears as 7.
7. From photo-lithograph accompanying Sircar's article.
8. Expressed by symbol.
9. This danda, as also the one in the next line, is redundant.
10. For the name, see n. on the corresponding portion in the preceding inscription. Here the language is obscure but the sense seems to be that these persons were then looking after the affairs of administration.
11. He is perhaps Viravarmā in whose battle Arasītha, mentioned in 1.9 for Arsinha, lost his life along with some others.
12. Probably to read दुर्गा, Sircar suggests that this obscure passage seems to mean "a person named Vajīta who was a resident of Dēvaśa (modern Dēvā) lost his life in the battle and that his wife committed sati, or it may mean two persons named Dēvaśa and Vajīta. But to me it appears to be restored to देवानाधिष्ठितम्, i.e., battle fought for the lord for two days (7)."
13. From an impression. It is No. 221 of A.R. Ep., 1914-15, Appx. B.
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  

No. 1679

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  

11  
12  
13  
14  

1  A faint trace above shows that the sign of sihara may have been cut above this akshara.
2 The correct form of the name seems to be Sainavarnini, for which see n. elsewhere on the corresponding portion.
3 Elsewhere this name appears as Deyit. The danda is superfluous.
4 For the sense and also for the name that follows, see n. in the preceding inscription.
5 It is possible that this akshara is ud.
6 All these letters are indistinct in the impression. Sircar read them as निर्देशित, but I am not certain about the reading.
7 That is, Kaita.
8 Read राजसिंह.
9 The name also indicates that the person died in the struggle.
10 This expression is again obscure and we may accept Sircar's interpretation of it that the person in question died in an area belonging to a person named Sahamma.
11 From an impression which is No. 212 of A. R. Ep., 1954-55, Appx. B.
12 Denoted by symbol.
13 Sircar read this akshara as ni, but what he took the sign of niha appears to be a fault of the writing which is very careless; and besides this, a number of the aksharas are damaged and indistinct as the same appears to have been for long exposed to rains.
14 Read देशम. The foot is metrically defective.
15 The reading of the bracketed akshara is not certain. Should we read उ? The name that follows is not known.
16 The consonant of this akshara appears as sh.
17 This appears to be the same as Krodha, but the preceding word, the reading of which is doubtful, is unintelligible, as also remarked by Sircar. Can it be the same as appearing in No. 162, 1. 5 (7)?
18 The name consists of three aksharas but the reading is doubtful.
19 The reading is not certain and the language too is defective. But as rightly held by Sircar, the passage refers to the heroes of the enemy's side who were killed by him.
20 This statement indicates that he won the battle, and if so, the victory favoured the Yayavapaler king.
BANGLA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GOPALADEVA, VIKRAMA 1337
BAÑGLA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÖPÁLÁDEVÁ, VIKRAMA 1337

From Facsimile
From an impression which is No. 222 of A.R., p. 1954-55, Appx. B.
* Six syllables along with the symbol for Siddham are indistinct here.
* The abhāsaras for the name of the family are indistinct in the impression.
* The reading of this name is not certain. The consistence of the first two letters are damaged.
* From an impression which is No. 214 of A.R., p. 1954-55, Appx. B.
* Expressed by a symbol. The āhāpata that follows it has disappeared, leaving only a trace.
* Sircar read tva sabhāvat and emended it to bhabhāvatā but the mātra of bhā is distinct.
* I am not certain if the curve of the mātra wrongly put on the first of these abhāsaras is later on scored off by a vertical stroke or it is only a scratch.
* By a redundant stroke of the chisel this letter has become na.
* Here appears a symbol to show that the record is complete. Its exact form cannot be made out.
* These two lines are illegible.
* It is difficult to know whether the first of these abhāsaras is na or on.
* The first and the third letters are rather so formed as to make the reading appear doubtful. The last two lines of the record, as also noted by Sircar, are in a different hand and the letters are slightly smaller in size. They appear to me, in a local dialect, and it is also a guess that the first five abhāsaras give the name of the lady who committed Safr. Female seems to be the same as the silver ornaments, for fingers still put on by newly married girls in the locality. Taking the second letter na (of Line 11) for the name of the lady may conjecturally be taken as Dhāmaka, whose hands and figures were decorated with the ornaments as stated here.
No. 170

1 सिद्धर्म [1'] सिद्धर्म [1'] संवत्त(श) १३३७ = वो पुरो(शुद्धि) ३ सु(शु)के
2 तेजसुरुप्तम [गिर(श्री)] राजापितासत्तमां-  
3 लेखा  मंदिल [पा] वेजामधुरस(शु)विना[हील]-
4 दिन ॥ राज [गिर(श्री)] गिर(श्री)कर्मबधिन [लृ] ॥ विलुप्ता-
5 नन्दी [श्री] दुःख धृत [श्री] काल धृत राज[श्री]
6 ....
7 ....
8 ....

No. 171

1 सिद्धर्म [1'] संवत्त(श) १३३७ = वो पुरो(शुद्धि)दि ॥
2 सु(शु)के कठानादवि(शे) ॥
3 श्री ...[2] राजापितासत्तमां-
4 गिर(श्री)कर्मबधिन(श) ॥
5 नन्दी ... राज [श्री]दि ॥

No. 172

1 ... ॥ (शु)दि ३ सु(शु)के। जशह थोभतुपुर्वरहा ... ...
2 गिर(श्री)कर्मबधि ॥ तत्त्वादिन [काले]

---

1 From an impression which is No. 218 of A.R. Ep., 1915-16, Appx. B. The letters are extremely damaged.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 The sign of vishva, if engraved, is smaller in size.
4 As in the corresponding portion of the preceding records. Here the person seems to be called a muni.
5 Read श्री.
6 As already noted by Sircar, these are probably the sons of the person who died in fighting.
7 Lines 6-8 are damaged and therefore indistinct.
8 From an impression which is No. 234 of A.R. Ep., 1915-16, Appx. B. It appears by a symbol followed by two illegible letters which appear as traces of Suṣṭi.
9 The number showing the tiṣṭi is lost here.
10 Read अश्रिक, which is followed by 2 or 3 letters which I cannot make out as they are carelessly formed.
11 Sircar observed that the broken letters may have been ब्रह्म, and the reading has to be adopted here. They are in the form of traces only.
12 See n. on the corresponding portions in Nos. 165, 166 and 174. Possibly to be read as कर्मबधि.
13 From an impression which is No. 218 of A.R. Ep., 1915-16, Appx.
14 This portion which is broken, may have contained the year and the name of the month. Also whether the consonant of the following akṣara is dental or palatal cannot be ascertained.
15 Possibly to be restored to राजापितासत्तम.
16 The letters are not clear in the impression; but the lacunae may conjecturally be filled in by नन्दी।
4. ...[paragraph]
5. ...[paragraph]

---

1. তৃতীয় ১৩৩৫ চত্ত্বর সু(শ্রী)ধি ৭ শু(শু)কে

---

No. 171

1. সিদ্ধম[१] সিদ্ধ[२] সংক্ষেপ ১৩৩৫[१] চত্ত্বর সু(শ্রী)ধি ৭ শু-
2. কে...[paragraph]
3. রাজার(শ্রী)মোগাদিস্বর [১'] ক্রুম[১]রত্ন(শো)-
4. জলাস(শো)হুদেব [১'] প্রথানেজনগর(শো)রে]
5. শরনি...[paragraph]
6. রাজ...[paragraph]
7. ...[paragraph]
8. ...[paragraph]
9. ...[paragraph]
10. ...ক্লান্তাদিশরে(শো)নে জুষ্মন্ডম...[paragraph]

---

1. The lost letters may have been রাজার, as in No. 162.
2. Sircar observed that here the portion may have contained শিশু, but to me they appear to be traces of শো, as taken here.
3. Here the name of the father may have been given but it cannot be made out completely.
4. That is, Rājāra. Following it is probably the name of the hero and the letters appear as শোগ্রু, but the reading is uncertain.
5. Whether the জলাস were followed by some more letters cannot be determined.
6. From an impression which is No. 217 of A.R. Ep., 1934-35, Appx. B.
7. The first two letters in this line are broken off, and except a letter or two here and there, the whole of the rest is lost. It is, however, included as it belongs to the battle and shows the year 1338.
8. From an impression which is No. 215 of A.R. Ep., 1934-35, Appx. B.
9. Expressed by a symbol.
10. The year agrees with that in Nos. 162, 168, 69 and 171, although in Nos. 164, 167, 170 and 173-174 it is given as 1338, for which see Dr. Sircar's remarks, as already stated above.
NARWAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÖPÁLADÈVA

[ Vikrama ] Year 1339

THE stone on which this record is inscribed was discovered in 1917-18, by M. B. Garde, the then Superintendent of Archaeology in the former State of Gwálior, and was brought to notice by the same scholar in the *Annual Administrative Report* of the department for the year Vikrama 1971 (No. 9), which was not printed,1 and also in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XLVII (1918), p. 242. The record was also enlised by D. K. Bhandarkar in his *List of Inscriptions of Northern India* under No. 603, and subsequently it was edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, with transliteration of the text in Roman characters, in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXXIII (1959-60), pp. 36 ff., with Plate, facing p. 40. It is edited here from the original stone which now exists in the Archaeological Museum at Gwálior.

The inscription was found at Narwar the ancient Nalapura, which was the capital of the Yajñaválka dynasty in the latter half of the thirteenth century A.C. The place lies in the Karéža pargáni in the Sipri (Shivpuri) District of Madhya Pradesh, about 26 kms. north-west of Karéža and almost equidistant south-east of Shivpuri, and contains ruins of old palaces ascribed to the ruling house of the Yajñaválkas. The stone bearing this inscription is stated to have been discovered in these ruins.

The complete dimensions of the stone including a plain border which it has on all the four sides, are 73.5 cms. by 72 cms. The writing, which is in a sunken panel thereof, covers an area about 56 cms. broad by 54 cms. high and contains 27 lines of equal length. But it has suffered a good deal owing to the effects of weather. A number of the aksharas have been brushed off or damaged, particularly in the middle portion of ll. 7-18, where some of the letters are more or less rubbed out, since the work of engraving too was far from satisfactory, as will be shown below. The size of the letters varies from 1.2 to 1.5 cms. in height.

The characters are Nágarí of the thirteenth century A.C. The forms of ṇh, dh and ṇ are often confounding with each other; e.g., the letter ṇh, which almost resembles ṇ in vīdhau cha, l. 1, has its loop angular in pramańcemhiha, l. 3 and it also approaches its modern Nágarí form as in ṇačyátas, in the same line. The horn of the left limb of dh is prominent in most of the cases; it is sometimes oblique, e.g., in vīdhau, l. 1, but in some instances it is joined to the top of the horizontal bar, as in nivrañḍhan, l. 3. Unlike the preceding record, this letter bears a top-stroke in the present one. J is in a transitional stage, its antique and modern forms being noticed respectively in the same word jajapétla, in l. 5. The subscript forms of cjh and th are alike; cf. avasatá and vánēhitā, ll. 1 and 19, respectively. The middle vertical bar of ṇ often ends in a loop as in vumápañ, l. 18; as a latter member of a conjunct consonant, this letter is marked as l, e.g. in vardiśhitvun, l. 21; and when joined with the same syllable, it is marked by a slanting stroke, as in ṇaḍgyāpta, l. 20. The forms of ṇ and bh combine as in the preceding inscriptions; and those of the palatal and the dental sibilants are so engraved as to show a combination of both; see sókata, l. 18. The consonant r which has assumed its modern Nágarí form, has occasionally the wedged form and also the one as the vertical marked by a horizontal stroke, as in the preceding records. The medial short u is sometimes denoted by a curve attached to the vertical of a letter to which it belongs, as in śruṭ, l. 1, sometimes the lower extremity of the curve is curled up, sharply, as in aścyátas, l. 3, and with an angle, as in nivrañḍhan, in the same line; but generally it assumes the modern form, e.g., in dīśatun in the same line. The medial long a is occasionally marked as the subscript t attached to the left lower part of a letter, e.g., in pátā, l. 17.

Mistakes of the writer and the engraver are to be noticed throughout the inscription.

1 The reference here is H. N. Dwivedi's *Gwalior Rāja-kē Abhālīkha*, No. 141, as noted before also.
and we also find limbs of some of the letters occasionally omitted, e.g., tasmā in 1. 7 appears as tasmā, without the horizontal stroke of m, and vāyu in 1. 1, as vīnu, as the tail of the left limb of s is omitted. On the other hand, a redundant chisel stroke has changed g to m in gavyā, 1. 3, and t is often formed as r, e.g., in ṛdā, 1. 5. Errors of this type and subsequent corrections and insertions that the inscription often has are all noted in the text that follows.

The language is Sanskrit; and with the exception of the opening word Siddhām and the portion containing the date in the end, the record is metrically composed in the same fluent style as the preceding one, by the same poet Śivavaiśa. In all there are 27 verses, which are all numbered. It is interesting to note that verse 10 is composed in a metre of rare occurrence, known as pārshāti, which belongs to the supratishtā group.

The following orthographical peculiarities may be noted. (1) The general use of v to denote b as in varṇita, 1. 2: (2) the doubling of a consonant following r with certain exceptions, cf. kirttita and dīrjita, both in 1. 5: (3) the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sīkhati e.g., in asuddha, 1. 25, and vice versa in śrēmā, 1. 15: (4) the general use of the sign of anuvāra in place of an appropriate nasal, even at the end of a stich, with a few exceptions as in kānti-kāntam, 1. 2. Besides these, the medial diphthongs are denoted sometimes by the pratishṭā-māndri and in the other instances by the ṛḍīrṇa-māndri; the sign of saugraha occurs only once, in 1. 14, to denote the name of Ajayadeva correctly; and the kāha-pāda sign is used at the end of II, 1, 2, 10 and 22.

The inscription is a prasasti (laudatory account), as the word is used in 1. 26 (v. 26), and refers itself to the reign of Gopahadeva of the royal house known as that of the Jajapelhā (Yajnapāla) dynasty of Nalapāri (the fort of Narwar). The immediate object of it is to record the excavation of a stepped well (ostpā) and planting of a garden by Gānagadeva, Minister of Gopahadeva, evidently at Narwar, where the stone was found. The last line of the record shows the date in decimal figures only; it is Thursday, the tenth of the dark half of Pausha of the (Vikrama) year 1339, which, as calculated by Dr. Sircar, regularly correspond to 26th November, 1282 A. C. The month was Purunama.

Like any other prasasti, the record falls into two parts, the first nine verses containing the maṅgaleśṭākas followed by the genealogical account of the royal house, and the remaining eighteen verses speaking about the well and its excavator, with the names of the composer, writer and the engraver of the composition. After the introductory word Siddhāh, the inscription has two invocatory stanzas inviting the blessings of Śudarśana and Achyuta, respectively. The next verse introduces Ratnagiri, and says that a hero of the name of Jayapāla was created by Mahākāśvān, who appears to have been the family deity of the house to which he belonged. Ratnagiri, where the family is stated here to have its seat, cannot be satisfactorily identified, though Dr. Sircar suggests that it may be the same as the modern town of Raunaghar Khedj (Lat. 24° 49'; Long. 75° 13') in the Mandla District of the former Gwalior State on the route from Narmuch to Bundi, 36 miles (58 kms. north-east of the former and 73 miles (117 kms.) south-east of the latter. The description of the mountain in v. 3, that it (is so lofty as to) obstruct the speed of the Sun's chariot is all poetic. With reference to the family name Jayapāla, it is possible to say that it may have been the Sanskritised form of Jayapāla, who appears to be an eponymous hero, or mythical king, in view of the fact that the real history of the house begins from Chāhāda. This prince is stated to have captured, by the force of his arms, Nalapāri and some other places from his enemies whom he vanquished (v. 6-7); and then we find the name of his son Nriyavam. After him (tadān) was born Asalladēva whose description is merely conventional (v. 8). The definite relationship between these two rulers is not mentioned in the present record, but from the other inscriptions of the house we know that the latter was the son of the former. Asalladēva's son was Gopahadeva who is stated here

---

1 Sircar, op. cit., p. 36.
2 Ratnagiri can hardly be identical with Raunaghar, as suggested. The fort at that place is not old. See G. A. R. for 1928-29, p. 21, and besides, it is situated about 400 kms. south-west of Narwar. It is possible that the place may have been identical with the village known as Dāngar, lying almost mid-way between Narwar and Shivpuri (See G. A. R. for 1928-29, p. 11), but in this case we have to presume that this place was called by the name Ratna, or it may have been a poetic fancy. In any way the hill appears to be near Narwar and not so far in the Mandua district.
to have vanquished Viravarman, the king of Jejjabhuki, in a struggle on the banks of the river known as Sikaná. The Chandella ruler Viravarman's reigning period is known to be from c. 1247 to 1286 A.C. and the battle referred to here is the same in which his distinguished general Balabhudra Mallaya vanquished the lord of Narwar, as seen above, while commenting on the Dáli grant of the Chandella king.  

What is new in the genealogy of the royal house of Narwar is only the name of Ásala's son Gópála, as stated in v. 9 of the present record, which also goes to corroborate the account of the battle between him and Viravarman, as seen above.  

The second part of the prakásti which commences from v. 10, mentions the ancestors of Gánggedádeva who got excavated a stepped well, evidently at Narwar, the place where the inscribed stone was found. The first name mentioned here is that of Víjáyádeva, whose son was Suraší, who was a warrior and who killed ministerial forces consisting of elephants in a battle (v. 13). Here the reading visvála-prabhu-baláni is doubtful; but it is not unlikely, as suggested by Dr. Sircat, that the word Bundéla may have really been intended here. The successor of this man there was one Víjádeva "who put the mark of gold in the form of his weapon on the army of the Máltáhhas which was the touch-stone". It is a poetic way of saying that he struggled with the Muslim forces and conquered them, which appears to be a reference to his battle with the army of Gájas-nád-dun Balban who was then carrying on raids in Rájasthán and in the surrounding region. Víjádeva's wife was Sábháyádevi (v. 16). She gave birth to Gánggedádeva, who became Minister of Gópaládeva and who actively participated in his master's warfare with Viravarman, the struggle with the Chandella king, as we have seen above. Verse 18 supplements our information by recording that in this battle he was associated with Jayanta, the Minister of the son of Nivávarman, i.e., Ásalládeva.  

Verses 21-24 state that Gánggedádeva, gratified the distressed (his subjects), spread merits, directed welfare, removed sins and distributed wealth. With a desire to increase his merits, he excavated the well where good water was obtained, and also planted a beautiful garden for the satisfactions of his ancestors, gods and travellers. The next verse expresses the hope that the well may be everlasting.  

Verse 26 gives the name of the poet, Sívanábhaka, who composed the prakásti. He was the son of the Treasury-Officer, Láháta by name, and a grandson of Damódara, who had emigrated to Gópárdri from Mathurá. The verse giving all this account is reproduced from the preceding inscription which too was composed by the same poet some three years earlier. The last verse states that the record was written (on the stone) by Maháraja. Here the inscription closes with the date, as seen above, and with the expression suhám = nata (may it be well) and the Nágári letter chha showing auspiciousness.  

The name of the engraver, which does not appear in the main body of record, is incised on the lower border of the stone. He was Jiú(r)andivára belonging to the engraver's clan.  

As for the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Ratnagíri (v. 3) may be the hill near Narwar, as seen above, and Nálagíri (v. 6) is the hill adjoining to Narwar where the stone was discovered probably the same. Síkáta-nímmagá (v. 19), also appearing as Saikáta-tatíni (v. 9) is the stream known as Barúl or Balúl, a tributary of the Sindh which flows near Narwar; and Gópárdri (v. 26) is, of course, Gáwláor.

2. See above, nos. 162-174.
4. As the second akshara of the name is so spelt also in No. 178, below, the name does not appear to be a mistake for Maháraja. This person is also obviously different from Maháraja, the son of Símarája, who is named No. 189, above, which is dated V. 1252, and is thus earlier by 87 years.
5. All these variants appear in the inscriptions discovered at Bálúl (to be seen above). Balúl is the corrupt form of Bálúká=Síkáti.
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Scale: Two-fiftieth
NARWAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÖPÅLÄDEVA

TEXT

[From the original stone.

Denoted by a symbol.

What appears as the sign of Anupāna above is the original fault of the stone.

This may also be taken as सरलीना.

In many cases this akṣara appears as a combination of the palatal and the dental sibilant. At the end of the second line, as also at the end of some other lines below, the sign of kāna-pāṇa is engraved.

By a redundant horizontal stroke, gāt appears as ma. In contrast, see n. 9 below.

In No. 176, below, the name appears as Mahārājā. Evidently the mātā of the second letter of the name is here dropped as it would not suit the metre here.

First engraved as याज्ञवल्क्य, and then the stroke above the top of the second letter is scarred off. Jñātā means 'a glorious achievement'.

The horizontal stroke of the consonant m is not engraved and thus it appears as g. cf. n. 5 above.

Restore to मुक्तवत्ता पपातम् — meaning 'who was dexterous in curbing the elephants of his enemies, lived on the hill'.

It can also be read as परक्ष. (v.s. 2.) The reading of the six bracketed letters that follow is from the traces left. The word Chandāra here probably denotes Chandellā (or Chandēra?).

Sūrya here gives the sense of 'the sun', and it means a distress, usually of six types as uṣṭhita, uṣhtubhi, etc.

The reading of the bracketed akṣaras is only from the faint traces on the stone and therefore uncertain. Sirca read [sdh]पारशुराम।]
12 बाहुल्यापार्वत्य सामान्य विद्यालयात्मकात्मक संतसौरांवासिन्द्रानां [[11.12 अन्तिम विज्ञानविज्ञान श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

13 ियें: [[11.13 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

14 ियें: [[11.14 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

15 ियें: [[11.15 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

16 ियें: [[11.16 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

17 ियें: [[11.17 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

18 ियें: [[11.18 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

19 ियें: [[11.19 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

20 ियें: [[11.20 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

21 ियें: [[11.21 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

22 ियें: [[11.22 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

23 ियें: [[11.23 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

24 ियें: [[11.24 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

25 ियें: [[11.25 अन्तिम अवयवनवर्ग श्रुती: शृगारिका] ।]

[[1 Here too the reading is from the traces left.]]

[[2 The sign of vaṣaṇā is almost mingled with the letter that follows.]]

[[3 This sthāna appears as vaḥ.]]

[[4 Most of the sthāneras in the latter half of this verse have now disappeared, leaving only traces.]]

[[5 The reading of bracketed letters is at both the places in this half of this verse is uncertain; and according to Dr. Sirca, they are Hastināpura and Vivasālā, respectively. Sirca also suggested that the latter denotes the Chāhāmāna king Vignāraja IV, whose known dates are 1153 and 1164 A.C.; and since Vijāvādeva's grandson, the hero of the present record, was a later contemporary of the Imperial Chāhāmāna king of Ajmer and Delhi, and probably also an officer under the Gahadāvāla monarch Vijayachandra (r. 1255-70 A.C.), we may be left to come into conflict with the king of Delhi. His grandfather (Vijāvādeva) may be taken to have been a minister under Asilā, son of Nirakārā, who also defeated Vīravarmā, in battle with Gopāla and thus he continued for two generations. For this suggestion of Sirca, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII, p. 37. But this is merely a conjecture, unsupported by any other evidence and also involving a number of probabilities, besides that it is based on the uncertain reading of both the names, viz. Hastināpura and Vivasālā, which may also be read as Vīravarmā.]]

[[6 Engraved ९, subsequently changed to ०, with the mark of the mātrā still visible.]]

[[7 The upper curve of the mātrā of the preceding letter is extremely faint on the original.]]

[[8 Sirca read शृगारि, which is not visible on the original.]]
SURWĀYĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÒPĀLADĒVA

No. 176; Plate CXL

SURWĀYĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GÒPĀLADĒVA

[vikrama] Year 1341

The stone bearing this inscription was found in an old ruined well, locally known as Dabia bāḍī in a jungle about 5 kms. to the north of Surwāyā; a tiny hamlet on the Jhānā-Śipri metalled road, about 20 kms. to the east of Śipri, the headquarters of a tehsīl and district in Madhya Pradesh. Removed from its original place some time in 1918 by the late Shri M. B. Garde who found the stone in the well, it was for some time exhibited in the portico of a temple at Surwāyā and was subsequently transported to the archaeological museum at Gwālior where it now exists. The inscription was briefly noticed in a publication of the department of archaeology of the former Gwālior State and entitled "A Guide to Surwāyā" (1919), on pp. 25-26 and illustrated on plate XII. It was also included by D. R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions in Northern India (No. 607). It is edited here for the first time from the original stone which I examined in the Museum where it exists, and from an impression of it which I owe to the Curator of the Museum.

The inscription covers a space 43.5 cms. broad by 42.5 cms. high. It is engraved on a counterstruck surface of a dark pinkish stone which has broad borders on all the four sides including which, the stone measures 57.5 cms. in each side. The writing is in a state of good preservation, except a letter each in the middle of 11, 6, 9, which has been abraded though it can be read with certainty. The letters are well formed and carefully cut and their size is about 1.5 cms., except in the last line where a little smaller. On the upper border of the stone and separated from the main body of the record, is another line, 20 cms. long, in slightly bigger letters which are sparsely written. It reads Pratāśa-Somaśhara-putra-śivara-vāpikā: and similarly, on the right side of the lower border of it is engraved another line which gives the name of the engraver of the record with date in figures.

The characters are Nāgari of the thirteenth century A.C. to which the record belongs. They are symmetrical in form and are written and cut more carefully than those of the preceding.

The sign of vēpha on the bracketed letter is very faintly carved.
On this name, see n. in the edition of the inscription.
It is the sign showing suspicionness. On the lower border of the stone, in the middle but slightly towards the left is engraved in the same hand ३४१ श्री पृथ्वीविंशासरीस्तग्रामका विवेक (३४१) (२) (१)
The history and antiquities of this place are described in A.S.I. R., XXIV, p. 25 and also in the P.R.A.S., W.C., for 1915-16, p. 11.
inscription which was engraved only a couple of years before. Attention may be drawn to the
form of the initial v, the loop with the tail of which is separated from the rest (e.g., in iti, 1, 12); to that of the initial n incised as nu (see udāra, 1, 9); to that of p with its middle vertical stroke ending in a loop (see purāṇa, 1, 18); to that of y engraved as y (cf. halph, 1, 1); and lastly, to the mark of a final consonant resembling the mātrā of long ū, as in sanyah, 1, 5. The limbs of the letters are formed angular.

The writing is correct but involves a few mistakes as tamnāt for tasmāt and nimmala for

mmata, both in 1, 9. The language is Sanskrit, which is generally correct; and except for

the opening word siddhiḥ, the record is metrically composed. The verses, which are all numbered,
total 19. The poet who had a deep knowledge of the Harṣacarita on which the initial portion of

the record is based, has some slackness in his composition: e.g., the use of the word su-videśu

and the redundant te and tua, all in v. 9.

As regards orthography, we note that (1) v is written throughout for h; cf. yudha, 1, 2; (2)

the dental s is put for the palatal ʃ in a few instances like Sarvva for Sarvva in the same line;

(3) anupāra is wrongly used in a few cases at the end of a stich, e.g., at the end of the first half

of v. 1, but not so at the end of it; and lastly, (4) a consonant after r is generally doubled ex-
cepting in a few instances; see sarvva, 1, 1 but not in urjita, 1, 13.

The object of the inscription is to record the excavation of a stepped well (vāpi), evidently

the same in which the stone was found, by a person whose name was Ishvara. The record does

not refer to any ruling prince by name nor to any dynasty which was then holding its sway in

the region; but as the date is mentioned to be the fifth of the bright half of Karttiika, Wednesday

of the Vikrama year 1341, which regularly corresponds to Wednesday, 3rd October, 1285 A.C.,

it may be ascribed to the period of the Yajñavalkya Goplādēva who was holding sway in that

region from 1279 to 1289 A.C.

Opening with the auspicious word Siddhiḥ, the record has one verse to invoke the blessings

of Śiva under the name Sarva. It then mentions the origin of the Saravata Brāhmaṇa, stating

that the river Sarasvati married the sage Dādhiḥ who was performing penances on her bank

and had from him a son of the name of Saravata (born of Sarasvati). He pleased Indra by his

penances at the time of a drought and obtained rains from him (vv. 2-3). In his generation

which flourished at Sarasvati-pattana, there were several learned persons who were all devoted to

performing sacrifices and worshipped Śiva (v. 4). The next verse states that in his lineages

by Bharadēvā, the great-jewel of the Dikshitas, who worshipped Viśnu (yajñapuruśa) by

sacrifices. His son was Aśīdharā, the foremost among those who knew the supreme Spirit and

the good conduct personified (v. 6). From him was born Harihikēśa, whose heart was pure and who

was compassionate, generous, of good conduct and a member of a society (sabhāstara). His wife

was Lāhuvidā, the daughter of Rālha, who knew two of the Vēdas (v. 8). She gave birth to three

sons, viz., Sāmādharā, Nāyaka and Gūḍjādēva (v. 9). Sāmādharā was proficient in the three

Vēdas, the Purāṇas and grammar (v. 10). His wife was Dēvarṣi (Devasī), the daughter of Bharah-

pāla (v. 11), who is otherwise unknown. Her sons were Rāṇi-kēśa, Soma, who was a poet, Ishvara,

Sīlara and Rudra (v. 12). The next verse states that the well, evidently the same where the stone

was discovered, was excavated by Ishvara. Nothing more about this person is known.

Verse 14 is devoted to describing the well in a poetic way; and the next verse states that the

pradāsi was composed by Sūmanātwa, the son of Sāmādharā and thus a brother of Ishvara himself,

who excavated the well, as known from v. 12, above. Verse 19, the last of the verses of the record,

states that it was written by Gāṅgadēva, the son of the Brāhmaṇa Maṅge who belonged to the

Gauḍa lineage. It was engraved by Rājana (Ratana), whose name appears on the lower border of

the stone, as seen above, along with the date in figures.

The inscription is void of any historical interest.

The only geographical name appearing in the inscription is Saravata-pattana (v. 4), which

is the modern village Saruṣāyā, near which the stone was found. For the ending -yā, we may

compare the name Padmāvati changed to Pawāyā, which is in the same region.

---

1 See I. I. H., No. 667. The year is expressed in word-numerals, excepting the first one.

2 For the meaning of this word, see s. under verse 7 in the text, below.
TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1-2 and 12 Sārddhāvāśrīśrī tīrtha ; v. 3 Saugdhanā ; vv. 4, 6 and 10 Upajāti ; vv. 5 and 9 Upajāti (combination of Yathāntha and Indravāndhi) ; v. 7 Sūkṣrīṣā ; vv. 8 and 18-19 Anaśīkha ; v. 11 irregulär ; vv. 13-14 Rāthādīhātā ; v. 15 Vasanaśīlākā ; v. 16 Upajāti (combination of Indravāndhi and Indravāndhi) ; and v. 17 Arjū].

1. अष्टेण सिरं : इति। विद्वेद बिधिमुःशया सुरूति य संख्यविभावस्य सुत्तु कृतिरिस्वा क्षणि यः सलक्यम्वायमरिषित(तम)। क्षणमायमिति(प्रि)।

2. य गुरुपर्वदेशस्तिथियतं श्री(श)यः सर्वमुखःगाधर्यो दिशालो वो देवः सुषं शालकः। अतिन्द्र(इ)हस्तारः गुरुमार्गः श्री(श)गुरुमार्गाधिरातः।

3. अविनाशः सरस्तातु गुरुपर्वदेशस्तिथियतं स्वातः सत्ताया भविः। सा [तेर्ये] तपस्या स्वितं कृतिरित स्वेच्छा सुयत्वमाय कृतिरित गुरूत्वस्तिथियतं सरस्तातु।

4. न नामः। 12. तनावशृङ्खलास्तिथियतं तनावशृङ्खलास्तिथियतं तस्यम्भास्तिथियतं वृद्धि कृतिरित तस्य देवमायसमाय। बेदांगी।

5. गे : सर्वमुखः स्मृतिययमयुयवावायमरिषित(श्या)हृद्यान भक्तिमायो भूयः सारस्तातु य अभिवत्तामुः पाठयाभास यथा॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

6. नामदेवों सारस्तातुस्तिथियतं सुतां (श्री)भद्रां। श्रीमुःशयासारस्तातुस्तिथियतंसिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(स्म)। विध्यं सतारास्तिथियतं सिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(स्म)। विध्यं सतारास्तिथियतं सिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(स्म)॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

7. हृद्यान भक्तिमायो भूयः सारस्तातु स्मृतिययमयुयवावायमरिषित(श्या)। विध्यं सतारास्तिथियतं सिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(श्या)॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

8. श्री(श)विनकसंग्रहश्च ब्रजवर्मण(श्री)भक्तिमायो भूयः। विध्यं सतारास्तिथियतं सिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(श्या)॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

9. शालकममत्स्यायमरिषित(श्या)द्वित्तियतं सस्तरं निबद्धस्मायमरिषित(श्या)॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

10. ज्ञानन्दिन्यायः श्री(श)श्यायं श्री(श)श्यायं श्री(श)श्यायं। विध्यं सतारास्तिथियतं सिधिशिष्यायमरिषित(श्या)॥ 13. सर्वकालस्य नामः।

11. गृहालयालयात्मको यष्टेण श्रीकृतिरित। अतितमस्तिथियतं सर्वकालस्य नामः।

12. गृहालयालयात्मको यष्टेण श्रीकृतिरित। अतितमस्तिथियतं सर्वकालस्य नामः।

13. गृहालयालयात्मको यष्टेण श्रीकृतिरित। अतितमस्तिथियतं सर्वकालस्य नामः।

1. From the original stone and an impression.
2. Expressed by a symbol.
3. This danda is very close to the following letter and appears as a part of it.
4. A redundant chlor stroke has made this akshara appear as ḍha.
5. For all this mythical account and the origin of the Sārddhāt, see Harsha-charitra, Ch. I.
6. The word sthāna has been contracted here for metrical exigencies.
7. The akshara in the brackets is engraved as niu.
8. One who conducts or is a member of an assembly. See Viśvaipatya, under the word, where it is stated:

शुभविश्वाशीपथिः सारस्तातु अभिवधारयात्र याः।
शृङ्खलास्तिथियतं सत्यम्यानादस्मारिषित॥
Also see Sabhākhandavāma of M. William’s Dictionary, under sādha.
9. It is not known if the second akshara of the the name has to be read as i, for which cl. iti in the next line and again in 1, 13.
10. By a wrong stroke the letter in the brackets shows a combination of the dental and the palatal sibilant.
11. The Sanskrit form of this name would be Dvārakā. What is intended is nāmāra, which would not suit the metre. It may also be noted that in each of the quarters of the verse, which is Saṅgītā, the first akshara which should be long has been changed to two short ones.
This inscription is on a memorial stone pillar in the tiny hamlet of Sésai on the Agra-Bombay road, situated about 15 kms. south of Stpř (Shivpur), the headquarters of a district of the same name in Madhya Pradesh. It was discovered in 1914, by M. B. Garde, the Superintendent of Archaeology in the former State of Gujūlr, and was brought to notice by him in the Annual Report of the department for that year (i.e., V.S. 1971), which is not available in print. The pillar was again found at the same place by Dr. D. C. Sircar, in 1955, in his tour in the Shivpur District: and from the impressions then prepared by him, he edited the record, along with some others, in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXI (1957), pp. 323 ff., with its transcript in Roman characters. The record is edited here from one of those impressions which were taken by Dr. Sircar and kindly supplied to me by Dr. G. S. Gai, the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The inscription consists of twelve lines of writing, covering a space about 30.5 cm. broad by 20.5 cm. high, and has suffered from long exposure to weather. Its preservation is not satisfactory. The mechanical execution was rather sloppy. The average size of the letters is 1 cm.

---

\[\text{This word denotes śrātrācharya, who is known to have been a poet.}\]
\[\text{The absence of ā is dropped according to the \textit{Pāṭhika} on \textit{Phāpinī}, VIII, 3 36. It is rare \textit{sandhi}.}\]
\[\text{The adjectives used in this verse are applicable to both, i.e., a pearl and the \textit{pradāst}.}\]
\[\text{The name of the engraver, which could not be accommodated in the main body of the inscription, is incised on the lower part of the border of the stone, on the right side, along with the date in numerical figures. The whole reading is:}\]
\[\text{नवास राजा} II II II \textit{गृहस्त्रु} 1111 साक्षात कुंज 3 II \textit{सुहु} II\]
\[\text{Here the reference is to H. N. Devedi's \textit{Gaṅgītor Rāyā-nāh Abhīdākha}, No. 151.}\]
\[\text{His No. is B-231 of 1955-56.}\]
SURWAYA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GOPALADEVA, VIKRAMA 1341

From Photograph
Sesai Stone Inscription of the Time of Gopaladeva, Vikrama 1341

Scale: One-half
The characters belong to the Nagari alphabet; and from the point of view of the palaeography, it may be noted that the letter bh is antique in form, e.g., in bhāṭāra, l. 2; that r is sometimes denoted by a vertical with a horizontal stroke attached to its middle, on the left, as in rāja, l. 4; and that the sign of the final consonant in saṁhitā, l. 12, almost resembles the sign of the medial n. The language is Sanskrit, which is corrupt and often also grammatically incorrect; and the entire record is in prose.

The orthography does not call for any special notice, except that vertical strokes, which are decorated with top-strokes, are often used to separate words as the commas of the modern times, for which see ll. 1, 2 and 4.

Beginning with auspicious words, the inscription mentions the name of the illustrious Gopālādeva with the epithets including Paramāhāṭāra, Mahārajaḥirāja and Paramēśvara, stating at the same time that he was a great devotee of Mahēśvara (Śiva). From the provenance of the record and also from the year mentioned in it, this king is no doubt the homonymous ruler of Narwar, whose rule extended from c. 1279 to c. 1289 A.C. Following this, it is introduced the illustrious Jaitujamadāva a slave of the devotees of Brāhmaṇas, who was then governing the region. The relation that this person bore to Gopālādeva is not specified in the record; but as rightly remarked by Dr. Sircar, on the basis of taking him identical with the Mahākañčanda or Kumbra Jairavārman called Jairavahmadēva, Jayatavahmadēva and Jēyavatavahmadēva of the Bāṅgali inscriptions, that he was undoubtedly a subordinate ruler under the Vajapeśa monarch and probably also enjoyed the status of a crown-prince (yuvāraja).

The object of the inscription, as given in ll. 5-8, is to record the death of Rā, i.e., Rāṭa Maladēva in a battle fought in connection with a case of cattle-lifting at the street (prāṭāṭi) in the village of Sēsai (where the inscribed pillar was found), probably along with both the wives who too were killed by the cattle-lifters, as suggested by the language of the record. The elder wife was Māhinidēvi and the younger one was Nāviladēvi (ll. 8-9). The pillar was erected by their sons who were the Rā (Rāṭa) Himāṇa and the Rā (Rāṭa) Hamārāṇa (ll. 10-11), who (thus) brought fame to the family.

The inscription ends with the date eis., the (Vikrama) year 1341 (expressed in numerical figures only), the first tīthi of the dark fortnight of Paūsha when it was Monday. Working out the details of the date, Dr. Sircar observed that "they (the details) are irregular, but may refer to the 25th of December, 1284 A.D." This view may be accepted.

Sēsai-gōma, mentioned in l. 6 of the inscription, is, no doubt the village of the same name where the pillar has been found.

**TEXT**

1. श्रीम् श्लोकम् प्रकटः परमारोऽविवर्तमानः ।
2. ततो श्रीम् परमारोऽविवर्तमानः ।
3. परमारोऽविवर्तमानः परमारोऽविवर्तमानः ।
4. ततो ततो ।
5. हाराणासृणुदानः श्रीम् ।

---

1. Above, Nos. 163 and 166, each in I. 5, and No. 174, in I. 4.
3. On Monday, the first tīthi ended at 00 moment of the day, and the second, at 97 moment on the same day. Thus the mention of the first tīthi, which was current at sunrise, appear to be justified.
4. From impression.
5. Expresses by symbol.
6. Here and in some lines below, the danda is used to separate the expressions, as already stated above. Sircar suggested that prakṛtyā may also be the reading, but it is generally not found in inscriptions.
7. A word like pātī is to be supplied here.
8. Read dhēka, to be restored to dhēka, Prathipatāko, as suggested by Sircar, drawing attention to his Select Inscriptions, pp. 283, 285, 324, etc.
9. Sircar read by, but the sign of the mātra appears to have been erased in the impression and the consonant tī is misformed. Read श्रीम् परमारोऽविवर्तमानः.
THE slab bearing this inscription is stated to have been discovered at Surwāyā,12 a small village about 20 km. east of Śipri (Śilvāpurī), and is now exhibited in the archaeological Museum at Gwalior. A synopsis of the contents of the record, prepared by Hiranand Sastri, was published in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. for the year 1903-04, Pt. II, pp. 286 ff. and it was included by D. R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 696. The inscription was also published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXII, pp. 339 ff., and Plate. It is edited here from the original stone, which I examined in the museum where it exists, and from an inked impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The record is incised on a stone slab measuring 57.5 cms. square, including a broad border on all the four sides. The inscribed portion, which is in a sunken panel of it, consists of 22 lines covering a space 41.9 cms. broad by 43.18 cms. high. It is neatly engraved and is in an excellent state of preservation, with a few akharas damaged here and there. Writing in 1903, Hiranand Sastri remarked that “one letter in the second line, two in the third and fifth lines, and one in the seventh and the seventeenth lines are abraded”; but now it has suffered slightly

---

1 This is a contraction of sañiśa. Perhaps we have also to read daūgrāha.-
2 This word stands for samgṛhaṇa, meaning a battle (B.C.S.).
3 That is, in fighting, as in some of the Bengali inscriptions. Cf. No. 168, I. 9, and No. 172, I. 5, above.
4 Restore the whole to t¹ṣṇa maṅgi āhāram. The second akshara which was probably intended to be at, is misemployed and appears as an.
5 That is, were killed in the battle.
6 Read kriyā. The second akshara which was probably intended to be at, is misemployed and appears as an.
7 This is a contraction of samāra. Perhaps we have also to read daūghāra.-
8 This word stands for samgṛhaṇa, meaning a battle (B.C.S.).
9 The last letter appears to have a faint sign of sañiśa above, or it may be the fault of the stone.
10 The information about the name of the place is based on H. N. Dvivedi’s Gwalior Rāvyān-kā Abhāleśha, No. 163. In his A.S.I. R. (Vol. II. p. 816) Cunningham states to have discovered an inscription in a well locally known as the Śipāl abāndī, and it appears to have been the same. In his Guide to Surwāyā, p. 23, n. 5, M.B. Garde also expressed the same view.
more showing damage of parts of one letter each in 11, 6, 15 and 22, though the whole text can be made out with certainty. The size of the individual letters varies from 1.3 to 1.5 cms. On the lower border of the slab are another line in two parts, the one on the left measuring 8.5 cms. and the other on the right measuring 8 cms. long. The letters in the main record are well formed and deeply incised, but those in the line on the panel are somewhat roughly formed, though they show the same palaeography. Two or three letters on the right side are indistinct.

The characters are Nāgarī, resembling those employed in the preceding inscriptions, but also showing some development in their formation and approaching those of the modern Nāgarī. The tail of the left limb of ỉ, ȫ, and ṣ is occasionally not carved when the letter is the first member of a conjunct consonant or when a mātra is attached to it below e.g., in ḍhāṭu, l. 1, surāsā, l. 5, and haraṇṭi, l. 16. The initial stroke of ch, which distinguished the letter from dhi and v, is occasionally lightly treated, or is bent, e.g., in Chāchīga, l. 13, chēṭa, l. 16, which is almost similar to v in vasu, in the same line, and in ruchī, l. 21; the slightly different forms of bh are to be seen in sambhava, l. 2, and bhūmi, l. 12; and lastly, the palatal sibilant, which has assumed its modern Nāgarī form, shows its ligature form less number of times and almost when it is a superscript.

The language is Sanskrit; and except for Om namah Sivāya, in the beginning, and the date at the end, the record ismetrically composed throughout, containing 23 verses, all of which are numbered. All the numerical figures are marked by two vertical strokes at their beginning, except the figures 4 and 5 which have the strokes also after them. The orthographical peculiarities are almost the same as we find in the preceding records, e.g., b denoted by the sign for v, as in vabhīna, l. 7; and the use of the sign of anusvāra in place of a nasal except in a few instances. The sibilants are correctly used, except in one case where the dental is put for the palatal, in anusvāra, l. 20, and there are two cases, viz., śuṇa, l. 8 and saṅka, l. 18, where the sign is used vāni. A consonant following r is reduplicated but there are exceptions; e.g., in karmaṇa, l. 4 it is observed but not in the same word in l. 5. The rule of sandhi is violated in padma, l. 17, and the plural in niyātiḥ, l. 9, is grammatically wrong, as shown in a foot-note. Writing vepi instead of vepī in l. 18, is apparently a scribal error. The name Śivāy in its Prakrit form in l. 9 is interesting.

The inscription is one of Chāchīgadēva, an officer under the illustrious Gānapatidēva whose dynasty is not mentioned, but from its provenance and from the year recorded therein, he can be identified with the Yajavāla ruler Gopāladeva of Narwar, whose known dates range from V.S. 1548 to 1556. The object of the document is to record the construction of a stepped well by Chāchīgadēva. The record is dated in the year 1550 (expressed in decimal figures only). The tithi was the 7th of the dark half of Kārttiika, on Wednesday. The year is evidently of the Vikrama era, and the date regularly corresponds to 23rd September, 1298 A.C. for The Northern Vikrama expired, as already calculated by Sircar, who also observed that the soptam titiḥ began on that date at 19 of the day.

After the customary obeisance to Śiva, the inscription opens with three invocatory verses in honour of the crescented moon adorning the forehead of Śambhu, the goddess Mahārūṇḍā, the family deity of the Yajavāla royal house, and lastly, the speech of the poet (goddes of Learning), devoting one verse to each of them. With verse 4 begins the pedigree of Chāchīgadēva who built the well. His grandfather was Gūḍhala (?) born in the Ladhaka family of the Kāśyapa gōtra. He was famous for his liberality and even brought contentment by acts of pious liberality (vv. 4-6). He had a son, Padma by name, who was an abode of the goddess of wealth.

---

1 In his article in I.H. R., Vol. XXXII, p. 399. Dr. D. C. Sircar takes Chāchīgadēva to be a feudatory of Gopāla, which may be possible from the use of Rāṇaka about him; but he is also called Gopāla’s dharmā-patrā.
2 See Narwar inscription of V. 1539, v. 5, above, No. 173.
3 For the word pāṭa, see M.S., Ch. IV, p. 226. D. C. Sircar connected Ladhaka with the Lodos of the neighbouring Agra region who are stated to be an agricultural community. See his article, p. 349.
4 The text here reads padma padma tiśaḥ iṣṭaḥ (v. 7). Grammatically the correct form would be padma-padaḥ; but what appears to have been intended is yamañātiḥ, meaning the goddess of wealth made her residence in him by padma, i.e., ten arbudas or ten thousand millions. Cf. Padma-saṅkhāḍayō nibbhoḥ (bhūth), as stated in the Amara-kāla.
His description in verses 7-9 is all poetic. His wife was Siyā (v. 10), who gave birth to two sons (v. 11). The elder of them was Kākali (v. 12), and his younger brother was the illustrious Rāṇāka Chāhchādadeva, who was a learned Kāhātriya and the adopted son of Gopāla (v. 13).

Verses 14-16 inform us that Chāhchādadeva performed pilgrimages to the holy places Kādāra (in the north), Somēśa, i.e., Somēśvara (evidently in Saurāṣṭra), Prayāga, and the Ganges, which are all well known. He performed obsequies for the manes at Gayā and paid his debt to Gopāladeva by noble deeds at the birhas and on the battle fields (vv. 15-16). His wife was Sahajā (v. 17).

The next verse tells us that considering wealth and life to be fickle and desiring to increase his spiritual merit, Chāhchādadeva built a stepped well (v. 18). Verse 19 is devoted to the description of the well: and v. 20 informs us that he also planted a garden full of creepers and trees bearing fruits and flowers to remove the fatigue of travellers. The next verse expresses the desire that the meritorious place (where Chāhchādadeva built the well and planted the garden) may prosper.

Verse 22 embodies the name of the poet of the Prāśati. He was Jayasimha, a son of Lōhata, belonging to the Māthura clan of the Kāyasahas. And the last verse of the record tells us that it was written (on the stone) by Maharāja, who was the son of Somarāja, who too belonged to the Māthura clan of the Kāyasahas. He is the same person who also wrote the Narwar inscription of V, 1339 (No. 175).

The record was engraved by Dēvasthīnaha, whose name appears on the lower border of the stone; and the right side thereof supplies the person who supervised the whole work. It cannot be definitely made out as this portion is mutilated.

Of the geographical name mentioned in the inscription, Kādāra is in the Himayalas, Somēśa or Sōmanātha, is in Saurāṣṭra, and Prayāga is near Allahābād, as already stated. Gayā is in Bihar. The community of the Māthura Kāyasahas was known after Mahārāja in Uttar Pradesh.

---

**TEXT**


1. सिंहः ॥ ओननमः । भिक्षाय ॥ ययः । विश्वः । शंभोमद्दिशकालिणी । कला । काकलानहुमनकरसः ।
2. द्वारा लिखितानि रिशो ॥ श्री । सुपी तन्त्रवर ॥ हिति मनोवाचारिण । [र्] । अर्थः । सा लीलावतेया महादेवा ।
3. पुनः[ु] कवः ॥ [र्] [द्वारा] कविभा की मृ(ु)सा सर्वसिद्धि ॥ न यः । नियमो ब्राह्मणमकत्वं ॥
4. तेहि मुक्ति ॥ कालापरं ॥ कालापरीक्षा । कृत्यः । कालापरकारः । कृत्यः । कालापरीक्षा ।
5. कवः । कालापरं ॥ कालापरकारः । कृत्यः । कालापरसंकल्पसंस्कारः ॥ महादेवा ॥
6. हलानकेवलितिर्कर्कस्वस्वमिति ॥ अनुव्रत्ममा यो भयति राजराज इत्यादि ॥ तस्य प्रारम्भं ॥

---

1. As remarked by Hirambad Satrī, the word rāṇaka here appears as an attempt to Sanskritize the word rāṇa though the latter is commonly rendered by Sanskrit rāṇāka.
2. Lōhata appears to have been the same person who is mentioned as Chāhchādadeva's treasury officer. See v. 27 of the next inscription.
3. From the original stone and an inked impression.
4. Denoted by a symbol.
5. A kāka-pātha appears here, as also at the end of ll. 4, 6, 16 and 20.
6. Originally pī with the sign of amsa sthāna scratched off later on; but its mark is still visible.
7. In place of the first of these letters some other letter was originally written and the second letter is uniformed; but the reading is certain, as also taken by D. C. Sircar. For a similar form of I, see Srudhāśa in l. 14, below.
8. All the three ahāras are abraded and the reading is not certain. I have, however, adopted the reading of D. C. Sircar.
9. This is a fine example of vyaśāsīka based on śīla and meaning that the person described just above, is, as it, another rāṇāka (Kūvēra, and his sovereign), for whereas Kūvēra is devoted to one god (śiva), is attended by the kinnaras and is a friend of the one who is nōt ngr i.e., is pleasant (meaning the moon), this person, quite unlike him, is devoted to many deities; he is served by unscrupulous people and is a friend of those who are gentle in behaviour.
The consonant of this akshara has totally disappeared.

Grammatically singular is required here. Drop the sign of snarga.

The sign of retadaha, which was originally put on this akshara, was later on erased on the stone, but the mark of it still exists.

This akshara was first omitted and was engraved in a very small size just above the line. The sign of retadaha, which follows (bhanta), is lengthened metrically. The dot on ꞌgay is faulty on the stone.

And not chalchhipchay, as originally read by Hirananda Sastri and was followed later on. This was first corrected by Dr. Siria in L.H.Q., Vol. XXXII, p. 899.

This akshara is mutilated.

As above.

Chachha is the colloquial form of Chāčhāga, mentioned above in v. 15.

On the correct form on the name, see s. in No. 175, above.

This line is engraved on the inner panel of the stone. The aksharas in the brackets are mutilated and the sandhi in the end, if the reading is corrected, is wrong. But the reading is not certain. Siria read these aksharas as kama [bhupandha]...taking them as two names, kama and saddha.
NARWAR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GANAPATIDÉVA

[T]his inscription was first brought to notice, in 1864-65, by General Cunningham in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. II (1862-1865), p. 315. Subsequently, a short account of it was published by Kielhorn in 1893, in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXII, pp. 81 ff.; but this account, which is based on a pencil rubbing supplied to him by Dr. Burgess, is without a transcript or a lithograph. The record was again referred to by M.B. Grade in the same Journal, Vol. XLVII (1918), p. 241, and also in the Annual Report of the Archaeology Department of the former Gwalior State, for Sahyant 1971 (1914-15 A.G.); and it was also enlisted by D. R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions (No. 649); and subsequently, it was edited by D. C. Sircar, in the (1958), Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXII pp. 343 ff., with a facsimile. I edit it here from the original stone and from two impressions, one of which was prepared by me, and the other which I owe to the courtesy of the Chief Epigraphist of the Archaeological Survey of India.

The stone bearing this inscription was found at Narwar in the Siwāl (Shivpuri) District of Madhya Pradesh and is now deposited in the Archaeological Museum at Gwalior. It has a broad border on all the four sides, and along with it, measures 56.5 cms. broad and 47.5 cms. high. The record consists of twenty-one lines of writing, covering a space 58.4 cms. broad and 49.6 cms. high, and is in a good state of preservation, except that three letters in l. 15 are abraded, though they can be made out with certainty from the traces left. The mechanical execution is good: the letters are bold and carefully formed and beautifully incised. The average height of the letters is about 1.2 to 1.5 cms.

The characters are Nāgarī, resembling those of the Sārūryā inscription that immediately precedes. Attention, however, may be drawn to the two forms of the vowel a in ajāra- and Ás ā l a-, both in l. 4; to the subscript forms of ehi and th, both of which are alike, as in nechha- and sthāna-, both in l. 16; to that of n as subscript appearing as n, e.g., in pūṣṇa-, l. 16, but not in uktēnya-, l. 21; and finally, to that of j which appears both in its antique and modern forms, e.g., in niṣṭāṭēṣa- in l. 7.

The language is Sanskrit; and with the exception of a small sentence paying obeisance to Śiva in the beginning and the concluding portion mentioning the name of the engraver and the date, the record is in verse. The total number of verses is 28, composed in all well-known metres; but in verse 2 the rare metre known as pādākuṭaka is employed. The style is fluent and the verses are often decorated with figures of speech, e.g., amapraha (v. 5), rāpaḥ (v. 13) and, upamā (v. 24). In respect of orthography, the points that call for notice are: (1) the use of the sign for v to denote b as well, e.g., in śrāvāna- in l. 5; (2) the dipthongs denoted by the pratiṣṭhā- and also by the uttāṇa-mātrā; (3) the occasional doubling of a consonant after v; cf. dharma-, l. 4, but not in varma-, l. 5; (4) the occasional use of the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in saṃmā, l. 4, and vice versa as in ajāra, l. 4, and śrīvā, l. 9; (5) the general tendency to put the sign of anusvāra for the final class-nasal, with a few exceptions, as in v. 9. The spellings udati in l. 9 and paṇī for paṇi in l. 10 exhibit the local element; and (6) placing the danda occasionally so close to the preceding letter as to look like an daṇḍārā, e.g., at the end of l. 5. There are a few mistakes of the engraver, e.g., rāṇi for rāṇe in l. 2; uṣchi for suchi in l. 2; and uṇāvudhāpam in l. 18; all such errors are pointed out in the text below.

The proper object of the inscription is to record that Palhadēva or Palhaja, who belonged to the Māthura clan of the Kāśyas, constructed a dharma-śāsta (sacred place). He erected a temple of Śambhū (Śiva), built a stepped well and also laid out a garden in memory of and for the spiritual benefit of his younger brother who had predeceased him. It is a pāsāti, as the poet is used in v. 27; and as such, it gives an account of the ancestors of Palhadēva and also

---

*For the description and archaeological remains found there, see n. in above, No. 175.*
of those of Gaṇapati, the king of Nalapura, in whose reign all these works of munificences were performed. The date of the record, as given in numerical figures only, is the fifth of the dark half of Kārttika of the Vikrama era 1355 and day was Thursday. The date regularly corresponds to 25th September, 1298 A.C.

The inscription opens with the customary sentence paying obeisance to Śiva; and the first two verses thereof, invoke the blessings of his matted hair and the Sun respectively.

The stanza, which describes the Sun, is rather ambiguous, inviting difference of opinion as to its interpretation. D. C. Sircar is inclined to take Rājā as a Prakrit form of Rājñī, who, as he adds, is known to the Epic and Purānic mythology as the wife of the Sun called Sāmbhādiya whose abode is at Sāmitiśala, which cannot be identified but may have formed a part of Narwar itself or may have been in its vicinity. But the difficulty in accepting this view is that the Prakrit form of Rājñī would be Rājñī and also that Rāppa can hardly be connected with it. It is also noteworthy that the word used here is with the dental and not the lingual n, as the Prakrit form would require. Thus, the suggestion, though ingenious, appears to be conjectural.

To me, however, it appears that the Sun is here described as ratiśāla, and it is so called because it surpasses all the shining objects and imparts brilliance to them all. The last of the adjectives used in the verse, namely sāmi-sthala-ratiśāla, probably denotes the residence of the Sun in the sāmi tree, in the form of fire, as is well known to the Purānic mythology.

The next verse describes Nalapura, and verses 4 to 8 are devoted to give an account of Gaṇapati and his ancestors, beginning from Chāhāda whose son was Nārīvarman. The latter's son was Asallādeva, his son Gopāla, and his son again was Gaṇapati. This genealogy is all known from the earlier records and it is also recorded that Nārīvarman predeceased his father and did not occupy the throne. The description is all conventional; but verse 8 is historically important as it tells us that Gaṇapati made his fame firm by capturing Kiṭridurga.

The name of the enemy from whom he captured this fort is not mentioned in the record, but it can be guessed. Kielhorn is perhaps correct in taking Kiṭridurga identical with Kiṭrigirdurga (i.e., the fort at Dēogadi), mentioned in I. 7 (v. 6) of the Dēogadi rock inscription of the time of the Chandella Kiṭīvarman, but the possibility that it may have been the fort at Chandērī in the Guna District cannot be altogether avoided. Both these places, however, are in the same region and both are situated to the east or south-east of the dominions of the Vaiṣṇavas, which was then included in the dominions of the Chandellas. Gaṇapati's contemporaries on the Chandella throne were Bhājavarman (c. 1286-1289 A.C.) and Hamītavaranman (c. 1289-90 to 1308 A.C.), and we know that during the reign of these two rulers who were the last to occupy the Chandella throne, the sway of this house was almost on its decadence. And though we have no evidence to support the suggestion, it is possible to presume that Gaṇapati may have renewed the struggle with the Chandellas, which was begun at the time of his father Gopāla, as known from the Narwar inscription of V.S. 1358 and also from those found at Banga and dated in V.S. 1359. Or it may be, as suggested by Sircar, that Gaṇapati as a subordinate ally of the Muslim Sultāns at Delhi, may have helped them in their struggle with the Chandellas. Both of these views are hypothetical.

With verse 10 begins the genealogy of the two brothers Palhadēva and Hanūsarāj. It commences with the praise of the fort of Gopāchala (i.e., Gwalior), the abode of many wealthy persons. At that place also flourished a family of the Māthura Kāśyas of the Kāśyapa gotra, who were intelligent and well known for their behaviour as also for their valorous deeds (v. 11). In that family was born a certain Ālhaṇa, who was well versed in all arts and was also bountiful (v. 12). Ālhaṇa's son, Kāhaṇa, was a devotee of Krishna (v. 13), and his son again was Viśajhaṇa, who is stated to have been a Chief Minister (mantri-varṇīśastra) of a king whose name is not mentioned (v. 14). Viśajhaṇa's wife was Managā (v. 15), who worshipped Gaṅgā and Yamuna at

---

1 In his notice of the inscription in Ind. Ant. Vol. XXII, p. 81, Kielhorn reads "either Guran or Sukrē", from the rubbings he had, and supposing the day to be a Friday, he equates the date to be 26th September, 1298 A.C. In his List of Inscriptions (No. 642) D. R. Bhandarkar read Sukrē doubtfully, but accepted the equivalent of the date. But in all the impressions before me I can clearly read Guram, and I have also verified the reading from the original stone. Also see I.N.I., No. 642, where the week-day is doubtfully taken as sukrē.

2 See above, No. 111.

3 See Bhandarkar's List, No. 2107, mentioning Chandērī (as Kiṭridurga).
Prayāga and obtained two sons who were named Gāgadēva and Yamunadeva respectively (v. 16). Gāgadēva is again extolled in the next verse, the description being all conventional. His wife was Lōhā (v. 18), who gave birth to four sons, viz., Palhaja, Harirāja, Śivārāja and Manārāja (vv. 19-20). Palhaja, who is evidently the same as Paṅkadeva of the inscription, as seen above, is enquired in v. 21, as the object of his master’s confidence, benevolent, pious, truthful and learned. He constructed a sacred place (dharma-vāna) by building a stepped well and a temple of Sambhī with Umā and planting an orchard, for the merit of his deceased brother, Harirāja, evidently at the same place and at Narwar where the stone was discovered (vv. 22-25). The next verse expresses the hope that the religious place may prosper.

The verse that follows is devoted to the description of Dāmodara of the Māthuṇa clan (of the Kāyasthas), his son Lōhāja, who was a treasury-officer (of Chhāhada, as already seen above), and the latter’s son Sivānūhā who composed the present praśasti. He is the same person who also composed the Rājasthān and the Suryavā inscription, dated respectively in V.S. 1336 and V.S. 1360; and in the same verse which describes him for three generations and appears in these two records has preserved the name of his son, and engraved by the Śrīrāma (architect) Dhamanka. And here the praśasti closes with the date which we have already discussed above.

As for the localities mentioned in the present inscription, Nalapūra (l. 2) is the same as Narwar, as seen above, and Gopāchala (l. 7) is, of course, Gwārāo. Kāśitvāra (l. 6), as we have already remarked, may have been identical either with Devagad or Chandī; and Gāgā, Yamunā and Prayāga (l. 11) are all well known. Samīstāla, or Samīsthal, or if it is a place, cannot be identified.

TEXT

[Meares: Verses 1, 2, 17, 24 and 35 Upaniṣā; vs. 3 and 29 Arjī; vv. 4, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26 and 28 Amrakul; vs. 6 Indraśā; vs. 8 Arjī; vs. 9 and 14 Gīth; vs. 16 irregular (first and third, pūṇa, Indraśa; and second and fourth, pūṇa, Indraśaha; vs. 21 Sengalā; and vs. 27 Śrīrāmāvā.)

1 स्त्रिया ॥ आँ नमः सिमाय ॥ तमस्मिनिविवः शचिरिधन्तमुख शुक्लगत्तालकृतिवाचः ॥ घोषो श्री ॥

2 कर्मयोऽकारं निवधये चालितालिकालम्य ॥ रक्षोऽर्ज: क्षितलिंगकातः पादुः राव: स समीक्ष्यानि ॥

3 भविः बहृतं समवयं समवयमषकोष: लोहा भ्रात: ॥ तत्ततजन: अवस्थौबालः प्रविष्किरिणीः ॥ अवसप्न: क्षितलिंगकातः मन्यात: ॥

4 अयोद्धातीतिविपशयः क्रोरयोऽकारं असर्वोऽसर्वत: सार्वद। ॥

5 रिति वध: नुः नलावितन्ति द्रामपनुस्तरत्वोऽभेदः ॥ तीर्थगाढः तिर्थस्मयादीमुखान्तिनिवेष्ये: ॥

As is also evident from the expression घोष in l. 3 and घोष श्री in l. 16 of the present inscription.

The poet also composed Nos. 161 and 173; and his brother Jayasimha composed the preceding record, as stated in its v. 22.

From the original stone and impressions.

Expressed by a symbol.

The part of the stone bearing the शालक्ष्म्यमित्रि has pecked off, leaving only a trace of it visible.

Here, as also in some places below, the letter in the bracket, appears as a combination of the palatal and the dental shiyānti. The इ that follows appears as ve by a wrong stroke.

The parts of the two letters appear as mixed with each other. इ इ bears an additional chisel stroke.

As also noted by Sircar, an सामासिक above घोष seems to be rubbed off by the engraver.

The sign of असर्व is faintly visible on the stone and the supercscript घोष is not properly formed. Sircar read सामासिक.

Read as one pūṇa after dropping the वर्गा after घोष and also after ि. The adjective triśthāna here denotes Akṣuṭi, Gajapati and Narwapati i.e., in common with horse, elephant force and infantry, as already suggested by Sircar.
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Scale: Two-fifths
6 यह मण्डलस्वत्त्वान्तिकेन हीरोइनकेनसामायति। आदया कौशलम् यथेको कौशलकर्तविरहः म ॥३॥
7 निर्गमंगमस्वतयः निवर्तमानस्वत्यः समस्यास्यः समस्यास्यः ॥ ॥३॥
8 स्मरणोवाचनाम् भुक्तनाम् भुक्तनाम् भुक्तनाम् ॥ ॥३॥
9 चाद्याय चाद्याय चाद्याय चाद्याय चाद्याय चाद्याय ॥ ॥३॥
10 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
11 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
12 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
13 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
14 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
15 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
16 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
17 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
18 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
19 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
20 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥
21 मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन मण्डलस्वत्तेन ॥ ॥३॥

This syllable is supplied metrica causa.

An unnecessary anuvāra above य was rubbed off by the engraver.

There is an unnecessary mark above य The sign of 'marga at the end of the verse appears to have been engraved in course of revision.

Sarkar read the first akshara of the name as य but the sign of its mālā appears to have been chiselled off.

This letter appears as cī ṭ as the vertical stroke that follows is placed close to it and a curve is also engraved above by way of ornamentation. The last akshara in this line is misformed; or it may have been य as Sircaz actually read it.

These three aksharas are abraded.

The superscrip is wrongly engraved as bh.

This akshara is superfluous. On the stone it also appears to have been cancelled.
SUPPLEMENTARY INSCRIPTIONS

No. 180 : Plate CXLV

HALAYUDHA-STOTRA IN THE AMAREŚVARA TEMPLE AT MĀNDHĀTĀ

[Vikrama] Year 1120

This inscription, which is a stotra in praise of Śiva, was enshrined by R. B. Hirdalal in his List of Inscriptions in Central Provinces and Berar, and subsequently it was transcribed and edited for the first time by P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri, whose article, without a lithograph but with a note by N. P. Chakravarti, was published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXV (1939-40), pp. 173 ff. Chakravarti also transcribed the colophon of the stotra, which was omitted by Sastri, since it was irrelevant to the main stōtra. The complete epigraph is edited here from the original stone which I examined on 21-3-1973, and a set of impressions placed at my disposal by Shri R. S. Garg, Curator of the Central Museum at Indore.7

The inscription is incised on four rectangular slabs of stone fixed into the southern wall of the ardha-mandapa of the Amareśvara temple at Māndhātā in the Khāṇḍāra tehsil of the East Nāsik District of Madhya Pradesh. The first slab contains ten lines, the second twenty-one lines, the third twenty-two lines, and the fourth only three lines of writing. The last lines of the second, third and the fourth slab are only half lines. They are all vertically placed, one below the other, and respectively measure in height 17.5, 35, 35 and 45 cms. The breadth of the writing on the first slab is 90 cms. and on the others, which are wider on the left side, it is about 94 cms.

The slabs bearing the epigraph are all corse and none of them was made smooth before engraving. And though the mason has done his work carefully, the writing has suffered from damages here and there, more so on the second and the third slabs which have lost a few aks harassing owing to slightly breaking off parts of stone on the farther left corners, where some of the aks harassing have also suffered from weather. It is a pity that a few aks harassing (7 to 10) at the end of each complete line of the whole inscription are also now lost in a part of a wall which was later on constructed.8 The engraving is rather shallow.

The whole epigraph consists of 56 lines. The language is Sanskrit. Except for a short sentence paying obeisance to Śiva in the beginning, the composition in lines 1 to 50 is metrical, and the rest of the inscription is all in prose. In all, there are 71 verses : and 61 of these in which the stōtra is composed, are in the Mandākharnā metre, in imitation of the style of Kāliṣa's Meghadūta, from which expressions have been occasionally adapted.9 The stanzas of the stōtra are all numbered. The language is almost correct, except in the colophon (11. 43 ff.) which is the writer's own composition.

The alphabet is Nāgarī of the time to which the document belongs. In respect of palaeography we note that the initial short i is indicated by two loops placed side by side and subscribed by the mūrta of short u ending in a graceful curve, as in itthu, l. 2, and the lower extremity of the forelimb of the initial i is joined to its vertical, as in ḍha, l. 8. Of the consonants, ṣ has not developed its dot, e.g., in utsa, l. 20 : ch has begun developing its own

---

1 Second edn., p. 81, No. 151.
2 It was prepared by R. G. Ojha, the former Curator of the Museum, in 1931 A.C. It may also be noted here that Chakravarti copied the inscription in 1938, when some letters were lost.
3 As already noted by Chakravarti, in the A.R. on Epigraphy for 1938, the northern wall contains (a) the Narmada stūti in 8 ll. and 9 vv. (b) the Śiva-Mahimna-stōtra in 22 ll. and 40 vv., and (c) Śiva-Pānāca-nīlaka in 3 ll. in 1 v.
4 These letters were, however, restored by Prof. Sastri from manuscripts of the stōtra preserved in Government Oriental Library, Madras (No. 1127-1128). In the text given below, I owe these letters to him.
5 For example, see vv. 24-25 and 38-39.
form as in \textit{pānca}, l. 2; \textit{dh} is in a transitional stage, occasionally showing a horn on its left limb, as in \textit{dudhrī}, l. 1; and the slightly differing forms of \textit{b} are to be noticed in \textit{Śiva}, and \textit{śāhīra}, both in l. 1.

The \textit{orthography} points out the usual peculiarities of the inscriptions of the time, for example, the use of \textit{v} to denote \textit{b} as well, as in \textit{vibhrad}, l. 2; the occasionally doubling of a consonant following \textit{t}, e.g., in \textit{-arika} but not in \textit{-archī}, both in l. 6; the use of a nasal and \textit{anuvāra}, both of which are placed side by side, as in \textit{danta} and \textit{kantha}, both in l. 1 and in \textit{pānca}, l. 2. \textit{Anuvāra} is generally employed for \textit{m} at the end of a sīkā; and the diphthongs are indicated both by the \textit{mārā} before and above. There are a number of orthographical and other mistakes, e.g., in \textit{pānca}, l. 6, \textit{sānśrī}, l. 7, \textit{punās}, l. 42, \textit{sanskāla}, l. 45, \textit{kincīlī}, l. 89, \textit{trudaś}, l. 22, \textit{mīhkrēnta}, l. 26, \textit{kṛṣṇa}, l. 40, \textit{triśī}, l. 48 and \textit{irīkāla}, l. 52. \textit{j} is employed for \textit{v} in \textit{sānśrīmā}, l. 51, and the reverse is the case of \textit{yusāhī} for \textit{-jusāhī} in l. 42.

The epigraph does not refer to any reigning king or the dynasty to which he belonged, but the main interest of it lies in the colophon containing the date. It is given in the last line as the 13th day of the dark half of Kārttika, and the \textit{year} is mentioned, in numerical figures, as (V.) 1120. In his reading of the year, Dr. Chakravarti expressed his doubt about that of the second digit and held that it may have been 2 as well, and accordingly, the year may be taken as 1220. But from my personal examination of the stone I am sure about my reading which is also confirmed by the impressions before me and taken about seven years before Chakravarti copied the record. The date cannot be verified, but taking the year as \textit{Chaṭṭrādī} (expired) and the month \textit{pārśmaṁśa}, the corresponding date in the Christian era would be Wednesday, the 22nd October 1063 A.C.

As stated above, the main theme of the \textit{stōtha} is to praise \textit{Śiva}. It was composed by the poet Hariśudha, whose identity we shall consider after giving the gist of the record. Opening with the auspicious symbol and a short sentence paying obeisance to the deity, it invokes the blessings of Gaṇapati, Viṣṇu (Kārtikēya), Śiva and Maḥākāla, respectively, devoting one verse to each of them. In verses 5-6 the poet, with all due modesty, proposes to describe the majesty of Śiva, stating in \textit{v. 7} that His aspects are manifold. Verse 8 again expresses The poet's modesty; and the next verse enumerates the well-known eight forms of Śiva. The tenth verse is again general, and the following verse identifies Him with Arhat and Sugata. The next five verses state that it is Śiva who directs the works of the Sun, the day and night, and the seasons, and also describes some of His forms, invoking blessings in favour of His devotees. Verses 16-30 again glorify The god's majesty, and the next eight verses speak highly of His various aspects, His \textit{śrīnīla} and His abodes. In verses 39-57 He is said to reside in Vārānasī and Śrīgiri, and finally, verses 58-63 invoke the blessings of the deity.

The \textit{stōta} ends with verse 64, which states that it was composed by a Brāhmaṇa named Hariśudha, who had hailed from Navagrāma in the Southern Rādha.
person, set up the record found on the slabs. From the following two lines we learn that the inscription was written by Padmātī Gāndhadālīvāya of the Chāpāla gātra. He was a disciple of Vivēkaṁśi, who was again a disciple of the Paramārthaśāntiśrī, the illustrious Suśrutaśrī.

The last line contains the date, which we have already discussed above.

Only stating that the epigraph is of inestimable value for the study of religion, we advert to Halāyūdana, the poet of the slabs, which again is important from the point of view of the study of Sanskrit literature. On certain grounds he has been identified with the poet of the same name, who was a follower of the Saiva cult and a native of Navagrāma and who is referred to in the Dīpāda. Bāvanavāpaṇī by the Telugu poet Pālikurī Somāmati who lived about 1190 A.C. Pointing out that he is also the same as the author of the Kavirāmakya and the Abhidhānamatratmikā. Prof. Sastri who edited the inscription held that he should have been flourished in the latter half of the tenth century A.C.

As for the place-names mentioned in the inscription, Navagrāma in Dakshina-Rājḍa (v. 64) has already been identified with the village of the same name in the Bhumra ḍārjanī of the Hooghly District in Bengal. Bhojañagar, where a monastery known as Sāmēvāradhuvāmaṭa existed (l. 51) appears to be identical with Dhārā, but while suggesting this identification, Chakravarti rightly observed that the Paramāra capital is always referred to by its name Dhārā even at the time of Bhoja and his successors. And in view of this, we may suggest another alternative of its identification with Bhojaipur, which is near Bhopal and contains an old shrine of Śiva with a huge linga installed in its sanctuary. Namīdiya the original place of the Saiva ascetic Bhavāvalīnkti (l. 51), remains unidentified in the absence of details; however, it may be observed here that the name appears much similar to that of the town of Nadīvād near Baroda in the Gujarāt State.

TEXT

[Metres: Verse l·16 Mandakrānta.; vs. 62, 61·71 Arumāraka.; vs. 63 Sākālavikāliṣṭa.]

1 सीतम् ॥ [1'] 'ओ मात सिद्धान्त ॥ विभंगु निन्दनिर्देशम् । विषयो वुलुकु विशयं वामु क्रेन्तिस्व[३]हर्षिन्द्र- ॥

2 करुपदा गौः स बहति किल केश वरुण सरसादृशे सैर्रविविचनगुप्तोऽष्ट्रो ॥

3 व्रजस्वपणात्मानं च गदना वस्तु नियुक्तत्वानि गदनित्वानि वचनीयः।

4 निमयोद्वादस्मानसमन(नमु) । शालीवेद निमया या विभिन्नता तत्तथावदेः स्वरुपम्पकता ।

5 लक्ष्मीमहाकालं शृंगारस्थनम रत्नकाओऽपि तस्य समयम्।

6 बतुद्वाराय सह निमित्तमनीयः।

7 तत्र अभिनवमहाविन्द सरसादृशे चक्षुसंग्राहया बहति सब्र श्रीमाहाकालम्।

8 श्रीमाहाकालम्।

9 वशम् कपिलविकालान्त्रियांवुष्टिः। का ते गुरुः। सुभृतिरस्यां मात्रायणग्नाति।

10 एवं शाला हर विश्वास तोपायः।

For details, see Ep. Ind., Vol. XXV, p. 173. Sastri has also shown that the poet must have lived prior to the 11th century and therefore he could not be identical with the famous Halayudha who adorned the Court of Lakshmanasena of Bengal and who was the author of several smaritas.


From the original stone and an inked impression. Later on, the text was compared by me from another impression supplied by the Chief Epigraphist; it is his No. C 1983 of A. R. Ind. Ep., 1965-66.

In app. C, 1985, the date is read as (571) 1120.


The portion between square brackets in this and the following verses is hidden behind a new creation in the temple and it has been adopted here from Sastri who restored it from manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.
व चक्रवत्तुकान्तासरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम १२२।। एकैहिः संिगः 

श: काशीस्वरः २५३।। वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १२४।। एकैहिः संिगः/मभ्रोऽस्यादाने काशीस्वरः ।। १२५।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १२६।। एकैहिः संिगः वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १२७।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १२८।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १२९।। एकैहिः संिگः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३०।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३१।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३२।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३३।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३४।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३५।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३६।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३७।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३८।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १३९।। एकैहिः संिगः 

वते सहस्रे यद्य चक्रवत्तुकान्तसरस्वतिकारवत्ती स दिराः पारस्परिवारामपराम ।। १४०।। एकैहिः संिगः
30 सीता प्रदीपः ॥३४५॥ गद्यमण्डलः सकलभूमिद्विषयान्तरोऽवशिष्यत । विनिमयित्वा ज्ञातित्वां कल्याणां शीर्षित्वा वैभवं
विस्मित (हस्म) । वेश्यालयः शिवः सुकृतसिद्धांसंसारः (हस्म) वाचकारायामायित्रयत् प्राप्तिमात्मायामायित्रयत्।

31 वाचावस्त्रिते वै वहनं वाचावस्त्रिते विनिमयित्वा निरूपणसंकल्पः (तमु) । गद्यमण्डलः

32 विचित्रधर्मपदान्तः । सत्यवानं विनिमयित्वा विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) विचित्रधर्मपदान्तः । वेश्यालयः

33 इतः विचित्रधर्मपदान्तः विनिमयित्वा विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । वेश्यालयः

34 साधुप्रसंगमनमोकुलः (हस्म) । उद्वर्धनः अवस्थायां तेजप्राचीनादेशब्रह्मचर्यकलः नमस्त । विनिमयित्वा

35 इतः वेश्यालयः विनिमयित्वा विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । वेश्यालयः

36 क्षेत्रस्थिवर्गः संयुक्तः विनिमयित्वा अपेक्षा निरूपणसंकल्पः (हस्म) । वेश्यालयः

37 अवशिष्यते प्राप्तिमात्मायामायित्रयत् प्राप्तिमात्मायामायित्रयत् (हस्म) ।

38 अवशिष्यते प्राप्तिमात्मायामायित्रयत् (हस्म) । वेश्यालयः

39 अवशिष्यते विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । गद्यमण्डलः

40 अवशिष्यते विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । गद्यमण्डलः

41 अवशिष्यते विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । गद्यमण्डलः

42 अवशिष्यते विकल्पमण्डनं (हस्म) । गद्यमण्डलः

---

1 This is as read by Sastri; but Chakravarti's reading of these letters as वृहत्संतरः यौगिकः appears to be correct. An antarāra was also at first engraved on यौगिकः and later on erased as unnecessary.
43 न महति गुणं कस्मचवासिः हुतं इत्यदानं निमुनन्यं तथ तु तस्मान्यकुटुः। ॥ ॥९॥१॥ वि(ि)कर्णदामिकृत
तनुपीता वष्णु वाक्पकं साधिता स विचित्रितः शिव किमवना यथव यत्राध्यक्षः।
तत्र भेद वल्लभसिंह वसुदेवसिंहनारायणं स्वरूपमिति।
44 यत्रे न भूतिः। ॥ ॥९॥३॥ वताधिकारस्यनाथार्यायमानं को विवस्ति प्रकाश प्रकाशो जनलोक जीवलिपि
सिन्यैं। अन्तर्द्वायणं (ि)भवानीलिपि भवानीलिपि में चेतं लग्नाणि सत्त्वा तथापि गुणमायः
॥ ॥९॥३॥ गृहस्थाणिनिदाचनीमयम् प्राचीन।
45 पृ. १ स्तुत्वा तृतीया गद्यिकोविरंदिनं नाति। नास्ति (संस्क.) तथ चरणाङ्गाः वेदवरुणास्त्रोते वेदः
प्रहति परस्परं वर्ष कर्तम्। ॥ ॥९॥३॥। भवानीर्जनम् सुन्दरमण्यं जीवलोकोंसमशोंकं कदं यथानिर्दितं
जगतीर्धस्य वेदः। गुरुका्भि तु स्तम्भ हिंदुद्विद नामवेद लोको दुराध्यक्ष वर्तं
कियं ह कस्मकुलज्ञसे २११।९।। कहलेन्
46 रस्त्रायाश्चिक विका सूपार यस्तेद चरणायांस्त्रीस्वीकारका्भि २११।९।। वेदस्तान्तवेदां हस्तमवमानोऽस्माच्यां
सारामथात्रावृि नवहस्तिति वो धीरोभुशदावाह। नास्ति ते स्तम्भ हिंदुद्विद नामवेद लोके। दुराध्यक्ष वर्तं
कियं ह कस्मकुलज्ञसे २११।९।। कहलेन्
47 नास्ति स्वरूपम् गुरुका्भि तु जनं महाकालं नोत्यव नास्ति। ॥ ॥२॥२॥ अव्यक्तसर्गालिनिते सत्त्वा
शिवाय सर्वेदः स्त्रियां सर्वाय सत्त्वाः सत्त्वाः सर्वाय सत्त्वाः सर्वाय सत्त्वाः
अव्यक्तसर्गालिनिताः किमि यथा। यथा। यथा। यथा।
48 स्याद्विजोतनान्तरे महति लयेयं भिक्षम् २११।२॥ हिंदो विक्षिप्ताश्चिको नवद्रामतिनिः
हूर्धवेदनानि(ि)विक्षिप्ताश्चिको नवद्रामतिनिः। ॥ ॥२॥२॥। प्रयं देवः २११।२॥। विक्षिप्ताश्चिको मृगे २११।२॥।
49 द्वे कामायानान्तरे(ि)।।। मायायानान्तरे(ि)।।।।। सप्तम वेदेवेनां श्रीकृष्णां चार्यम् चुम्मि(ि)
२११।२॥। वेदां द्वारे विक्षिप्ताश्चिको नवद्रामतिनिः। ॥ ॥२॥२॥। गृहस्थाणिनिः।
50 गृहस्थाणिः। ॥ ॥२॥२॥। गृहस्थाणिः।
51 द्वारे गृहस्थाणिः।
52 द्वारे गृहस्थाणिः।

1 The danda is redundant.
2 A flowery design is carved between the double danda, as intended to separate the second part of the inscription.
3 Read तस्मान्यकुटुः, but it would be metrically defective. Better तस्मान्यकुटुः.
4 Read तस्मान्यकुटुः; तस्मान्यकुटुः, or better, तस्मान्यकुटुः.
5 The phila contains seven (kind not eight) syllables.
6 Read दुराध्यक्ष, for the sake of metre.
7 These two letters are illegible. They may be conjecturally restored as द्वान्.
8 The portion in the brackets is now lost and has been restored here from Chakravarti's reading. He also observed that some portion after द्वान् was probably left owing to its damaged condition.
UDAIPUR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF UDAYĀDITYA
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UDAIPUR STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF UDAYĀDITYA

(Undated)

This inscription is incised on a pillar standing on the left side just above the stairs leading to the eastern entrance of the celebrated Śiva temple, (and on the right side of the same slab which bears inscription No. 19, edited above) at Udaipur in the Bāsodā tehsil of the Vindūśa District of Madhya Pradesh. It was noticed in the Annual Administration Report of the Department of Archaeology of the former Gwalior State, for V.S. 1974, No. 111; but the report is now not available. The inscription is edited here from the original stone which I examined in situ, in my visit to the place on 10-3-1973.

The inscription consists of seven lines which are in a fair state of preservation, except two aksharas which are lost at the end of l. 6. The writing covers a space 32.5 cms. broad by 24.5 cms. high and the height of the individual letters is about 4 cms. The script is Nāgari.

The language is Sanskrit.

The inscription does not bear a date; but the palaeography and the peculiarities of writing and engraving the letters suggest it to have been almost of the same time as No. 19, above, which is inscribed by its side, just to its left. The purpose of the record is to state that Udayāditya named the place as Udayapura and also excavated a tank there. The record was engraved by a mason whose name is lost and who was a brother of the mason Madhvasūdana.

The inscription consists of two verses in the Amuṣṭāṭha metre in the beginning, and following them, a portion in prose. Nothing special is worth noticing by way of orthography. The first of the verses state that the king Udayāditya, whose family is not named but who can be no other than the well-known Paramāra King, excavated a tank in the best of the towns which he also named after himself; and the second verse is devoted only to eulogise him. In the prose portion that follows, we learn that the stanzas were engraved by a mason whose name is lost but who was a brother of Madhvasūdana, as already seen above. The record ends with the customary words meaning auspicious, great fortune.

On a separate slab of stone of the same type and just below the inscription No. 19, mentioned above, is engraved another stanza in two lines, which appear to be in continuation of the

1 This symbol is mutilated.
2 Read सस्तना, etc. (clarification).
3 There is a flowery design between each of the double dandas.
4 The Report was not printed. Our reference here is to Haridar Nivasa Dwivedi's Gwalior-Kīṣṭā: Abhillāsha, No. 649.
5 The details of this are discussed below, in the corresponding portion of the text.
present record. The verse has lost three aksharas at the end of l. 1 and six at the end of l. 2. It states that the stanzas were composed by Malipala and were engraved by the illustrious Sthiradvipa, who appears also to have been the engraver of the present record and whose name, as we have seen above, is lost at the end of l. 6.

Calling both these documents mentioned here as A and B, respectively, and connecting with our No. 19, above, as our study of them enables us to do, we are inclined to suggest that they are all mutually connected and very probably are the parts of the same record engraved on separate slabs of stone and placed together. Thus the record were all composed by Malipala, who is called a Pudita in B and a son of Sringavasa in No. 19; and also that it was engraved by Sthiradwipa, whose name is missing in No. 19, lost in A here, but can clearly be read in B.

Thus all the three records taken together go to show that Udayaditya gave his name to the place where he also excavated a tank and built the celebrated temple of Siva.

TEXT

A

[Metre : Verses 1:2 Anushthubh ]

1 स्वयंरूपः श्रीमानुवार्तसुपप्लि [1]
2 पुरेष्वकोकटसमुदारायंकवित्रकनायाणां[9]
3 किंवर्नकाम्(क)सुविज्ञवे: किंवर्नकाम्(क)सुविज्ञ स्व-
4 वेत्। एक्षयाकन्कोकटो गंत्स सवेत्-
5 मसिद्विंद्रि[11] उक्कोणः कलोकः
6 सुन्दरस्वरूपमुदंकन्तास्वरूपः
7 देवेन। मंगलमहाबधि: ॥

B

1 एवं कलोकः समुक्कोणः [सिर|क्वेवेन शिल्पिता[1]
2 पंक्तिप्रशस्तसुपप्लि: सवेत्[भ|सास्तकः ॥

1 From the original stone.
2 The slanting stroke marking this consonant is inclined as a mātrā of long ॐ.
3 Read एक्षयाः. Possibly, also to read एक्षया in the first foot of this verse.
4 Two letters which are lost here can be restored as शः with the help of B, l. 1.
5 The use of the plural shows that all the verses of No. 181 and of A and B, were engraved by the same person.
6 The danda is engraved as a mātrā. The three aksharas, along with the six at the end of the next line, are now lost and are restored with the help of the illustrations.
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DABHOKA STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF NARAVARMAN

(Undated)

This inscription was discovered by the Superintendent of Archaeology, Mewād, at Dabhōka, a village situated about 18 kms. to the east of Udaipur, formerly the capital of a State of the same name and now the headquarters of a district, in Rājasthān. The inscribed stone was subsequently removed to the Archaeological Museum at Udaipur, where it is now exhibited.

The record was noticed by N. P. Chakravartī, in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, under Epigraphy, for 1936-37, on p. 124. In his notice, he observed that the stone was found fixed in a small platform built round the worship-stone known as Rājājī.

The inscription consists of 20 lines of writing, and measures 24 cms. broad by 31 cms high. It is in a very bad state of preservation. Besides a few letters which have completely disappeared in the middle of ll. 9-12, the stone has lost a portion at the top of the right side, and also at the lower left corner, measuring about 11 cms. long. Moreover, very few of the letters that now remain are completely decipherable, and most of the syllables are partly or wholly worn away. However, from a set of impressions prepared by the technical Assistant of the Western Circle of the Survey and with my gratitude to the authorities of the Museum for kindly according permission for the same, a general idea of the contents of the inscription is given below.

The alphabet is Nāgarī and the language is Sanskrit. The object of the inscription appears to mention the building of two Śaiva temples, probably by Mahīṣpati (l. 12), who belonged to the Kāyastha family and was probably a son of one Rindrāditya, who is mentioned as a pre-eminent Kāyastha (Kāyastha-kutiṣṭha), in l. 9. The inscription appears to belong to the reign of the (Paramāra) king Naravarman, whose name is mentioned in l. 7. By way of the genealogy of the house, the record gives the names of Śindurājā Bhūjadeva, and Udayāditya respectively in ll. 4, 5 and 6. The portion containing the description of each of these rulers cannot be fully made out, and equally so the relationship of each of them with his predecessor, which, of course, is otherwise well known. The names of Jayasīhā and Lakshamivarman are, however, omitted.

The extant portion of the inscription does not bear any date, nor any geographical name is mentioned therein. The information supplied by the record is very meagre, but it undoubtedly indicates that the Paramāra kingdom continued to extend up to Udaipur during the days of Naravarman.

As the inscription cannot be completely made out, the text is not given here.

No. 183: Plate CXLVIII

HOSHANGĀBĀD HERO STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF THE MAHAKUMĀRA HARIŚCHANDRA

[Vikrama] Year 1243

This inscription was found by Shri Jagadish Dube, a lecturer in the Government Intermediate College at Hardā in the Hoshangābād District, who intimated this discovery to me in 1972, also providing me with an eye-copy of it. Almost at the same time, a note on the record was contributed to the Session of the All-India Oriental Conference held at Ujjain in December 1972, by Dr. Haladbhar Pathak, Professor in the Home Science College at Hoshangābād.

1 Vide our observations in the general history portion where we have shown that the region around Aghān (Chitor) was annexed by Vākpati-munja to his kingdom. Also see P.B.P., p. 88 and note.
bad. Being interested in its date, I visited the place with the kind permission of the Director-General of Archaeology in India, and studied the inscription in situ, on 8-3-1973. The record was edited by me, for the first time, from the original and a photo-copy kindly supplied to me by Prof. Pathak, in the Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Vol. XXXV, pp. 231-32. From the same photograph, it is edited here.

The inscription is incised on one of the facets of a dwarf rectangular pillar of hard sandstone, about 95 cms. high, now set on a platform of mud and stone, in front of the General Post Office in Kothi Bazaar Mohalla at Hoshangabad, the chief town of a district of the same name in Madhya Pradesh. I found the pillar obliquely resting against the lower part of a tree, with a part of it imbedded in the earth below so as to hide its lower portion. The writing, which consists of seven lines of crude engraving, covers a space 28 cms. high by 22 cms. broad. The script is Nagari, and the language is Sanskrit, all written in prose. In respect of orthography, nothing is worth noting except that shu is spelt as shu in pandha in l. 1.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the illustrious Mahâkumâra Harîšchandra, and its purpose is to record the death of a hero, as also can be known from some figures carved in relief on all the sides of the pillar. The name of the hero, which was engraved before satu in l. 5, cannot be made out; but that he certainly lost his life in an encounter is suggested by the word yudhâya (for yudhâvâya) in the last line. The letters giving his father's name are also equally indistinct. The date of the record, as given only in figures in the beginning, is the 9th day of the bright fortnight of Pausha of the Vikrama year 1243, and the day is mentioned as Thursday. The date regularly corresponds to 18th December, 1186 A.C., taking the year as expired and the month beginning with the full moon.

The royal family to which Harîśchandra belonged is not mentioned in the inscription; but his designation Mahâkumâra shows him to have been the homonymous Paramâra ruler whose two inscriptions, one of which was found at Bhûpâl and the other at Pipilângar, are dated respectively, in V. 1214 (1157 A.C.) and V. 1225 (1178 A.C.). From both these years we know that the Paramâra Mahâkumâra Harîśchandra was on the throne at least for 21 years, which is the average period generally calculated for the reign of a king; and accordingly, this king appears to have closed his reign soon after he issued the second grant. The historical value of the present inscription, however, lies in indicating that Harîśchandra continued to rule for at least about eight years thereafter, thus making the interruption between himself and his son Udayavarman still shorter, as the latter of these rulers is known only from his grant of V. 1256 (1200 A.C.).

There is no evidence to know anything about the struggle in which the hero mentioned in our inscription lost his life. But the political situation of the time reveals that the Yadava Bhûlanna V, who ascended the throne in 1185 A.C. and died only a year before the present record was issued, was carrying on military expeditions in the north, and it is not impossible that in the course of his invasions he had also to face the Paramâra Vindhyavarman, who had only shortly before this date relieved Mâlava from the Gujarât sovereignty and who may have endeavoured to check the Yadava forces. The Mutagi stone inscription of the reign of Bhûlanna, dated 1189 A.C., describes the Yadava ruler as "a severe pain in the head of the Mâlavas," and this appears to have been the encounter mentioned in the present inscription.

No geographical name occurs in the inscription.

---

1 For example, a hero on horse, with weapons, the same worshipping Śiva-līnga, and finally, lying on a couch, with a lady (his wife) sitting by his side.
2 Above, Nos. 44-45.
3 No. 46, above.
4 Cf. for the chronological scheme, infra, in No. 47, v. 12.
6 Also see O. P. Verma: The Yâdavas and their times, p. 19.
HOSHANGABAD STONE INSCRIPTION OF MAHAKUMARA
HARISCHANDRA: VIKRAMA 1243

From Photograph
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No. 184 : PLATE CXLIX

A FRAGMENTARY STONE INSCRIPTION FROM UJJAIN

(Date lost ?)

The stone bearing this inscription was found some forty years ago by Pt. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Vyās, in the ruins near the temple of Mahākāla at Ujjain the well-known ancient place which is now the headquarters of a district of the same name in Madhya Pradesh. The contents of the record were briefly noticed by the late M.B. Garde in the Annual Report of the Archaeology Department of the former Gwalior State for V.S. 1992 (1935-36 A.C.), p. 15, and it was also published in the Nāgari-pracītīṭi-Patrikā (a Hindi Monthly), Vol. XIX, pp. 87-89, with a lithograph. The stone is now kept in the University Museum at Ujjain. The inscription is edited here from the original stone which I inspected in my visit to the place, and from an impression kindly supplied to me by Shri V. S. Wakankar, the Curator of the Museum.

The inscription is only a loose fragment of apparently a very large inscription incised on a smooth black stone. The piece is almost triangular in shape, with one of its sides on the left, showing its maximum height to be 18.5 cms. and another side, that at the top, showing the total length of 29.5 cms. The third of the sides, which begins at the right corner at the top and gradually decreases the number of letters as it comes down to the bottom on the left, measures 30 cms. The inscription contains fourteen imperfect lines, the first of which shows only four complete letters with the lower parts of the others. The number of the aksharas gradually decreases from 35 in the second to 4 in the penultimate line, and the last line shows only the upper parts of two letters. We have no means to ascertain the actual size of the original inscription. The existing portion is in a perfect state of preservation, and the average size of the aksharas is about 1 cm.

1 From the original stone.
2 The unit figure is mutilated but its reading is certain. As for the decimal, the curve at its lowest extremity is damaged and partly disappeared, making it appear also as 9. But my close and minute examination shows it to be 4, as taken here, which is also consistent with the period assigned to Harīchandra, mentioned in the inscription.
3 The reading of both the names is uncertain.
4 Some three aksharas are lost at the beginning of this line, and in the next one, the letters are partly imbedded below.
5 The inscription appears to be incomplete and it is not known as to how many lines are below the surface.
The alphabet is Nāgarī, closely resembling that of the Mōdi and Māndhātā inscriptions of Jayavarman. The mechanical execution also is as careful as of those. The vowel i is indicated by two loops placed horizontally and subscribed by the sign of the medial u; the ākṣaras ch and dh are distinguished from v; the former by its beginning with a stroke on its loop, as in -chakrā, l. 5, and the latter by a curved horn on its left limb, as in vaisdhavya, l. 8; and lastly, the patañā i has a horizontal stroke in the middle as the e.g., in śīhāla, l. 5.

The language is Sanskrit and the available portion is all metrical. The verses were all originally numbered, as we notice the numbers 18, 19, 22 and 26, respectively in ll. 5, 6, 8 and 10. None of the verses in the existing fragment is complete. The only point worth noting from the point of view of orthography is that whereas the mātrās of i and ā are marked above the line, those for āi and au one of the mātrās is a puṣṭa-mātrā.

The inscription seems to be a pradaśī, as suggested by its ornate style and the conventional manner of the description. Its immediate object, however, cannot be ascertained, though it appears to record the construction of a temple, as we usually find. That the temple was constructed by a son of the royal house of the Paramāras of Malaya is known from the expression Nirūḍīs Mahāviṣṇu occurring in its line 9, and we know it to be one of the titles of Naravarman, the son of Udayaditya. This is also suggested from the name Muñ(ja) at the end of l. 7, used to denote another illustrious member of the royal house and well known to us from the inscriptions. The preserved portion does not contain any date, but on palaeographical grounds it may be assigned to about the 13th century or a little earlier.

The first five lines of the existing fragment describe a king or kings leading his (their) victorious army to the north up to Ayódhyā on the Sarayu and up to the Himalayas, in the west up to Dvārakā, and to the south up to the Malaya mountain and father up to Lāhūkā. This description is all conventional and it does not yield any historical information.

All the geographical names occurring in the preserved portion of the inscription are well known.

TEXT

[Metres: Līmis 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 Śāradālvīrādās: ll. 5 and 6 Sāpadārā; ll. 1, 2, 4, and 6 Śāradālārā; ll. 1, 2, 4, and 6 Śāradālārā, Śāradālārā, Śāradālārā, and Śāradālārā, Śाहरसी�

1 See above. No. 36. ll. 12, 13.
2 See n. 9 in the text below.
3 For a similar extravaganter assertion, see above. No. 24. v. 17.
4 From the original and an inked impression.
5 None of the verses is complete and the metres here are as indicated by the cadence of the ākṣaras as preserved in each of the lines.
6 Of both these ākṣaras the mātrās above are broken.
7 The reading here is certain but it cannot be grammatically defended.
8 Apparently, the letter ra is lost before the mātrā.
9 The bracketed letter is broken in its latter part but the restoration appears to be certain.
A FRAGMENTARY STONE INSCRIPTION FROM UJJAIN
(DATE LOST)

Scale: One-half
A FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION FROM MĀNDU

B

(Date probably lost)

Two small fragments of a long inscription were found built up in a modern wall at Māndū, the well-known archaeological place in the Dhar District of Madhya Pradesh, by R. B. Deshpande, supervisor of the repair of ancient monuments at this place, in 1923. Fitting both the pieces together, the text was deciphered and published, with a small introductory note, translation and a small-size photograph, by K. K. Lele, in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Vol. VIII (1927), pp. 142 ff. The inscription is edited here from the original fragments, which are not preserved in the archaeological museum at Dhar, and from the photograph accompanying Lele’s article.

The record is inscribed on a well-polished black stone, and, as stated above, it is fragmentary. The initial portion which pays homage to Sarasvati is fortunately preserved. The extent portion shows fifteen lines of writing, of which a number of aksharas are lost on either of the sides; and we have no means to ascertain the portion which is lost below also. The dimensions of the existing portion are not noted. All the lines being incomplete, no coherent sense of the record can be made out, except the general idea that it contained a hymn to Sarasvati, the Goddess of Learning.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit; and except for the customary Oṁ namah Sarasvatīyaḥ in the beginning, the preserved portion thereof is all metrical. The verses seem to be all in the anushtubh metre. They are not numbered, but it appears that they were separated from each other by a double danda, and a single danda was also put at the end of each of the halves. As to palaeography and orthography, we find that the letter k is its ligature form, e.g., in kalpa, l. 1; that ṣ has not developed the dot, as in the first letter. That is preserved in l. 7; that ch and ṣ are alike in form, cf. chēd = bhavati, l. 5, but dh has its distinct shape in showing a curved horn above its fore-limb, as in dharmam, l. 3. The signs of the medial diphthongs are put above and also before the letter to which they belong: and the sign of acāgraḥa occurs in l. 11. All these peculiarities tend to indicate that the inscription was engraved in the 11-12th century.

Beginning with paying homage to Sarasvati, as already seen, the inscription eulogises the deity as fulfilling all desires, like the wish-giving tree, and therefore highly victorious. In ll. 5-6 we read that all dharmas (undertakings?) are supported by her and her alone, that she is embodied in sounds and words, and for these reasons her charm attracts in every dispassionate ascetic. Lines 7-10 state that her charm is in the form of the various metres used in the hymns of the Vēdas: her devotee becomes a good poet and also that the entire universe is held by the wise persons. And lastly, ll. 11-15 appear to mean that Vālmīki, Vyāsa and the other poets were sent in this world by her, for doing favour to it (the region) and that Dilipā and Vasiṣṭha, by serving her (in the form of a cow) became a model king and a model sage, respectively.

Only the upper parts of two aksharas are visible, but they cannot be made out.
Connecting the present inscription with the one found at Dhār and now in the British Museum, we note that Māṇḍu, where it was discovered, must also have been a place of learning in the 11-12th centuries A.C.

---

2. From the original and also from the facsimile accompanying Lele's article.
3. Two indistinct letters, probably to be read as णा, are partly visible before this word.
4. The letter in brackets is partly rubbed out and the reading is therefore uncertain.
5. The margin of short i is visible after this akṣara.
6. The first three akṣaras are indistinct and the reading is not certain. It is adopted here from Lele's reading.
7. The akṣaras in this line read like a foot of Viṣṇumlakṣaṇa.
8. One letter in the beginning of this line is indistinct. It may have been ल.
9. To be split up as done here and not to be taken as one word as taken by Lele, as charayā.

---

No. 185: Plate CLXI

A FRAGMENTARY STONE INSCRIPTION FROM MĀṇḍU

A

(Date lost?)

The stone bearing this inscription was discovered 'in the debris of fallen houses, in Māṇḍu' and brought over to Dhār by Pt. Vaman Shastri Islampurkar towards the close of the last century. It is said to have been found broken in more than half of the earlier portion which was lost. The extant fragment is stated to have measured about 9" (i.e., 22.86 cms.) in height and about 26" (i.e., 66 cms.) in length. The inscription was first deciphered and pub-
A FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION FROM MANDU (B)
(DATE LOST)

Scale: Actual size
lished by the late K. K. Lele, in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute*, Vol. XI (1929), pp. 49-55, without a lithograph. The present whereabouts of the stone could not now be traced; and as even an impression of the record is also not now forthcoming, there is no alternative before me except to reproduce the text given by Lele in his article and add to it my own notes.

The record is said to have been incised on an oblong plain slab which is broken at the top and also on portions of both the vertical sides. The correct estimate of the broken portion cannot be made, and the record has also suffered considerably. As stated by Lele, “some of the letters in the middle portion are much worn, precluding the possibility of deciphering the inscription completely”. The existing portion contained seventeen lines of writing, which are all fragmentary. The letters are well formed and carefully incised. The height of the individual letters is not recorded.

The *script* is Nāgari of the 12-13th century A.D. The *language* is Sanskrit. The extant portion of the inscription is all metrical; and except for the last three verses, the first of which is in Mālāi and the other two in the *Rathodahata* metre, all the rest of the verses are in the *Śrīdāsaharīdita* metre, composed in the artistic *kāvyā* style. They are not numbered but each of them has a double *danda* at the end, and the halves are separated by a single *danda*. The *orthography* shows the usual peculiarities of the occasional reduplication of a consonant after *r*, the substitution of *b* for *d* and of *s* for *f*, and finally, the use of the sign of *anuvāra* to denote the final *m*, except in a few instances like *aruvānīr-vana*, l. 6. The word *vijayā* in l. 7 is wrongly spelt as *vipala* and *mukhtala* has the sign of *visarga* instead of *sh* in the same line. *Sandhi* is not performed in *mē-ship* in l. 14.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the son of the king *Vindhyavarman*. He is not named here but can be inferred to be undoubtedly the Paramāra king Subhatavarman. The *object* of the inscription is to record the donation of two gardens by the same king, i.e. Subhatavarman, to Bilhana who was his *śrīhīngrahita*, i.e., Minister for Peace and War. The record was composed by Bilhana himself, with whose acquiescence were composed the three inscriptions of Arjunavarman, as already seen. The date is perhaps lost in the last line.

The earlier portion of the inscription that was available (vv. 1-8) gives a poetic description of God Vishnu in his different incarnations and thus it is of no historical interest. Verses 10 ff. eulogise the same deity in his *Krishna* incarnation, and is equally devoid of historical value. The concluding part of the record (l. 16-17, vv. 18-19) informs us that “observing that his material body was frail and mortal, Bilhana composed this poem of (describing) the eternal glory of the god, and Subhatavarman’s son, Vindhyavarman, highly respected the poet and donated two gardens (*vētikā*), presumably for the maintenance of the deity installed by the latter in a temple, about which our inscription has nothing to say. It is not known if the construction of the temple and the installation of the deity therein were mentioned in the portion that is now lost.

From the three preceding inscriptions we know that Bilhana held the post of the Minister of Peace and War under Arjunavarman and Devapala; and the present inscription adds to our knowledge that he was on this post during the reign of Arjunavarman’s father, Vindhyavarman, also. It also tells us that this officer was highly devoted to Vishnu; and, as Lele has rightly pointed out in his article referred to above, Mandapa-durga, where the inscription was discovered, also appears to have been a great seat of learning at that time.

No geographical name figures in the extant portion of the inscription.

---

1 See above, Nos. 47-48 and 51.
1. शृंगारायुक्तं पातनामार्कर्णिकम्

2. मुक्तं प्रमणं न चक्षुः समर्पयतेन शिवस्वरूपेऽवस्तुमात्रं

3. पं प्रभृतिर्विवेय पुंजम् श्रावणं। नन्दसु बेलि कि न विविदं वालि ते

4. लघु हितकोटि होरं। यतू वा। यतू वा। श्रेयोऽनंतरस्त्रीस

5. ताकालम् भ्रमित्वातः। नववसुवहरस्वरूपेऽशीवस्वरूपातः

6. बेश्मकालम् कोदरायुक्तं चं मन्यं वर्ष्येद्वरे। संयोगमनुक्षेत्रस्य

7. नमः। किरः। प्रक्षिपिनम्। ष्टियास्तरस्तः। प्रक्षिपिनम्। ष्टियास्तरस्तः। नन्दसु। नन्दसु। श्रीमयानम्। नन्दसु।

8. धितास्त्रमीराप्तु। किम्।

9. न: तक्षिणास्त्रमीराप्तु। किम्।

---

1. From Lele's transcript in A.B.O.I., Vol. XI, pp. 49 ff. It may be noted here that his transcript does not represent the original accurately and he has made several changes, e.g., that of न to त, as is obvious.

2. For the sake of convenience, the verse existing on the extant portion has been taken here as 1. Its metre is not certain, and the portion commencing the second line appears to be a part of either Manabhumā or Brhadāranyā.

3. I am not certain about the metre in this line which is fragmentary.

4. Insert a daṇḍa here.

5. Here the number marking the stanzas is pal, of course assuming that two stanzas are fragmentary on the preceding portion which is now not available.

6. This verse has lost 15 letters of the first quarter, the whole of the second quarter, and three letters of the third.

7. Read =निष्क्रियबी.

8. Read a viṣarga after this akṣara.

9. Here this akṣara has to be taken separately in the pade-embhata.

10. Read घम.

11. Lele has taken this line separate but it appears to be connected with the preceding one and in continuation of it.

12. This akṣara should be prosodically long. Should we read म or with the case-ending?
We should read here either sadyaḥ or adyaḥ, dropping the visarga.

It is incorrect as it should be mūrtis, but it cannot be known whether it is a mistake in the original or in the transcript.

This verse is separate from the preceding one is only conjectural from Lele's transcript. It is not possible to know if some more aksharas are lost here.

One long letter is missing after da.

Prosodically, the bracketed letter should be long.

Read ṣadaṃṭu.

Sandhi is violated here.

As the stone is broken on both the vertical sides, it is not possible to ascertain as to how many of these letters are lost at the end of this line and how many at the beginning of the next line. This is to be noted in cases of the other breaks also.

Read śkaparda.

Probably the date was given in the end. The break in this verse may perhaps indicate that the gift was made by the king Subhatavarman, whose name was possibly shown, for metrical exigencies, by the letters Suvaramāṇi just fitting at the end of the first hemistich of the stanzas. This is also justified by taking किंवदंतिस्मृतिः as one compound word, taken as two by Lele, which cannot be construed properly.
UDAIPUR STONE INSCRIPTION OF JAYASIMHA IV

| Vikrama | Year 1366

This inscription was brought to light by Kielhorn, by publishing transcript of its first four lines, in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XX, p. 84. It is edited here from the original stone which I examined *in situ*, in my visit to Udaipur on 9-5-1973.¹

The record is incised on the lower part of a sandstone pillar on the right side just above the flight of steps leading to the eastern porch of the celebrated Śiva temple at Udaipur in the Bāsōdēl tehsil of the Vidišā District of Madhya Pradesh. It consists of nine lines of Writing, measuring 31 cms. broad by 32 cms. high. The average height of the letters, which were curiously drawn, is about 2 cms. The engraving was done most carelessly, even without making the surface of the stone none too smooth. The letters have also suffered from weather; and as a result of it, the last two lines have become almost illegible. A few letters are also at the end of ll. 6-9, as part of the stone has peeled off.

The alphabet is Nāgarī and the language is Sanskrit. The record is all in prose. The orthography does not call for any remark except that in 1. 4 ḍha is employed for ḍha in the name of Jayasimha.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Mahārājādhirāja, the illustrious Jayasimha-deva who was endowed with all regnal titles; and the object of it is to record the donation of one-eighth of the revenue from the village Hathivāhā by the Thakura (?) Vidyādha, to a Brāhmaṇa whose name is indistinct. The last line contains the name of Chandraprabha, who is mentioned as witness.

The date, which is given in numerical figures only, in ll. 1, was the twelfth of the dark half of Sravaṇa, on Friday, of the (Vikrama) Year 1366, which regularly corresponds to Friday 24th July, 1310 A.C., for the Southern Vikrama, expired, and the month ending with the full moon.

The inscription says nothing about the lineage of the king mentioned in it; but from its find-spot he appears to have been no other than a Paramāra ruler. He cannot be the same as Jayasimha-Jayavarman, one of whose inscriptions was found at Udaipur itself and another at Paṭhārī, about 15 kms. distant from it, and dated, respectively, in V.S. 1311 (1255 A.C.) and V.S. 1326 (1269 A.C.), since the latter of these records bears a date which is about 40 years earlier than that of the present inscription. We also know that Jayasimha-Jayavarman was succeeded by Arjunavarman II, and he by Bhōja II; and that the last known ruler of the house, Mahākāla-deva, was killed in a battle with the Sultan Al-āk tar Khālaq, in 1565 A.C.² The present inscription, which was dated about six years later, tends to indicate that Jayasimha, during whose reign it was engraved, was a successor of Mahākāla-deva, if a Paramāra king at all,³ and that he was reigning as an independent king in the region around Udaipur; or it may be that he was allowed to rule there after he had accepted subordination to the Muslim throne. And unless any corroborative evidence is available, this view should remain to be hypothetical.

The only geographical name mentioned in the inscription is the village Hathivāhā (ll. 4-5), which is obviously the modern Hatuvāhā, about 24 kms. east-south-east of Udaipur.

¹ Since this article was written, the inscription has been edited, with transcript and a facsimile, by Dr. Ramkrishna, of the office of the Chief Epigraphist, in the *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 54 ff., from impressions. *A.R.-Ep.,* 1961-62, No. C1857. The facsimile which was prepared about 10-11 years ago, was helpful to me in reading some letters which are now wholly or partially lost on the original.

² See *Janita*, No. 961.


⁴ This view too is doubtful, as neither the family to which this ruler belonged nor any of his predecessors is mentioned in the inscription. He is tentatively taken to have been a Paramāra ruler on the similarity of names and also as we do not find in this region any other ruler bearing this name during this period.
GIRVAD STONE INSCRIPTION

TEXT

1. [२९३६६] २७०५६ श्रावण विक्रम २९४ [२९४]
2. उदयपुरे समलराजस्वली—
3. [समलराज] [2] वाराणसीके
4. सिंह(ह) देवराज श्री[बाल्या]—
5. प्राम—अब्दुल्लाह(शी) जन(वालल ?)
6. विद्याभरण श्री हुणचे—
7. कृते पादौ मथातिल्ला मद्र—
8. के। पद्धति—
9. श्री—

No. 187: Plate CLXIII

GIRVAD STONE INSCRIPTION

[ Vikrama ] Year 1181

The stone slab bearing this inscription is built into a side-wall of the mandapa of the Paṭanārāyana temple at Girvad, a tiny hamlet about 16 kms. west of Abu Road, the principal town of a tehsil in the Sirohi District, Rajasthan. The record was briefly noticed by D. R. Bhandarkar in the Progress Report of the Western Circle, 1906-07, p. 2739 and it is edited here, for the first time, from personal examination and from an impression prepared under my guidance, by N. M. Ganam, the Technical Assistant of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India.

1 From the original stone. Subsequently, I have also compared my reading from facsimile facing p. 35 of E.R. Ind., Vol. XXXVIII. The inscription begins with a symbol which is partly mutilated.
2 Here supply अंबाकर, or अंबलिक; or, as suggested by Ramsharma, मथी; but on the original it appears, as taken here, at the beginning of the third line.
3 The reading of the bracketed akshara is based on those ending the name of a village which exists in the neighbourhood even today. The मति of the first of them appears to be mixed with the slanting stroke of the second. On the original the last two syllables appear as त्।
4 This akshara is followed by two hollow circles and a horizontal stroke, and the reading of them, as adopted here, is doubtful. Ramsharma read the fourth and the fifth letters in this line as वर्ग।
5 This akshara is deformed, and the मैराय on the preceding त resembles a curve.
6 Two or three aksharas are lost at the end of the line and the reading जुश is adopted here from that of Ramsharma; but the reading is not certain, as the last of the aksharas appears as a conjunct.
7 Read प्रजास्त. Possibly, what is intended is उदके, for (उदके?).
8 Two or three aksharas are lost here also.
9 Some letters are distinct here, and some lost at the end. Ramsharma read them as [भर(भर(k))e गोवी]।
10 Eight aksharas are lost here and they were read by Ramsharma as विनयविवेर्ष्यज्ञ(ग)व(श्री)। with some doubt from an impression prepared in 1916-17.
11 The temple is about 3 kms. south of the village known as Chandel which is connected with Abu Road by a metalled road. The present inscription just faces the one edited above under No. 82.
12 Also see A.S.I., P. R. W. C., 1916-17, recording some more antiquities at that place.
The inscription is on the lower part of the slab bearing another above, with which we are not concerned. The writing measures 48.5 cms. in breadth by 28.5 cms. in height, and consists of 14 lines, the last of which is about half of the length of the others. It is well preserved, excepting three aksaras in l. 13, as to be seen below. The technical execution is, on the whole, fair; and the signs of the mātrās above show a graceful curve. The letters are all distinct and vary in size from l to 2.5 cms., including the flourishes.

The script is Nāgari of the 12th century A.C. The aksara ṛ as a subscript resembles ṛ, as in Visnū, l. 1; cbb and th in their subscript form have the same sign, for which see chebbhaya, l. 5, and śthāna, l. 9; and the slightly varying forms of bh are to be noticed in bhāse, l. 1, and bhākti- in l. 10, and those of ṛ in purandara and ratta, both in l. 2.

The language is Sanskrit, which is generally correct; and with the exception of the customary obeisance to Nārāyaṇa in the beginning and the formal part in ll. 11-14, the record is all in verse, consisting of seven verses, which are all numbered. The orthographical peculiarities are as usual, viz., (1) the use of the sign of amuṣāra to denote the class-nadir even at the end of a verse or its stich, (2) of ṛ to denote b as well; (3) of the prīthvamārī, occasionally, e.g., in tejasvinav, l. 4, and vidadhē, l. 8; and (4) the reduplication of a class-consonant following ṛ. The name of the village is spelt as Gṛiva in l. 8 but as Gṛivinda in l. 9.

The object of the inscription is to record that the temple in which the stone is set up was repaired by one Śrī Satyāmā, after taking permission from the Gṛivinda (Girvad) Brāhmaṇas who too made some donations to the deity, in Samvat 1181. Jyeshtha vadi 12 v(b)udha-dinē. The date is given only in numbers; and, for the Chaitrādi expired; it regularly corresponds to 11th June, 1124, when it was a Wednesday and the month, amanita. The names of the writer and the engraver of the inscription are not mentioned.

Beginning with a sentence in prose paying customary obeisance to Nārāyaṇa, as seen above, the epigraph has three stanzas to record homage, respectively to Visnū, Murāri and Paṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, who are all the same. The last of these deities (now enshrined in the temple) is here described as “possessing boundless greatness (anuṣaya-abhimana), and excelling all the other forms of lustre.” From the next two stanzas we learn that the great sage Vasiṣṭha had established the god near a kūrda called Paṭṭa-kūrda, and that this temple was repaired by Satyāmā, after taking permission of the Brāhmaṇas residing there, as already stated above. The portion that follows records the donation of the villages of Paṭṭaṅkhera and Rudrāvanti to the god by the people of Girvad. The other donations mentioned in the inscription consist of a draṇana for clothing those who observed fast for a month (maṅgavaiśākha), twenty palas of thread for pani-śe, maniśe (details not mentioned), two kālas of oil for anointing the body (of the deity), and some others, all mentioned in the local language which I cannot make out.

Nothing about Satyāmā who repaired the temple is known either from the present record or from any other source. Nor is the name of the king mentioned here. However, the find-spot of the record goes to suggest that the repairs of the temple referred to above were made during the reign of the Abh Paramār ruler Vikranmaṭha or his elder brother Rāmadeva, respectively the uncle and father of Vāsodhava, whose earliest known date is V. 1292. The absence of material to throw light on the history of this period prevents us from saying anything definitely on this point. It is, however, interesting to see that the Brāhmaṇas could jointly make a donation, as stated above.

Of the two localities mentioned in the inscription, viz., Paṭṭaṅkhera and Rudrāvanti, neither can be satisfactorily identified for want of names of places fully corresponding with them, around Girvad. To make some suggestions in this respect, however, I am tempted to identify the first of these names either with Pandalū, lying about 14 kms. north-east of Girvad, or with Padrūkhēṣṭā situated about 25 kms. in the same direction. Both these places are now included in the adjoining lehal of Kēoḍhār. The other place, viz., Rudrāvanti, may possibly have been the modern village of Rējvā, situated about 6 kms. south-east of Girvad.

The name of the reigning king is not mentioned in the inscription and the reason of it is not far to seek. In the history of this house we have seen that Dantivarman was succeeded by his son Kṛishnarpāla, by ousting his nephew Yōgarāja who was the legitimate heir to the throne; and it is possible that Yōgarāja and his son Rāmadeva may have been striving hard to oust

1 See the Ajahari stone inscription, above, No. 66.
Krishnaraja and his successors, viz., his son Kaksola and grandson Vikramasinha. Thus a struggle for the throne appears to have been going on for two or three generations from the time of Krishnaraja to that of his grandson Vikramasinha, roughly from about 1060 to 1115 A.C.; and during this period Ramaedeva, who is described as fierce in battle (ran-ôtkata) in our No. 76 (v. 7), may have occupied the throne at least for some time. If this suggestion is accepted, we may conclude that it is perhaps owing to the confusion caused by this struggle that the mention of the name of the reigning king may have been avoided by the composer of the inscription.

TEXI

1 \text{सिद्धम्} II लो नमो नारायणाय \text{हृ} \text{विवेकतुल्ककाकाळिनिविवर्धि(व)भास:} \text{यदर्शरीनवसमसुत्रिचलया: पुरुषु:} \text{विवेकपुत्रः} \text{विवर्धिकमः}

2 \text{क्वेकल्लोक्यस्वर्णाहितानामसमध्चहेंहें II} \text{पाणारुप} \text{दससमाहर्षिरोत्तल्लचाया:}

3 \text{सुभृश्चकसा} \text{लिकव} \text{सुरोर:} \text{को} \text{वर्ममपापकते} \text{कालनाथा} \text{मृगृःति} \text{बृहस्तुतुः}

4 \text{शिला} \text{शिलुतुः(पिस)} \text{२} \text{बहरां} \text{मानता} \text{चिह्नां} \text{व न पदे} \text{विभिन्न} \text{रेखाविही} \text{किभारा} \text{विनिविधता} \text{पदे}

5 \text{तत्त्वो} \text{निविन्ना} \text{वर्ममच्छ} \text{वर्ममच्छ} \text{सपत्तिपेन} \text{तल्लेक} \text{वर्मप-पौरेष} \text{मृगृः} \text{श्रीमान्तस्त्रावरणे} \text{२} \text{उल्लेखमृगे} \text{भीमे} \text{विकारे} \text{निविन्न} \text{नमः}

6 \text{कितान्तर} \text{स्त्रावरणे} \text{श्रुतागुन्फु} \text{श्रुतागुन्फु} \text{वर्ममतित्तिः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः}

7 \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः}

8 \text{पशुस्तूरिचलया:} \text{ब्रह्मचारियोकोमय वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः}

9 \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः}

10 \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः} \text{वर्ममपापकतेः}

11 \text{कालर्क} \text{सम्म} \text{र} \text{तथापति} \text{नुक्रकर्म} \text{पत्र} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा}

12 \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा}

13 \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा} \text{द्वारकारंशा}

14 \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु} \text{शार्दु}
THE discovery of this inscription was intimated to me by Shri V. Mishra, Superintending Archaeologist of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, who also favoured me with a set of impressions which were prepared by his technical assistant Shri K. P. Gupta, who found the stone in 1971. The inscription does not appear to have been noticed before, and it is edited here, for the first time, from the above mentioned impressions.

As I was informed, the record is incised on the upper part of a pillar on the right side of the entrance to the maṇḍapa of a temple dedicated to Śiva, popularly known as Satalēsvara, in the village Chitri, on the bank of the Mahi, and about 10 kms. south-southwest of Sagwāḍā, the principal town of a tehsil in the Dūngarpur District in the southern part of Rajāstān. The inscription consists of ten lines, and, to judge from the impressions, it covers a space 37.5 cms. broad by 25 cms. high. It is in a fair state of preservation, except that parts of some letters in the first line are obliterated. The height of the individual letters ranges between 2.5 and 3 cms.

The alphabet is Nāgari of the thirteenth century, to which the record belongs. What is worth noting from the paleographical point of view is only that the letters ṇh, dh and n have developed their distinct forms, e.g., in uddhāraṇa in I. 2 and uddhāraṇa and Chittalīya, both in the last line. The record is bilingual: in the first three lines the language is Sanskrit, and what is stated here is repeated in its latter part, in a local dialect. The orthography calls only for general remarks, such as the use of b for ḅ, as in viṇāha, I. 1, of the dental for the palatal sibilant, as in -vamn, I. 5, of the prabhāva-mātṛkā, and of the Prakrit word satīka in I. 2.

The aim of the inscription is to record the restoration of the temple where it was found, viz., that of Satalēsvara, as called in I. 2 there of. It is stated to have been originally constructed by Sansakumārā, who belonged to the Paramārā clan, and it was restored by the Rāja Jāla. The date, which is recorded in the first line only in figures is the amāvāsyā of the month Phālguṇa, on Wednesday in the (Vikrama) year 1314, which corresponds to 6th March, 1258 A.C. The year was Kārtikā and the month amāṅaṭa. But as the circle of the unit figure shows a point at the bottom, it is also possible to take the figure as 7, with its curve lost. If it is so intended, the date would correspond to Wednesday, 7th February, 1257 A.C., for the Chaitrā expired year and for the month beginning with the full moon.

With respect to Sansakumārā who originally constructed the temple, the inscription says nothing except that he was in the Paramārā clan; but we have no evidence to show that he belonged to any of the royal houses of the Paramārās. However, the inscription is included here in view of its being bilingual and also in that of its provenance, which is in the southern region of the Dūngarpur District which adjoins to that of Bāṅsvāḍā in Rajāstān. The region as a whole was at one time known as Vāgada where one of the junior branches of the Paramārās held sway, as already seen above.

In respect of the geographical names occurring in the inscription, Chitli is the modern village of Chītri, as already seen above, and Budāpāṭa, occurring in the last line, appears to be the village Bēdōoṇā, situated about 12 kms. south of Chītri.

TEXT

1. रिधिम् [त] सं. 1314 वर्षः पक्ष माग वटः 0 मुन्यन्तरितः.

*1 From impressions.
*2 Expresed by symbol.
*3 After the first two figures of the year, there appears to be a scratch resembling the symbol for 4. There is also a scratch appearing as the sign of māra on the following in, or the sign of māra on this letter, which was first engraved and later on erased (?)
A Paramāra Inscription from Chitrē, Vikrama 1314

Scale: Three-seventh

Varmān Stone Inscription of the Time of Vikramasimha, Vikrama 1356

Scale: Three-eightheenth
VARMĀN STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VIKRAMASIMHA

[Vikrama] Year 1556

This inscription is incised on a pillar in the vestibule of the marble-temple dedicated to the Sun-god in the village of Varmān in the Sirōhī District of Rājasthān. The place lies along the main road from Dēvakhetā to Mandār, about five kms. south-west of Rōdhār, the principal town of a tehsil in the district. The inscription was first referred to by V. S. Sukthankar in the Progress Report of the Western Circle of the Survey, ending 1917, p. 72. It is edited here, for the first time, from the original stone and inked impressions prepared in my presence by Shri N. M. Ganu, Technical Assistant of the Western Circle, who accompanied me in the tour.

The inscription, which is in a good state of preservation, contains six lines, the last of which is about three-fourth in length of the others. The writing covers a space measuring 25 cms. broad by 16 cms. high. The average size of the letters is about 2 cms. The characters are Nāgarī and the language is Sanskrit. As regards orthography, medial ē is indicated by both, the śrīvatsa and the prākṛti, e.g., in Somī, II-2: Jyēṣṭha is spelt as ṣyēṣṭha, in I-1, sūra as śūra in I-3, and the influence of local element is visible in the last three lines.

The inscription refers itself to the auspicious and victorious reign of the illustrious Vikramāśīha who is called here as belonging to the family of Mahārāja (Mahārāja-hulā). The object is not clearly mentioned, though it appears to record some donation made to the temple, or, what is more likely, some repairs made to it, by Lalana, which name has probably to be restored to Lalīnāvī, the wife of Chichār, or Chichāga, about whom nothing is known from this or from any other record. This portion, which contains two abbreviations in I-4, cannot be satisfactorily made out. The inscription also appears to be incomplete in the end.

The inscription begins with the date, which is the fifth of the dark half of Jyēṣṭha of the (Vikrama) year 1556, given in figures only, on a Monday. The date regularly corresponds to 9th May, 1300 A.C., taking the year as Southern Vikrama, expired, and the month beginning with the full-moon.

The record is silent about the name of the family to which Vikramāśīha belonged, nor

---

1 The sign of visarga has disappeared, leaving traces. The letter that precedes this sign is deformed, also appearing as sū or śūra.
2 That is, Rōdhār.
3 The reading of the first akṣara in this line is not certain, the second is indistinct, and the third one has a vertical stroke on either side, appearing as the sign of either a prākṛti, or of ē. Thus the reading of the first four letters in this line is uncertain.
4 This akṣara, which may have been intended to be ṣū, as it appears also, is redundant.
5 This akṣara also appears to have attached to it a mārā, which was probably subsequently erased, but the sign is still there.
6 For the other inscription from the same place, see No. 61.
does it say anything about his pedigree. But from the provenance of the record it is not unlikely that he may have been a successor (and probably a son) of the Paramār king Pratāpasimha mentioned in the preceding inscription which was dated in V.S. 1544 or 1285-86 A.C. and which comes from a place (Girvad) which is only 20 kms. to its south.

The preceding inscription which we have just referred to, mentions Pratāpasimha, a brave king who relieved his kingdom from Jaitarakarpa who was, as we have already seen, the Guhila king whose known dates range between 1213 and 1253 A.C. And in view of this, it would appear rather curious that Vikramasimha, who was his successor, as we have presumed here, is mentioned in the present record not with any reigning title but only as belonging to the family of a Mahārāja or Mahārājakula, i.e., Mahārājula, which is a lower title: and this may go to indicate that his kingdom, too, may have been circumscribed about this time. The Sūndhā stone inscription of 1263 A.C. states that Chāchāgadeva of Jālār (c. 1255-1285 A.C.) "enjoyed the fall of the tremulous Pātuka" who has been correctly identified with Pratāpasimha, the Paramāra ruler of Abū. From his inscriptions found in the areas of Jālār, Sīrōhī and Mewād, Chāchāga also appears to have made further conquests in these regions adding to the dominions left to him by his father Udayasimha, even in the turbulent days when Nāsimuddīn Mahmūd and Balban were invading parts of Rājasthān, and his zest of conquest is also well known from his inscription of V.S. 1330 or 1274 A.C. found at Barloot, which is only about 16 kms. from Sīrōhī, to its north-west, and situated about 50 kms. north of Girvad, where the preceding inscription was found. In view of this, Vikramasimha, who may have been the last ruler of the house, appears to have lost some of his territories to the Chāhamānas, who were gradually extending their conquests in this direction in consequence of the pressure caused on them by the armies of Abūdīn Khalji from 1510 to 1514 A.C.

The only geographical name appearing in the inscription is Vihārnā in l. 2, which may undoubtedly be identified with Varmān where the inscription was found and which is the corrupt form of Vrahānā, as already seen above.

TEXT

1 स्वल्प [1] सेंसु १२९५ वर्ष ग्रेह(घँट्ड) विद भ. सो.-
2 मे प्र(ब)धवरहस्त्याने महारा-
3 धनराजसिद्धिभवित्समी(स)हकर्णा-
4 गक्षणाएव(को) पञ्चा-१० राज. चे.-
5 एवभाजन्[१]लक्ष्याः [२]क्षोभ(ब)धरा-
6 पालाविकरय[ए] ? १२ ते [३]····

1 This title was also borne by some other kings, e.g., Sāmamūhā, son of Dhūravarsha of this house, Udayasimha and his son Chāchāgadeva at the Chāhamāna house and some of the kings of the Guhila dynasty, and it is taken to have been probably a religious rather than a political title somehow connected with the Rāvatis. See A.S.I.R., W.C., 1907-8, pp. 38 ff.
2 E.g., Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 74 ff.; text, v. 30.
3 E.C.D., p. 156.
4 The Sīnpur and Sūndhā inscriptions come from Sīrōhī and the Karbhē inscription from Mewād.
6 From Naimo's account it is rightly concluded that the Chāhamānas conquered Abū from the Paramāras. See E.C.D., p. 176.
7 See Note 61, above.
8 From the original and inked stampages.
9 Expressed by a symbol which is partly visible.
10 This and the following abbreviations I am unable to make out. The reading of this letter too is doubtful and the horizontal stroke of the mātrā is joined to the letter, as in the case of dha.
11 It is impossible to say whether Chāchāga was a royal personage or a private individual. It is equally impossible to say whether the word cāh has to be restored to dhārā; in that case, however, the name that follows has also to be restored to Lakṣādī, i.e., Lakṣādītya.
12 The upper part of the loop of the subscript of ed is faintly visible.
13 This portion is corrupt. Before the last okshara, appears a sign resembling a crescent with that of anusūtra above; and the inscription is incomplete.
DHUBÉLĀ MUSEUM STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF MADANAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1205

This inscription was very briefly noticed by N.P. Chakravarti in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1935-36, p. 94. As he stated therein, he found it "lying in the compound of the Dewan's house at Chhatapur, the principal town of a State of the same name and now the headquarters of a district in Madhya Pradesh. Some time subsequently, it was removed to the Museum at Dhubéla, an adjoining village, where it is now exhibited." The record was edited by B.C. Jain, Deputy Director of Archaeology and Museums in Madhya Pradesh, in the Journal of the M.P. Historical Association, No. VI (1968), p. 44. The same scholar also favoured me with a rubbing, from which, and also from a photograph which I owe to the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, the inscription is edited here.

The record is incised on the pedestal of a black stone statue representing Sātinātha, the sixteenth Jaina Tirthankara. The figure, which is in the kūṭātsarva posture, measures 150 cms. by 56 cms. The inscription consists of four lines of writing, measuring 28.5 cms. wide by 8 cms. high. It is in a perfect state of preservation. The writing shows slovenliness. The average size of the letters ranges between .8 and 1 cm.

The alphabet is Nāgari. The letter dh has developed a horn on its left limb, as in śīkhara, l. 1.; the mātra of long ū is marked so as to appear a subscript ū, as in pūrva- in the same line; and the form of ch is distinct from that of v, as in cha in l. 1, and va in line 4.

The language is Sanskrit, but the names in the last line are all without any case-ending. The record has two verses in the Anushṭubh metre, followed by a portion in prose, giving the date along with some other details. The orthographical peculiarities are that the consonant following s is reduplicated, as in dharmā, l. 1.; the dental sibilant is put for the palatal except in one clear instance, śrēṣṭha in l. 2.; and the prāṣṭhā-mātrās are occasionally used.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the illustrious Madanavarman, whose dynasty and the royal titles are not mentioned in it, but it appears to be doubtless the homonymous king belonging to the Chandelā house of Jējakakubhti. The object of the record is to show the installation of the statue of Jñāntama (Sātinātha), by Lakṣmīdhara, the son of Harīchandra, whose predecessors are mentioned in it. The names are all without any historical interest. We are further told that the image was regularly worshipped by his successors.

The date is given in the last line, as Sainvat 1293, Phā (Phalgun) 9th Monday, which corresponds to the 10th February, 1147 A.C. It is an intermediate date for the reign of Madanavarman who is known to have occupied the Chandella throne from 1125 to 1163 A.C.

The inscription is sectarian and devoid of any historical interest. It does not mention any geographical name. It appears to have originally belonged to Ajayagāth, one of the strongholds of the Chandellas.
NO. 191: PLATE CLXVII

AJAYGADH STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF TRAILÖKHYAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1269

This inscription was found by Alexander Cunningham at Ajayagadh, in the working season of 1883-84, and he transcribed its portion containing the date and published the same with his comments in the *Archaeological Survey of India Reports*, Vol. XXI, for the same year, on p. 50, with Plate xii-D. From the same plate it is edited here.

The record consists of six complete lines. It has extremely suffered from weather, and consequently nothing except the portion containing the date and the name of the king in the beginning, is legible, besides a few letters here and there. The dimensions of the writing are not recorded.

The alphabet is Nagari of the 13th century A.D., to which the record belongs. The language is Sanskrit, and the inscription is all in prose. By way of orthography, nothing is noteworthy except that the letters व औ and औ are almost similar in form, for which, see विजयानीये, in l. 2.

The inscription refers itself to the victorious reign of the illustrious king Trailokyavarmman, who, from its provenance, can be no other than the Chandella ruler, the son of Paramardin and three of whose inscriptions have been edited above. The object of the record cannot be made out from its mutilated nature. As to its date the day is obliterated, but the month is given as Philiguma-radi of the (Vikrama) year 1269. The week-day is mentioned as Saturday.

From the data available, I agree with Cunningham in concluding that the date must be either:

---

1 From a photograph supplied by the Chief Epigraphist.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 It seems that Devasvamii was a name and he was a younger brother of Saini. It so, the change of सिम to सिन is not necessary. The construction here is faulty and nothing can be definitely said.
4 This foot is metrically defective as it has one akshara more than necessary. Singular is also wrongly used instead of dual.
5 This word is wrongly put in the accusative instead of the nominative, as required by the construction.
6 Two aksharas are indistinct here.
7 The reading of the akshara in the brackets is not certain and the name of the family cannot be known definitely.
8 All the names in this line are without any case-ending, which is nominative.
9 I am unable to explain the meaning of this expression.
10 This is, Philiguma.
11 Nrs. 141-145.
2nd or 9th of the month, dark half, Saturday, the latter being equivalent to the 16th of February, 1213 A.C. However, it may be remarked here that according to the scheme of the current and expired year and also that of the pūrgīṃtha and aṇāṇa month, the number of alternatives, with Saturday, may be multiplied, and in view of this, we cannot be definite on this point.

The latest known year of Trailokāyavarmā’s reign is supplied by the Dhurēti copper-plate, dated in the Kalachuri year 967, equivalent to 1212 A.C. The month given in it corresponds to May; and the importance of the present record is in that it furnishes for the ruler a date which is above 8-9 months later. It is also the only record of this king’s reign available so far at Ajayagadh itself.

TEXT

1 सिद्धम् [1'] संवत् १२६२५ फल्गुन वद्य — ५ शनी राजग्रीजाकोशरजाम—
2 मन्दिरविजयराजाय.... .... ...  

No. 192 : PLATE CLXVIII

AJAYAGDH STONE IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF VĪRAVARMĀN

Vikrama Year 1335

This inscription was brought to light by N. P. Chakravarthi by mentioning its purpose and date, in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, under Epigraphy, for 1935-36, p. 92. It is edited here for the first time from a photograph kindly supplied to me, at my request, by Shri B. C. Jain, Deputy Director of Archaeology in the State of Madhya Pradesh.

The record is incised, as we learn from Chakravarthi’s report, on the pedestal of a colossal image of Śantanātha in a ruined Jain temple, to the west of the Ajaypāl tank, on the fort of Ajayagadh in the Panā District of the Vindhyā Division of Madhya Pradesh. The inscribed portion measures about fifty cms. broad by nine cms. high. The size of the letters gradually decreases in each of the lines, which are four in all, till in the latter half of the last line it is almost half of those employed in the first line. The preservation of the record is satisfactory, except that four letters at the end of l. 2 and three at the end of l. 3 are totally lost.

The script is Nāgarī of the thirteenth century to which the record belongs. Worth noting from the palaeographical point of view are the somewhat similar forms of ch and v, as in cha and vṝṇ, both in l. 3, and the slightly varying bend of the horn of dh, as in sādhu and madhumā, in ll. 2 and 3 respectively. The consonant s is occasionally written so as to resemble m, e.g., in Māsīra and sādhu, both in l. 2.

The language is Sanskrit; the inscription is all in prose, excepting two verses in the concluding portion.

The orthography calles for no remark, except that the class consonant preceded by r is

---

1 See No. 148, above.
2 For a still later date for the king, see No. 202, below, of A. 1283.
3 From plate in Cunningham’s A. S. I. R., Vol. XXI.
4 Expressed by a symbol.
5 The first of these figures is broken, but the reading is absolutely certain.
6 The figure for the day is obliterated.
7 The rest of the inscription is obliterated.
doubled, as in *varma* and *durgā*, both in l. 1; *Yasa* in l. 2 is written as *Jasa*; and *yasya* in l. 4, as *java*, and that the proper names used in l. 2 are without the case-endings and are separated by a *daṇḍa*.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the king *Viravarmanādēva*, who, from the provenance of the record, can safely be identified with the Chandellā king of that name, the son and successor of *Triśaṇya*varman, and whose earliest and latest records bear the years V. 1311 and 1337 respectively. The purpose of the record is to register the installation of an image of *Sāntinātha* (evidently the one on the pedestal of which it was found), the sixteenth of the Jaina pontiffs, by the *siddha* *Sōdhala*, the son of *siddha* *Śīhāla* (also called *Śīhāla* below in the verse) and *Dēvak*, residing at the *Jayapura*-durgā and belonging to the *Grahapatī* family. The inscription was dated on Monday, the thirteenth of the bright half of *Chaitra* of the (Vikrama) year 1335. The corresponding Christian date, as calculated by *Chakravarti*, is 27th March, 1279 A.C. It is regular. The year was Ādīśāni (Southern Vikrama) expired.

The record is of sectarian interest and gives only an intermediate date of the Chandellā king *Viravarman*, who is known to have occupied the throne from c. 1247 to 1286 A.C. Beginning with the auspicious symbol for *Śiddham*, which is followed by the customary adoration to *Vitaraga*, it mentions the setting up of the image in the temple on the fort, by *Śōdhala*, in the year which we have seen above. *Śōdhala* is described in it as devoted to pleasing others by doing good to them. His speech was sweet and his body was even pure in consequence of paying homage to the feet of *Jina*. He had three brothers of the names of *Dāmodara*, *Gangādhara* and *Jaśōdhara*, that is, *Yaśōdhara*, and a son called *Nānādeva*.

The only point of interest that the inscription contains is to show the prosperity of the *Grahapatī* family in the Chandellā kingdom, since we know that one of its members installed a Jaina image at Khajurāho in V. 1215 or 1157-58 and another at *Aśā* in V. 1237 or 1180 A.C., which also show the continuity of the family.

The only geographical name mentioned in the record is *Jayapura*, which is *Ajayagadh*, as we have often seen.

**TEXT**

*Amrta* : *Verse 1. FumātiMālā : v. 2 Anuśūlākh.

1 निरंरः
2 सोमो नरीराम ि । श्रीमःश्रीमविकाबिणयाराजे संवतः(प.) 1335। । ।
3 तत्र सूत् तु(लु)वि । ।
4 सतय सख्य प्रेमप्रभुषतानाम त्राभिगति।

1 Nos. 144 and 147, respectively.
2 See Nos. 124 and 133, respectively.
3 From a photograph.
4 Expressed by a symbol.
5 The *aśāhara* in brackets shows an unnecessary curve above.
6 This and the other proper names below are all without case-ending but separated by a *daṇḍa*.
7 The bracketed letters are all lost. Rather read *पुरुसः*.
8 The bracketed letters are formed as if by a wrong stroke of the chisel, as some others also which are not noted separately.
9 The same as above, in the forms of *tṛa* and *tṛa*.
10 The correct word required here is *प्रमणिनः*, which would not suit the metre.
11 I am not certain about the closing sign in the end.
AJAYAGDH ROCK INSCRIPTION (OF THE TIME OF BHÒJAVARMAN)  

[VIKRAMA] Year 1344

This inscription was discovered by N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist. A brief notice of it appeared in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1930-34, p. 92. It is edited here, for the first time, from an inked estamapage kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist.

The record is inscribed on a rock to the right side of the pedestal of a group of sculptures carved on the rock of the so-called Ashta Shakti images near the Tarihān gate in the fort at Ajayagdh in the Panna District of the Vindhya region of Madhya Pradesh. It consists of only one line which is very long, measuring 165 cms. It is carefully engraved and is in a fair state of preservation. The average size of the letters ranges between 2.5 and 3 cms.

The characters are of the Nagari alphabet resembling those of the stone inscriptions of the time of Bhòjavarman. The top-strokes of letters occasionally show either a crescent or a slanting stroke at the beginning, as in the Bhogad stone inscription of Kritivarman. The vowels  and  show the same peculiarities as in them; cf. Īvara and īlaya; the subscript  is written in its complete form with the preceding letter half drawn, e.g., īpratima; and lastly, the conjunct  is engraved as  ā, as in durgga, as we find in several inscriptions from the region. The language is Sanskrit and the record is in prose throughout. The orthography does not call for any special remark.

The inscription opens with an obeisance to Kedara, i.e., Śiva. Following this, it records that one Nihaladeva caused to be made (carved) the images of Kedara and Pārvatī, Vrishabha, Nirmāna, Ambikā, Tārā, Tripura, Kāmākhyā, Durgā, Harasiddhi, Aindri, Chāmūnda, Kālikā, and again Iśvara and Pārvatī. The images, as already noted by Chakravarti, are all found in the neighbourhood of the rock and most of them also bear separate tables.

The inscription mentions the pedigree of Nihaladeva. It tells us that he was the son of Thakkarśas, the grandson of the Thakkarśa Vāné and the great-grandson of the Thakkarśa Viśana, who was in charge of the Jaya-prātpā, along with its gatehouse (prātā). The same genealogy of Nihaladeva is also found in the undated Ajayagdh stone inscription of the time of Bhòjavarman, and thus he is undoubtedly the same person as Subhata called therein, and the Superintendent of the Treasury and the Chief Minister of the king.

The date of the inscription, which is recorded in the end, is (V.) S. 1344, in the month of Vaiśākha, in its dark half. The figure for the week-day is not clear but we are also told that it was a Saturday. And presuming the figure for the date to be nine, as it resembles the unit figure of the year in line 92 of No. 114, above, the date would regularly correspond to Saturday, 27th March, 1288 A.C., for the Kārtriṇḍor Vikrama expired and the pāramānta month.

The name of the king is not mentioned in the present record, but it definitely belongs to the time of the same Chandella king whose latest known date is V.S. 1346, which is also the earliest known date of his successor Hammiravarman, as we know from the latter’s Charkharī grant.

The inscription closes with the expression Subhamata.

On the basis of the dates of both these rulers, Chakravarti guesses that Bhòjavarman was not a usurper, as conjectured by Hirala, but that he had only a short reign of 3 or 4 years, and possibly he was a younger brother of Viravarman and reigned only during the minority of Hammiravarman. And this is probably the reason why his name has been omitted in the
Charkhārī grant of the latter. Or it may be, as we have already suggested while editing this grant, that Bhūjavarman’s name may have been omitted in it, as he may have been a collateral of Hammīravarman and possibly another son of Vīravarman. Neither of these views can be finalised unless we get some fresh material to enlighten us on the point.

There is only one geographical name mentioned in the inscription. It is Jayapura-durgā, which is, as we have seen above, the fort of Ajayagāth where the inscription was found.

**TEXT**


**No. 194 : PLATE CLXX**

**PANNĀ STONE PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION**

[Vikrama] Year 1366

This inscription was first brought to notice by N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist, who published a short abstract of its contents in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1930-34, p. 94. It is edited here for the first time from an inked impression kindly supplied by the Chief Epigraphist.

The inscription is incised below a group of images, carved on a block of stone, which Chakravarti found lying near the waterfall in the old part of the town of Pannā, the headquarters of a district of that name in Madhya Pradesh. The record falls into two parts, called here A and B. Part A, which is on the left-hand side, covers a space measuring 95 cm. broad by 6.5 cm. high; and part B, which is on the right-hand side, measures 92 cm. broad by 12 cm. high. The former contains 2 lines of writing, with nine or ten aksharas in the end of the third line, and the latter 3 lines, the last of which is about half in length of the other two. The average size of the letters is about 2.5 and 3 cm., respectively.

The inscription is very carelessly written, and it has also suffered considerably on both the sides; but much of it can be read with confidence, except a few letters which have altogether disappeared or have left only a few traces. The characters belong to the Nāgari alphabet of about the beginning of the fourteenth century A.C. The language is Sanskrit and the record is throughout in prose. The orthography does not call for any special notice.

The object of the inscription is to record the installation of a group of images by Sūhādādeva, the son of Ashau and the grandson of Vāse, born in the Vāstavya Kāśyapa family.

---

1 See above, No. 161.
2 From an impression, which is No. B.192/19370 of A.R. of Ind. Ep.
3 The sign of mātra of the first akshara of the name is detached from it.
4 This and the names that follow are all without case-endings, which can easily be supplied.
5 The consonants of this and the preceding letter are conjunct; but I am unable to make them out from the impression. The reading of both these letters is uncertain.
6 In the transcript the names are separated by me with horizontal strokes for facility of reading.
7 The mātra is denoted by a curve above.
8 A flourish above the first of these letters denoting the mātra is to be seen.
sprung from Kāśyapa and belonging to (in charge of) the gateways of Jayapura and Kālānjara. The names of Suhadhadeva and his wife Devalladevi are also written in the part on the left-hand side. The inscription is dated in the (Vikrama) year 1366, on Thursday, the 10th of the bright half of Śrāvana, which, as calculated by Chakravarti, is equivalent to 17th July, 1309 A.D. Thus we know that these images were carved nearly 22 years later than those mentioned in the preceding and the following inscriptions which are dated in 1344 and 1348 A.C., respectively, by the same Suhadhadeva and his wife Devalladevi, about whom we have said in our editions of them.

The block on which the present inscription was found must have originally belonged to Ajayagadh, as is indicated by its contents, and seems to have been brought to Pannā, some time in the past. The record does not give the name of any reigning king; but from the year mentioned in it, we may well conclude that it undoubtedly belonged to the time of the Chandella king Hammśvarman who was on the throne from 1289-90 to about 1309 A.C. when the Muslim armies were overrunning Bundelkhand. Thus it is clear from the present record that though a great part of the Chandella territories was then occupied by Alā-ud-din, at least the fort of Ajayagadh was in possession of the Chandella Hammśvarman in whose reign the images were engraved.

The geographical places mentioned in the inscription, namely, Kālānjara and Jayapura, have already been identified. The latter of these is Ajayagadh itself.

TEXT

Part A

1  श्री[१]  पं. । सुहद्वेष्य पत्नी देवलविविधे[[:]]।
2  ..............प्रतिमा: ।
3  .............स्थितेष्येन स्थ: ......

Part B

1 तिदमु । तिदिः: ॥ सं. १३६६ आद्या सु[२]तवि १'० सुरी कालान्तःप्राच्यकालस्थापकविवेदे का-
2  वहरक्षयुतो [१] प्रतीकात्मविव....। तुरबधीविव(द)प्रायेन तुरबधीवधिविव अं[३]।
3  ख़देवे[४]श(श)।[५]सा:........५ समक्षात्मविव: ॥ कारिता: ॥

1 From an impression which is No. G-1996-97 of A.R., Ind. Ep., 1963-64.
2 The reading of this akṣara is absolutely certain. Whether the vertical after it is a part of a letter is not known.
3 The letter lost here is to be restored as न; Read देव: and preceding word as कन्या.
4 Six syllables are lost here. They should be taken as showing the names of some deities.
5 The lost letters may have been कारिता: followed by a punctuation mark.
6 Denoted by a symbol.
7 Four akṣaras are indistinct here.
8 Five akṣaras are lost here, leaving only traces.
   Better read the first of these words separately, both in the nominative plural.
PANNA STONE PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION, VIKRAMA 1566

Scale: One-half
AJAYGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION (OF THE TIME OF BHOJAVARMAN)

[Vikrama] Year 134X

This inscription, like the previous one, was discovered by N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist for India, and was briefly noticed by him in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1930-34, p. 92. It is still unpublished. It is edited here from an impression which I owe to the kindness of the Chief Epigraphist.

The inscription is engraved on the rock to the left side of the pedestal of a group of sculptures carved on another, incised with the so-called Asha sakti images near the Tuirahoni gate in the fort of Ajaygadh, in the Panni District of Madhya Pradesh. The record consists of one line, which is unusually long and measures 200 cms. It is all in prose. The letters are crudely engraved, unlike those of the preceding one, and have also suffered from exposure to weather; but with the exception of 2 or 3, they can be restored, of course, with the help of the other epigraphs near it. The average size of the letters is 3 cms., excluding the flourishishes of the mātrās above.

The characters are Nagari. Some of the letters, like those of the previous one, show either a knot or a curve at the beginning of the top-stroke, and the letter ī in ēdā appears as a triangle ending in a vertical strike. The subscript r is written so as to appear as ī, e.g., in pratīnā.

The language is Sanskrit, which is incorrect, and the whole inscription is in prose. The pṛśāhita-mātrās are generally used, and sometimes they appear side by side with ardha-mātrās as in Devallā devī.

The inscription does not mention the name of any king. Its object is to record that the images of Surabhi, Śiva, Gauri and some other deities were caused to be made (carved) by Devallādevī, the daughter of the Thakkura Devadhara and the wife of one Subhādeva of the Vāsavya Kāyastha family. Subhādeva was the son of the Thakkura Ashau, grandson of the Thakkura Vāse and the great-grandson of the Thakkura Vidana, who was in charge of the Jayapura-durga along with its gateway (pratīhā). The year of the record is mentioned in the end as the (Vikrama) Year 134X, without the other details. The unit figure of the year is not clear, though from the long vertical stroke it appears to have been either 1 or 5; and taking the year as 1345, the Christian equivalent would be 1286, when Bhōjavarman was on the Chandella throne.

Subhā, the present inscription is the same as mentioned in the previous record as Subhā, who was the Treasury officer and Chief Minister of the king, as we have already seen.1 The genealogy recorded in this inscription is also the same as known to us.

The additional information that the present record supplies is that Subhā’s wife was Devallādevī, the daughter of the Thakkura Devadhara.

Subhā and his wife Devallādevī also caused to be made some other images, as we understand from still another inscription engraved below a group of them, on a block of stone, discovered by Chakravarti in his turn, lying near the water-fall at Panni.2 The record, as he informs us, gives the same genealogy of Subhā, along with the name of his wife, and was dated on Thursday, the bright half of Śrāvana of the (Vikrama) year 1366, which is equivalent to 17th July, 1309 A.C.

The block appears to have originally belonged to Ajaygadh; and the inscription shows that the images on it were carved nearly 22 years later than those mentioned in the present inscription and in the days when a great part of Bundelkhand was under the Muslim ruler Alā-ud-din.

Jayapura-durga mentioned in the inscription is, as we have already seen, is the fort of Ajaygadh.

---

1 Above, No. 158, vv. 28-30.
2 A.S.I., A. R., 1930-34, p. 94.
RASIN STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIN

[Vikrama] Year 1466

RASIN, or Rasin, is an old town situated on the high road leading from Bandi to Kalañjar, 47 kms. distant from the former and about 30 kms. from the latter. The antiquities found at this place go to show that it must have been a place of considerable importance in former times. The present inscription was noticed here by Alexander Cunningham, in his visit to the town in 1884, on a temple of goddess, locally known as Chandlā Mahēśvarī and situated in a dense jungle on the top of a hill, about a mile to the east of the town. The record was published by the same scholar, in his Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XXI (1883-85), p. 18, with a translation and a photo-lithograph, Plate No. XIV. From the same plate it is edited here.

The inscription consists of six short lines of equal length. The dimensions of the writing are not recorded, but it can be stated here that each of the lines has eight aśkharas in it. The photo-lithograph shows that it was well preserved when seen by Cunningham. The alphabet in which it is written is Nāgarī of the fifteenth century. The language is Sanskrit, which is almost correct; and except a verse in the Amśuṭubh metre in the end, it is all in prose.

The epigraph is a pilgrim's record, and its aim is to register the name of one Jaipālā, the son of Surañjī, who visited the place, apparently for paying homage to the deity enshrined in the temple where it is engraved. The date is given in figure only: it is the seventh day of the bright half of Chaitra of the (Vikrama) year 1466, falling on a Saturday which, as calculated by Kielland, corresponds to Saturday, 23rd March, 1409 A.C.

The record begins with the date, as seen above, and then it proceeds to mention a person, without giving his name, who was the king's slave in Rājāvasī, the royal residence of Paramardin, the lord of the earth, whose slave was Jaipālā. The name of Paramardin is mentioned here without that of his family and also without any of his ancestors; and even his royal titles are missing. And for the reason that the record was found not very far from Kalañjar, he is likely to be identified with the homonymous Chandellā king, the grandson of

---

1 From an impression which is Chief Epigraphist's A.R., No. B-194/69-70.
2 The date may have been preceded by a symbol which is now lost.
3 Read either Prakrit or supply tasya i.e., the names are all given without case-endings and there are some more grammatical errors throughout the record. They are not shown here and can easily be known.
4 The dates in the brackets are all mostly lost leaving only parts of them. The reading is probable in view of the sign of āsītha visible on the first of the letters. The word has been restored from Chakravarti's writing.
5 The reading is probable, but not certain. I am unable to explain the use of the following word also.
6 The unit figure which appears to have been later on corrected, may possibly have been 1 or 5, the vertical stroke of which is clear.
8 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 355, No. 156. The year was the Northern Vikrama, expired.
AJAYGADH ROCK INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF BHÔJAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 154

Scale: Four-seventh
Madanavarman. But since the last year of this ruler is well known to be 1202 A.C., and we also know that after the reign of Hammuravarm a the region was conquered by the Moham-
medans in circa 1308 and in view of the date of the present record, we have to presume that there was a second king of the name Paramardin, whose existence we do not know from any other source. This view, however, appears to be less possible, in view of the fact that the region was then annexed by Alai-ul-din. Thus this point remains uncertain till we get fresh material to solve it.

Rājavāsinī, the place mentioned as the king's residence, is Rāsin itself, where the record was found.

TEXT

1 आर्थिति: || संबाट(२) ||
2 १४६६: क्ष्य जैस-||
3 तव्व ७ स(श)नौ || राजा ||
4 दास: सी(ओ)राजवास्त्वया[१] ||
5 परम(विंि)नो ||
6 कस भूत्सिति जैसाल ||
7 समाचारुपाल्य: ||

No. 197: PLATE CLXXIII

MAKĀVAL STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF DHĀRAVARSHA

[Vikrama] Year 1276

This inscription was discovered by V. S. Sukthankar, then an Assistant Superintendent in the Archaeological Survey of India, in 1916-17, and its date was noticed by him in the Progress Report of the Western Circle for that year, on page 69. It is edited here for the first time from an inked impression supplied by the Superintending Archaeologist of the Western Circle.

The epigraph is incised on the base of a column of stone pertaining to a temple on the western bank of a small tank, about 1 km. north-east of the village of Makāval, in the Rēdhar tehsīl of the Sirhī District in Rājaštān. The place is about 8 kms. straight south of Rēdhar and about 25 kms. west-northwest of Ābu Road.

The writing is in a sunken panel and covers a space about 19 cms. broad by 18.5 cms. high, and consists of ten lines. It has suffered a good deal owing to exposure. The portion on the left-hand side is almost completely obliterated and only an akṣara here and another there is now visible; whereas that on the right-hand side, which has suffered less, cannot be completely read. But the record is of interest, as we shall see presently.

1 From facsimile in A.I.R., Vol. XXI, Pl. XIV.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 This word remains unconnected.
4 The sign of अम(ो) ishōh appears as a vertical stroke.
5 I am unable to make out the meaning of this
RASIN STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PARAMARDIN (II?), VIKRAMA 1466

From Facsimile
MAKAVAL INSCRIPTION OF DHARAVARSHA, VIKRAMA 1276

Size: Three-fourth
The script is Nāgarī and the record appears to have been in a local dialect. The purpose cannot be made out. The inscription refers itself to the reign of the illustrious Dhāravārsha, whose name is fortunately preserved in l. 4 in it. It is dated, as we read in the beginning of it, on the 3rd day of the bright half of Srāvaṇa in the (Vikrama) year 1276. The probable equivalents for V. 1276 the surrounding years are:

- Northern V. 1276 current: = Friday, 27th July, 1218 A.C.
- Northern V. 1277 current: = Tuesday, 16th July, 1219 A.C.
- Northern V. 1277 expired: = Saturday, 4th July, 1220 A.C.
- Northern V. 1275 expired: = Friday, 27th July, 1218 A.C.

None of these equivalents shows the week-day to be a Monday, as mentioned in the inscription: and, in view of the second of these alternatives, which is of course the nearest from the point of view of the week-day, I am inclined to think that the true equivalent seems to be the 15th of July, 1219 A.C., when the third ṭīthi commenced on it at 25 of the day and ended at 41 moment of the next day, on the 16th. But since the object of the inscription cannot be made out, I can give no reason why the day should have been joined with the ṭīthi which commenced on it.

The importance of the epigraph under study is that it shows the western most limit of the dominions of Dhāravārsha, evidently the Abū Paramārā ruler, since it is the only record found so far of his time in the adjoining Ichālī Rādhar. The record is also important from the point of view of its date. Before its discovery the last known date of Dhāravārsha was supplied by the Kāyapāl inscription dated V.S. 1274 (1216 A.C.) and the epigraph under study extends his reigning period by about three years. The next certain date that we know is V.S. 1277 (1221 A.C.) when his queen Śrīnārādevī was looking after the administration of his son Sūmāṇihā whose earliest known date is furnished by the Abū inscriptions of V.S. 1287 (1230 A.C.). Thus we may presume, of course hypothetically, that Dhāravārsha died some time after July, 1222 A.C. and was succeeded by his son Sūmāṇihā who was a minor at that time and the administration of whose kingdom was conducted by the dowager queen Śrīnārādevī for about 7-8 years, particularly during the time when the kingdom was threatened by the Sūṅgārā Chāhāns from the north, as we know from the Bārlā inscription of V.S. 1283 (1226 A.C.).

The only geographical name appearing in the record is Makāvāla (l. 6), which is evidently the place where the inscribed stone was found.

**TEXT**

1 दिषुदेव "सांकु(क) १२७६ वर्ष साह(ष) मणि
2 ढूठि ३ सी(से) [भें?] . . . . . . . . . .

---

1 No. 76, above.
2 No. 77, above.
5 From an impression.
6 Expressed by a symbol.
7 The latter in the brackets appears as a conjunct. The rest of the inscription is obliterated, as stated above.
Rājpūr Copper-Plate Charter of the Paramāra Raṇadhavaḷa

[ Vikrama | Years 1148 and 1127

THE present charter is the earliest record of the time of the Paramāra king Naravarman, yet found and issued by his subordinate chief Raṇadhavaḷa whose name is revealed from it for the first time. It is engraved on three copper-plates which were received as a treasure-trove find, in 1958, in the Collectorate at Khargone in the West Nēmād District of Madhya Pradesh. As far as information is available, the plates were found by a peasant, in course of ploughing his field at Rājpūr, the principal town of a tehsīl in the district; and very recently they were acquired by the Central Museum at Indore. When received, they were considerably corroded, with some of the letters choked with verdigris. With great care they were cleaned by Shri R. S. Garg, the Curator of the Museum, who also deciphered a major part of the record; and finding it important, placed the plates at my disposal for critically editing the inscription, which is done here from the originals, owing my thankfulness to the Curator.

Each of the plates measures 28 cms. broad by 19.5 cms. high, but the height of the third one exceeds that of the other two by .3 cm. Their rims are slightly thickened (.3 cm.), to protect the writing. A small circular hole (dia. 1 cm.) in the middle of the lower border of the first plate and in the upper border of the second and the third, so as to disturb the continuity of the writing, shows that they were held together by a ring, which is not now forthcoming. The total weigh of the plates is 2800 grams. The lower right corner of the third plate is occupied by a roughly-engraved figure of Garuḍa in human form, kneeling and facing left, with folded hands, with letters Garuḍa, engraved in Nāgarī, near its face. The figure occupies a space 5 cms. high by 4 cms. broad. The average height of the letters engraved on the plates is 1 cm., except on the third plate which shows letters slightly bigger in size, and sparsely written. The last of the lines consists of the sign manual of the king Naravarman, and the one just before it is in bigger letters which I am unable to make out.

The inscription comprises 56 lines of writing, fourteen of which are inscribed on the inner side of the first plate, fifteen on either side of the second, and twelve on the inner side of the third plate. The engraving is shallow, and thus the letters do not show through on the other side of the plates, which are rather thick. They are slovenly formed, and besides that, a number of them are uncouth in shape; some of them were also distorted by the engraver who committed mistakes of omission and commission in cutting them. For example, ṣvāma, the first two syllables in l. 28, are cut as maṁśāḥ; the consonant of the second aksara in Kaṇḍāṇya, l. 26, as ga; the second letter in vaṁśi, l. 49, as ra, by omitting the middle horizontal stroke, and in the same line pa is engraved as sha, and ma as na. In this respect, the record shares the peculiarities of the Kadambapadraṅga grant of Naravarman. Similar expressions appearing in some other charters are no doubt helpful in deciphering a great part of the inscription, but this device fails to vouchsafe the correct reading of names occurring in the record, for example, in l. 27. Besides this, owing to mutilation, the reading of some of the letters remains uncertain, and hence there are a few lacunae in the transcript given below.

The alphabet is Nāgarī, which is regular for the period and locality to which the record belongs. For example, the initial short i is formed by placing two loops side by side and subscribed by the sign of short u, as in iva, l. 24; the letter h loses its loop when subscribed by the maṭrā of short u, or ri, or by a conjunct; the signs of ch, sha and u are distinct from each other; and the conjunct, ṣ of sh is found as ll.

The language is Sanskrit; and except two sandhyas in the beginning, two in the middle, and eight in the end, which are all almost the same as generally to be found in the Paramāra charters, the record is in prose throughout. As regards orthography, we may note the identity of the signs of b and ṣ, the use of the priśṭha-maṭrā with a very few exceptions, the interchange

---

1 Above, No. 34.
of the palatal and the dental sibilants, occasionally; sometimes doubling the consonant following r; and lastly, a confusion between the formation of a danda with that of a prithiśa-mātrā or one of the components of the signs of the secondary i, almost all the same as to be found in the contemporary inscriptions. The uṇuṣāra is throughout employed for the consonant m; and it is often carved so lightly as to be seen only on the original. Examples of superficial marks of punctuation are to be found in ll. 25-26 where the names of the donors and their forefathers are engraved. And finally, māhāryāyaḥ in l. 4, uṣṭhatharī in l. 32, and Viṣṇuaka and yāyātē, in ll. 44 and 47, respectively, betray the influence of the local element.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the illustrious king Naravarmanēya, who meditated on the feet of the illustrious Udayādītya who meditated on the feet of the illustrious Bhījadeva, who, in his turn, had meditated on the feet of the illustrious Sīndhurāja. All these kings are mentioned in the record as endowed with the sovereign titles of Paramaḥātma-rāja, Mahārājadhīrāja and Paramēkṣa. The purpose of the inscription is to record the perpetual donation of the village Mahādāhā, by the subordinate prince, the mahāmaṇḍālēvara Ranadhavala, from his own bhūki, viz., Madhumatt-700, which was also a pratiṇāgarāmaka in the Daksīṇapāthaka and was bounded in the west by Pāṇā(?)360, lying in the Pūrṇa-pāthaka. The donor was the Nāyaka, Tripāṭhī Mādhala(va?)/arman, son of Tripāṭhī Vāvana (Vāman), and a grandson of Tripāṭhī Pavanāha (Pavanāha), and belonging to the Lāda community and migrated from the mahādāhā Pāṅchāla. His gōtra was Kaṇḍūṇa, with the three pravaraś Kaṇḍūṇa, Vasishthā and Maṭiravarn, and he was a student of the Saṅkt (?) Śāhā.

The grant was issued by Ranadhavala from the Amartēvara Brīha, after bathing in the confluence of the Rēvā and the Kapīla, for the spiritual benefit of his parents and of himself. It is dated in ll. 16-18, both in words and numeral symbols, on the fifteenth tīthi of the dark fortnight of Patsha in the (Vikrama) year 1148 on a solar eclipse. Below, in ll. 25-36, there is another date, when the grant was confirmed (or re-issued?) by Naravarman. It is Thursday, the seventh day of Chaitra of 1177, expressed both in words and numerical figures.

In view of the general practice of dating in the expired year, the European equivalent for the first of these dates would be Sunday, 25th December, 1091 A.C., but there was no eclipse on this day, and we have no other means to verify our calculation. The solar eclipse that occurred just before, however, fell on the 15th of the preceding Jyeshtha, corresponding to Wednesday, 21st May of the year; and this would seem to point out that the grant was originally made at the time of the eclipse, but was actually registered seven months later, in December.

According to the same scheme, the English equivalent for the second date would be 10th March, 1120, A.C., but the week-day on this date was Wednesday, as mentioned in the inscription. I am unable to explain this difference.

The Duṭakas of the grant were the Purāṅhīta, the illustrious Vāmanāsvāmin and the Rāja-putra Kumaraṇḍara (Kumāranḍara?). The inscription was composed by the Akṣapātāṭika (keeper of records) whose name cannot be made out, in the bhūkāla (royal treasury), the name of which appears to have been Śṛṇya (or the illustrious Jaya). The announcement of Ranadhavala was made in the presence of officers, viz., dandaṇāyaka, kuṇarā-purusa, kṣayeśa dandaṇāvriśthā (or dandaṇāvriśthā?), niyuktipurusa, viṣṇuaka, and the people of the village.

The inscription is composed on the model of the royal charters of the Paramāra kings of Mālava, and it ends with the sign-manual of the king Naravarman, as stated above. The genealogy mentioned in it is all well known; but the record presents a number of problems, the first of which concerns the succession of Naravarman. On the evidence of the Amēr inscription and the Dēvā grant, we have seen above that Naravarman ascended the throne in 1093-94 A.C., but the present charter tends to show that he was actually reigning in 1090 A.C., with the paramount title of Mahārājadhīrāja. From the Dēvā grant, we also know that his father Udayādītya died in 1083 A.C., and the conclusion that can apparently be drawn from the date given in the present record is that Udayādītya may have abdicated some time about 1090 A.C., of course in favour of his youngest son Jagadēva, whom he liked most, and the latter offered it to Naravarman, some time before or about 1090 A.C. Whatever may have been the case, the record
under study seems to push back the accession of Naravarman by about a couple of years than known at present.

The view expressed above, however, appears to be one-sided when we take into account what is stated in ll. 33-36 of the present record, namely, that Ranadhatavala, who had originally made the grant as a subordinate prince, again got it verified in the office of the Mahākāśapa-pahu, in order that the next king (obviously Naravarman) may know all about it, for restoring the same. From this statement it is evident that the grant may have been issued by Ranadhatavala, during the reign of Udayāditya; and thus we can neither place Naravarman's accession earlier than the generally accepted date, nor Udayāditya's abdication in favour of any of his sons.

Another historical information furnished by the present record is that Naravarman had under him a feudatory of the name of Ranadhatavala, who governed the southern region of the Paramāra kingdom. This name, which is otherwise unknown, may perhaps be recognised in its Prakrit form Rindhuvula, mentioned in the Rāsamālī; as a son of Udayāditya and thus a brother of Naravarman, by whom he was appointed as the governor of the region around Rājpur, the find-spot of the inscription. This place lies to the south of the Narmadā, and thus it is rightly said to have been included in the Dukshina-pathaka, in l. 12 of the inscription.

The reason why the grant was renewed is not stated but can be conjectured in view of the political events of the time. In this respect, the present charter of course shares the peculiarities of the Kadambapadraaka grant which is referred to above and which was originally issued in V. 1167, and also records the confirmation of it along with two other grants made previously, by the king. One of these was made by the Mahāmardārika Rājadēva in V.S. 1154, and the other by his daughter-in-law (sudālikā) Mahādevī, probably on the same date. A reference to all these grants in the Kadambapadraaka charter, is, as observed by R. D. Bamerji and N. P. Chakravarti, may have been made with a view to bringing together all the grants of land made to the donee up to the time when that charter was issued; but the case of the present grant is altogether different. It is possible that the grant made by the feudatory Ranadhatavala would probably not be valid unless it is confirmed by his sovereign, and that appears to have been done in the present case, under his sign-manual engraved in the end.

The confirmation or re-issuing of the original grant after the long time of twenty-nine years leads us also to presume that it may have fallen into abeyance due to reasons which are not stated, or which cannot be made out due to the uncertainty of the reading, and thus we are reduced to making a conjecture in this respect. We know that Naravarman was pre-occupied with his enemies on all sides, viz., the Chaulukyas on the west, the Chāhmānas in the north, and the Chandellas in the north-east of his kingdom; but particularly in the south of his territory, beyond which lay the kingdom of the Western Chāluksyas, who were the most inveterate enemies of his house. As is evident from the present epigraph, the region to the south of the Narmadā and around Rājpur, the find-spot of the plates, was under the Paramāras in V.S. 1148 (1091 A.C.), but the recently published Aṣṭī plates, dated Saka 1020 (1098 A.C.),8 show that the Yādava king Agramadāva was at Narmadāpura, which we have identified with Nemāwar (now in Dewā District), just opposite to it, on the north bank of the Narmadā.9 Agramadāva was a zealous feudatory of the Chāluksya king Trikānadvīma Vikramaditya VI (1076-1126 A.C.), whose principality lay in the south; and unless it be presumed that he made an encroachment on some territory lying to the north of the river, his feudatory could not have issued the grant from that region. This part of land appears to have been subsequently reconquered by the Paramāras, some time before the date when the grant was confirmed or re-issued.

Most of the geographical names occurring in the inscription can fortunately be identified. Rēvā is doubtless the Narmadā; and Kapila, which is mentioned as its tributary, as in the Schôre grant of Arjunavarman and the Mandhāra grant of Jayavarman II, edited above, dated

---

1 Vol. I, p. 117.
2 See *Ejg. Ind.*, Vol. XX, p. 103.
3 *Ibid.* Vol. XXXVI, p. 254; text II. 36-37. This grant mentions Siddheśvara-khēva at Narmadāpura; and our identification of the town with Nemāwar is supported by the fact that a temple known as of Siddhānaśī, or Siddhēvara, exists there, on the banks of the Narmadā. See *P. R.*, *A. S. W. J.*, 1920-21, p. 98.
4 For details, see above, No. 46.
respectively in V. 1272 and 1317, is evidently the small stream known as Kolār, and figuring as Kuvilā in one of our inscriptions. Pūrṇāpatthaka has already been identified by us with the territory around the modern town of Pūnāsi, situated about 30 kms. south-east of Amāreśvara, which is at Māndhālā. Mahāndhāla, the gift-village, is obviously the modern Mōhādiyā, lying about 40 kms. north by east of Rajpur, the find-spot of the plates, which itself is about 50 kms. due west-northwest of Kārṇārē. The village is about 20 kms. south-west of the adjoining tehsil of Kāśāvād and about 6 kms. south of the Narmāḍa. As for Tāwā, the other gift-village, it is impossible to speak with confidence, in the absence of any place with that name existing in the neighbourhood. It may however appear to have been a village, now no more extant, lying on a stream known as Tēv, also spelt as Tēva and Tēo, one of the southern tributaries of the Narmāḍa and flowing about 12 kms. east of Mahāndhāla. Or, from the use of the word antah before it, it seems to have been, rather more probably, a part of Mahāndhāla itself, though separately mentioned in the inscription. Madhumati, the bhūdāri of the donor which was also a prati-jāgaranānaka, may probably be identified with Māhāpurā, also known as Mōliapurā, situated about 20 kms. north by west of Rajpur, on the southern bank of the Narmāḍa. The place is mentioned by this name (Madhumati-magare) in an inscription of the thirteenth century, found there and recording the construction of a Śiva temple, and has a mound in its vicinity, vouchsafing its antiquity. Pāṇopali may perhaps have been either the same as Pāṇāwā, about 10 kms. south of Rajpur, or more probably, Pāṇā, lying about 16 kms. north by east of it. Dakshināpathaka appears to be the same as Dakshināpāthaka or -patham, which denotes that portion of the Indian Peninsula which lies to the south of the Narmāḍa. And finally, Paḍchāura, the original place of the donee and mentioned as a mahāsāthana in the inscription, suggests its identification with the modern town of Paṭhār in the Rajgadh District of Madhya Pradesh, on ethnological grounds; but the word vānirgata (migrated from) after the name indicates its existence outside Mālāva, unlike Paṭhār, and another similar name, vīṣ, that of Paṇchāmakāla in Gujarāt (just to the west of Bāsāswādā and south of Dīṅgarpur, in Rājasthān) and adjoining to Mālāva on its south-west, may be suggested here, though nothing can definitely be said in this respect.

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1-2, 4-11 Anuṣṭhāna : v. 3, 7, 11 Vaṃstāśāla : v. 6 Indraṇaṣṭā : v. 8 Sālīṇa : v. 12 Paṭhāṇkapāli].

First Plate

1 सिद्धम् II स्वाभिन्नमुदयेत् I वालित्वोक्षरोऽसि(श) वः स्थानाय विनिदिं=1
2 तिति (तात्र) I एविनि विनिदिं विनिदिं लेखत(श) ज्ञस्मि (श्री) यां (श्री) ज्ञस्मि लिं (श्री) (111) लिं (श्री) विनिदिं=1
3 साधने: कल्याणम्
4 निस(श) ज्ञद: I कल्याणानमश्वदित्वविनिदिं (श्री) (111) श्रिमहाराजायमि I शरमि (श्री)
4 सतवालज्ञिनमाईयासरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरयज्ञसरय�्ञसरयज्ञs

1 Nos. 49 ; 57 ; II. 29-30 and 31, respectively.
2 See above, No. 18.
3 Information due to Dr. V. S. Wakankar of the Vikram University, Ujjain, to whom my thanks are due.
4 From the original plates.
5 Expressed by a symbol.
6 Read सातमी, as the other characters of the house. The first of these akṣaras is omitted ; the forms of the second and the third are changed by a redundant horizontal stroke in each ; and the consonant of the fourth is engraved as था.
7 Read एततः.
8 Sandhi between the first two akṣaras in this line, as also in some instances below, is not observed.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHANDÉLLAS OF JÉJÁKABHUKTI

8 स्त्रीमनरस्मिदेव: कुशली।
9 राज्यीतानन्दायोऽपि समताता(ः) सतेन्द्रसिद्धिमभिमेव(ः) सतेन्द्र(ः)
10 कारकारथानामहामहेश्वरकरणानि: पुरुषाकारसात्मनि:।
11 पाणिषासिद्ध(ः) सत्यानिद्राय(ः) दर्शनसिद्ध(ः) श्रुतिसिद्ध(ः) योग(ः) अष्ठि:।
12 नेत्रे प्रतिज्ञानां दश्योऽपि समुद्रको प्रस्तावान्यां नीतिनिद्राय।
13 मय(ः) समस्तस्थानाकारणा स्विन्ध्रि: | क्रियाकालुः (ः) | योग(ः) | वैरविकर(ः) | योग(ः)
14 श्रुति (ः) श्रुतिर्मय|श्रुतिर्मय|समुद्रको|नीतिनिद्राय| प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रतिज्ञानां | प्रति...
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30 विद्यामाले[र्यादि] कन्तमलातात्त्वालाशाहिस्तबोधेऽलेति[र्य]णिवेदानि-
31 क्यो मातापिनीग्राण(ः)नवनानुभवतः(क्रि)सिद्धैलिङ्गेऽसा(ः)सनम् कलिमेकुञ्जः-
32 कल्यकने(कल्यके) प्रति। सत्यवर(ः)स्त्रियक्षक्षाशिवायसतस्यति। तयावेदः
33 वि नात्यां महात्मानमःवुलक्ता[दृश्य]क्षीरसे भाङ्गरारेण(ः) निम्न(ः)क्रिया(ः) "[१]" पुष्म(ः)पालण-
34 दस्यमारा(ः)सनमृतस्यविभाषायम्(ः)सिद्ध(ः)कुञ्जः[२] सिद्धिराशिजातिः श्रीमाधवराधाराति-
35 श्रीमधुभाषस्यदेवकर्तणः। विजाय शुनिष्कय गुलङ्गदेवलामालः यशः-
36 दृश्यविभाषायम्। तत्तवसःमानतायमानविभाषकरिष्ठवाविभाषायम्[क] शेतवाय(ः)ह्रमुन्न-
37 फिक्तसमाजःश्रीविभाषाय(ः)सूर्या मरणः पवित्रस्य तथे दश्यनुपालः
38 शापदितं तत्तवसः। समुपक्षाय(ः) सानात(ः) न नेतृत्वसः तथा(ः)वहाः
39 स्मार्तवीयसः। स्मा समायुक्तसमाजस्यविभाषायम्(ः)दायायम्(ः) नुस(ः)रेत(ः)वद(ः)
40 पालिमां वर्षां न नेतृत्वसः। बो(ः)ह्रमुन्नविभाषायम्। शृष्टिज्ञानोऽपि। समायुक्तसः
41 क्यो यव नर्वो शुक्लस्तर्य तथा दश्य(ः) ह्रमुन्नविभाषायम्। शृष्टिज्ञानोऽपि। समायुक्तसः
42 नाति धार्मिकोपन्यायः। निम्नायुक्तसंस्कृतिमाति लावन्यः। को नाम दाता(ः)
43 शृष्टििकुलकम्यतः(ः) नुसा(ः) नुस(ः)रेत(ः)वत(ः)वद(ः) वनस्मिनिन्दमम्
44 नुसाधिनिन्दः(ः) सक्षायासितलिङ्ग[दृश्य]वद(ः) वचनसमालः शेतवा पालिमाः परस्याविभाषायः

45 पालि व[१२२२] समायुक्तान्तरातिः पाणिवाक्षरसुभोवृतो यान्ति रामभाषा-
46 द्वारा। सामाजिकं कांस्यसिद्धां पाणियां काळे काले पालियोऽध्वनि: [१२२२] स्वतः व-पर
47 स्वतः नाति यान्ति न यो स्वतः व-पर्यायोऽध्वनि: [१२२२] स्वतः व-पर्यायोऽध्वनि: [१२२२]
48 स्वतः व-पर्यायोऽध्वनि: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: महः[१२२२]। प्रस्तावतोऽध्वनि: शेतवा पाणिवाक्षरसुभोवृतो
49 महः शेतवाय[१२२२] मह राजकी: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: [१२२२]
50 शेतवाय[१२२२] शेतवाय[१२२२] शेतवाय[१२२२] शेतवा पाणिवाक्षरसुभोवृतो यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: [१२२२]
51 शेतवा पाणिवाक्षरसुभोवृतो यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: [१२२२]
52 शेतवा पाणिवाक्षरसुभोवृतो यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: यो नात्यार्थोऽध्वनि: [१२२२]
53 सक्षायासितलिङ्ग[दृश्य]वद(ः) वचनसमालः शेतवा पालिमाः परस्याविभाषायः[१२२२]
54 पालिमाः परस्याविभाषायः। संस्कृतमहाशि[१२२२]।

1 Both the bracketed aksharas are engraved only in parts.
2 The three aksharas in the brackets show unmarked forms.
3 The three aksharas in the brackets show unmarked forms.
4 This is mentioned here in Prakrit. For the Prakrit in the expression, cf. bāyā (Sansk. dudchat-vānīḥ) in the Kamali plate of V.S. 1190, in Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, pp. 111-112.
5 Originally, a dānya, with an attempt to change it to the sign of visarga. Nibadhta means registered. Cf. Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 18, 1, 16. The reading of the two preceding letters in the brackets, is not certain.
6 The sense of this and the preceding word is not clear to me. The reading of the first two of these aksharas is also uncertain.
7 This is grammatically incorrect. Read व श्री(ः) दृश्य(ः) सेवक(ः) दर्शाम। Obviously, the same villages which were donated previously. The danda in the preceding line is redundant.
8 The akshara in the brackets is written above the line, in smaller form.
9 Read श्रीवालीस्यः।
10 This is a contraction of Dīraka. The consonant of hi that follows is engraved as d.
11 Delete the danda, and read both the names as one word.
EULOGY OF SUN-GOD FROMUDAIPUR

This inscription was noticed, by M. B. Garde, in the Annual Administrative Report of the Department of Archaeology, former Gwalior State, for the Vikrama year 1977. It is edited here, for the first time, from an inked impression, prepared by the Technical Assistant of the Central Circle of the Survey, to whom my thanks are due.

The inscription is incised on the countersunk surface of a rectangular slab of stone surrounded by a plain raised border, imbedded in the left hand side of what appears to have been the mandapa of an old temple, at Udaipur in the Vidyas (Bhilā) District of Madhya Pradesh. This temple, which stands at a little distance to the south of the well known Śiva temple at that place, is now dilapidated, and is owned by a resident of the place, who continued making additions and alteration to it from time to time. It is locally known as Bijāmanḍala. In my visit to the place, I found a number of old images lying helter-skelter in the inner cells of the structure, all to be ascribed to about the time of those carved on the Udayēśvara temple in its vicinity, as stated above.

The inscription consists of eight lines of writing, covering a space 80 cms. long by 26 cms. high, with one akṣara in the line that follows. It is incomplete, in spite of the fact that the lower portion of the stone, measuring about half of the whole, is left blank. The reason why the record was not fully engraved is not known; it may, however, be conjectured from the engraving of the last two lines, where the letters are rather indistinct in comparison with those of the earlier portion, that the sand-stone, on which it is engraved, was probably found unfit to bear the marks of the chisel, in its lower portion. The size of the letters ranges between 2 and 2.5 cms. A number of them are lost, and some mutilated.

The engraving is fairly deep. The characters are Nāgari of the twelfth century, and bear a close resemblance to those of the celebrated Udaipur prāśasti, edited above. The formation of the letters is also of the same type, more or less also showing the same characteristic feature of the writing, viz., that a short vertical stroke is attached to the left of the top-line of almost all the letters, and occasionally, also to its right. To note the peculiarities of the individual letters,

1 The syllable in the brackets, which was originally omitted, is engraved just above the preceding letter, and it also appears to have been rubbed off.
2 The preceding line is in bigger letter and engraved as separate from the main body, as we find also in No. 51, above. Two of the letters in the line, viz., न and म may perhaps be explained as the initial akṣaras of कुरुक्षेत्र: राम. The first of the akṣaras in the line, i.e., र, is also found in No. 38, L. 14.
3 It also goes by the name Ghodiyalan-komahā; and from this expression it is inferred that "it was probably the house of the time-keeper or clock-man on the establishment of the great temple." See D. R. Pausil, The Cultural Heritage of Madhya Bhārata (Gwalior, 1932), p. 104. But the word Bijāmanḍala, which may have been at the root of the name, appears to have been a corrupt form of Vījaya- manḍula, an analogous instance of which is furnished by one at Vidyāś, where too we have an inscription, No. 36, above.
4 For another incomplete inscription edited here, see above, No. 460, in which case the reasons appear to be different.
we find that ch and v are almost alike in form, as in visvarttu and chakra, both in l. 1, whereas dh shows its own distinct form in bearing the horn on its left limb, and the vertical of dhā are joined by a horizontal stroke, as in śraddadāhā, l. 2. The ṛepha is often denoted by a serif, attached to the lowest extremity of the preding letter, as in chakra, l. 1.; and the slightly varying forms of the palatal sibilant are to be seen in kṣita and śraddadāhāna, both in l. 2. The conjunct sīna in uṣṇā, l. 3, is written as sīla. Mistakes of engraving, which are only a few, are noticed below in the text.

The language is Sanskrit, and excepting an initial short sentence paying obeisance to the Sun-deity, the record is metrically composed. It contains ten verses, the last of which is incomplete. The verses are not numbered. The orthography calls only for a few remarks, which are usual, e.g., the doubling of a class consonant following r, as in karmma, l. 5.; the occasional interchange of the palatal and the dental sibilants, e.g., in pralāda and prabhāsa, respectively, in ll. 2 and 4.; the general use of the sign for u to indicate h; and finally, the use of anusvāra for final m, even wrongly at the end of a stich, except in a few instances, e.g., at the end of the first half of vv. 1. and 2. The mātrās of diphthongs are used before a letter, and sometimes also above it.

The extent portion of the inscription does not refer itself to the name of any king nor does it bear any date. Thus, historically it is of no value. Its importance, however, lies in showing the popularity in Māvā, of the worship of the Sun-deity, eulogised in it, in the twelfth century, to which its palaeography belongs, and this account is corroborated by another eulogy of the same deity, engraved on a slab which was found at Vījaśā.

Beginning with the Siddhārya symbol followed by the word svasti and a short sentence showing obeisance to the Sun, the inscription has a māngalalāho, intending to say that this deity bears the name of the moving world-wheel, to which his rays in the form of spokes are attached. In the next stanza the poet shows his modesty, and the god’s (Sun’s) favour which actuates him to compose the eulogy. The following two stanzas refer to the well-known fact that the Sun’s splendour is reflected in the moon; and also to be seen in the fire, which is eulogised by the gods, and that be is the lord (store) of the eternal light. Verses 5-6 state that the Brahman and the world are nothing but the forms of the Sun, the first of these being unmanifested and minute, as to be seen only by the ascetics, and the latter, when it becomes manifest and extensive, in the world. The next stanza, which is partly preserved, means that the deity imparts lustre, not only to the eyes but also to the mind. The last verse identifies the world with the Sun-God.

No geographical name appears in the extent portion of the record.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1, 4-5, 7-8 Anushūbh; vv. 2, 9 Mandalahānā; vv. 3, 6 Śraddhāśrīkṛṣṇa; v. 10 Śh̄hānā].

1. सिद्धम् जोम् नमः सविभु | विवर्त्तसरसरकारकः प्रभातिः (नाम) | बिंभिः भाण भित्ताभिःविद्वा मन्मतयुग- | स्वाह || [II.1] | सुप्रतिकोंक निरर्थकः सन्निहिताहिः कठोप्युगायत्वा || [II.2] |

2. कलियंक प्रोक्तसौरगत्वम् (मूर्तिः) ॥ निमातु मा कुमारसिद्धिः अहं भान गोधि(गो)धर्मीहादकरणिंमण्डलवाय- | (सत) || [II.1] | स्वरीजः प्रतिबिंकिलारिकिः सविभु.

---

1. Above, No. 37.
2. From the original and an impression.
3. Expressed, respectively, by symbol, and the Nāgāri letter ṗ with the sign of anusvāra above.
4. Here, and at the end of some other lines below, there is an unnecessary danda followed by a horizontal stroke, intended to cover a little blank space at its end.
5. The danda is placed quite close to the preceding aksiha; so as to appear as the sign of mātra.
6. The anusvāra on III is redundant.
SĀWARGAŌN STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF JAGADDEVA

(Undated)

The stone bearing this inscription was discovered by Doctor A.M. Shiralkar, an officer in charge of registering antiquities in the State Department of Archaeology in Mahārāstra. The same scholar also published the record in the Indian History and Culture, a Quarterly Journal in Marāṭhī (Bombay), in its issue of January, 1928, on pp. 44-49, with the text but without a facsimile.

About ten years thereafter, the inscription was edited by Prof. V. B. Kolte of Nāgpur, with his own reading of it from an impression sent to him by Shri Kāwadkar, Officer in charge of archaeology of Mahārāstra State, stationed at Aurangābād. Kolte's article, in which he corrected Shiralkar's reading of some important interpretations, is published in the Fidarbhā Research Society's Annual for 1928, pp. 73 ff., with a lithograph. From the same lithograph the inscription is edited here.

The slab bearing the inscription is said to have been found at Sāwargāōn, also known by its longer name Rānī Sāwargāōn, a village in the Paneli District of the Marathawādā region of Mahārāstra. Its exact find-spot is not known. The writing covers an almost squarish
EULOGY OF SUN GOD FROM UDAIPUR (UNDATED AND INCOMPLETE)
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space, about 30 cms. The size of an individual letter is about 2.5 cms. The lower left corner of the stone is slightly broken and lost, causing no loss of any letter.

The writing consists of eight lines of equal length, and, with the initial word Svasti and with the exception of a small sentence in the end, which gives the poet's name, the record contains only one stanza in the Śrāddhāvā metre.

The language is Sanskrit, which is correct. The palaeography shares the peculiarities of the Dūṅgārgōn and Jainād inscriptions, edited above. For instance, the letter dh is formed as v, in kudina, I. 3; n when doubled is written as l; see Kavunī in I. 2; and the letter r resembles a verticle with a horizontal stroke attached to it on the left in the middle, as in vīra, I. 6. The rare jha occurs in I. 3.

Orthographically, we note that the syllable following r is doubled, of which we have only two examples, namely, Karṇāṭa (I. 2) and pārwakāś (I. 5). The diphongs are denoted both by the prishṭha- and the ardha-matrās, even side by side, as in jagaddēvā-dēvō in line 6.

The record refers itself to an illustrious hero of the name of Jagaddēva who is described as vanquishing thousands of (enemical) warriors, all alone, when even those who sided him in the battle had fled off. The stanza was composed by the poet Āvattāvāma. The record bears no date, but on palaeographical grounds, it may be assigned to about the same time as the Dūṅgārgōn inscription which was dated in Śaka 1034 or 1112 A.C.

Beginning with the auspicious word Svasti, as said above, the inscription says that when the terrified Kaliṣīḍā had fled and the Karṇāṭa forces were melting away (had dispersed somewhere), when the Pāṇḍya chieftain had sought hasty refuge in some mountain crevices, and even when his own army too had scattered at the nick of the time, when Bhāru (lit. Āditya, the Sun) was wandering (busy) in the eastern hill-peaks, the daring, dauntless, valiant and illustrious Jagaddēvā, riding his (war) horse Kālāmēgha (lit., the cloud of deluge), only by the strength of his arms, vanquished hundreds of thousands (lakṣa) of the hostile warriors.

Neither the family nor the parentage of our hero is mentioned in the record, but on the basis of its find-spot, which is in the same region where the Dūṅgārgōn and Jainād stone inscriptions were found, it is not difficult to identify him with the homonymous son of Paramāra Udayāditya and a brother of Naravarman. Our conclusion is supported by the fact that this record was composed by the poet Āvattāvāma who also composed the latter of these records. The palaeography too points to the same, as observed above.

In the above respect, the expression Bhāruṇ pārwakāśana (II. 4.5) is also noteworthy. Kolte has rightly shown that the word Bhāruṇ, as a synonym of Āditya (the Sun), obviously refers to Vikramaditya (VI), the Later Chākukya emperor (1076-1126 A.C.), who has entrusted Jagaddēvā with the administration of a province which comprised parts of the Yeōmāl and Ādilbād Districts, roughly to speak, the northern districts of the old Hyderābād State; and the find-spot of the present inscription, which is in the same region, leaves no doubt in identifying the latter with the illustrious son of the Paramāra Udayāditya.

The verse obviously refers to some engagement by Jagaddēvā, in which he was sided by Kaliṣīḍā, the army of the Karṇāṭas and the Pāṇḍyas, against an enemy who is not mentioned by name. Kaliṣīḍā appears to be the same who was the general of the Western Chākukya king Vikramaditya and the son of Madhumārasa, the Commander of the army of Sūmēvara I. Āvattāvāma. Karṇāṭa-danṭā, mentioned next, obviously refers to the Chākukya army led by Kaliṣīḍā, though the word sometimes refers to the Huyasālas also.

---

1 Above, Nos. 28 and 29.
2 The reading is lākṣa and not laksya, as amended by Kolte, for which, see note on the text below.
3 Above, Nos. 29 and 29. Yeōmāl is about 80 kms. straight north-west of Ādilbād, from which Parbhāti lies about 160 kms. straight south-south-west. Still another inscription of Jagaddēvē, dated Śaka 1056 (1134 A.C.), was found at Bhurphapuri (Bīja District), which is about 120 kms. west of Sāwargōn. This information is due to Shri. Chandrāshēkhara Gupta, Registrar of Antiquities, Nagpur. For want of an impression this inscription could not be edited here.
4 See Yarlanti, Early History of the Decem, p. 396. This general appears to the same as defeated with some others, by Rajāllīrāja, son of Kālindra Chālō. See Journal of Ind. History (Calcutta), Vol. VIII, Pt. II, p. 81.
5 Above, p. 55 (no. 84). Textverse 10. Also see above, pp. 78 f.
The enemy who was vanquished by Jagaddēva by killing the warriors of his army is not mentioned in the record, but he can be no other than the Hoysala Ballāla I, who probably ruled conjointly with his brother Vishnuvardhana. Jagaddēva's conflict with the Hoysala king is mentioned in the Jainā inscription, which states that he slaughtered the enemies at Dūrakāsamudra, as already seen, while editing the inscription. We know that Ballāla's grandfather, Vinayāditya, recognised the sovereignty of the Chālukyaas from 1078 A.C., and he was faithful to his overlord till his death in c. 1100 A.C., also siding in some of his battles. But Ballāla or Vīra Ballāla as he was also known, was an ambitious and adventurous prince, and he appears to have made an attempt to declare his independence, by making aggressive activities against some of the feudatories of the Chālukyas and also by aggravating himself against his neighbours. From one of his inscriptions we learn that he, along with Vishnuvardhana, put down the Pāṇđyas of Nolambavāḍ and seized their wealth. This account is supported by another inscription dated in 1116 A.C., which tells us that Vishnuvardhana fell upon the Pāṇđyas, from whom he captured the fortress of Uchchchārā.2

Vikramāditya, however, could not tolerate this sort of overbearingness on the part of his own subordinate, but since he was fully occupied with the Chōla affairs in the east,3 he appears to have sent a punitive expedition against Ballāla, under his loyal subordinate Jagaddēva with a strong force of the Chālukyaas, led by his general Kāhdēsa, which on the occasion, was also joined by the army of the Pāṇđyas, who had a special grudge against the Hoysala king.

In the conflict that ensued, the armies of the Chālukyaas and the Pāṇđyas left the field, but Jagaddēva, all alone, killed the soldiers of the enemy and came out victorious, as we learn from the present inscription.

That the Chālukya emperor was then fully occupied with Chōla affair in the east is shown by the expression Bhūnā pūrveśādriśāgna, the significance of which can hardly be missed, as already seen above.

The struggle between Jagaddēva and Ballāla appears to have taken place after the latter ascended the throne in 1100 A.C.4 and in the very initial years of his reign.5 Jagaddēva's success against the Hoysalas has also been discussed above.6 But this does not seem to have been the only phase of the battle, which may have continued even thereafter, as we know from some of the Hoysala records which also claim victory of Ballāla over the Chālukyan army.7 It also appears possible that these conflicting references may not be taken to allude to one and the same contest.

The geographical names appearing in the inscription have already been identified above.

TEXT

[Metre: Saggherā.]

1 स्वतिष्ठ्य | सागरस्से कालिदास | इव- | 2 नि सिवालिति क्षापि क्षारदिति[ए] | 11

---

3. For details, see Journ. of Anc. Ind. History (Calcutta), Vol. VIII, Pts. III, pp. 91-95. Also see S.E., p. 244.
4. Ballāla was on the throne from 1100 to 1110 A.C. See A Hist. of South India (1955), by K. A. N. Sastri, p. 215.
7. See S.E., p. 175.
9. This word is preceded by some indistinct incisions appearing as of the Siddhāḥ symbol.
10. The poet is very fond of using alliterations as he has done here and also below, for example, in driwati and vigali, kudha and randha, bhāma and śini, etc.
11. The bracketed akshara is not well formed but the reading is certain. The word āsaya means an army here.
The plate which bears this inscription was found at Digodā, a village about 24 kms. straight north of Tikamgadh, the principal town of a district in the Vindhya region of Madhya Pradesh. The record was briefly noticed in the Annual Report of Epigraphy, 1971-72, as No. A-7. The plate was then in the possession of Shri S. P. Srivastava, Principal of the Basic Training Institute at Kundesvara, near Tikamgadh; but at present, as I am informed, it is exhibited at the local Museum at that place. The definite year and the circumstances under which the plate was found are not known. The inscription, which is of great value for the history of the Chandella rulers and the Turkish invasion of India, as to be seen below, is edited here for the first time, from an impression kindly provided to me by the Chief Epigraphist. I also revised my reading from the original plate placed at my disposal, due to the courtesy of Shri P. C. Sen, the Director of Archaeology, Madhya Pradesh.

The inscription is on a single copper-plate, which is fairly large but thin. The plate is broken on all the four sides and the corners, especially at the lower right-hand side, resulting in the loss of some letters in the last three lines. Its ends are slightly raised and it shows a curvature on the right side also. It is inscribed on one side only. The greatest length of it is 58.8 cms. and the breadth is 34 cms. The writing covers an area about 58 cms broad by 33.5 cms high. In the middle of the top margin the plate shows a rectangular hole (1 cm. by .5 cm.), which appears as bored some time later, apparently for hanging it by a nail on the wall, as also stated in the Report of Epigraphy, referred to above. A similar attempt also appears to have been made at the bottom, which has mutilated a portion of the plate. It weighs 2 kilograms and 8.80 grams.

1. The word, which is used here for alliteration, means a mountain.
2. The danda has disappeared, leaving only traces.
3. As said above, here the word denotes Vikramaditya VI of the Western Chalukya dynasty.
4. The word kala is used in double meaning: army and strength. Since Jagaddēva’s army had scattered, he won the battle on his own strength.
5. Prof. Kolte emends the second letter to lāya, meaning the aim. But it is unnecessary. Here it means hundred thousands, that is, innumerable, which is also consistent with śayati.
6. The first akṣara in this line is partly broken, and the sendhi is not observed for the sake of metre.
7. This akṣara too is partly broken. Kālāśraya, literally meaning “cloud of deluge”, appears as the name of Jagaddēva’s horse.
8. Kolte read the third letter of the name as chikha and corrected it to stha. But also see the same letter in the name of the post, above, on Plate NXXII, line 28.
9. This place is mentioned as Dugunija, above in No. 112, verse 6, and as Dugunjā, above in No. 150, verse 7.
The incisions are not deep, excepting in the commencing and the concluding portions, which also show the chisel-strokes on the other side. The inscription has also suffered from corrosion and oxidization, particularly in the middle of II. 7-14 and also in the lower left corner, and consequently, a number of letters and their parts, with their subscribes and the signs of anumāra and mātra, have either totally disappeared or are damaged. The writing consists of 23 lines, the last two of which, containing the sign-manual of the king, are inscribed in the lower left corner. Besides these, there are two lines along the top and one in the left margin, which are all completely corroded, leaving one or two aksharas here and there, appearing as containing names which were engraved some time subsequently. In the right-hand margin, too, is incised a line, repeating in figures, the year, which has already been given in the main inscription, as we shall see presently. The size of the letters ranges between 1 and 1.5 cms. in the first five lines, but it is reduced to about three-fourth of it, in the rest of the lines which are incised most slovenly.

The record is written in the Nāgari script of the tenth century. The characters, though closely resembling those of the Nanyaurā copper-plate inscription of Dhaṅgadēva, which was incised only five years before, also mark the transitional stage between those of this plate and the one issued by Devaavarman and found at the same place.1 Noting the palaeographical peculiarities of the writing, we find that the letter nā in Dhaṅga in I. 1 is written without the dot; rā: y and v are often alike in form; and dh is devoid of its horn on the left limb. The syllable t occasionally occurs in its old form also, as in datā in I. 6.; and the palatal sibilant in almost all cases begins with a short stroke with a loop in the middle, as in Paramēśvara in I. 2.

Most of the letters, particularly the conjuncts, are imperfectly formed; and due to the carelessness of the writer and also of the engraver, many of them appear so much alike in form that it is difficult to distinguish between them, for example, between ga and va, as in Ganda and Gavra, both in I. 2.; between ya and va in Vidyādhara in the same line and also in line 5.; and between n and t in pītri and manuṣya in I. 5. Too often it is not known whether a vertical stroke is intended for a danda, which is so often redundantly put throughout the inscription, or for a sign of mātra, particularly after a geographical or personal name; and consequently, all the names, which are several in the record, cannot be read with confidence. Often the mis-formed or lost akṣhara have also to be conjecturally supplied, for example, it is not known whether in I. 19 the name has to be read as Udākā or Udāma. All these difficulties, which baffle the efforts of a decipherer of the record, are noted below, in the footnotes appended to the text.

The language is Sanskrit, and except for one customary imprecatory verse in the end, the record is all in prose. The orthographical peculiarities are almost the same as to be found in the Nanyaurā grant referred to above. For example, the sign for v is put throughout to denote both v and b; the palatal sibilant is used for the dental in sahastra, I. 4., and Vajasaneya, I. 10., but not in the same word in I. 8. and 9. The consonant following r, and also often preceding it, is usually doubled, as in tuvār = mamār, I. 4., and in pūtra and gūtra, so often figuring in the record. The pṛṣṭha-mātrās are generally used, except in a few instances. Besides these, we find the unnecessary use of the sign of visarga after āhyāta in I. 1., and tri in I. 7.; the change of anumāra to m in sameva and samevatam, both in I. 4., and the violation of sandhi throughout the record, particularly in the formal portion thereof. The rules of grammar and syntax are also occasionally violated, and most of the personal names, with those of the gūtras, pravesas, etc., are put without case-endings and are also separated by marks of punctuation, which are, on the other hand, omitted where they are really required. The sign of the mātra is often detached from the letter to which it belongs, and in several cases it appears as a mark of punctuation. Besides all these, some unnecessary strokes of the chisel make the task of the decipherer indeed a difficult one, as already observed above.

The inscription belongs to the time of the Chandella king Vidyādharma who is mentioned in it with the royal titles Paramahattāraka, Mahārājadhīraja and Paramēśvara, with two of his predecessors, viz., his father Ganda and grandfather Dhaṅgadēva, with almost the same royal titles. This purpose of the inscription is to record the grant to some Brāhmanas the (produce of the) village Iṣaṁfi, situated in the Vāraṇa-sī. The language giving the names of the donors in

---

1 Above, Nos. 100 and 107, respectively.
II. 3-4 is grammatically incorrect, but the sense appears to be that the donation was made by one Čāhā, who belonged to the Chandraśāya family, the chief queen Sāryabhāmā and the mahānāma-putras Gopāla and Vitvana, all combined. The record is dated on the Amāvāśyā of the Śrāvaṇa of the (Vikrama) year 1060, on a solar eclipse. The week-day is not mentioned. The date has been calculated to correspond to 20th July, 1004 A. C. when there was a solar eclipse. The year was Kārttikādī expired.

Commencing with the sign for ॐ which is followed by the expression Brahmaśāstra, which is indeed a peculiar feature of the record and is generally not found in land-grants, the inscription gives the genealogy of the royal house of the Chandellás, from Dhanag to Vidvādhana, and with the date, it then mentions the donation of the village, as stated above, by the chief queen Sāryabhāmā (one of the donors), who is known from it for the first time. She is said to have been the daughter of one Nama, who cannot be identified for want of details. Then the record states that the gift was announced in the presence of the headman (mahātama) and the village folk (janapada), who were obviously concerned. We do not know that Vidvādhana, in whose time the grant was issued, had two sons of the names of Gopāla and Vitvana, and hence the expression mahānāma-putra has to be taken here to denote feudatories or some royal office holders, or noblemen, in which sense we often find it used in inscriptions. There is nothing definite to show that the gift-village was included in their fief and hence they are mentioned here, or that of the queen.

The proceeds of the village were divided among Brahmānas belonging to different gōtras, sākhás and pravara, and they are mentioned as hailing from different villages, most of which are called bhātṛ-grāmas, probably indicating rent-free localities in the possession of learned Brahmānas. In a number of cases some of these details are dropped, particularly in the latter part of the record, mentioning only the names of the donors, sometimes with those of their fathers. Sometimes two brothers are mentioned together, without any other details. And with each of the Brahmānas is mentioned the share (from one to four) that he was to receive.

It has already been noted above that because of the indistinct engraving a number of the names of the Brahmānas, with the details about them, can not definitely be read; and this difficulty is enhanced by the punctuation-marks so often used in the inscription. It is also not known where we are exactly to add the names of the donors mentioned in the left-side margin and also at the top of the plate.

The inscription comes to an end with the sign-manuscript of Vidvādhana, engraved in two short lines in the lower left margin, as already stated above.

Having thus disposed of the formal part of the grant, we now turn to the historical information furnished by it. The so far latest known year of Dhanagāda is 998 A.C., when he issued his Nanyāura grant; and it has been usually presumed that he closed his reign not long after this date, since at that time he had already been on the throne for more than a normal period of reign commencing sometime before 953-54 A.C. when he put up the Khajurāho stone inscription of his father Yāśovarman. Some scholars, on the other hand, are inclined to hold that this king may have lived at least up to 1008 A.C., which saw the downfall of the Śāhī dynasty. But the present record, which mentions Vidvādhana on the Chandella throne in 1004 A.C., undoubtedly shows that Dhanagā had already died before this year, and also that he was succeeded by his grandson Vidvādhana, and also that the latter's father, Gopāla, if at all he occupied the throne may evidently be presumed to have done so only for a few months. Thus the present inscription materially adds to our knowledge with reference to the successor of Dhanagā on the Chandella throne.

Another important point that may be noted here is that the present inscription solves finally the controversy raging so long with reference to the name of the enemy of the Prañāhāra

1 See D. C. Sircar, Epigraphical Glossary.
2 Above, No. 99.
3 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 142. But we have to observe that the very basis of this conclusion is frail, since the confederacy of some Hindu chiefs organized by Anandapāla, as referred to in it, is reported only by Firishtha (Briggs, Vol. 1, p. 48) and by no other Muslim writer. Here also see D.H.N.I., Vol. II, p. 689.
4 As also shown by G. S. Gai, in his Presidential Address of the Ind. Hist. Congress, December, 1974.
king Rājyapāla. Muslim chroniclers are not unanimous in mentioning his name: for whereas Ibn-ul-Aṣir calls him Bīda, 'Nizamuddin,' Firishta' and Gardtiz refer to him as Nandā. Considering all these different readings, Cunningham thought that Nandā of these writers is a misreading for Gaṇḍa; and this view was accepted by Hultzsch, Smith, Ray, Tripathi, and some other scholars. But the present inscription, which is dated in 1004 A.C., shows that Vidyādhara came to the throne immediately after Dīranga, and thus both the names referred to above, viz., Nandā and Bīda should be taken as denoting only Bīda, obviously the Prakrit form of the Sanskrit word Vidyā and thus signifying only Vidyādhara. This also shows that Rājyapāla, the ruler of Kanaūj who is said to have acknowledged the sovereignty of Mahmūd, was killed at the instance not of Gaṇḍa but of Vidyādhara. This conclusion is also in agreement with the statement of the fragmentary Mahābōhi inscription, which gives to Vidyādhara the credit of bringing about the destruction of the kingdom of Kānyakubja, i.e., Rājyapāla, and also with that of the Dūbukū inscription of the time of the Kachchhaphagāṭa king Vikramāsīnhā, which states that his predecessor Arjuna killed Rājyapāla at the instance of Vidyādhara. As regards the geographical names figuring in the inscription, none of them can be satisfactorily identified for want of details. The gift-village Isamī and the territorial division Vārīngī however, suggest their identification with the modern places respectively appearing in the maps as Isamagar and Bārnāgār, the former of which is situated almost about 45 kms. east, and the latter about the same distance in the south, from the find-spot of the plate. As regards the various bhūṣṭa-gramas mentioned in the inscription as the places of the origin of the donees, no name corresponding any of them appears on the maps; and besides this, they may also have been in distant regions, and hence I have not attempted to identify any of them. It may here be observed, however, that one of them, viz., Patikavāda, occurs in a Chandella inscription.

TEXT

9. Hist. of Kanauj, p. 285, n. 5. Also see J.D.L., Vol. X, p. 74, n. This led scholars to suggest that Vidyādhara was then the crown-prince who led the army. See Hist. of Kanauj, p. 285; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 128 and 142.
10. See above, No. 113, v. 22; and No. 134, v. 8.
11. Above, No. 119, Text, 1, 19.
12. From the original plate and an impression.
13. Expressed by a symbol represented by the Nāgarī it with the sign of sansāra above.
14. The upper circle of the viśarga is engraved as the Nāgarī ā and the lower is omitted. The names of Chandella kings also end in Brāhma in the Prīsthāṇiṇī Śāhī (Nāgarī Prachāṇiṇī Sahīh), pp. 2529.
15. For the reading of the consonant in gō, see the same in Gaṇḍa in line 2, and for that of ū, see the same letter in dāvat in line 6. The second appear to be a strange name. The sense of Chakula-above, is not clear to me, but the reading is certain. Probably vitt-ātra is intended (?).
16. Sandhi is not made here and also in the next line in idāha and I.
KUNDÉSVAR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF CHANDELLA
KING VIDYADHARA, VIKRAMA 1060

Scale: One-third
6 यों । दला वारुःकालातिः(सिस्काविकप्रमानं(क)सहभाषीयां महासमग्रमानी(सोआयति) हतो शायतिसमागमविवेचनारायणारायण रक्षनामभित्ताय से-
7 द दे । अर्माणातिःविन्यायाः। हृदिरोगे(क)कुतुहार व(क)हृदिरोगाय विन्यासे(क)विन्यासे। पश्चिमविन्यासातिः पदकवि न (क)तत्त्व व(क)हृदिरोगाय। हृदिरोगा(क)हृदिरोगाय।
8 बाराकाख्यास(क)नोतिः। विन्यासाय। ब(क)लहृदिरोगायमनिम्नायाः। बालसनयातिः पदक 4(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय(क)होक। हृदिरोगायकुतुहारै। अभिमुखैया। हृदिरोग(क)स्य।
9 श्री(स)विनिमयाः(क)पदक 3(क)तथा हृदिरोगकुतुहारै। देवतालहृदिरोगाय। कालविनिमयाः। ब(क)नोतिः(क)दोषाविनायाः।
10 पदक 2(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय। पदक 2(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय। अभिमुखैया। श्री(क)विनिमयाः। श्री(क)नोतिः। वास(क)नोतिः।
11 व(क)गुप्तु। वास(क)गुप्तु। वास(क)गुप्तु। वास(क)गुप्तु। पदक 3(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय।
12 पदक 1(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय। हृदिरोगाय। पदक 1(क)विनिमयाः। वास(क)गुप्तु। पदक 1(क)तथा हृदिरोगाय।
13 कालविनिमयाः। बालक(क)वासनायाः। पदक 1(क)तथा हृदिरोग(क)क विनिमयाः(क)पदक 1(क)तथा हृदिरोग(क)क विनिमयाः(क)योगिः(क)योगिः।
14 श्री(क)विनिमयाः। श्री(क)दोषाविनायाः। वास(क)गुप्तु। वास(क)गुप्तु। पदक 1(क)दोषाविनायाः। श्री(क)विनिमयाः। श्री(क)विनिमयाः।
15 पदक 1(क)तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः। पदक 1(क)तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः। पदक 1(क)तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः।
16 तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः। पदक 1(क)तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः। पदक 1(क)तथा समांत पद 2(क)तथा श्री(क)विनिमयाः।
17 तमस्य (स)मोहं। वासनेनालापा। पानिकृतितिनिर्मातय। तथा महायण। पद १ तथा महोपाल
पद २ [१'] वृक्ष(वृ) ब्रह्मचारी(वरी) उपरे—
18 शरणुः। तथा महोपालिकस्मु वद १ [२'] तथा अवश्य। महार(वृ)सुत। पद १ [१'] तथा सांस्कृत न
कामेवकरसुत। पद २ तथा—।
19 यात्रा। भ्रमणविकार(तरी)। युध्यम(वृ) किमकरित्विनिर्मातर(तरी)। पद २ [१'] तथा
वासनया। [द्रव्यसुत] पद १। युध्यम(वृ) किमकरित्विनिर्मात्र [१]......
20 द-र[१'] ग्रामेष् शासने ग्रामहः। यदा भगवानमहर्षिद्विज्ञसमप्राच्य यादया। जस्मप्रभुष्यायमिति। उक्तमय।
य(श्र) भिक्षु। जननी-भिक्षु।
21 सुवना तत्र राजविष्ठ सर्वार्दिविनि[१'] तथा २ [८] यदा सृष्टः(पदसु) तथा २ तथा फल(क्ली) [२]।
22 [क्ष] विदार्दित।
23 स्वजनो मम [१]
भगवानविष्ठ [१]। सहरणुः। अस्सत्— पद १० [१']

1 वत्स। ग्रामायं...पति॥ जगस्तन्(शाम्य) पद १[१'] अस्सतायम विष...पति...सिच(पिठ)वस(थ)स्मिण्य पद
10
d)
2 ग्रामा नौ। परात(क्ष)सिद्ध-२ (?)

[चतुर्दशी १०६] १५

---

1 After an indistinct akṣaras following tatha, a portion of the plate is lost in this and the rest of the lines.
2 One syllable after dha is indistinct and cannot be made out. It is engraved as vai, or sāi, but what appears to be intended is sva.
3 Both these akṣaras are partly broken and their reading is not certain. They may also be read as ddbham. The first three letters, though not separated by a punctuation mark as in the other cases, denote the names of the donor or his father.
4 Perhaps a datida is intended here.
5 Read jāmaṁāna pradattām for pradattāh. One expects a word line stava, before this and also iti, before maññata.
6 The correct form would be śīkṣaṁ+upanaṁ+yam.
7 For bhukti, as usually found.
8 The use of the numeral showing repetition is noteworthy. Also see above, p. 319, Text-line 3.
9 The akṣaras in this line are slightly advanced in form than those in the main inscription. After jāha, two of them are altogether lost, and the third one is indistinct. The reading of the number after pada is also uncertain.
10 The letters which are indistinct on the plate are shown here by the number of dots, and when more, by a line. The second line begins after some space in the first, and ends much before it.
11 Reading from the original. The akṣaras here are most slovenly formed, and those in the brackets are also weather-worn, but are fairly visible.
12 Both the numbers in the brackets are almost lost, and their reading is from the traces left.
RĀMVAN MUSEUM COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF TRAILOKYAVARMAN

[Vikrama] Year 1283

INFORMATION about this plate was received by me from Shri B. C. Jain, Deputy Director of Archaeology and Museums in Madhya Pradesh, Eastern division, who also favoured me with a photograph of the inscription. From the same photograph the inscription is edited here.¹

The record is inscribed on a single plate of copper, now preserved in the Museum at Rāmvan a village lying about 16 kms. from Satnā on the metallic road to Rewā, in Madhya Pradesh. It was presented to the Museum by Professor Urmil Prasad Shukla of Amarapāṇi (in Satnā District), who procured it from his friend the late R. D. Gautama, belonging to the family of spiritual preceptors of the former State of Nāgōd (in the Vindhya region of the present Madhya Pradesh),² in whose possession it was from heredity. Nothing could now be known about the provenance of the plate.

The plate is inscribed on one side only. The writing is protected by copper-bands (7 cms. wide) fixed with copper-rivets on all the four borders of the inscribed side. It measures 40 cms. broad by 27.5 cms. high, and is in a good state of preservation, except in Il. 14-15 where most of the letters are either abraded or mutilated. In the central part of the upper section of the inscription, a space about 4-5 cms. square is occupied by the seated figure of the goddess Lakṣmīi, with four arms, the upper two of which hold a lotus in each. The figure disturbs the continuity of the writing in the first four lines of the inscription. The plate, together with the riveted border bands, weighs 2502 grams, as I am informed by Shri Jain.

The writing shows slovenliness, though the charter is an imperial Chandellā record. Most of the letters are rather carelessly formed; and the engraver, who failed to follow the precise shape of the letters, worked in his own arbitrary way, deforming most of them, with the result that often they cannot be deciphered satisfactorily. This difficulty is accentuated particularly in reading the names of the donors mentioned in the grant portion where we have no clue to decide the precise letters forming a name. Moreover, the signs of mārās, omūras and the superscript ṛ are often omitted in the process of engraving; the daṇḍa, which also bears a top-stroke, as the letters do, is many a time confounded with a sign of ṛ-mālā, and the curve of the mārā of short and long ṛ is often omitted.

The inscription has in all twenty-four lines of writing, the last of which, which is about one-third of the length of the others, is wholly occupied by the sign-manual of the king.

The alphabet is Nāgāri, regular for the period and the locality to which the record belongs. The characters resemble those of the Gaḍhāi and Sāgar plates of Trailokyavarmān, who issued this plate also. To note the formation of the individual letters, ch, dh, and ā often appear alike: p, m, and y occasionally resemble each other: ṛ is sometimes confounded with n; and ō, which is generally marked as a vertical, so as to resemble a daṇḍa, has sometimes a slanting or horizontal stroke, or only a dot, attached to it on the left. Occasionally the letters are also crisped into each other, and the limbs forming them are often separated.

The language is Sanskrit, excepting in the use of some of the Prakrit words which are given in their original or local forms. The record is composed in prose, with the exception of two verses in the beginning and two in the end.

The inscription refers itself to the victorious reign of the Chandrātīrīya (Chandella) king Trailokyavarmān, and speaks of the royal house to which he belonged. Its object is to record

¹ From the same photograph, the inscription was edited by me in the Journ. of Academy of Ind. Numismatics (Indore), Vol. I, pp. 1 ff.
² Satnā and Rewā, both of which are now district headquarters in Madhya Pradesh, are connected by a metallic road. Amarapāṇi is now the headquarter of a tehsil, situated about 16 kms. north by east of Satnā and 40 kms. south by east of Rewā. And Nāgōd, now a tehsil headquarter in the Satnā District, is about 25 kms. west of Satnā, which is a Railway Station on the Central Railway. Thus all these places are situated in the same region.
the donation made by him, of the village Varahi lying in the vishaya (territorial division) of Paṭisā, to some Brāhmaṇas, from his stay at the fort of Jayapura, which is Ajayagadh itself, as we have so often seen. The dēte of the record, as mentioned in line 7 in numerical figures only, is the eleventh of the bright half of Chaitra of the Vikrama year 1283, on a Wednesday, the date regularly corresponds to 11th March, 1226 A.C., for the expired Vikrama year, when the titti was current at mean sunrise.

The orthographical peculiarities to be noted are: (1) b has been written by the sign for v, as in kutumv, l. 5; (2) the letter following r is often reduplicated, e.g., in durgē, l. 7, but not in nirgama, l. 10; (3) occasionally we find the use of the palatal for the dental sibilant, see vasundhārā in l. 4; and (4) the mātra of ē is marked by a vertical before the letter and not above. Signs of the anuvātra and the visarga are often omitted in the process of engraving. Another feature of the epigraph is that the names occurring in the grant portion are separated by the danda, the use of which is sometimes so close to a letter as to look as an a-mātra or a prishtha-mātra. In this respect, the grant shares the peculiarities of the Sēmṛa grant of Paramardin, edited above.

This is the third grant of the Chandella king Trailokyavarman, brought to light for the first time, as already stated above, the other two grants of him being the two Gadēha plate inscriptions, and the Sēgā inscriptions. Beginning with the symbol for Siddham, which is followed by the auspicious word naasti and the off-quotted two verses generally to be found at the commencement of a Chandella grant, the inscription gives the genealogy of the house, beginning from Maṇavarman, who was succeeded by Paramardin, who, in his turn, was succeeded by Trailokyavarman, the donor or the present grant. All the three rulers are mentioned as sovereign lords, and the additional title of Kālaśa-pāta (supreme lords of Kālaśa) is applied to Trailokyavarman. The relationship existing between these rulers is already known from the other records of the house. Thereafter, is named the village Varahi, with the vishaya as mentioned above, followed by the names of the Brāhmaṇas donees, with the names of father and grand-father of each, the gōtras they belonged to, and the shares donated to them each, as given in the appendix that follows. Then we find the usual terms of the gift: and, with two of the concluding verses followed by the sign-manual of the king, the inscription is closed.

The historical significance of the inscription lies in its date. The latest known date of Trailokyavarman is V.S. 1259 or 1212 A.C., supplied by the fragmentary stone inscription found at Ajayagadh; and the earliest known date of his son, Vitavarman, who succeeded him is V.S. 1311 or 1254 A.C. when he issued the Charkhārī grant. Trailokyavarman is also known to have occupied the throne after V.S. 1258 or 1201 A.C., the latest known date of his father Paramardin. The present grant, which supplies for him the year 1226 A.C., shows that he ruled at least up to this year, when he was succeeded by his son Vitavarman.

It is worthy of note that the first-mentioned person of the donees was called Gaútama. It is therefore likely, that along with some others, he may have settled at the gift-village. It is also likely that some of his descendants later on came to Nāgōḍ, which is not far from the village, and may have become the religious preceptor of the house which ruled over the territory. And in view of this assumption, it is likely that the plate was his ancestral property and he adopted the surname Gaútama.

As for the localities mentioned in the inscription, Jayapura (l. 7) is of course Ajayagadh, as we have so often seen. It is interesting to note that this stronghold of the Chandellas is about 50 kms. north by west of Nāgōḍ, the findspot of the inscription. Paṭisā, the donated village (l. 5), is probably represented by its modern name Patiśā, with the last consonant s changed to h, as we generally find in Pāṣkrita. The place lies about 16 kms. west of Nāgōḍ,
where the plate was for some time deposited; and last of all, Varāḥi mentioned as the head-quarters of the territorial division in which the grant village was situated (I. 5), is the modern village Varāhi, lying about eight kms. south by west of Nāgōd, on metalled road to Jāsō and in the same region as of the well-known archaeological place Chandrāhē.

APPENDIX

The following table shows that the produce of the village was divided into 33 shares which were donated to thirty-four Brāhmaṇas, excluding, of course, two or three in each cases mentioned in line 15 where their names and the other particulars are chiselled off. It is not necessary to presume that each of the donees received one share, for, as we are told, two of them (Nos. 3 and 4) obtained three shares each, one (No. 6) two and a half shares; three (Nos. 1, 5 and 19) received two shares each; five (Nos. 7, 14, 22, 29 and 33) got half a share each; and the rest sixteen obtained one share each.

It may also be observed here that donees No. 8 to 12 appear to have been all brothers; and Nos. 17 and 27, whose particulars are not mentioned, seem to have been, in each case, a brother of the donee mentioned just before.

Note:—In the table that follows, a question mark is put in the case of doubtful reading; an asterisk to show that the particular item is not mentioned; and two asterisks to show that the details are lost in the chisel strokes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of donee</th>
<th>gōtṛa</th>
<th>Surname or title</th>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Father's surname</th>
<th>Shares received</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mahāśama</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>Srūṭi</td>
<td>Mahidhara</td>
<td>Ayapati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bhūmibhāna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upāśa</td>
<td>Gōvinda</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manīraṭha</td>
<td>Agasti</td>
<td>Srūṭi</td>
<td>Vyāsa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dēvaputra</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bharata</td>
<td>Srūṭi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dēlhiśka</td>
<td>(Brother of the preceding one)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Āḷhana</td>
<td>Kusūkā</td>
<td>Pāḍi</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Dikṣita (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gōlīkā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>Lāhāda (with four brothers)</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gāgēka</td>
<td>Kusūkā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janahā</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mālākharā1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Sāḍūka and Risisā</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dēku</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Jāsō and Vārīka (1)</td>
<td>Śūdīya</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Śūdīya</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nārēka</td>
<td>Śūdīya</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Mahē</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sumānaka</td>
<td>Rāhula (7)</td>
<td>Tāha</td>
<td>Rāyādhara (7)</td>
<td>Tāha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vīsudeva</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>Tāha</td>
<td>Nārāyana</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bhārābēka (7)</td>
<td>Vyāsa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Vāmadeva</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sūlīhāya</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Mādīhāya</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dhanādhāra</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Gangādhāra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vīhāra</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Vīhāvāta (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pānīkā</td>
<td>Pāṛāsāra</td>
<td>Pāṇi</td>
<td>Kulachandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pītūka</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jātukā1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sāgāka</td>
<td>Gargga</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Dēvōditā</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pūrūbhōtama</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Gajānāma</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dēvōditā (7)</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Gōgū</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pūlīhāna</td>
<td>Bharadvāja</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>Dāḍē</td>
<td>Dēi (7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Māṛkākṣa</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nārāyana</td>
<td>Tāha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Brother of the preceding donee.

Total shares=33; plus two complete or part shares lost in line 15.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHANDELLAS OF JEJAKABHUPTI

TEXT

[Note: Verse 13 Anushjubhak]

1. सिद्धम्। स्वतिः || जयविछाअधिनिष्ठ: सिद्धराजिलिङ्गः। 1 चंद्रेन्द्रपितामहः महायद्रश इश्वरोः। 11. तव वधाइनाविव।

2. रोपसर्वज्ञाचार्यज्ञांसिद्धोपक्षप्राचार्योपक्षोपभाषां पारसमनार्ज्याराज्याराजरेखास्मात्।

3. तपस्मानर्ज्याराज्याराजरेखास्मात्।

4. राज(श्री)कलाकारभिरतिः(श्री)वेदावधिसंदेशोऽवयव्ययः। 11. व्रज(श्री)धर्मः।

5. वेष्यसङ्गलिङ्गब्रजसङ्गलिङ्गः।

6. अनव्यासानमीलिङ्गः।

7. लक्ष्मीविकल्पः साक्षरोऽपूर्वाधिकारिनान्तिकालमहिः।

8. कारणविसर्गः।

9. प्रतिधीविसर्गः।

10. श्रीवर्षम(सम्) मोहविज्ञानमेकत्रोऽवत्ति। 10. मोहविज्ञानमेकत्रोऽवत्ति।

11. विनाशक्षमस्मात्। देवतादेवताविशेषमेकत्रोऽवत्ति।

---

1 From a photograph.
2 Expressed by symbol.
3 The punctuation mark and the preceding visarga sign are intervened by the figure of the goddess.
4 The punctuation mark is redundant.
5 Read 11. श्रीवर्षम(सम्).
6 Read श्रीगृहस्तकोषम्.
7 Read श्रीगृहस्तकोषम्.
8 These two syllables we also find in some other Chandella grants. For example, see above, No. 125, line 17. In the business portion that follows, the words denoting names etc., are all without case endings and are also intervened by unnecessary punctuation marks. They are reproduced here, without any emendation.
9 That is, 5553.
10 Reading uncertain. Probably 5553 is intended, as in the other cases.
11 Probably to be emended to 5553. For Triśādā or Trīśādā.
12 That is, Upādhyāya. The reading of the first name that follows is doubtful.
13 Here, as also in some cases below, this syllable has no omomāra sign above, and with the following śānta, it is likely to be taken as Pā, for Pāṇḍita. But in view of all the instances which are invariably followed by a punctuation mark, the syllable denoting the first letter of the surname is read as used for Pāṇḍita in all these cases. — Also note Vyasas as a name.
14 The curve of 5553 is not engraved.

Either the father's name is omitted here, or, the first letter dī may denote Dikshita, and the rest two, which are indistinct, may have been intended to denote the name, which cannot be made out.
BUDHĒRĀ PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF GANAPATI

[ Vikrama Year 1351 : Śaka Year 1216

HIS inscription was first brought to notice by M.B. Garde, the then Director of Archaeology in the former State of Gwalior, who announced its discovery in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Department, for Satavat 1986 (1929-30 A.C.), pp. 22 and 59-60 (No. 23). A number of errors appearing in this notice were subsequently corrected by D.C. Sircar, who edited the record in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXIII (1960), pp. 162 ff. and plate, in which he also gave a revised reading of the text. From the same plate the inscription is edited here.

The inscription is incised on a pillar which is about 5.5 metres high above the ground, and stands on a hillock close to the eastern end of the Jhitāli tank, at Budhērā, in the Pichhōre pargāna of the Shyvpi District of Madhya Pradesh. The pillar is roughly dressed and the portion on which the record is incised was not made smooth for the purpose. The letters too were not well formed, and they have also suffered very much from the weather; some of them are lost altogether and some others are mutilated. Thus, the preservation of the inscription is far from satisfactory, and at times, we have to resort to imagination to decipher them.

The inscription has seven lines of writing, occupying a space about 36 cms. in breadth and 23 cms. in height. The letters too are indifferently formed, as said above. In all these respects the record resembles the Bangālā inscriptions edited above (Nos. 162-174). The individual ākṣaras are about two cms. in height.

The record is all in prose. As to the orthography, we notice scribal errors, e.g., in durge (for ādurge), bhāṭārā (for bhāṭārā), in ll. 2 and 3, respectively and in the proper names which are all given in the local language.

The inscription refers itself to a ruler named the glorious Gaṇapati, whose dynasty or lineage is not mentioned, but from the Imperial titles used in it, he was undoubtedly the last of the Yaṇḍavāla rulers whose known dates range between V. 1348 and 1337, or 1292 and 1300 A.C. The purpose of the inscription is to record the raising of the pillar on which the inscription was incised, to commemorate the memory of two persons who are described in it as kāta (killed), apparently in a contest with some enemies who are not specified. The year, which is given only in figures and without the further particulars, is (Vikrama) 1351, Śaka 1216, regularly corresponding to 1294-95 A.C.

Beginning with the date, as mentioned above, the record, in its first half (ll. 1-3) refers to the ruler Gaṇapati, endowed with royal titles, and says that his mahāpradhāna (Chief Minister) Dēōva was in charge of administration i.e., his governor or viceroy, at Kīrtidūrā. This place appears to be more likely the town of Chandērī in the Gūna District, rather than Dēōgadh, as

The first two letters in this line are repeated inadvertently, by the writer.

The curve of the mijra of mi is omitted in engraving.

Also spelt as Budhar, Budhērā, Budhēr and Budhēra.

The first of the ākṣaras of the name is in traces, with 87 before it.
we have already seen above, while identifying place-names in No. 179. For we have no evidence to show that the Yajnapālas in their last days succeeded in extending their dominions so far as to include Déogadh in the Jhansi District which was under the Chandelās.

The second half of the inscription (II. 4-7) is more corrupt and also fragmentary: but as reconstructed by Sircar, it seems to introduce the Prahban Raviya of Jatuhāṭa, his son Muddhāśīha, and the latter's two sons, Harirāja and Jayarāja, both of whom lost their lives in a battle with an unspecified enemy, and also that the pillar was erected in memory of their death, by Jayarāja's son, Yamarāja. Here the word used is nirvāśita.

As already observed by Sircar, the name of Raviya's wife and that of the mother of Yamarāja cannot be fully deciphered, because of the mutilated condition of the record.

Of the geographical names appearing in the inscription, Kirtidurga is more possibly Chandēri rather than Déogadh with which we have identified above; and Jumhāṭṭa (Sansk. Jatuhāṭa) appears to be a locality in the vicinity of Budhērā where the pillar was found.

**TEXT**

1 [म|व्रजु ९२४| शालके १|२१|२२|२३] स्थिति श्रीशी-  
2 सिल्सिला (४) समालराज (ज) कालियेराजकुतमहं (र) -  
3 [म|व्रजु|टरका|परडी|राज] [श्रीमा] परतिमहाप्रयाण-  
4 वेदन . . 'यागः' [ख] करावति [ख] जीव्हितप्रयाण-  
5 रविय [पाली] दिनुणयुग्लीह व.  

---

1 See note on the corresponding portion of the text.  
2 See No. 179, above.  
3 From plate facing p. 165 in Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXIII.  
4 The consonant of the penultimate sibilant is palatal and not dental, as used in jāmasta in the next line.  
5 Read वत्री.  
6 The two akṣaras which are lost here may have been त्र, as suggested by Sircar.  
7 As read by Sircar, according to whom, the first of these words is the Sanskrit Jatuhāṭiya. But all the letters here are mutilated and the last two appear as न.  
8 All these letters are either mutilated or lost, and are given here as tentatively read by Sircar.  
9 Reading uncertain.  
10 Four syllables are lost here.  
11 Probably we have to read योग, to be restored as Yamarāja.  
12 As read by Sircar, who amended them to nirvāśita. But some of the letters are misformed and some others are lost.
INDEX

By T. S. Ravishankar, M.A., and Jai Prakash, M.A.

The figures refer to pages, and n after a figure to footnotes. The following abbreviations also have been used: au. = author; Br. = Brahmana; ca. = capital; ch. = chief; cl. = city; co. = country; com. = composer; de. = deity; dl. = district or division; do. = dino; dy. = dynasty; engr. = engraver; ep. = epithet; f. = family; fe. = female; feud. = feudatory; gen. = general; imp. = imperial; ins. = inscription, inscriptions; k. = king; lo. = locality; lm. = linear measure, land measure; m. = male; min. = minister; mtn. = mountain; myth. = mythological; n. = name; off. = officer, officer; p. = people; pr. = prince, princes; q. = Queen; reg. = region; rel. = religion; ri. = river; s. = same as; s. = Southern; sur. = surname; t. = temple; t.d. = territorial division; t.t. = title; th. = taluk; t.o. = town; v. = village; W. = Western; w. = work; w.t. = weight.
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Barād, da., 130, 554
Baroda, dts., 3, 27
Baroda, etc., 50
Barodiā, vt., 41
Baruā s.a., Bālā, etc., 578, 588
Barn B.M., 487
Barūd, v., 203
Bārūt, s.n., V.S., 1493, 839
Basak R.G., 179n
Bāsādā, k., 185, 187, 611, 622
Bāsādā, pargāṇā, 65, 75, 98, 144
Bastur, dts., 91, 96
Bātīsvara, in., 473 and n
Bātīsvara stone ins. of Paramārđīva, 354n, 421, 462n, 490, 526n
Bhāgājālī, v., 536n
Bāyānā Jaïna ins., 365
Bhājādā, v., 485
Beeköt, da., 422
Bēndandi, da., 128
Bengal, co., 125, 340
Bengal, r.t., 20-21
Bēntī, s.n., 19-20
Berar, etc., 78, 89
Bērmān, v., 44
Bērtār, dt., 422
Bīrnā, in., 19a, 28, 33, 33 and n, 36-37
Bīrma copper plate ins. of Bhōjādēva, 28, 37, 40, 46, 52, 54, 56, 102
Bētā, v., 116, 397, 500
Bētā, v., 116, 131, 342, 354, 362, 371, 379, 423, 441, 450n
Bētā, r.v., 116, 397, 501
Bhābhī, v., 242
Bhābhī, m., 424
Bhāḍādeva, da., 273
Bhāḍādeva, da., 178, 180, 424, 592
Bhāḍākā, da., 314n
Bhāḍānā s.a. Bhāndipadra, etc., 232 and n
Bhāḍānā stone ins. of the time of Pūrṇāpāla, 258, 321
bhāgā, a portion of produce, 33
Bhāgavatpura, v., 15-16
Bhāgavatpura s.a. Bhāgar, in., 104 and n
Bhāgavatpura-pratijógarana, t.d., 193
Bhāgavatthāy, k., 338
Bhāgō, v., 15-16 and 16n, 104
Bhāgūr, v., 282
Bhālī, m., 22, 40
Bhālāsvāmin, etc., 122
Bhālī, m., 314, 354
Bhālāsvāmipura s.a. Vīḍiśa s.a. Bhīṣa, ci., 149
Bhānīr, v., 193
Bhāḷī x.s.a. Jhāḷī, m., 301
Bhāmīnī, s.c., 425n
bhāṇḍā, 'royal treasury', 641
Bhāṇḍākā, v., 110
Bhānd, v., 422
Bhānkā, m., 424
Bhānpur, in., 194
Bhānpur, s.a. of a pargāṇā, 21
Bhārādāvā, m., 148, 152
Bhārāhpāla, d., 592
Bhārāko, t.m., 289
Bhārava, m., 659
Bhārātāpāla, m., 180
Bhārataśāha s.a. Bhōjākālī, s.a. of Bhāpā palace, 49
Bhārat Kālī bhāvan copper plate ins. of Harīrāja, 541
Bhārat Kālī bhāvan copper plate ins. of Paramārđīva, 471, 483
Bhāratpur, extantible state, 865
Bhārtiharī, m., 304n
Bhāskatā, m., 273, 424
Bhāsvat s.a. Bhīṣa er Vīḍiśa, in., 342
Bhātahāda, tanā, 444
Bhātia F., 26m, 250n, 290
Bhātā sā, m., 401
Bhātīgādhā, 'aghrāra of learned persons', 421, 440-41, 444, 448, 452, 460, 471
Bhātīgādīm, etc., 20, 25, 358, 364, 662
Bhātīja, Māgān Mērūn, m., 1
Bhātīka, com., 314
Bhāvā, f., 550
Bhavabhūt, m., 76m, 143n
Bhavagupta, A., 229
Bhavampāla, s.m., 424
Bhāvānājām, m., 424
Bhāvākumudchandārīkā, v., 191n
Bhāvārsānā, m., 207
Bhāvārsārapa, offic., 299n
Bhāyālī, m., 424
Bhedāgāthā stone ins. 131
Bhēlā, v., 155 n
Bhērābhāka, m., 659
Bhikangō, m., s.a. of a pargāṇā, 128
Bhil, state, 58
Bhil, tribe, 54
Bhilāsā, Vīḍiśa k., 185, 119 and n
Bhilāsā H., da., 78, 214 n
Bhilāsā V., da., 159, 214 n, 246, 614
Bhilāsā, place, 517
Bhilāsvāmin, etc., 397
Bhilāsvāmin, etc., 215
Bhilāsvāmipura s.a. Bhīṣa, in., 116, 135, 146, 206-07, 213, 216
Bhilāsā s.a. Vīḍiśa, in., 122, 125, 129n, 135-36, 140, 146, 153, 188, 206-07, 340, 342, 397
Bhilāsā, fort., 188, 203
Bhīma, v., 620n
Chaulukya of Gujarât, dy., 52, 79, 131, 236, 314, 397, 500
Chaulukya W., fro., 52
Chauramba, vi., 21
Chaukotka, of., 57, 59n
Châyā s.s. Châyāsâkâta, dy., 4
Châyâ, co., 55, 57, 342, 359, 415
Chôd, dy., fl., 88, 78, 340 and n. 418, 500
Chôdás, peo., 116, 340
Chôláka, m., 325
Chôkha, of., 483, 492, 514, 516, 600, 624
Chôkrâ, subscript, form of, 107, 211, 278, 305, 309, 400, 529, 586, 600, 624
Chôsara, B.C.H., 90, 229
Chôschacha, m., 310
Chôsadda, scribe, 29
Chôshânâ, vi., 274
Chôshânâ, do., 273
Chôshandas, one of the Védâgamas, 358n
Chôshângâ, L., 289
Chôshâprik, vi., 335n
Chôshâtarjû, dy., 535, 537, 347, 553, 588, 381, 385, 409, 411, 418, 483, 485, 497, 629
Chôshâtarjû, Râjâ, ch., 337n
Chôshâtrasâna, peceptor, 314
Chôshâtraâne, m., 205
Chôshâtâtâgâth, dy., 335, 480, 519n
Chôshârâna, vi., 274 n. 456
Characters —
Roman, 27, 32, 34, 60, 61, 114
Châlrâhi, evârâ-vâlâ e., 300, 321
Châlrâhi, râ., 495
Châlrâhi copper-plate grant of Hamârâvarman, 327 and n
Châlrâhi plate dated in 1178 A.C., 154
Châlrâhi grant, 529, 397, 402, 613-34, 638
Châlrâhi grant of Vîtarâman of V. S. 1511, 812
Châlrâhu, râ., 117
Chârûpi (or Rûpi?), fe., 272
Châturbhujâ, râ., 337n
Châturbhujâ, m., 424
Châlîvarnagacchânanâ, m., 156n, 380n
Chârubâ Iâra, râ., 89
Châuhan, dy., 581, 628
Châulukya, dy., 43, 50, 34, 357n, 55-57, 63, 70, 77-80, 82, 91-92, 98, 109, 116, 135, 139, 159, 163, 174, 200, 213, 215, 228, 234, 237-38, 240, 242, 244-46, 251, 250-61, 282-89, 321, 324, 327, 328n, 421, 474, 573n, 642, 650
Châulukya of Lâta, dy., 30, 52
Châulukya, kingdom, 56
INDEX

n, 458n, 461, 465, 468, 469n, 475n, 478, 480, 491,
498-90, 501, and n., 504, 505n, 507, 510, 511n,
512n, 515, 526, 528-29 and 529n, 534n, 535-36,
559n, 548, 550n, 562n, 563n, 586n, 600, 650.
631n, 637 and n. 634
Curpid, god., 421
Curzon Lord, 86

D

5, form of, 28, 32, 115, 347, 361, 553, 552
5, form of, 28, 60, 296, 303, 367, 395, 499, 529, 536
Dabháka, vi., 615
Dabháka stone ins., of the time of Naravarman, 619
Dabhýushandavarman, k., 496-97
Dabhalóoöl, n., of a well, 591
Dábí plate ins., of the Chandella Viravarman, 579n
Dálápadra, vi., 148-49, 150n
Dámári, do., 401
Dámó, m., 639
Dádhi, race, 500
Dadra, vi., 20
Dágundá s. Dígurá, do., 518
Dáláha, m., 531
Dahí, t.d., 496-97 and 497 n
Dálí, vi., 529n
Dási grant of the Chandella k., 388
Dálwhí, f., 949n and 95n
Dámpúr, do., 93n
Daksha, son of Bhadra, 334n, 544
Dákshina-dáša, ca., 181
Dákshína Káśala s. the upper Mahánadí valley, reg. 440
Dákshínpáthaka, t.d., 103-04
Dákshínpáthhaka, do., 537, 641-45
Dákshínapádha, ca., 19-21
Dalana, m., 180
Dálána, do., 181
Dámanaka, n., of a festival, 75
Dálmana, do., 424
Dámaní, pr., 108
Dámbáralátha, Paramára k., of Vágújá and n., 281-82, 288
Dándí, eng., 110
Dámirá, m., 181, 235, 306, 421, 540, 554, 588,
602, 632
Dámirára, t.d., 570
Dámissá, vi., 189, 223, 525-26, and 526n
Dámissá, vi., 526, 528
Dámissá-fihálpur, reg. 526
dánda, Lm., 193, 104n, 113, 127n
Dándí, a., 491, 494n
Dáníka, off., 255
Dántapálli, a ‘kind of weapon’, 545n
Dántavarman, k., of Chandehádá, 598-61
Dántivarman, Paramára k., of Bhíhmádl, 821
Dántivarman, Paramára k., of Ábu, 624
Dáparú, vi., 21-22
Darbat, do., 363, 368, 456
Darbat image ins., 374, 379, 412
Darbarıkú, vi., 20-21
Daráátishámaránu, m., 133
Daráára, m., 479-80
Daráára, Eastern, reg., 480
Darárúpa, sek., 12

Dasáraáhasá Varáma, 193n
Daría, t.d., 497
Darí, m., 424
Dájí, do., 233
Dáväha s. Dávähágáma, vi., 401
Dávähí, m., 215
Dávára, m., 492
Dává, do., 257
Dáwélía, vi., 282
Dáyachandra, m., 456
Dáyí, do., 424
Days—
lunar (tithí)—
height fortnight—
  1  29, 251, 326
  2  119, 283, 310, 572, 383, 436, 37, 484
  3  202, 297, 299, 296, 296n, 343, 683
  4  410, 486, 530
  5  256
  6  33, 36, 10, 173, 333, 473, 592, 614
  7  621, 928, 549
  8  63, 90, 191, 208, 212, 254, 288, 548,
  9  568, 421, 453, 491, 578, 837
  10  184, 322, 393, 496
  11  392, 629
  12  19, 79, 162, 267, 274, 479
  13  105, 202, 246, 297, 468, 377, 638
  14  115
  15  232, 499, 594, 632
  16  41, 47, 73, 237n, 462, 471
  17  19, 19, 33, 36, 51 and n., 90, 115,
  18  134, 148, 153, 158, 165, 177, 225,
  19  243 and n., 237 and n., 266n, 318,
  20  362, 396, 440

dark fortnight—
  1  195, 905
  2  484, 488, 651
  3  45, 128, 188, 299, 357
  4  443, 459
  5  233, 401, 557, 600, 627
  6  597
  7  448
  8  16, 228, 406, 464
  9  330, 587
  10  23, 62, 141, 323, 522, 622, 624
  11  151
  12  5, 55, 133, 166, 249 and n., 257,
  13  265, 420, 553, 626, 641, 653

tithi: not
specified 186 and n., 633, 636
fortnight: not
specified—
  7  641
  9  145
  10  407

Days holy—
Akkhaya-tritíya, 250, 313

Days of the week—
Sunday, 26, 49, 158, 202, 240, 321, 348, 350, 372,
406, 456, 440, 475, 522, 553
Monday, 51, 103, 166, 191, 249, 256, 263, 265,
256n, 267, 293, 313, 352, 340, 350n, 357,
362, 396, 457, 435, 464, 479, 496, 504, 540,
595, 627, 629 and n. 632.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHANDÉLLAS OF JÉJAKABHUKTI

Tuesday, 99, 105, 119 and n, 178, 362, 401, 445, 459

Wednesday, 3, 142, 158, 208, 222-25, 231, 234, 330, 468, 468, 482, 592, 597, 624, 626, 638

Thursday, 33, 103, 119, 131, 141, 162, 177, 188, 189b, 202, 207 and n, 242, 246, 310, 320, 409, 420-21, 462, 499, 507, 601, 614, 656, 661

Friday, 49, 142-160 and n, 212-248, 385 and n, 456, 484, 488, 578, 622

Saturday, 89, 141, 148, 173, 243, 323, 353, 467, 471, 630-51, 633, 637

Decan, reg, 52, 109

Decan, territory, 18n

Đđdi, m., 243, 423

Đđdharā, do., 321

Đđdakā, do., 22, 273

Đđdās a.s. Đđdakā, do., 29

Đđdās, m., 339

Đđdās, vi., 414

Đđdē, m., 424

Đđdē, do., 424

Đđdū, do., 412

Đđdū, do., 366

Đđhūlā, do., 424

Đđjā, do., 243

Đđkū, do., 659

Đđlaya ma a.s. Đđhāng, do., 163

Đđhā, do., 56, 152, 424

Đđhā, do., 424

Đđhāng, m., 222-73

Đđhāng, m., 424

Đđhūlā, vi., 508n

Đđhūlā, m., 424

Đđhūlā, do., 659

Đđū, do., 153

Đđwāḍā, vi., 282

Đđvāḍā, do., 401

Đđvāḍā, do., 240

Đđgāḍā, m., 116, 353, 368, 371, 662-63

Đđgāḍā ins., 374, 379, 598, 406

Đđgāḍā ins. of Vatara-jā, 531

Đđgāḍā ins. of the time of Kiritvarman, 377, 601, 658

Đđgāḍā ins., 8n

Đđpālpur, m., 34, 45, 47

Đđpālpur copper-plate ins. of Bhrjādjēvā, 34, 44, 102

Đđpālpur purānm, i.d., 35 and n

Đđshumik M.G., 89

Đđshumik, m., 139, 244

Đđshumik, R.P., 57n, 210, 617

Đđ, m., 242

Đđūlā, vi., 220, 254

Đđūlā, m., 479

Đđud a.s. Đđwētā, vi., 128

Đđlāpākāsā, do., 281-82

Đēvāra, th. m., 602

Đēva, m., 218

Đēvāchandra, m., 564

Đēvāchālī Māṭhiks, m., 273

Đēvāduttā, do., 424

Đēvādān̄a, do., 424

Đēvādān̄a, do., 481, 484, 531

Đēvādān̄a, eff., 39n, 128, 686

Đēvādān̄a, m., 474-75 and 475n

Đēvādharāmapūri, m., 488

Đēvāditya, m., 2122

Đēvāgāthā s.a. Đēvāgarh, fori., 372, 602

Đēvāgāthā ins. of the time of Kiritvarman, 377n

Đēvāgīri, m., 159, 161n, 179, 214-15, 372

Đēvāgūpta, m., 364

Đēvāharā, m., 424

Đēvākharā, vi., 627

Đēvākā, fe., 632

Đēvālabbhī, Chandēlā k., 354

Đēvālabbhī Sudhīra, do., 540

Đēvālappāka, vi., 128

Đēvālādevē, fe., 605

Đēvānābha, m., 424

Đēvānāgā, do., 540

Đēvāpāla, do., 119, 368-69, 456

Đēvāpāla, Paramēra k., 30, 416, 125-73 and 125n, 174, 177, 182n, 191, 196, 201-02, 215-14 and 214n, 217n, 519

Đēvāpāla, Piḷa k., 584n

Đēvāpāla, Pratīhāra k., 342

Đēvāpāla k., of Kachiṣkaphaghatā dya., 538, 549 and n

Đēvāpālādēvā, Paramēra k., 186, 188

Đēvāpālāpura a.s. Đēvālpur, m., 216

Đēvāpura, m., 659

Đēvat, vi., 21

Đēvārāja, Paramēra k., of Bhimnālā, 248, 288n, 318, 321, 324, 326 and n

Đēvārāja, m., 319, 464

Đēvārāja, Paramēra k., of Jāloit, 353

Đēvārāja, m., 424

Đēvā r a.s. Đēvāsā, do., 581n

Đēvāsarman, m., 115, 424, 540

Đēvāsarman, com., 179

Đēvāsēnā, m., 551

Đēvāshumē, fe., 496

Đēvāsinā, m., 583-91, 598

Đēvāsināpāla, k., 212

Đēvāsinī r a.s. Đēvāsinī, m., 392

Đēvāsvāmin, m., 21, 539, 630n

Đēvāsā, do., 401

Đēvāsā, engr., 234

Đēvāsā, m., 357

Đēvāsarman, Chandēllā k., 357-58, 361-62, 378n, 379 and n, 397, 419, 652

Đēvāsā, m., 424

Đēvāsā, vi., 558

Đēvēndra, m., 401

Đēvēvāra, do., 243-44, 424

Đēvē, m., of a tank, 66

Đēvēsā, m., 424

ĐēvēśŚēntar, vi., 266 and n

ĐēvēśŚēntar stone ins. of the time of Sāmasinī, 266

ĐēvēśŚēnā, m., 659
dēvēśŚēntara, "emi-free holding in the possession of a god", 546n

Đēvēśā, vi., 351

Đēvēśā, m., 128

Đēvēśā, vi., 179

Đēvas, enst., state, 556

Đēvas copper-plate ins. of Naravarman, 99n, 117n, 123, 169, 641

Đēy N., 129, 400n

dī, form of, 23-8, 11, 18, 28, 32, 36, 46, 49, 51, 55, 59, 62, 85, 70, 72, 76, 83, 84, 90, 102, 107, 116

'ofh. subscript, form of, 419

(ab.d. form of, 297, 305, 325, 350, 361, 382, 447, 529, 536, 640, 647

Dhābhā, m., 68
Dhānākā, m., 564
Dhāvī, f., 70
Dhālī, m., 173
Dhāmādeśi, do., 182
Dhāmādevāsaivāraṇam, do., 202
Dhāmādevāya(s), off. 186
Dhāmājīt i.e. Dhāmām, m., 184
Dhāmāmod, do., 228
Dhānapāla, au., 77
Dhānapāla, m., 103
Dhānapati-bhāsta, do., 43
Dhāpati s.a. Dhānāni, pi., 294
Dhānauka, m., 602
Dhānuarā s.a. Dhānaurā, vr., 443-44
Dhānavāla, dt., head quarters, 492-93
Dhānvanāka, m., 321
Dhānvi, m., 424
Dhānvinī, Paramāra k., of Chandrāvati, 225, 228, 233-34, 260-61, 321
Dhānvinīka, Paramāra k., of Bhīmān, 321, 324, 326, 327, 335, 327
Dhāngalapāta, t.d., 110
Dhānikā, Paramāra k., of Vāgada, 280 and n., 381, 388
Dhānecar s.a. Dhānākheda, lo., 498
Dhānēśvarā, up., 256
386, 387, 412-14, 422, 436, 625-54
Dhāṅgāvati i.e. Dhāṅgāvātikā, n., of a garden, 57
Dhāni, m., 12
Dhānum, engr., 226
Dhānut large ins. of the time of Śūmantānāha, 254, 266
Dhānuti, m., 262
Dhānu, m., 342
Dhār, rd., 10 and n., 15, 84v, 86 and n., 217, 618
Dhār, s.a. Dhāra, dt., 12, 31, 34, 55n., 57, 49, 62, 66, 131-32, 146, 163, 169, 170 and n., 216-17, 241-42
Dhārāvari state, 68, 83, 198
Dhārā ins., 374
Dhārmāruri, m., 4-5, 9-10 and 12n., 12, 15-16, 128, 169, 170, 204, 649n
Dhārmārurīi grant of Vakpatirajādeva, 15, 18, 26, 42n., 128n
Dhāmarākṣanda, m., 321
Dhāmarudrīya, do., 321
Dhāmarudhara, do., 181, 273, 424, 650
Dhārājñādhara's (Dhārājñāvalī) copper-plate of

V.S. 1059, 326n

Dhārājñāvalī, Paramāra k., of Bhīmān, 260, 326

and n., 528n

Dhārāmadīha, m., 216
Dhārāvarsha, Paramāra k., of Abhī, 639
Dhārāvārsha, Paramāra k., of Chandrāvati, 234, 238, 242-44 and 244n, 246 and n., 248, 249 and n., 251-57, 280-61, 292n., 263, 296n, 265-66, 299, 272, 275n., 335
Dhārāvīra, off., 335n, 491-92, 628
Dhārāvīrava, engr., 234
Dhārkura, l., 221
Dhārmā, m., 235
Dharmādīha, lo., 218, 423, 471
Dharmā-nīthi, 'writer of legal document', 390, 401, 448, 459
Dharmānāsika, s.t., 179
Dharmānanda, m., 324
Dharmāvaḷī, a house for accommodating pilgrims free of cost, 320 and n., 329
Dharmatirıṣṭya, s.t., 357, 359n
Dharmānītha, m., 563
Dhānasi, n., 342, 422
Dhāvala, Pāgā terminals, of Gujārāt, 231
Dhāvali s.a. Dhāvī, vr., 68
Dhīmāsa \"a\" 'well', 273, 277n
Dhīmkā, f., 358n
Dhīrā, do., 364
Dhīrābhās, ci., 493
Dhīrārā, Relastry Station, 104
Dhīrābhatta s.a. Dhīrābha, ci., 492-93
Dhīrārādhana, epic Pandava k., 388n
Dhūra, H., 1
Dhūra, vr., 629
Dhūmatā, ch., 379n
Dhūmādīha, ch., q., 379n
Dhūmārāja, k., 212, 245, 258, 272
Dhūmārān, Paramāra k., of Chandrāvati, 260 and n.
Dhūmārī, ci., 490
Dhūmārī, copper-plate, 484, 482, 658n
Dhūrva, ci., 335
Dhīmār, a Joins sect, 312

Dhīmarī—ахa-patālika, 592, 611

amātra, 243
ātavari, 491, 602n
ājāvi, 289, 452, 454n
bhūtvarāhaka, 50n
dāndālābhita, 166 and n., 167n
dāndāśana, 125, 644
dānapāthika, 57, 59n
dāpaha, 34, 9, 16, 24
ādālāka, 57, 59n
dāṇgākā, 644n
dāṇaka, 14n, 116, 118n, 128-29, 149 and n., 158, 161, 179, 183n, 203, 246, 644, 644n
gājāpati, 491, 602n
gāmaṇaka, 57, 59n
Karaṇāpuruṣa, 641
Karaṇika, 339
Mahāmāhata, 492
Mahāmāthya, 553
Mahāprāltidhā, 128, 197, 201, 662
Mahāprāltidhāeka, 391
Mahāśīhakāraka, 15, 224n
Mahāśāhīvīyagāhika, 167, 169, 173-79
Mainakam, 57, 537, 653
Muni, 492-93
Muntirisvarithika, 601
Mukhyaksa, 149
Nagarukya, 240m
Nāyaka, 488
Nīyukthupusaka, 641
Pañjakas, 19, 29, 33, 44, 70, 103, 210
Pratihar, 663
Pratihāra, 202, 269, 270n, 289, 414, 422
Pratihārya, 37, 52m
Pratihāryaksa, 240m
Pratihāra, 128
Rājputra, 30 and n. 128, 197, 215, 275, 641
Sakhu, 154
Sāthane, 15, 169n, 212, 218, 224n, 249n, 394n
Sāthanevarithika, 492, 619
śākara, 368
śākaraśāhia, 368
śākaraśāhia, 107
Śrīdulapāla, 641
Tulīra s.a. Tularakṣa, 238, 240 and n
Thakura, 128
Udāngaśvarithika, 641
Vaiākāśar, 299n
Vṛīka, 370n
Vīshāyika, 641
Vīsakti, 517n
Dīghī, vi, 631
Dikshit N.S., 1, 5-6, 6n, 7n, 8n, 14 and n, 19 and n, 20 and n, 24, 27n, 28, 29 and n, 27, 48, 49n,
493n, 495n, 496m, 497n, 631
Dīlpur, myth. k, 617
Dinajpur, dt., 20
Dinakara, m., 51, 424
Dindori, m., 58
Dīndvānaka s.a. Dindicrama, vi, 179-80
Dīśakara, N., 1-5, 6n, 8 and n, 9, 35, 37 and n, 60, 60n, 52, 57-58
Dīsakara, m., 202, 212
Dīwana Setti-Brijmohan Das, 146
Dīlīkā s.a. Dilukund s.a. Dīlukund, vi, 530, 532
Dīlī, m., 299
Dīlpāyika, vi, 34
Dīlpāyika, m., 305-06
Dīnpākika, do, 21
Dīnpākī, f.m., 278, 277n
Dūngar, vi, 587n
Dūngaragam s.a. Dūngaram, do, 89-90, 92
Dūngaram, surnames of the time of Jagaddēva, 63,
80, 83n, 146, 213, 669
Dungapur, vi, 375
Durgah, do, 355n
Dūrgaśāyī s.a. Dūrgaśāyī, do, 54
Dūrghasamudra, s.a. of the Housalas, 94-95, 159, 650
Dūṭi, m., 173
Dowton, 472n
Druma, n., of a coin, 53, 57, 142n, 197, 273, 299,
295n, 322-24, 330, 624
Drumā, f.m., 396, 444 and n. 445, 448
Duke, f., 168n
Dukund s.a. Dukund, vi, 329n, 365, 328, 329n,
330-31, 533n
Dukund, ins., 531m, 654
Dudālī, s.d., 5n, 423
Dudālī s.a. Bīna, vi, 553-54
Dudhāi, do, 421-22
Dudhāi, do, 421
Dudhāi s.a. Dudhāi s.a. Dudhāi, vi, 459
Dudhāi, i.d., 459
Durgā s.a. Durgā, vi, 375, 517, 651m
Durgā s.a. Durgā, do, 35
Durgabhāsi, do, 235
Dūngarpur, dt., 40, 229, 279, 287, 307, 314m, 628,
543
Dūngarpur, restwite state, 557
Dūngarpur, reg., 557
Dūravāvāhā, 60, 351
Durgā s.a. Durgā s.a. Durgādīśa, m., 229
Durgādīśa, do, 253n
Durgā Prasad Bāun, 395
Durgāvānī, m., 255
Durgā, do, 235
Durgabhāsi, do, 249
Dūrthākṣa, 60, 319
Dūrthākṣa, Chhāvīhāka k, of Gujarat, 56, 526
Dūrthākṣa, k, of Badari, 229
Dūrthākṣa, m., 531
Dūrvāśāhā, vi, 351
Dūrvāśāhā, epic hero, 545n, 553
Dūvāla, k, 326
dev, form of, 569
Dvārakā, vi, 616
Dvārmā, do, 207
Dvijatapa s.a. Dvijatapa s.a. Chhītapā, corp., 125n
Dvivedī H.N., 65n, 561n, 572n, 586n, 594n, 596n, 611n
Dvīpati-Līyava, u.d., 30, 242n, 291n
Dvijatapa s.a. Dvijatapa, vi, 34
E
E, initial, form of, 2, 50, 55, 65, 94, 338, 361, 971,
374, 377, 385, 455, 529, 536
ē, medial, form of, 29, 408n, 411, 523
ē, vowel, form of, 445, 447, 465, 561, 633, 636
ē, vowel, confounded with a, 491
East Narmād, dt., 61, 143-46, 169, 171, 176, 179n,
200, 209, 504
Edsman, f.m., 273, 277n
Lunar, 15 and n. 19, 53, 134, 148, 168, 177, 257
and n. 318, 319n, 350, 352, 440
Solar, 55, 108, 114, 153 and n. 160-67, 246,
429, 641, 653
Ekadāsi, vi, 471
Elliot, 475n, 622n
Eras——
A.H. years of, 632
Kalachuri, years of, 907, 925n
914
967
Sākāsāka, years of, 1249
Saka, years of, 1382
5
831
18
832
879
5n
889
5n
INDEX

910 50
911 55
996 109n
1003 96
1004 89-90
1774 203n

Vikrama years of,
955 153
1005 289, 340
1011 339, 347, 383n
1011 or 1111 438
1026 4, 9
1051 4, 9-12, 15, 26, 128n
1054 140
1056 4, 14-15 and 15n, 16
1077 15n
1078 4, 18-19, 21
1090 241
1093 4, 23-25, 39
1095 25n
1095 330, 384
1099 318, 383-84
1099 653
1097 27, 29, 70
1074 34, 53
1076 25n, 35-36, 99-100, 43
1078 42-43
1079 45, 47
1091 48-49
1099 76, 223-26, 228, 234, 238
1102 72-73
1102 232-34, 248
1103 50, 79
1107 556-57
1108 360
1112 64-62, 213
1117 221
1122 228, 363
1126 228
1137 65-66, 70
1138 66-67
1140 67-68
1143 69-70
1145 530
1147 367, 382
1148 641
1149 587
1151 98-99 and 99n, 104, 106
1152 99n, 102-04, 117n
1154 113, 371-72
1157 105-06
1159 115, 300
1161 106, 108, 549
1165 310
1166 313
1167 114-15
1173 383
1174 333
1177 553
1181 628
1186 291
1187 302
1188 568n, 395
1190 104, 106, 127, 396, 557
1191 118-19 and 119n, 133-34
1192 149, 150
1193 126, 128, 132, 135, 401, 419n
1194 131n
1195 131-32
1196 132-33, 149, 150
1197 237-38, 242, 226n
1198 239-40, 242
1199 159, 498
1200 241-42
1201 410
1202 135 and n, 143, 145-46, 148
1211 412
1214 209, 662
1215 248, 350
1216 420
1219 159, 243, 246
1220 421
1221 436
1223 449
1228 453
1233 448
1234 153n
1235 135, 145, 146, 152, 165n
1236 132-33 and 133n, 453
1237 245-48, 456
1239 248, 250, 459
1240 254, 464
1243 468
1245 259-61
1247 471
1249 253
1250 354n, 475
1252 254
1253 145, 157-58, 169n
1255 479
1256 484
1258 136, 165, 165n
1267 659
1269 136, 160
1270 256
1271 136, 168
1272 257
1274 171, 175, 186, 213
1275 246
1276 254, 255-56, 256
1277 173, 175, 177, 186, 195, 213
1283 658
1286 185-86, 209
1287 187-88, 207, 209
1290 264-65
1293 265, 629
1298 491
1300 191, 267-68
1311 191n, 496
1312 190-91
1314 191-92
1314 194-95 and 195n, 209
1317 116, 156n, 206, 207, 211, 409
1319 562
1320 188, 206-07
1321 269
1323 503
1325 504
1326 188, 208
Enrachi s.t. Erich, vi. 444
Krempigtg. Hopoito k., 80, 91, 93, 109n
Erich, l.d. 402
Ernest Barnes, 86

F

Firuzsha. Muslim Chronicler. 79n, 188n, 378, 562, 653n, 654
Fitz Edward Hall, 10, 552
Fleet J.F., 14, 106, 129, 133, 157n, 157 and n. 159n, 160n, 161n, 345, 355, 361, 365, 398
Forbes X., 78n, 350n
Kragarvavary Malhiva ins, ending with the name of Kottivavarn, 665
Führer A., 75, 418

G

g. form of, 23, 18, 25, 39, 278, 350, 413, 473, 504, 530, 549, 587
g. subscript, form of, 350:
   ga. form of, 632
Gadadhar, m., 180, 424
Gadadhar, ch. min. 415-14
Gadadhar, min. and com. 374-75
Gadadharaka, p. 421
Gadaga, te. 102
Gadha la. Gàrra, vi. 483
Gadhī plate ins, of Trallókavaran, 657-58
Gadhāya, m., 290
Gadhāya, la., 278, 286n, 290n, 300
Gadhīnagar s.a. Kāñyakubja, l.m. 537, 550, 542n
Gāgā, m., 118
Gagā, da., 424
Gagāka, da., 469
Gāgā, m., 650
Gagāvāla, da., 444, 470-71, 491
Gahī la. Gahuli, vi. 443-44
Gahū, b.a. name, 412
Gai G.S., 179n, 322n, 378, 594, 653n
Gajādhar, m., 218
Gajādana, m., 559
Gajānana, m., 659

Gajanan Gopāl Joshi, 54
Gālā grant of Jayasimha Siddharāja of V.S. 1193, 151n, 152n
Galkha, m., 444 and n
Galahā, da. la. 184
Gallā, da., 424
Gallā, da., 468
Gallāvāra, la. 5
Gāmā, m., 424
Ganapāra s.a. Ganora, vi. 159-60
Ganam N.M., 920, 933, 937
Ganapati s.a. Gannyaśa, m., 594-95
Ganapati, Vajrapata k., 601, 602
Ganapatidēva, k., 597
Ganada s.a. Ghandhēva, Chāndēla k., 588, 575, 578, 580n, 591, 593, 595-96
Ganathavas, m., of a type of semi-casteless being, 534
Ganadhānt, vi. 12
Ganēśa, m., 440
Gangī, j. 55
Ganga s.a. Ganeges, vi, 66n, 116, 260, 362, 384, 987, 989, 999, 153n, 598, 601-02, 625n
Gangadhēva, eng. 273
Gangalāva, off. 202
Gangalāva, m., 363, 592, 602
Gangalāva, min. 387-89
Gangādēra, m., 192, 198-91, 424, 512, 520, 522, 639
Gangādēraka, m., 512 and n
Gangādēra, com. 492
Gangādēraka, councillor of the k. Paramanand, 517
Gangā-Jamūn, m., of a well, 499
Gangasimhadeva, k., of Kachchhapaghātī, v. 535
Ganga Udayāditya, gen. 91, 109
Gangayā, Kālakirti k. 378
Gangayendrā, m., 588
Gangū, off. 273
Gangū, m., 424, 433n
Gangū, G.L., 176
Gangūy D.C., 48, 15n, 58, 83, 79, 91-02 and 92n, 93, 95n, 976, 98n, 110, 136n, 148, 154, 155n, 164n, 165n, 167n, 168n, 191n, 217, 227n, 230n, 241n,
   247n, 250n, 278, 277n, 280, 282, 289, 326, 328n.
   471n, 539-31, 565n
Ganjā, dī. 79n
Ganjī, vi. 169
Ganṣī la. Gorri. dā, 4, 18, 26, 21, 24, 25
Ganṣī copperplate ins. of Vākpati Munja, V.S. 1093, 39
Ganṣī copperplate ins. of Vākpati Munja. V.S. 1098, 21, 92
Garana, m. of a stream, 595
Garbhivāra, m., 180
Garbhūla, vi. 11-12
Garbhūpāṇya, dā, 11-12
Garjā J.J., 114
Gārde M.B., 18, 24, 65, 81, 88, 129 and n. 144, 183, 187, 241, 561, 563, 572, 577-78, 588, 591,
   994, 996n, 609, 615, 616, 612
Garḍi, Muslim chronicler, 634
Garg R.S., 604, 640
Garī, dā, 41
Garīṣṭhā, m., 182
Garrā, vi. 483, 485n
Garrā plates of Trallōkavaran, 422, 487-89, 496
Garwa ins. of V.S. 110, 312n
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Śrīvaśi s.a. Śiva, 592
Śātāśāva, 626
Śkanda, 562
Śmara s.a. Cupid, 464, 550
Śmarārāja s.a. Śiva, 33, 40, 43, 46, 62, 103, 115, 134, 148, 281, 464
Śōmanātha s.a. Śiva, 73, 421
Śōmeśvarā s.a. Śiva, 325
Śrīkanṭha s.a. Śiva, 11
Śrīpati s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 108
Śūhā s.a. Śiva, 94
Śudhibhāvā s.a. Śiva, 272
Śūlapāti s.a. Śiva, 272
Śrīmūrti, 173
Śripurāṇi s.a. Śiva, 94, 293n
Uđalmaśēva s.a. Udāyēśvara s.a. Śiva, 186
Udāyēśvaradeva, 66
Udāyōcana s.a. Sun, 247n
Vādyānātha s.a. Śiva, 188, 197
Vāmanā s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 292n, 293n, 345n, 477n
Vaiṣṇava, 512, 545n
Vaiṣṇavīsī a s.a. Gaṇapati, 504
Vaiśhā s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 292n, 512
Varuṇa, 233, 281
Vāsudeva s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 338, 342, 474, 510n
Vaiṣṇava, 512
Vaiṣṇava, 3, 73, 96n, 108, 111n, 124, 143n, 172n, 218n, 228n, 238, 239n, 248n, 310, 362, 372, 425, 426n, 474, 477n, 484, 490, 505, 565, 566n, 512, 536, 535, 534n, 533, 392, 619, 620n
Vīvāmarī s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 512
Vīvāmukta s.a. Śiva, 33, 40, 43, 46, 62, 72, 74n, 103, 115, 134, 148
Vijñānapuruṣa s.a. Vaiṣṇava, 592
Yama, 53n
Gōḍārupu, vi, 200
Gōḍāvari, vi, 78, 82
Gōḍāvēra

Aindra, 683
Aṁbhīkā, 215, 683
Bhūrakī s.a. Sarasvati, 108, 173, 289, 383
Bhāṣeṣvara, 15
Chāchchikā s.a. Chāchchikā, 121
Chāmūṇḍa, 635
Chāndā Māhēśvarā, 637
Chāndikā, 272, 574
Chārchikā, 121 and n, 174
Dēvī s.a. Durgā, 108
Durgā, 517, 633
Gajalakṣmī, 460, 463, 483, 491
Gaurī, 656
Girītā s.a. Pārvatī, 260, 479n
Harajasīhī s.a. Durgā, 15, 633
Kail, 508, 633
Kāmikāśvēya, 633
Kamalā s.a. Lakshmi, 508
Līmāhārya, 172-74
Mahāraja, 597
Mahābhūṣanamārti, 203
Pārvatī, 67n, 98n, 238, 478-79, 551, 683
Śaṅkī, 594n
Śaraśāvati, 49, 219n, 233-34, 491, 617
Śītā, 576n
Śivā s.a. Pārvatī, 501n
Tārā, 635
Tripūrā, 633
Vaiśeṣī s.a. Sarasvati, 49
Vaiṣṇavī s.a. Sarasvati, 509
Gōḍāhāla, m, 597
Gōḍāhanā, 424
Gōḍāhrā, m, 5
Gōḍārupu, vi, 63, 155n
Gōḍāvedā, 588
Gōḍāvēśavā, te, 558
Gōḍāvēṇa, m, 33
Gōḍākāla, vi, 241
Gōḍālī śrī Gōḍāla, m, 9, 595
Gōḍalikā, 152, 428
Gōḍalī, m, 639
Gōḍalotam, Paramānta, k, 91
Gōnd, tribal peo, 353n
gōn, a measure of grain, 551
Gōpā, m, 542
Gōpā s.a. Gōpāla, m, 369
Gōpābūtpa s.a. Gōpāpāla, Vaiṣṇavā, k, 570
Gōpāchāra s.a. Gōvalo, ci, 601-02
Gōpādīvya, m, 29
Gōpādī śrī Gōvind, ci, 588-589, 588
Gōpāgar, s.a. Gōvalo, do, 342, 570
Gōpāla, gen, 372, 379
Gōpāla, eng, 512
Gōpāla, m, 598
Gōpāla, feu, 653
Gōpāla II, Pāla h, 240
Gōpāla III, do, 501n
Gōpālaśeṣa, k, of the Vaiṣṇava dy, 497, 583, 598-60, 572n, 578-79, 588n, 587-88, 590n, 592, 595, 597 and m, 598, 601
Gōpāl Lal Vyas, 256, 288n, 292n, 296n, 296n
Gōpāsenā, s, 469
Gōpāti, m, 424, 517, 554
Gōpanātha, Raō, 19n
Gōsāla, m, 180
Gōsāraṇa, do, 21
Gōṣe, do, 180, 421
Gōṣēka, do, 209
Gōṣṭhika, a member of a society, 233, 236, 234-55, 553n, 635
Gōṭhika, m, 119
Gōṭha, do, 424
Göra —
Adavāha, 132
Agaši, 43, 659
Agastya, 21
Atriya, 46, 218, 235
Atri, 423, 594
Anālaya, 180
Anupamāyaka, 29
Bāhāraṇya, 423
Bandhula, 423
Bandhānyāna, 423
Bhīṣṇadāya, 22, 100, 181, 152, 180, 202, 217-18, 350, 358, 359, 423, 522, 539, 554, 659
Bhūrāsana, 21-22, 180, 202, 423, 554
Chandaśeṣa, 218, 423
Darabā, 423
Dānṛṣṭhachyuta, 423
Dhāmaṇya, 180, 423
Gāgga, 21, 159, 273, 423, 659
Gāpati, 2
Gautama s.t. Gautama, 21, 152, 180, 202, 217, 401, 423, 554, 659
Haritaṅkata, 180
Jātukarṇa, 423
Jivantiṣyana, 423
Kapila, 554
Kāṇṭhinya, 115, 153, 180, 218, 423
Kāryākṛitya, 4n, 152, 423, 641
Kausika, 46, 423, 659
Kautsa, 189, 401, 423, 459
Kripākṣṭhārya, 152, 361, 423, 460, 554
Laugākṣi, 423
Māhul, 22, 423
Maitreyya, 21
Māṇḍavaya, 423
Mārkaṇḍya, 180
Māndugāla, 21, 423
Mauna, 423
Mauni, 22
Munḍala, 180
Pāṇini, 423
Parāśara, 21-22, 153, 180, 423, 659
Parāśvara, 180
Pavitra, 180
Rādha, (7) 659
Sāṁśkrītya, 21, 23, 152, 423, 444 and n
Sāṃśīḍṭha, 21-22, 152, 180, 218, 235, 423, 659
Saṅnika, 446n
Saṅsāravas, 152
Saṃvarī, 423
Śāṁvarīya, 218
Śāṇḍīka, 446n
Śāntakṣyana, 423
Upanayana, 423, 553
Vārsha, 22
Vaṅga, 423
Vasiṣṭha, 21, 40, 180, 218, 423, 429n, 475
Vāsa, 21-22, 33, 180, 218, 423, 452, 498, 492, 505, 659
Vidvauvairūḍha, 423
Vīṣṇu, 659
Gōra-ūvē, ‘f. deity’, 174n
Gōra-pravaranabhādradambu, s.k., 364n, 446n
Gōta, vi., 101
Gōvaradhana, m., 3
Gōvindā, do., 181, 206n, 235, 306, 319, 424, 553, 659
Gōvindā, su., 589
Gōvindā, off., 197
Gōvinda Bhūta, m., 43
Gōvindachandra, k., of Gāhādāvaḍa dy., 414, 471n
Gōvindarāja, h., 500
Gōvindāsāman, m., 163, 168-67, 169
Gōvindasāvāmin, do., 21
gō, form of 407
Grahapāti, j., 356, 409, 412 and n, 456, 632
Griḥādhas, m., 540
Gṛṣṇī, do., 324
Guhilas of Māwaḍ, dy., 210, 231, 269, 272-73, 314, 628
Guhya-tirtha, lo., 272
Gūjaraṭ, state, 4-5, 8-9, 12, 21, 27, 29-30, 53, 50, 52, 56, 78-79, 92n, 93, 162-63, 196, 269, 215, 234, 246, 251, 266-61, 272, 281, 614
Gūjaraṭ chroniclers, 92n, 506
Gūjaraṭ empire, 181
Gūną, etc., 119, 459, 601, 622
Gumadhara, m., 3
Gumākara, do., 22
Gumapaḷa, do., 504
Gumapaḷaka s.t. Gumapaḷa, off., 119
Gumapura fort, 153, 155
Gumapura, vi., 16
Gumaraṇa, m., 95
Gumā-nil, vi., 158, 159n
Gumāvād, do., 16
Gumpa K.P., 626
Gūrtjara s.t. Gūjaraṭa, co., 53-56, 508
Gūjāraṭa, dy., 78-80, 91-95, 280, 341, 421n, 508, 530
Gūjārāṣa, pro., 340
Gūjārāṣa-Pratihāras, dy., 341, 379n, 384
Guvādāḥatpa, n., of a bathing place, 159, 160n
Guvādāḥ, n., 159
Guvūḍa, do., 197
Gwāluor s.t. Gwalīṛa s.t. Gwālīṛa, et., 75, 81, 412, 522, 850n, 355, 357-39 and 599, 531 and n, 557-58, 562, 569, 591
Gwāluor, erdhitale state, 18, 24, 81, 241n, 551, 588, 572, 586-87, 600, 615, 682
Gwālīṛa Archaeological Museum, 98n, 123, 241
Gwālīṛa fort, 213, 348
Gyraspur, vi., 144-45
Gyraspur pillar ins., of Trailokyavarman, 142
Gyāta, Paramāro k., 91

H, form of, 28, 32, 39, 42, 70, 102, 154, 287, 338, 357, 377, 392, 391, 409, 516, 536, 597
Hala, Lm., 20, 43n, 44n, 68, 101, 115, 117n, 127n, 128-29, 192, 358-61, 424, 444, 440, 452, 470n, 472n
Halduhar Pāṭhak, 613
Halduharā Ṭhām, Lm., 226
Halṣṭhunḍa, au., 341n
Halder R.R., 257, 258n, 259n, 254, 256-57, 258n, 273 and n, 282, 281n, 512 and n, 514 and n, 514n, 516n, 517n
Hall T.E., 4n, 12n, 75, 77, 128n, 130, 133, 150n, 140, 159n, 162n, 164n, 169n, 167n, 168, 169n, 171, 172n, 174n, 355-34 and 354n, 555n
Hainana, m., 484
Hainul, do., 140
Hamilton R.N.C., 12
Hamurmadanamadura, uk., 261n
Hamipur, do., 35a, 360, 360, 375, 402, 410, 453, 448
40, 401, 462, 484, 493, 521, 526n
Hampure, in., 193
Hamura Chañamânum k., of Rayanthambhur, 193
Hamunvanur, Chandellâ k., 378, 519n, 522-23, 525-28 and 528n, 570, 580, 581, 601, 603-34, 638
Hamsarajâ, m., 602
Haminun Darwâzâ, n., of a gate, 461
Hâsoi, l., 79
Har sa. Siva, le., 549-50
Haradèva, m., 197
Hârâka, l., 289, 292n
Harasâna, m., 568
Harcâ. Railway Station, 159, 613
Har Dutia Sharmâ, 181
Har, le., 511, 638
Har, m., 212, 218, 229, 306-47, 421
Haridasâ, do., 424
Harideva, do., 218, 218, 421
Haridharâ, do., 181, 424
Harihara, an., 499
Haripâla, off., 492
Haripâla, few, 496
Harirâjâ, m., 518, 602, 603
Harirâjâ, Pratiharâ k., 341
Harisâman, m., 202, 218, 424
Harichandras, do., 119, 629
Harichandras, off., 611, 615n
Harichandras, Paramâra k., 135, 143, 143-46, 148-49, 150n, 153-54, 156, 159, 173, 177-78, 218
Harishâ, m., 301
Harivâra le., 305-56
Harshâ, enge, 70
Harshâ, cri. 1, 8-10, 28n, 30, 146
Harshâ gold-plated-plate grant of Sivaka, 9, 28m, 51, 77, 241
Harshâ grants of Harshâdeva, 310
Harshânâth, le., 30, 171 and n
Harshânâth stone ins. of the time of Dêvapâla, 30, 146, 186, 188, 189, 213
Harshacharita, uk., 592, 593n
Harshadîva, com., 207
Harshâdeva sa. Sivaka, Paramâra k., 77
Harshapura sa. Harshâ, le., 5
Harshapura, vi., 29-30, 174
Harshapura, do., 145-46
Harsood, in., 145-46
Harsood, r., 174n
Harsood pargana, le., 171
Harâuka, m., 512 and n
hâl, 'a kind of measurement', 444 and n
Hasânâparâ, le., 178-80 and 189m, 590n
Hâzâ, do., 457
Hâzâ—18, do., 421
Hâthâdâl, do., 246
Hâtâchânâ, sa. Hâthâdâl, do., 245
Hâtâvâda, do., 55-58
Hâtâkâsthâ, do., 421
Hâtâvnâra sa. Hâmâwar, do., 168-69

Harivâvânâ, do., 522
Harrnâpur, do., 169n
Harhnâwar, do., 170
Harhûndi sa. Harshâkundâ, la., 257-38
Hânsâ, M., 325
Hârâ, k., 522 and n
Hermachandras, Jain 'preceptor' and au., 38, 80, 396
Hermâdri, au., 73, 136n, 396n
Hermânâ, sessen, 545n
Hermânîhâ, pr., 150
Hermânîpûla alias Vinâyakapâla, Pratiharâ ruler, 342
Hesbert C. Jobvan, 172
Himâlâyâ, m., 108, 340-41, 465, 544n, 616
Himâlâyā, reg., 598
Himânâ, m., 595
Hindu ari, 49
Hindu chief, 653n
Hindu, community, 556
Hindröpa, do., 520
Hirâdhâra, m., 421
Hirâdhâra R., R., 93n, 107a, 110, 198, 360, 361n, 362n,
364n, 402, 438n, 441, 444 and n, 445n, 446m, 451-53
and 453n, 454n, 455-57, 521 and n, 522 and n,
528, 529, 527 and n, 525-27 and n, 528n, 604, 683
Hiramanda Sastri, 366m, 371, 396, 398n, 529n
Hiraya, m., 424
Höeren, 336
Höli, fe., 314
Hörumâh, 469
Horniman Museum, 469
Hosângâdâ, dâ., 116 and n, 142, 159n, 169n, 171n, 613
Hosângâdâ, in., 155, 614
Hovasaâla, dy., 80, 81-92, 95m, 96, 169, 649-50
Hovasaâla, f., 76m
Hovasaâla ins., 91
Hrihântkâ, m., 592
Hultsch, 37, 39, 41a, 42n, 44n, 208, 37-72, 378n,
376, 378 and n, 379n, 380n, 473, 475n, 477n,
536n, 548, 550, 551n, 528n, 654
Hüpa, dy., 78
Hüpa, tribe, 16n, 20-21, 78, 196
Hüpasamandla, do., 18-20
Hüpas, pos., 20
Hyderabad, east while state, 95, 649

1
1. Initial, form of, 2, 18, 25, 28, 35, 49-50, 62, 75, 91,
102, 126, 127, 130, 141, 147, 176, 185, 201,
211, 254, 278, 286, 296, 305, 312, 338, 347, 356,
377, 382, 395, 435, 473, 536, 592
2. Initial, long form of, 336
3. Initial, short form of, 503, 506, 640
4. medial, form of, 46, 522
5. vowel, form of, 503, 447, 483, 499, 311, 325, 561, 616
6. vowel, form of, 635
7. Basic Aśri, Muslim chronicles, 378, 654
Ishchâdhâra, m., 540
Ishchâdvâra, vi., 438 and n, 440
Ishchâdvâr grant, 401n, 402
Ishchâdvâr copper-plate inst. of Paramândirâvâ, 443-44,
447
Ishchânâkumârî, fe., 351n
INDEX

Igongí sa. Igongí sa. Ringnúd. vi, 558
Ilhaka, m., 119
Ilumandí. Mamíliciya Sultana of Delhi, 188, 203, 206-07, 213-14, 562
Images —
Ambiká, 173
Aramakí, 118-19
Aroha-biki, 315, 633
Bhirají (Bállarajhi), 321b
Brabhum, 66, 241-42
Chamunda-vánizéka, 145
Chárraká, 121
Divi, 66
Gauésa, 173
Harí, 312
Jáma-thirthánaka, 60.
Krishna, 173
Káthapúla, 178
Kumáranátha, 118-19
Káthunátha, 272
Nákűlú, 173
Nýṣáníka, 405
Parávánítha, 105
Pávakti, 66
Parávánítha, 272
Sambhu-ványóníka, 456
Sántamuga, 118-19, 456
Sun, 149
Trímitrú, 200n
Vishnu, 66, 113b, 182a
Vishvakarmá, 315
Ingirmípadra — sárdhava-pratásra-bhágá. Ld. 103
Itamavám, m., 538
India, cos. 167-68, 530, 421
India Office Library, 420
India, cos. 10, 14, 35, 37, 102, 146, 217
Indian, vi, 26, 640
Indore. extant site, no.
Indore museum, 45, 194, 197a
India III, Rádhákrúka k., 355, 340n, 331
Indra, k., 78
Indra-tanaya s.a. Ajaruna, epic Párukáša prl., 542n
Jágasapadra, vi, 337-38
Igongí, do., 556
Igongístí, do., 104n
Igongípadra s.a. Igongí, do., 104, 149
Ins. of Ayapála at Udaipur of V.S. 1229, 150
Ins. of Candádátha, 381n
Imginiá —
Gajaláshu, 491
Garuda, 1, 8, 10, 11, 18, 25n, 32, 21, 39, 42, 45, 51n, 62, 67, 103, 114, 127, 147, 158a, 153, 157, 160, 176, 201, 211
Ins. of the Ayapála of Norwar, 561
Imgar, m., a. of a place, 634
Isarbara—páncélla, vi, 421
Isutum, do., 652, 654
Iśvara, m., 21-22, 591-92
Iśáltí, vi, 470-71
Iśáva s.a. Etavah. ln., 422
Iśáva-páncélla, vi, 421
J
J. from of, 18, 32, 33, 55, 76, 89, 99, 115, 134, 158a,
143, 192, 211, 312, 325, 334, 392, 499, 501, 586, 600
Jáballí. teacher of the Párvítsa, 524
Jabalpur, dt. N., 107a, 110, 179, 217, 526
Jackson, A.M.T., 200, 222n, 323 and n, 324n, 529, 531n
Jadulla, off., 339
Jáj, m., 424
Jágolíkiva s.a. Jágolíkva, Paramára pr., 90-92 and 92a, 93, 95 and n, 151, 140, 212, 564, 649 and n, 650-51
Jágadállma, m., 424, 506
Jágádakálama II, Western Chásákya k., 139n
Jágadáldí. Dube, 613
Jágadádíra. min., 504-45
Jágárdhí, m., 424
Jágásúká, do., 424
Jágásúaka s.a. Jágásúaka, do., 312
Jágavání s.a. Jágatavání, ct., 229
Jágavání s.a. Jágatavání, do., 323
Jágatavání, do., 321
Jágartúnga. Rádhúrkúka k., 340n
Jágé, m., 424
Jágurá, vi, 282
Jágú, m., 424
Jágáda. do., 423, 459n, 476
Jain, Do. sa. Chánábá, Chándála k., 562
Jáhála, m., 424
Jain R.C., 114, 457n, 487a, 629, 631, 637
Jain L.P., 525n
Jáma, comm.unity, 412, 455
Jáma grants, 57
Jáma image, 61, 499, 632
Jáma, etc., 57, 60, 392-302, 513, 411, 330, 536, 561, 651,
51
Jainád, vi, 91 and n
Jainád ins., 649-90
Jainás temple ins., at Khojáráhá, 412
Jainín, ref. 304n, 346, 356, 536, 569
Japálá, m., 526, 657
Járalmer, do., 528n
Járalmer, reg., 328
Játránábha, m., 424
Játe, do., 424
Jáupur, tr., 331
Jáupur-Pánwári, k., 349, 358
Játrákura s.a. Játrásáíná, Gůhíla k. of Mśváijol, 372, 628
Játrásáíná, m., 163, 200n, 216, 563
Játrásáíná, off., 382
Játrásáíná s.a. Javavarmn II, k. of Dhrád, 569
Jatrasáíná, Chándála k. of Rájapáta+hók, 195, and n, 209
Játavarmn, k., 580n, 589n, 595
Játugeti, Yádava k., 162, 214
Játugeti, Paramára k., 203, 214
Játugídátha, do., 191, 202, 214
Játúragábodha, f., 585
Jápálá s.a. Javapála, dy., 587
Játú, m., 584
Játúka, k., 527
Játúka, m., 422
Játúka, k., 474-75 and 373n
Jatúka, m., 512
Jatúka, one of the descendents of Vástu,
Jayasapura, cr. 332
Jayasarman, ma, 424
Jayashita, do, 424
Jayasimha, du, 251, 598, 602a
Jayasimha II, Chalukya k. of Kalyana, 55-56
Jayasimha, W. Chalukya k., 52
Jayasimha III, Later W. Chalukya k., 79
Jayasimha, k. of Gajura dy., 421a
Jayasimha, Kalachuri k. of Tripuri, 154, 465, 492
Jayasimha, Paramara k. of Bhilmal, 330
Jayasimha, Paramara k. of Vagada, 281
Jayasimha, Rāhūvajñāta, sv, 199
Jayasimhadiva II s.a. Jayavarman, Paramara k., 191-93 and 193a, 206b, 207-08, 209a, 212, 221a, 275, 622
Jayasimhadiva s.a. Jayasimha, Paramara k. of Mālā, 62-65, 73, 91, 95, 104, 109, 213, 276, 309, 318, 615, 622
Jayasimha Siddharaja, Chalukya k. of Gujarath, 92a, 95, 131 and or, 132 and or, 135, 189, 193a, 212, 213a, 297, 492, 508, 557
Jayasirī s.a. Jayavarman, Paramara k. of Mālā, 163a, 551
Jayavāmīn Jayatānātha, Paramara k. of Bhilmāl, 248
Jayavarman, Chandella k., 338, 385
Jayavarmanadeva II. Paramara k., 202-03, 213
Jayavarman, Chandella k. 413-14, 500, 501a, 505, 550
Jayavarman s.a. Jayavarman, Paramara k., 139-32, 154-55, 158-59, 214, 541
Jayavarman II, du, 178, 193-97, 202, 214a, 216
Jayavēlī, f, 565
Jōci s.a. Jayasvēti, Chandella k. 378
Jējāka, ma, 321
Jēkakabhuṭi s.a. Bundelkhand, t.d. 335, 484, 588, 629
Jējāka, do, 335, 369
Jēla, ma, 321
Jēndurāja, Chēlamāna k. of Nāgol, 324
Jeśvēla, s.a. Jayasvēti, f, 564
Jērūnā, off, 499
Jēsī s.a. Jayatānātha, Paramara k. of Bhilmāl, 330
Jayavēlī, f, 563
Jī, form of, 90, 278, 338
Jha, form of, 649
Jīhēūrī, dt., 5
Jīhīrāvād, do, 69, 71, 74
Jīlā s.a. Bhūlla, ma, 301
Jīlōḍī stone ins. of the time of Dhrāvarṣa, 250, 264
Jīlōḍī, n., of a tank, 502
Jīnāpāṭāṇ, in, 69, 71, 119, 195
Jīnāpāṭāṇ stone ins. of the time of Udayavatiya, 72, 119
Jayampīṭha s.a. Jñapat, gītā, n. of a place, 193
Jhānsī, du, 371, 373, 412, 418b, 440, 457, 459, 459, 489, 663
Jhānsī, in, 116, 351, 354, 397, 418a, 422-23
Jhānsī, reg, 446, 446, 457, 459-60
Jhānsī-Gūḍā, do, 341-42
Jhānsī-Sīpī, do, 591
Jhārā, dt., 79a
Jī, m., 363-66, 456
Jīna, se, 301
Jinachandra, ma, 412
Jinamandana, su, 238, 242, 261a
Kānyaśakti sa Kanaṣu, ca, 9, 19, 31-32, 378, 385, 380, 572, 654
Kāpadi, sa, Kōlar, vi, 168-69, 202a.3 and 205a, 641-42
Kāpészvara, m., 424
Kāreśa, vi, 26
Kāreshī, tū, 568
Kāreshī Pargana, l.d., 561, 572, 586
Kāresī, m., of Kāruja, III, 5n
Kāteshī, ca, 425
Kāshē, vi, 628m
Kārīgāvā, ca, 448
Kārūkarāyī sa, Kārūkāyī, do., 492
Karki, vi, 47
Karki, do., 197
Karmadāsa sa, Karmadāsa, m., 273
Karnā, epic pri, 340, 500, 546m, 555
Karna, GHzūtāya k., of Gujarat, 82, 94-95
Karna, the caller of Chāmpā, 357
Karnāl, do., 37
Karnāpatra, mu., 508m
Karnasīhī, m., 563
Karnā, reg., 290, 649
Karnātaka Brāhmaṇa, community, 53
Karnāta, reg., 109, 112n, 288
Karnātaka sa, Kāpēsara, vi, 73-74
Kārle, 'u., of a weight,' 299-299a, 624, 625m
Kārīlāpāla, m., 464
Kārītihāsikā, system of reckoning, 62, 70, 119a, 128a, 134, 169, 167n, 177, 186n, 202-203, 207, 226, 228, 233m, 240, 265, 306, 323, 629m
Kārunā sa, Kāruna, m., 453
Kāsēkavā sa, Kāsēkavā, vi, 244
Kāśmir, 341 and n
Kāt, vi, 413-14, 471n, 570
Kāthākā sā, Vārāṇasi, do., 300-51
Kāṭārī, 421m
Kāṭāvī-Warāvāla, tā, 209
Kālāmī, poc., 540
Kāsāvāda, vi, 217
Kāsāyā, j., 463-64
Kātanātra, system of Kāt. grammar, 88m
Kashāmī, S.L., 81m, 138-39 and 139n, 140n, 144, 166n, 367-68 and 368n, 506 and n, 370n, 375, 375m, and 376n, 487 and n, 488n, 689n
Kathahāna, vi, 537-58
Kakaj, m., 181
Kakaju, m., 314
Kanarsahī sā, Kosan, tā, 512-13
Kāmalāyānasa, l.d., 512-13
Kanu, sa, of a gem, 142, 288
Kautheśa granit of the Chāmpīya Vikramśaitya, 326m, 333 and n
Kautiśa, vy., 41m, 452
Kāvāda, vi, 21
Kāvēśa, vi, 219, 216
Kāvīda sa, Kāvīda, off., 245
Kāvindravachanasamuchchaya, uk., 123
Kāvindrasyaya, wk., 541m
Kāvirāja Shisayamadās, 286
Kāyā, style, 371, 382, 473-79, 357, 362, 619
Kāyādharā, uk., 491, 492m
Kāyālakṣāna, do., 111n
Kāyaprabhāka, do., 543
Kavaddar, 468
Kawarthā, vi, 355n
Kāyādāra, do., 74n, 245
Kāyādāra, some ins., of Dhāravarṣana, 228a, 246-51, 269 and n
Kavāsā, community, 3, 197, 198n, 268-69, 289, 375, 379, 383-84, 440, 511-12, 516-18, 519n, 564, 578, 600, 602, 615
Kāyābhrāta, kind of posture, 629
Kōdāna sa, Sīva, i.e., 79
Kāśita, mu., of a place, 598
Kēth A.B., 12n, 76n
Kēth, m., 262
Kēthana, Chāmpāna k., of Nētōl, 163, 250, 254, 261, 264
Kēthana, do., 181, 273, 330, 538
Kēth, vi, 432
Kōndi, vi, 414
Kōrāla, ca, 77-78
Kētā, m., 116, 173, 181, 273, 301, 424, 448, 511, 553-54
Kēsavāsārman, do., 452
Kēśa, ligature, form of, 473
Kēśi, subscript, form of, 107
Kēṭākhekēṭ, vi, 189
Kēṭākopālikā, lā, 21
Kēṭālāpāčāka, do., 110
Kēṭāparābā, vi, 353, 357, 342, 347, 351, 366, 370, 378, 381, 400, 411-12, 456 and n, 632
Kēṭāparābā ins. of Dhaṅgādeva, 558, 597
Kēṭāparābā ins. of Y.Š. 1011, 456
Kēṭāparābā ins. of Yaśeśvarman, 378, 655
Kēṭāparābā Jaina image ins., 666
Kēṭāparābā, ca, Kaṭhīpāṭa, m., of Tārā, 280, 282
Kēṭāparābā, Sattān of Dehī, dy., 215
Kēṭāpaṇakaṇakaśāla, l.d., 124n
Kēṭāpala, do., 119
Kēṭāpala, lā, 167n
Kēṭāpala, lā, 61n, 179
Kēṭāpala, do., 191, 216
Kēṭāpala, tā, 601
Kēṭāparābā, vi, 187n, 189 and n
Kēṭāparābā, tā, 89, 640, 643
Kēṭāpi, stream., 12
Kēṭāparābāsa, sa, Kēṭāparābā, vi, 353, 385
Kēṭāparābā, do., 21-22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 21-22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 421
Kēṭāparābā, sa, Kēṭāparābā, do., 422
Kēṭāparābā, do., 160
Kēṭāparābā, do., 21
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Kēṭāparābā, do., 22
Lakshmideva, Paramdriya k., of Mahan. 68. 84, 91
and s. 95, 106, 110, 115n. 500
Lakshmana, Kalachuri k., 77
Lakshmana, m. 372, 404, 551
Lakshmana, epic Padmika pr., 272
Lakshmanya, Chaitanyakarna k., 285n
Lakshmanya, Kachchipagadhya k., 587
Lakshmanajit. te. 337
Lakshmanavaraja II, Kalachuri k., 341
Lakshmanasena, k., of Bengal. 125
Lakshmanasinhah, m. 563
Lakshmi, fe. 424
Lakshmibhara, m. 110, 152, 218, 470
Lakshmibhara, off. 505, 629
Lakshmi Karna i.e. Karna, Kalachuri k. 372, 378
Lakshmi Narayana, te. 73
Lakshmipati, loc. 487
Lakshmivardi, do. 188
LakshmiVarman, Paramba k., 30, 132, 134-36, 139-
40. 143, 145, 154, 158-59 and 139n. 815
Lali Bhairav ST Shonker. 56
Lali, fe. 424
Lalipur, th. 418n
Lalindara, m. 627
Lalidevi, fe. 627
Lalidevi, fe. 628n
Lalipur, tr. 116, 371, 575, 423, 447
Lalipur, dr. 335n. 428
Lalipur, subdivision, 353, 371, 459, 485, 489
Lallika, ted. 29
Lalika, m. 314
Lallika, do. 110, 314
Lamda, co. 310, 516
Language:
Deshahi. 350n
English. 105, 107n. 114
German. 106-07 and 107n
Kanarese. 95n
Moghadi. 95n
Marathi. 450n
Patishah. 530n
Prakrit, 29, 55, 87, 122n. 96, 218, 224, 248 358,
374, 394, 396, 417, 359, 355, 601, 657
Sandali. 9. 11, 18, 25, 28-29, 32, 35, 40, 43, 46,
49, 51, 55, 60, 65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 75, 80, 87,
89-90, 94, 99, 102, 106-07, 115, 121, 122n.
123, 127, 130, 134, 138, 141, 145, 147, 153,
158, 162, 166, 168, 172, 176, 182, 186, 190,
192, 195, 201, 208, 214, 224-25, 227, 238,
237, 240, 242, 245, 248-49, 251, 253-34, 256-
37, 260, 263, 265, 271, 279, 287, 297, 300,
303, 305, 310, 312, 318, 320, 322, 325, 329,
332, 335, 338, 347, 350, 354, 357, 361, 365,
367, 371, 374, 377, 379, 382, 391-93, 396,
400, 405, 407, 409-410, 419, 420, 436-57, 440,
443, 447, 452, 455, 458, 461, 464, 466, 468, 470,
475, 479, 485, 488, 491, 496, 499, 506-04,
507, 510-11, 516, 522, 529, 537, 549-50, 553,
556, 561, 565, 578, 592, 595, 597, 600,
604, 611, 614-16, 618, 622, 624, 627,
629-31, 635-34, 636-37, 640, 647, 649, 652.
657
Sandhi (corrupt). 207, 209, 526
Sandhat mixed with local dialect. 215
Sarasvati. 350
Laur, caste. 67
INDEX

Lasha(khajamadevi, ch., c., 353
Leshamugla, m., 553, 558
Lashamunyika, s.m. Lakshamanini, m., 257, 258m
Lashapura, vi., 216-17
Lashla, m., 202, 391
Lasen, 106
Lata, cs., 9, 19-22, 30, 55-57, 77-78, 215, 261, 301, 322
Lata-Vidhi, m., of a gene, 531
Latter Chalukya, dyn., 314, 649
Lutias, n. of a community, 421
Lavasi, vi., 488
Lavanasudha, min., 201
Lavanyadevi, q., 571n
Lekula, Lmu., 470
Lokhamaladi, u., 252n, 253n
Lele K.K., 66, 67n, 65, 84n, 86-87 and 87n, 88 and n., 173, 200, 317, 616n, 619, 620, 621n
Lila, m., 21
Liladhya, do., 22
Liladri, uk., 41n
Lilamadeva, m., 202
Lilambaka, k., 279, 281, 288
Linga, m., 421
Lichana, do., 430n
Lukla, n., of a agricultural community, 597n
Lokada, do., 424-25
Lobi, vi., 485
Lobapa, m., 21
Lobana, vi., 203n
Lobara, co., 341n
Lobasa, u., 484
Lobasahani, t.d., 485
Lobasta, m., 22, 180, 398
Lobata, off., 588, 598n, 602
Loliya, m., 21
Lokananda, do., 21, 25
Lolarka, mini., 93-96
Lolliga, de., 70n
Lollis, m., 425
Lona, f., 402
Lodibhadra, q., 571n
London, 10, 24n, 42n, 49 and n., 499
lt., form of, 356
Luari C.E., 16n
Lubala, uk., of a f., 597 and u.
Lucknow, c., 354, 418-19
Lundassika, m., 188
Lunaz, race, 464

M

m., form of ed., 70, 308, 389, 413, 420, 504, 529, 556, 587, 657
Madana, royal preceptor and com., 163, 167, 169, 178m
Madanapala, gen., 440
Madanapala, m., 181
Madanapura s.m. Madanpur, vi., 421-23, 456, 465
Madanarama, u., 73
Madanavigna i.e. Bahu Ta, m., of a lake, 458
Madanasimha, off., 207
Madanavarman s.n. Madana s.m. Madanavarmedeva, Chandra, k., 116, 131, 159, 390-93, 396-97, 401-42, 401-42, 412-14, 420-21 and 421n, 423, 427n, 438, 444, 448, 456, 463, 467n, 471, 474-75, 479, 493, 496, 500, 505, 506n, 528, 529, 538, 548, 558, 564, 589, 591, 607
Madanavarman's Bhurakalal-Bhavan grant, 421
Madanosigarpura s.n. Ahir, vit., 457
Madhusudana, do., 23, 26n
Madhavaka, c., 305
Malav, m., 500
Madhava, u., 121, 339
Madhavasarama, m., 202, 641
Madya, do., 425
Madhu, do., 22, 181, 340
Madhu, demon, 219n
Madhu, n., of a tree, 352n, 396
Madhuka, m., 425
Madhukarana, do., 181
Madhumathana, do., 22
Madhunapala, u., 21
Madhupuru, vi., 21n
Madhumathi-700, do., 641
Madhumati, t.d., 643
Madhumatinagara, do., 643
Madhusudana, m., 122, 180, 255, 425, 549-50, 561
Madhusudana, t.d., 250
Madhuvasara, gen., 649
Madhyadika, co., 19-21, 115-16, 179-80 and 180n
Madhusudana, m., 500
Madhukarana, do., 320n
Madhuvati, f., 115, 642
Madhulika, m., 181
Madhuvadaka, t.d., 134-36, 148-49, 159
Mahasana, m., 412
Mahakula, off., 15
Mahakala, t.d., 12, 79n, 83-84, 87, 89, 188, 203, 280, 615
Mahallapura s.n. Ujjain, t.d., 66-67
Mahakalapatula, off., 642
Mahamana, m., 273
Mahana, do., 184, 322, 306
Maharanda, do., 425
Mahasimha, do., 208
Mahapuru s.n. Mihipura, t.d., 643
Maharaja, m., 425, 598
Maharaja, eng., 474-75, 588 and n.
Maharaja, f., 627-28
Narayani grant of Devavarman, 350
Nāpiñamadal, "harber's canal", 355
Nārāyaṇa, n. 37
Nārāyaṇa, m., 115, 122, 180-81, 216, 298, 425, 564, 659
Nārāyaṇa, ca., 192, 194n., 310
Nārāyaṇa, Chandelā, k., 377
Nārāyaṇa, t. c., 414
Nārāyaṇadēśam, m., 401
Nārāyana, r., 10n., 11-12, 21, 26n., 50-62, 61, 65, 104n., 128, 154 and n., 135n., 169 and n., 174n., 179 and n., 180, 200 and n., 203 and n., 209, 212, 222, 233, 290, 385a, 642-43
Nārāyana, s. a. Nāmikāvar, t. c., 139 and n., 462 and n.
Nārāyana, Pratijāgarana, t. c., 158
Nārāyana, s. t., 604
Nārāyana stuti, u. k., 602
Nārāyana, n., 425
Nārvāl, m., 18, 19n., 21, 25s., 26
Nāravar s. a. Nālāpurā, ca. of the Yajnavallīka's, 203, 593-34, 564-63, 568, 570, 572, 577, 579, 580 and n., 587n., 589, 595, 606-02
Nārāyana, nā, of V.S. 1338, 601
Nārāyana, nā, of V. S. 1339, 997n., 598
Nāsa, m., 501
Nāta, d., 54, 57-58
Nāṭa, Sultan, Sultan of Dehā, 206, 562, 628
Nāta, m., 425
Nāṭapāṭika, v. k., 282
Nāṭārvadā, v. k., 282
Nāṭē, m., 425
Nāṭērī, v. k., 216
Nāṭṭipāṭika, d., 281
Nāvāglā, d., 40-41
Nāvgłam, Railway Station, 209
Nāvāghramā, f. a., 478
Nāvāγunāvā, v. k., 222-23, 441
Nāvāṣa-pratijāgarana, t. c., 361-62, 482n
Nāvāṣa-rājakara, u. k., 44, 12 and n., 76-79, 198.
Nāvāṣa, m., 327n
Nāvāṣa, s. a. Nāvaṣa, fort., 327n
Nāvāvā, t. k., 308
Nāvāgjāvā, d., 568
Nāvām, t., 203
Nāvāramadēśam, d., 471n
Nāvāyaka, m., 592
Nāvāyaka, n., 641
Nāvāyānadī, f., 595
Nāvāyōkm, t., 203
Nāvāyāwandī, n., 471n
Nāvāyāvā, m., 592
Nāvāyāvā, n., 641
Nāvāyāvādī, n., 30n
Nāvāyāvāsinā, m., 503
Nēkativu, d., 387
Nēkativu, d., 87-27
Nēkvār, v. k., 159
Nēkvār, n., 140, 160
Nēkvārandī, d., 37
Nēkvārā, d., 22
Nēpāl, v. k., 37
Nepal, c., 341n
Nīcēhāvār, s. a. Ichchāhāvā, v. k., 438
Nījāra, m., 121
Nīlī, f., 144
Nīlīcīmanḍala, t. c., 153-54, 160
Nīlākānta, t. c., 357 and n., 358, 390, 392, 405, 478, 507
Nīlākānta, m., 425
Nīlākānta-dēśa, t., 265
Nīlākānta Jamādāra, Kīrtīnā, 10, 556
Nīlākānta Mahākara, t. c., 247, 291
Nīlākāntārvāra, d., 65
Nīlīgāth, d., 152
Nīma, s., 73
Nīrīnāsā, m., 425
Nīmā, d., 555n
Nīnā, d., 538n
Nīnūkā, s., 130
Nīnūktā, t., 57, 115, 157n., 127n., 129n.
Nīnīsdinī, d., of a Muslim chronicler, 378, 654
Nīnīsa, form of, 353, 355, 356, 382, 395, 495, 499, 511, 549, 640
Nīnīsā, conjunct, subscribe form of, 504
Nīnōka, m., 223
Nīnāla, d., 467n
Nīnāla, d., 467n
Nīnāla, d., 467n
Nīnūsā, s. a. Nāvaṣa, fort., 328n
Nīnūsā, s. a. Nāvaṣa, fort., 328n
Nīnūsā, s. a. Nāvaṣa, fort., 328n
Nīnūsā, s. a. Nāvaṣa, fort., 328n
O
O, medial, form of, 28, 338
Ojha G.H., 43, 47 and n., 48n., 60n
Oktāvā Māṁsākā, d., 121n., 160, 209
Oktāvārvāra, t., 216
Orchhā, erstwhile state, 375n
Orissa, State, 79n.
Oxobyography —
a. medial, sometimes appearing as prīṣṭhamātrā of the adjoining letter, 511
ai and eu, mātrā sometimes used as prīṣṭha-
maṭrā, 616
auvāra, use of before a vowel, 19
auvāra, use of, to denote final m, 325, 329, 385, 420, 443, 447, 474, 499, 511, 619, 644, 647, 652
auvāra, use of, to denote n, 400
auvāra, use of, wrongly at the end of a stich, 440, 455
Pradyumna, m., 218, 235, 275n, 420n, 429n
Pragyā, f., 228
Prabhādāna sā. Prabhādānādēva, a member of the Chandrāvatī Paramāṇa dy., 250n, 263
Prāmnāth, m., 349
Prāntiṣṭha, tk. 1, 5
Prasadā, n., of one of the gunas in poetry, 108
Pratara, l.m., 46n, 154, 444 and n., 448, 453n
Pratāpavatī, Para-tama k., of Chandrāvatī, 268-69, 271-72, 628
Pratāpavaran, Chandellā k., 508
Pratibhā, dy., 4, 5n, 52, 79, 356, 340-41, 342n, 378, 384n, 528, 557, 655
Pratijñavaranaka s.a. Pargalī, 'territorial division', 104, 116, 641, 643
Pravaras—
Agharanāshana-Vīvāmātra-Kaśika, 56
Aṅgirasa-Ambarisha-Yauvanāśa, 401, 459
Aṅgirasa-Bāhraspatya-Bhāradvāja, 202, 350, 358, 396
Aśvayya-Archanamāsya-Savāva, 46, 561, 440
Bāhraspatya-Aṅgirasa-Bāhraspatya, 108
Bhārgava-Chavanā-Āpavāna-Aurva-Jāmagnāya, 202
Gargga-Sulinya-Aṅgirasa, 158
Gautama-Aṅgirasa-Auvatihāya, 202
Gautama-Aṅgirasa-Ayasya, 401
Kālayapa-Avatsāra-Naidhrūva, 165, 448
Kātyāyaṇa-Kapila-Vīvāmātra, 115
Kauṇḍinya-Vaśishtha-Maitrīvaruṇi, 641
Sāṅkhyāya-Aṅgirasa-Gautvīya, 444 and n., 446
Vatsa-Bhārgava-Chavanā-Āpavāna-Jāmagnāya, 452
Vatsa-Bhārgava-Chavanā-Aurva-Jāmagnāya, 488
Prayāga, rī, 598, 602
Price, 413
Prince of Wales Museum, 54
Pritīhu, myth. k., 78n, 393, 500, 542n
Pritīduḍaka, commenator, 124n
Pritīvidhāra, m., 181, 406, 425, 440, 512
Pritīvidhāra, engra. 422
Pritīvidhāra, off., 459, 444 and n
Pritīvipāla, k., 537-54
Pritīvipālādevī s.a. Bhartripāda, do., 557
Pritīviṣṭha III, Chākauṇā k., of Ajmer, 246, 330, 423, 462, 465, 470, 480
Pritīviṣṭha-rāsā, uk. 654n
Pritīviṣṭha-Vijaya, do., 136n
Pritīvivarman, Chandellā k., 391, 396, 401, 413, 421, 440, 444, 448, 459, 500, 501n, 505, 508
Pujīparīṭha (Bastar dt.) Stone ins. of Göpālādeva, 121n
Pulindas, ped., 517
Punāās, vi., 26n, 643
Punḍrī, reg., 179n
Punjab, state, 57, 110, 179
Pūṇa, m., 119
Pūṇamapāthakā-pattana, vi., 26n
Pūnyābhara-sarit, rī, 25
Puppā sā. Pushpā, jē., 384
Puruṣa, saks. 361, 374, 519n, 592
Puruṣas—
Agni-puruṣa, 543n
Brahmapuruṣa, 508
Kālikāpuruṣa, 416n
Mārkaṇḍeya-puruṣa, 103n, 341n, 343n, 466n
Padmapuruṣa, 76n
Sują-puruṣa, 96n
Śkanḍapuruṣa, 37n
Śyāmapuruṣa, 508n, 542n
Putn Chand Nahar, 267, 325 and n., 328n, 328n, 329n
Pūrāṇa, rī, 63, 272-73
Pūrāṇa, l.d., 25n
Pūrānpāṇḍya, min., 319
Pūrāṇapāla, Paramāṇa k., of Chandrāvatī, 225, 228n, 230n, 235-34, 238, 250-61, 321
Pūrāṇapatha, l.d., 23, 641, 643
Pūrāṇapatha-maṇḍala s.a. Poomāsi, do., 62-65
Pūrāṇa, vi., 25n
Punushētana, m., 21, 180-81, 425, 540, 659
Punushētana, min., 474-75
Punushētana, off., 128
Pūrāṇa, m., 218
Pūrāṇapatha, l.d., 23-26
Pusad, rū., 89
Pūrāṇa, m., 258

Q
Quub-ud-din Aibak, Sultan of Slave dy., 163,475, 484
Quick, 409

R
r, superscript, form of, 39, 76, 123, 297, 310, 312, 338, 354, 355m, 371, 411, 442, 452, 455, 464, 522, 537, 567, 633, 656
r, subscripts, form of, 447, 522
ru, form of, 32, 338, 360
Rāhāla sā. Rāsila, m., 396
Rājājī, n., of a place of worship, 615
Rādha, rū., 229n, 384-85
Rādhaghajjā sā. Ghatija sā. Ghatijā, vi., 68
Rādha Kumud Mookeri, 463n
Rādhi Bhārmanas, community, 20n
Rādupatī, rū., 4n
Rāghava, m., 425
Raghu, Myth. Ichāda, k., 95, 233
Raghunāth Sastri, 214n
Raghuvasī, uk., 5n, 55, 124n, 220n, 376n, 543n, 545n
Rāhaigadh, hillfort, 190-91
Rāhaigadh stone ins., 589n
Rāhils, Chandellā k., 336, 339, 378, 384
Rāhu, demon, 122, 124 and n., 545n
Raideś, m., 423
Rākōura, vi., 489
Rāi Krishnadasajī, 399, 458, 469
Sahhanna, m., 582a
subhāṣītra, 'a member of an assembly' (?), 592
Sābhūṭa, m., 425
Subuktigā, ruler of Chauhāni, 378
Sāchāni, n., 592
Sāchi, consort of lord Indra, 357
sāchika, 'minister', 414
Sādājī, ins., of V.S. 1251, 330
Sādāka, m., 272
Sādāli, d., 598
Sādhāra, gen., 52
Sādā, m., 58, 659
Sādādriau, d., 563
Sādāhāra, fe., 289
Sādāhāra, m., 181, 218, 235
Sādhu, v., 255
Sādulākārāmaṇita, m., 125 and n
Sāgara, m., 145n, 487, 497n
Sāgara, d., 398, 418n, 422, 483
Sāgara plate of Trailokāyatrī, 485, 657-38
Sāgara, legendary k., 588n
Sāgara, m., 61
Sāgara, d., 215
Sāgara, vi., 432-33
Sages—
Agastya, 124, 222n, 500
Aksahapāda s.a. Gautama, 414
Aṅgirasa, 414
Atri, 339, 343n, 383
Bharadwāja, 425n
Bharata, 510, 511n
Chandrāvatī, 339, 383
Dadhīchī, 592
Gautama, 272, 414, 416n, 530
Kāvyapa, 374, 412, 635
Maṇḍuka, 196
Maṛchī, 330, 383
Śārvasva, 502
Upanaya, 272
Vasiṣṭha, 76n, 84, 90, 94, 109, 196, 212, 228,
228, 260, 272, 277, 279, 288, 306, 326, 333,
351, 617, 624
Viśvāmitra, 90, 94, 280, 288
Vīśvāsa, 37, 545n, 817
Sagord, Railway Station, 325n
Sagövād, th., 229
Sagwād, th., 626
Sahadēva, m., 364
Sahajā, d., 300-91
Sahajā, q., 281
Sahajā, fe., 508
Sahajē, m., 425
Sahajusārman, d., 401
Sahārana, d., 401, 425
Sahārana, off., 459
Sahasa, d., 314
Sahasamullāmbikā, k., 464
Sahasantika s.a. Vikramāditya, d., 464 and n
Sahasrābahu, 'thousand-armed', 536
Sahasrābālu, 'multiple-peaked temple', 456, 457n
Sahasrārāma, legendary k., 199n
Sahasra-vīśchana s.a. Indra, god, 541n
Sahasrabāha s.a. Sārvabhauma, d., 52
Sahi, d., 655
Satšānum, vi., 177, 179-80
Śaraka, m., 659
Satānandā, do., 425
Śrīvāvana, ḍya., 52
Satī, m., 410, 534
Śrīmā, in., 657 and ni
saśā, 'charitable feeding hall', 538
Saśyabhadra, th. q., 633, 635m
Satyaśrī, Paramāṇa k., of Vāgāṇa, 280-81
Śatyaśrī, ma., 327
Śatyaśrī, Chāṭhikya k., of Kālyāṇa, 55
Śatyaśhma, ma., 624
Śuabhaśyaddevi, q., 237-38
Śuabhaśyaddevi, fe., 528
Saugon s.a. Sājgir, in., 190-91
Sauhitika, off., 37, 57, 59n
Samānik, engr., 99
sa namedhara, 'the worship of the sun', 321
Saunaśtra, reg., 4, 327, 414, 598
Sauṣa s.a. Sauṣasara, lo., 423
Saśādhi Lāḍda ṣa. Baḍḍi Anāl, vi., 256
Sāvaitāśā, lo., 167n
Sāvā, q., 570
Sāvanta, m., 484
Śāvathikā s.a. Śrīvastā, co., 19-22
Śeveda, vi., 167n
Śevasaṃga ṣa. Rāni Sawargenal, do., 648, 649n
Śaxena, S.S., 187
Śayanaśūta, vi., 29-30
Śeṣā, do., 265
Śeṣore, do., 32, 152n, 157n, 166
Śeṣore, in., 160n, 168
Śeṣore copper-plate ins. of Arjunavarman, 173, 179, 642
Śeṣhika s.a. Śatane, in., 57
Śeṣhika, do., 37
Śeṃbalapura, vi., 15-16
Śeṃlā, do., 16
Śeṃrā, do., 418, 525n
Śeṃrā grant of Paramardin, 357n, 398, 409, 439-40, 443-44, 446n, 447, 451n, 452a, 458, 460m, 470, 472n, 482, 485, 488-89, 658
Śen P.C., 651
Seṣaṇaṇhada, ma., 70
Śeṣṭindhā ṣa. Fort, 497
Śeṣṭindhā-Mālā, ṭk., 155n
Śesā, vi., 504-95
Sesavigrāma s.a. Saiyec, do., 421-22
Śeshaṇa, ma., of a celebrated serpent, 124
Śeṭ-Mahēj ins. of V.S. 1276, 512n
Śeṭvāra, m., 492
ṣ, form of, 99, 279, 374, 420
Śhābhād, ṭk., 193
Śhāḥgadh, vi., 418n
Śhāḥ, ṛ, 79
Śhājasjpur, do., 19n, 79n, 132, 162, 166n
Śhāmajā, Railway Station, 19
Śharrna O.P., 327n, 250, 296, 300, 312
Śhastri H.P., 27, 28n, 30n, 31n
Śhastri V.N., 245, 247n
Śhastrihā, m., 549
Śhastriyā s.a. Sayanapājaka, vi., 50
Śhāṅgadh, in., 70-74, 118-19, 193
Śhāṅgadh, fort, 118
Śhāṅgadh stone ins. of Udaiyēdīya, 68, 70
INDEX

Sūrya, ṛṣi, 320
Sūrya Nārāyana, Vyās, 615
Sūryapāla, member of the Kachchhaphālā dyas., 558
Sūryarāva, m., 319
Sūrya-siddhānta, ukt., 124n
Sūryāśrama, tv., 119
Sutherland J.C.C., 381
Suvannavaschī s.a. Gövinda IV, Rāḍhāraṇī k., 18
Suvāsītā s.n. Sīvāsī, vt., 154, 156
vca, form of, 503
Śvāhinī, m., 425
Śvāmi, do., 650n
Śvapuṣpa, do., 452
Śvavāyapato, do., 22
Śvērāmbara, Jaina sect, 57, 59n
Śwamikamanū Pillai, 35
Śyāma, m., 570

T

t, form of, 28, 32, 39, 42, 70, 72, 90, 102, 190, 278, 297, 300, 325, 338, 350, 356, 357, 377, 395, 470, 504, 522, 529, 556, 586-87, 597, 652, 657
t, subscript, form of, 303, 386
†, superscript, form of, 62, 127, 395, 465, 536, 561, 565n
Tahaqta-: Nāseri, ukt., 562n
Tākālī, demoness, 545n
indra, 'a piece of land', 11-12, 13n
Talapa, Chālīkyya k., of Kāliyān, 5, 16n, 55, 77-78
and 78n, 214n
Taiḥākavaya, 'oilman's lineage', 70
Taaju, m., 364
Takali, lo., 179
Takārī, vi., 179-80, 202-03, 216-18, 351, 538, 598
Takārāja, do., 179
Takkārī, do., 351
Takkārikā, do., 501, 517-18
talāka:pāla, 'a market on the low lands', 153
Talapāpata s.n. Talwāḍa, vi., 514
talapatra, 'ear-ornament', 547n
Tālān, m., 425
Tālāyakēṭī, vi., 217
Tālakaka, 'a stamped coin of silver', 100n
Tātu-:12, vi., 421
Tānukkutā s.n. Tamō, n., of a fort, 327-28
Tapati, ri., 30, 63
Tāraka, demon, 562
Taranā, ṛṣi, 104n
Tārāpur, tvn., 87n
Taranōri, n., of a gate, 636
Tārāsilāṭhira Shāhī, ukt., 562n
Tārāśikā, n., of a gate, 633
Tarkārikā s.n. Tarkārikā, vi., 179n, 350-51, 358, 384-85
Tanmō, do., 217
Taulakapuri, do., 217
Tāvā, do., 645
Tāvney, au., 70n, 92n, 109
Tātāla, m., 437
Te[p]i, vi., 485n
Tējōvarma, jen., 139
Tērī, lo., 216-18
Tevāṭhub, ṛ., 492, 413-14
Tevāṭhūra, tv., 402

Tevā, ṛṣi or Teō, n., of a stream, 642
th, form of, 59, 70, 72, 123, 143, 201, 227, 237, 297, 356, 372, 382, 405, 410, 459, 536
th, form of, 405
th, subscript, form of, 349
th, subscript, form of, 72, 107, 193, 211, 278, 305, 399, 571, 393, 400, 529, 586, 600
Thāl (Thā?) m., 354
Thākāra, vi., 557-58
Thākāṭā, f., 321
Thākūr Das Jain, 399, 469
Thali s.n. Sūrī, t.d., 40-41, 314
Thānā ins., dated in 1272 A.C., 214-15
Thānesar s.n. Sūvāyīsī, tv., 37
Thāneswar, do., 79
Thānū, m., 425
Thātgarīkā, do., 96
The fragmentary Mau ins., of Madhavanarman, 471n
Thedū, m., 425
Thākkārikā s.n. Thākri, vi., 128
Thūkhī, ṛ., 179
Thomas F.W., 125
Tīhāri s.n. Tēhrī Bānapur, vi., 488-89
Tilēnumāla s.n. Talbānapurā, k., 440, 557n. 558
Tilēnumāla, m., 448
Tilēnumāladeva, k., 557
Tilēnumudā, m., 540 and n
Tikama, do., 425
Tikamgadā, dt., 379
Tikamgadā, tvn., 399, 455, 458, 469, 489, 518, 651
Tikāva, m., 425
Tilānā, engra., 381
Tilēka, m., 540
Tilakamānjarī, skt. ukt., 49, 77, 232n
Tilakaprabhatīśtri, com., 255
Tilakavādā, tv., 21, 34, 30, 32
Tilakavādā grant of Bhōja, 21, 34, 56, 79
Tilavād, vi., 217
Tilīhā, m., 426
Tippāpadā, vi., 15-16
Timūr, do., 497
Tintīri s.n. Tināthir, tv., 402
Tintīri-pattali, t.d., 401
Tirhiwān, m., of a gate, 515
Titi—
rātho-saptamāni, 322
tītīṣyā, 558

Tirthānkaras—
Adīśevā s.n. Rishabhadeva, 562
Adīśa, 411
Chandrapraba, 550
Jinīstāma s.n. Sāṅkitā, 620
Mahāvīra s.n. Jina, 254, 255n, 336, 530, 562, 622
Nāṃkūṭā, 403-10
Pādmaprabhanātha, 536
Pārīvanātha, 103, 261, 562
Rishabhavāmī, 530
Rishabhavānātha, 411 and n
Sāṅkitā, 253n, 363-66, 455, 530, 629, 631-32
Savrāṭadeva, 55, 57
Rishabhendranātha, 305
Vīrābhādriādādevā s.n. Rishabhānātha, 301

Title—
Achāryā, 258
Adhirāja, 341
INDEX

Udaipur, c., 4n, 20, 65a, 71, 75, 81-82, 91n, 98, 172n, 185-89, 191n, 208, 279, 611, 613, 622, 646
Udaipur copper plate ins. of the time of Devapala, 207, 209
Udaipur Pralasti, 56, 63, 65, 81, 91, 104, 109 and n., 196 and n., 212, 250, 288, 517n, 646
Udaipur stone ins. of the time of Udayaditya, 70
Udama, off, 393
Udāri ins. dated in 1276 A.C., 214-15
Udavachandra, m., 412, 457
Udayaditya s.a. Udayadityadeva, Paramāra k., 63, 64n, 65, 68, 70-71, 73, 76, 79-80, 82, 84, 89-91 and 91n, 94-95, 99 and n., 100, 105-04, 109-10, 115, 130, 134, 135, 161n, 162 and n., 177, 193, 208, 213, 313, 397, 508, 611-13, 615, 641-42, 649
Udayadityā, do., 426
Udayapura, n., of a place, 611
Udayarāja, Paramāra k., of Bhīmālā, 327
Udayarāja, writer, 551
Udayasahāsī, Chāhānīmā k., of Jālīr, 272, 350
Udayasahāsī, Paramāra k., 628
Udayasahāsī, m., 563
Udayavarman, Paramāra k., 135, 145, 148, 158 and n., 159, 173n, 214n, 614
Udayēvatřada, fe., 66, 646
Uddhārana, m., 218, 253
Udhrava(ta), do., 180
Udña, m., 426
Udña, do., 401n
Ujjain, vt., 20-21, 24 and n., 31, 33, 67-68, 79n, 102, 104n, 217
Ujjain, reg., 166n
Ujjain copper plate ins., of Bhōjadeva, 54, 36n, 40, 47n
Ujjain copper plate ins., of Udayavarman, 187
Ujjain copper plate ins. of Mahākāla Vakrashubhakarman, 139, 148-49, 150 and n.
Ujjain copper plate ins., of Yasōvarman, 104
Ujjain some ins. of Chalukya Jayasimha of V.S. 1195, 242
Ujjayinī-śaṭiśīmā-pathaka, t.d., 44
Ukāvadd, vii., 136
Uldan, n., of a place, 422
Uldana, s.a. Oldana-Khurd, vii., 422
Uldana, do., 421
Uldana, engra., 396, 401
Ullē, m., 426
Ulmāja s.a. Ulmartha, vii., 157n
Ulmājan, do., 157, 159n
Unā, te., 605
Umāra s.a. Umārathama, vii., 189
Umārathama, do., 21
Un., do., 79n, 89
Unā ins., 644n
Unda s.a. Undra, vii., 225
Undapur, lo., 173-74
Undwā, do., 174n
United Province, 21
On Sarpabhadra ins., 89
Upādhyāya, sur., n., 3, 178, 181, 184n., 216, 218, 223n, 224
Upādhyāya Lalla, n., of a nagara br., 3
Upādhyāya, vi., 116
Upāri-bhādā maṇḍala, t.d., 191
upāri-kara, tax., 33, 105n
Upāndra, Paramāra k., 109
Upendrapurāṇa-śāstra, t.d., 116
Upêndrasūjā t.a. Krishnārāja, Paramāra k., 77
Urmila Prasad Shukla, 657
Usa s.a. Dūsha, m., 326
Ustrā, vi., 21
Uṣha, fe., 537
usthara, 'dry land', 350, 352n
usthara-Prabhadha, 'bounded by a barren spot', 351
Uttaravajaka, vi., 134, 156, 157n
Utpala, commentator, 124n
Utpalaraśča, Paramāra k., of Chandravatī, 226, 269
Utsavālai Purani, 27
Uttara, epic pr., 546n
Uttarāditya, m., 426
Uttarākula (ru 7), co., 19
Uttara kula, do., 21
Uttarākureda, do., 21
Uttarā-patika, t.d., 142n, 143
Uttarārya, Sanākṛiti, 43
Uttarārya, vi., 167n
Uttahapaka, vi., 289-90
Uttāhāpyaka s.a. Arāhīna, do., 313, 114
Uttahāpyaka s.a. Arāhīna, do., 510 and n
V
v., form of, 631, 640, 649, 652, 657
Vāchaspūri, min., 4n, 5n
Vāchaspūri, Preceptor of the gods, 537
Vāchaspūrya, 559n
Vachchala, m., 46
Vachchhia, do., 426
Vachchhārāja, do., 426
Vachchhila, do., 426
Vachchhū, do., 426
Vachchhukha, do., 152
Vadhāna, s.a. Varapravānī, do., 196 and n
Vadāṇa, vi., 154, 156, 157n, 202-08
Vadānā, do., 484
Vadānā s.a. Bedvādā, do., 424, 485, 489
Vadānāvi s.a. Varbhavaṁ, do., 518
Vadānāvi, do., 492-23, 488
Vaddiga, Rādhrākṣita k., 30, 139
vādha (pa), 'the area of land granted', 445n
Vadugara, lo., 5
Vadugara Pralasti of the reign of Kumārapāla, 139, 242n
Vadovypattana, s.a. Bodhā, vii., 209
Vāgāda, t.d., 40, 279, 281-82
Vāgāda, province, 78, 234n, 288, 290, 295n, 297, 301
Inscriptions of the Chandellas of Jejakabhuki

Varaha, m., 22, 426
Varahamihira, astronomer, 124n
Varahavami, m., 540
Varahī, vi., 658
Varahā, t.d., 630
Varāshāni, "an acetic living on leaves", 285n
Varāparasā, vi., 50, 102, 204n, 351, 378, 399, 476-71
Varāngī, t.d., 654
Varānī - 84, do., 632
Varbhava, vi., 517-18
Varadhamunapura s.a. Badmāvar, in., 131-32, 217
Varadhamunapura pratijāgaraṇa, t.d., 216
Varāndra, m., of a place, 179n
Varāndra Brähmāṇas, community, 20n
Varidurga, m., of a place, 420
Varikas, religious sect, 368
Varman, vi., 223, 627
Varma - nāgakappiya, "alphabetical snake -
scimitar", 84-85
Varuṇā, Lm., 299, 294n
Varuṇapār, consort of lord Varuṇa, 281
Vāsā, vi., 297
Vāsadhara, m., 181, 426
Vasi, vi., 402
Vāsā, do., 243-44
Vasatichārya, m., 12
Vasatadvēsa, do., 365
Vasantagadha, fort, 226 and n
Vasantagadha stone inc., of the time of Parnāpāla, 76,
223, 234, 236, 290, 321, 326n, 328n
Vasanta-Vilasā, vi., 242n
Vādri, k., 212-18
Vasutā, vi., 401-02
Vasavachandra, m., 548, 365-66
Vasavadūndu, do., 366
Vātē, off., 517, 633-34
Vātē, s.a. Vātēka, m., 518
Vātēka, off., 517
Vasishtha, m., 540
Vasishṭhārama, n., of a hermitage, 251 and n, 252
Vātavṛtta Kāyastha, j., 634, 636
Vātū s.a. Vātakarman, architect of gods, 517
Vātan, "the site of a house or a building", 517
Vātiskātra, ep., 496
Vātū, m., 426
Vātudēva, engr., 142
Vātudēva, m., 21, 218, 426, 504-05, 570, 639
Vātudēva, royal preceptor, 368 and n, 369, 370n
Vasubhāti, vi., 457
Vasuki, m., 426
Vasupāla, do., 426
Vapi, do., 659
Vataviṣṭaka, vi., 131-32
Vatangara s.a. Vatapura s.a. Vasantagadha, in., 40n,
229
Vatapadra, s.a. Badūdī, vi., 149
Vatapadra, do., 40-41
Vatapura, in., 40n, 228
Vatītra, m., 581n
Vatsa, do., 425
Vatsa, ch. min., 414
Vatsarāja, gen., 116, 372, 393, 394n, 397
Vatsarāja, Chālukya k., of Lēla, 29-30
Vatsarāja, m., 426, 475
Vatsarāja, poet, 499
Vaisala, Paramāra k., of Jālār, 333 and n
Vaisālāvī, Vāgīśhā k., of Gujarat, 203
Vāsāgrimā, vi, 30-37
Vāsālā Udagramamaka, m, 245
Vīśṇu, da, 22, 152, 181, 426
Vīśnu, offic., 5, 297
Vīśnū, cv, 202, 297, 342, 413, 474-75
Vīṣṇukā, m, 430
Vīṣṇukārnā, do, 426
Vīṣṇuvaradhana, Hayaśa h., 650
Vīṣṇukārnā, the architect of gods, 517n
Vīṣṇula, lo, 500n
Vīṣṇunātha, tc, 391
Vīṣṇuvarāṇa, m, 103, 426
Vīṣṇusūrīma, do, 92
Vīṣṇuvēda, da, 180, 216
Vīṣṇuvēravā, sa, 492
Vīṣṇuvarāja, jaina dc, 503, 513, 456, 632
Vīrā, m, 420
Vīra-bandha, 'mortgage of a village', 491
Vīrāhāra, m, 420n
Vīrvana, fen, 653
Vīsača, lm, 470n
Vīsādīś, lo, 158-59
Vīṣṭrapāni, cv, 536-27
Vīṣṭra, tc, 321n
Vīṣṭrā, demon, 344n
Vīṣṭrāsattav s, Indra, god, 344n
Vīṣṭrayabhandhā, tc, 314
Vīṣṭrayanātha, coin, 239
Vruvacāka, vi, 70-71
Vṛṣa-rājā, do, 41n
Vṛṣa-arāṇikā s, Bāgīḍorā, province, 290
Vṛṣapura-munḍāla, l.h., 108, 110 and n
Vṛṣa, m, 659, 660n

W

Waidhwān plates of the time of Mahāpāla, 324
Wakasur, A.W., 86
Wakasur V.S., 31-32 and 32n, 48n, 49n, 67, 615, 643n
Wardhā, in, 5n
Wäś, vi, 244
Wasura, do, 240
West Bengal, State, 34
Western Chāḷakoy, dy, 131, 154, 649, 651n
West Némaū, di, 70n, 85, 128, 217, 640
Wilkinson L., 157n, 152, 153, and n, 162, and n, 163n, 164n, 169
William Hoye, 438
William M., 294n, 295n, 358, 370n, 625n
William Price, 412
Wright, vi, 110

Y

ya, form of, 623
Yadava, f, 70
Yadava, dy, 191, 193, 179, 191, 196, 203 and n, 214
and n, 215, 246, 518n, 614
Yadava ins. of Saka 1119, 215n
Yadu, f, 196

Yajñadharma, m, 158, 425
Yajñavalkya Smriti, śat. mk, 97n
Yajñapālita s, Jajapālita, dy, 497, 564-64, 568-70, 578-79, 580n, 582n, 586, 592, 595, 597, 601, 602-03
Yamaraśā, m, 665
Yamunā, ri, 361-62, 384, 492, 471, 473, 515, 525n, 601-02
Yamunādeva, m, 602
Y(Paramārīśa, ā, of Yajñapālita, dy, 362
Yahākara, Kālachuri k., 93, 110, 500
Yahnāpāla, m, 364, 444
Yahnāpāla, min, 503
Yaksaka, m, 540
Yakṣāhata, engr., 362
Yakṣēdeva, m, 285, 294n, 426, 433n
Yakṣēdeva, scribe, 327
Yakṣēdeva, a Jain sage, 500
Yakṣēdeva Digambarākara, poet, 539, 550n
Yakṣādhāra, engr., 327
Yakṣādhāra, Chandella k., 358n
Yakṣādhāra, m, 426, 462
Yakṣādhāra Bhātta, do, 550
Yakṣādhāran, k, 20
Yakṣādhāvala, m, 352
Yakṣādhāvala, Paramārā k., of Chandravati, 159, 237-38, 240, 242, 244, 246, 253, 256, 257, 258n, 260-61, 269n, 321
Yakṣādhāvala, Paramārā k., of Abū, 624
Yakṣāmati, fe, 351
Yakṣāvarman, fe, 29, 57, 58n, 59n
Yakṣāvarman, Chandella k., 335-36 and 338n, 339, 340 and n, 341 and n, 342-50, 354 and n, 358, 378, 383n, 384, 397, 414, 421, 459, 474 and n, 506, 557n, 633
Yakṣāvarnān's grant of V.S. 1192, 44n
Yakṣāvarman's ins, 383n
Yāyadhāra, vi, 245n
Yazdani, 649n
Year reckoning—
Chaitrī, 448, 456, 459
Kārtīkā, 633
Years cyclic—
Nandana, 90
Pramāthini, 212
Yellow-mountain, dt, 517
Yecnālī, do, 89, 140, 649 and n
Yoga—
Parighā, 138
Silā, 202
Yogārī, ch, 4
Yogārī, Paramārā k., of Chandravati, 250-61, 321 and n
Yogārī, Paramārā k., of Abū, 624
Yogīvāra, m, 218, 539
Yogīvāra, k, 414
Yoga, do, 229
Yudhīsiṣṭhīra, epic hero, 162, 340, 357, 362, 372, 384, 388n, 402n, 417n, 421, 538, 553
Yuvārāja, Kālachuri k., 56, 77, 340 and n
Yuvārāja, Kṛtāśhapahānī, k, 559