

JOURNAL
OF THE
EPIGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF INDIA

[BHARATIYA PURABHILEKHA PATRIKA]
(BEING VOL. V OF STUDIES IN INDIAN EPIGRAPHY)

VOLUME FIVE : 1978



PUBLISHED BY
THE EPIGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF INDIA
MYSORE

JOURNAL
OF THE
EPIGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF INDIA
(BHARATIYA PURABHILEKHA PATRIKA)

(BEING VOL. V OF STUDIES IN INDIAN EPIGRAPHY)

VOLUME FIVE : 1978

15845



15845

Editors

S.H. Ritti
DHARWAR

Ajaya Mitra Shastri
NAGPUR

Secretary and Executive Editor

K.V. Ramesh
MYSORE

Assistant Editor

S.S. Ramachandra Murthy
MYSORE

PUBLISHED BY
THE EPIGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF INDIA
MYSORE

Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India [Bhāratīya Purābhilēkha Patrikā
[Being Vol. V of Studies in Indian Epigraphy]: Vol. V, pp. vi+146. Editors : Dr. S.H. Ritti
and Dr.A.M. Shastri; Secretary and Executive Editor: Dr. K.V. Ramesh; Assistant
Editor: Dr. S.S. Ramachandra Murthy. Published by the Epigraphical Society of India,
C/o Old University Office Building, Mysore - 570 005.

First Published-1979

COPY RIGHT © EPIGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF INDIA

CHIEF EPIGRAPHER
LIBRARY
MYSORE

Acc. No. 15845

Date 31.7.80.

Call No. 417.05 / RIT

EP2-V

PUBLISHED WITH THE HELP OF A GENEROUS GRANT FROM
THE INDIAN COUNCIL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH,
35, FEROCZE SHAH ROAD, NEW DELHI - 110 001

PRINTED IN INDIA AT


Vidyasagar Printing and Publishing House
Saraswathipuram, Mysore-570 009

CONTENTS

1	The Date of The Malhāra Plates of Ādityarāja	... V.V. MIRASHI, NAGPUR...	1
*2	Epigraphical Howlers	... D.C. SIRCAR, CALCUTTA...	10
*3	Art of Dance in The Temples of Tamilnadu- Epigraphical Evidence	... A.N. PERUMAL...	15
*4	Were Mādhavarman I and Tīvaradēva Contemporaries ?	...AJAY MITRA SHASTRI. NAGPUR...	
*5	Anatomy of Political Alliance from Temple Records of Tirunavalur and Tiruvorriyūr	...M.G.S. NARAYANAN, CALICUT...	26
*6	Social and Economic Conditions of Ancient Chamba	...B.K. KAUL DEMBI, SRINAGAR...	32
*7	Epigraphical Discoveries at Guntupalli	...I. KARTHIKEYA SARMA...	48
*8	Some Epigraphical Echoes of the Sangam Period	...K.V. RAMAN, MADRAS...	62
9	Epigraphical Notes	...H.V. TRIVEDI, INDORE...	64
*10	Religious Conflict in the Tamil Country: A Reappraisal of Epigraphic Evidence	...R. CHAMPAKALAKSHMI, NEW DELHI...	69
*11	A Hero-Stone Inscription from Maḍavāḷam	...C.R. SRINIVASAN, MYSORE...	82
*12	A New Chalukya-Āḷupa Inscription from Jambāṇi	...M.J. SHARMA, MYSORE...	
13	Jaunpur Stone Inscription of Īśvaravarman	...S.R. GOYAL, JODHPUR ...	89
14	Mahasamund Plates of Sudēvarāja : Year 3	...BALCHANDRA JAIN, JABALPUR...	93

15	Note on the Indore Plates of Pravarasēna II	...G.S. GAI, MYSORE...	98
*16	A Kannaḍa Hero-stone Inscription in Madras City	...MADHAV N. KATTI, MYSORE...	103
*17	The Regnal Year	...N. SEITHURAMAN, KUMBHAKONAM...	105
*18	New Inscriptions from Kanheri	...SHOBHANA GOKHALE, POONA...	110
19	Garhi Matani Inscription of Kanishka (I)	...B.N. MUKHERJEE, CALCUTTA...	113
*20	Phulbāni Copper Plate Grant of Śrī Raṇabhañjadēva, Year 9	...SMT. S. TRIPATHY, BHUBANESWAR...	115
21	The Palaeographical Study of The Āraṅg Copper Plate of Bhīmasēna II	...NISAR AHMAD, VARANASI...	126
22	Legends on the Coins of Chimuka-Sātavāhana and his Predecessors	...P.V. PARABRAHMA SASTRY...	136
	Book Reviews...		143

* Papers presented at the Madras Congress in January, 1978



ISSUED
IN MEMORY OF

Late Shri N. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO
Govt. Epigraphist for India (Retd.)



15-5-1898—14-1-1979

[Honorary Fellow of the Epigraphical Society of India from its inception]

1584-

EDITORIAL

We have great pleasure in presenting to the world of scholars Volume Five of Purābhilēkha Patrikā, the journal of the Epigraphical Society of India. The publication of this issue has been made possible by a generous grant from the Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi. The Editorial Board places on record its deep debt of gratitude to the Council authorities.

We thank the senior as well as junior scholars whose articles adorn the pages of this journal. We hope to achieve before long our objective of bringing out more than one issue of this journal per year.

Our thanks are due to the Vidyasagar Printing and Publishing house for printing this Volume within a short span of time.

K. V. RAMESH

(For and on behalf of the Editorial Board)

1. THE DATE OF THE MALHARA PLATES OF ADITYARAJA

V. V. Mirashi

In 1974 an odd plate of a copper-plate grant was brought to the Central Museum, Nagpur, by the Marketing Officer of Achalapur in the Amraoti District of Vidarbha for decipherment. The other plates of the set were not forthcoming, but, after herculean efforts, they were traced several months later, some to Achalapur and one to the village Malhārā, a few miles away. The grant was edited by me first in Marathi in the *Annual (Vārshika)* of the Vidarbha Saṁśōdhan Maṇḍal, Nagpur, for 1975, pp. 1-17, and next in English in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. LIV, pp. 1 ff. In my article I tried to show that the plates belonged to the pre-Vākāṭaka period, and recorded the earliest grant so far known, discovered in South India.

The plates state that in the Muṇḍa family, which was a worshipper of Bhagavat (Vishṇu) and performed an Aśvamēdha sacrifice, there was born a Brāhmaṇa named Sōma of the Bhāradvāja-gōtra, who took delight in the study of all the four Vēdas. He was followed by Vardhana, who is described as follows:—“Regular performance of religious duties and observances, righteous conduct, Vedic learning, hospitality to guests and austerities—this was his mode of life.” His son was Muṇḍa, who was always consecrated for sacrifices and engrossed in the performance of vows, and never had his hand tainted by the acceptance of any gifts. Indra is said to have showered wealth during

his sacrifices. This is evidently to be understood in the sense that, though he himself accepted no gifts, people spontaneously made all arrangements for his sacrifices and supplied the necessary provisions for them. He brought prestige and fame to the family, which became known as Muṇḍa-varṁśa after him.

None of these three Brāhmaṇas who are eulogised in the beginning of the grant ever wielded any royal power. They were all pious and learned Brāhmaṇas who were always engrossed in the performance of Vedic sacrifices and never cared for pelf or power. The next member of the family was Rāshṭra—mahārāja, son of the aforementioned Muṇḍa. He is said to have obtained a royal title (*rāja-śabda*) by his merits. The circumstances in which and the means by which he obtained a royal status are not mentioned in the grant. His successor Rājakula-mahārāja is said to have made offerings of the lives of his enemies to the fire of fighting which had flames in the form of the warriors' spears. This suggests that he obtained a memorable victory in some battle or battles. He was probably the king who performed the Aśvamēdha sacrifice with which the Muṇḍa family is credited. His son was Ādityarāja, who issued the present plates recording the grant of some villages to certain Brāhmaṇas. The purpose of the grant was the acquisition of religious merit and fame by the donor and his parents. The

present grant is written in elegant and almost faultless Sanskrit and is incised in box-headed characters. Its date is given at the end in Prakrit as the (regnal) year 2, the season *gimha* (summer), the fortnight 2 and the day 10 (and) 5. The plates were issued from Vāna-khēṭa, which was probably Ādityarāja's capital. This place is probably identical with Vānakhēḍapur in the adjoining Akola District. The other villages mentioned in the grant can also be satisfactorily identified in the Amraoti and Akola districts. So this grant undoubtedly belongs to Vidarbha.

Though the grant is not dated in any era, it can be referred to the pre-Vākāṭaka age on the following grounds:—

(1) The Muṇḍa family is described in the grant as *Aśvamēdha-yājin*, i.e. the performer of an *Aśvamēdha* sacrifice. No royal family could have performed such a sacrifice in Vidarbha during the age of the Vākāṭakas as their supremacy was then unchallenged in the country. The sacrifice went out of vogue after that age. No king of Vidarbha is known to have performed it in later times.

(2) The grant contains a season date. Such dates are noticed in the records of the early centuries of the Christian era. A few, no doubt, occur in those of the Vākāṭaka period, but none are noticed in any records of the post-Vākāṭaka age.

(3) The date of the present plates is recorded in Prakrit. All inscriptions of the first two centuries of the Christian era are written in Prakrit. Later, the preliminary portion was written in Sanskrit and the formal portion in Prakrit. This is noticed in the Basim plates of the Vākāṭaka king Vindhyaśakti II. The present record was evidently drafted by a learned Brāhmaṇa

and so it is written in elegant Sanskrit. It seems to have been sent later to the record office for entering its date. This was done in Prakrit as was the custom at the time. All records of the Vākāṭaka age in Vidarbha are written completely in Sanskrit. There is not a single Prakrit word therein. So the present grant must be referred to an earlier period.

As the grant cannot refer to the Vākāṭaka period and as its features mentioned above clearly indicate that it cannot be of the post-Vākāṭaka age, we must refer it to the period between the fall of the Sātavāhanas and the rise of the Vākāṭakas. From the Purāṇas we learn that the Andhras (i.e. the Sātavāhanas) ruled for 460 years. If they had risen to power in *circa* 230 B.C. soon after the death of Aśōka, they may have disappeared in *circa* A.D. 230. From the Tarhālā hoard of coins we learn that they continued to hold Vidarbha to the last, i.e. to the end of the reign of the last Sātavāhana king Puṣumāvi. Their downfall seems to have been followed by chaos and confusion in Vidarbha as in other countries under their rule. This led to the rise of new ruling families there. The Muṇḍa family seems to have come forward to establish peace and order in Vidarbha. The *Manusmṛiti*¹ enjoins that the twice-born people (such as the Brāhmaṇas) should take up arms when religion is in danger. The contemporary son of Muṇḍa seems to have responded to this call of duty. He changed the sacrificial ladle for the sword and soon established peace and order in Vidarbha. He then assumed the significant name of *Rāshṭra-Mahārāja* as he had come forward for the protection of the *rāshṭra*. His successor Rājakula-Mahārāja seems to have performed the *Aśvamēdha* sacrifice and thereby proclaimed his supremacy in the country. His successor was

Ādityarāja, who made the present grant in the second year of his reign. As no other members of this family are known, Ādityarāja seems to have been overthrown soon thereafter by the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna I, who invaded Vidarbha in *circa* A.D. 270. The total period of the rule of this family seems to have been about 40 years (from A.D. 230 to A.D. 270).

Ajay Mitra Shastri does not agree with this interpretation of the present grant. He has critically examined our view in the present *Journal*, Vol. IV, pp. 30 ff. He would place the rule of this Muṇḍa family in one of the two gaps, *viz.* (1) that between the second quarter of the sixth century, which marked the end of the rule of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman I, who occupied Vidarbha after the death of Vākāṭaka Harishēṇa, and A.D. 573, the date of the Kalachuri feudatory Svāmirāja in his Nagardhan plates and (2) that between the aforementioned date, A.D. 573, and the occupation of Vidarbha by Chalukya Pulakēśin II some time before A.D. 634, the date of the Aihole inscription. He does not accept as valid the reasons adduced above for fixing the date of the Malhārā plates in the pre-Vākāṭaka period. His objections are not unanswerable², but we prefer to examine critically his theories, and show how they are untenable.

The first theory — The Muṇḍa family flourished in the period between the second half of the sixth century A.D. and A.D. 573, the date of the Nagardhan plates :

Shastri admits that Harishēṇa closed his reign in A.D. 500, and that Vidarbha was thereafter occupied by Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman I, who closed his reign in the second quarter of the sixth century A.D.

He has not given any definite date for the latter event. We have discussed in the last volume of this *Journal* the question of the reign-period of this Mādhavavarman in the light of evidence now available. It is probably from A.D. 487 to A.D. 528. Thereafter Vidarbha came under the rule of the feudatory prince Svāmirāja, whose known date is A.D. 573. Svāmirāja does not mention his suzerain, but he must have been the contemporary of the Kalachuri king of Māhishmati.⁴ We have shown elsewhere from the recently discovered Māṭwaṇ plates of Traikūṭaka Vikramasēna that there was a political revolution in Western Mahārāshṭra in A.D. 533, when the Traikūṭaka king was overthrown by the Kaṭachchuris.⁵ The Kaṭachchuri king, probably Kṛishṇarāja, defeated Vikramasēna and occupied Western Mahārāshṭra including North Koṅkaṇ. Kṛishṇarāja's coins have also been found in several places in Vidarbha such as Dhāmori and Betul. So after conquering Western Mahārāshṭra he must have soon extended his power to Vidarbha, where there was no powerful ruler after the death of Vishṇukuṇḍin Mādhavavarman I in *circa* A.D. 528. The exact date of his occupation of Vidarbha is not known, but it may be approximately taken to be A.D. 540. He did not himself rule over Vidarbha, but appointed his feudatory, either Svāmirāja or his father whose name is unknown, for the purpose. Kalachuri occupation of Vidarbha is indicated not only by the finds of Kṛishṇarāja's coins in several places of Vidarbha but also by the use of the Ābhīra (or the so-called Kalachuri-Chēdi) era which had been current in Kṛishṇarāja's home province of Anūpa.

So the gap between the end of the rule of Mādhavavarman I (*circa* A.D. 528) and the commencement of the rule of the Kalachuri

feudatory in Vidarbha (*circa* A.D. 540) comes to 12 years. Is it likely that the Muṇḍa kings Rāshṭra-mahārāja, Rājakula-mahārāja and Ādityarāja ruled in this brief period of a dozen years? They not only established peace and order in Vidarbha but also performed an Aśvamēdha sacrifice. Is all this possible in this brief period? Shastri's first hypothesis is thus clearly inadmissible.

The second theory — The Muṇḍa family ruled in Vidarbha in the interval between A.D. 573, the date of the Nagardhan plates of the Kalachuri feudatory Svāmīrāja, and the occupation of Vidarbha by Pulakēśin II some time before A.D. 634, the date of his Aīhoḷe inscription.

We do not know how long after A.D. 573 Svāmīrāja or his descendants continued to rule in Vidarbha. As shown above, they were probably feudatories of the Kaṭachchuris. The latter maintained their supremacy in Mahārāshṭra till about A.D. 620, the approximate date of the defeat and overthrow of the last Early Kaṭachchuri king Buddharāja by Pulakēśin II. Pulakēśin then became the lord of the three Mahārāshṭras, which evidently included Vidarbha. Svāmīrāja's descendants probably continued to hold Vidarbha till this date. Thereafter, the Chalukya conqueror seems to have placed his own nominee in charge of Vidarbha.

For the subsequent history of Vidarbha we have to rely on two copper-pate grants, viz. (1) the Akola plates⁸ dated Śaka 615 (A.D. 693) and (2) the Multai plates⁹ dated śaka 631 (A.D. 705), both of the Rāshṭrakūṭa prince Nannarāja *alias* Yuddhāsura. They give the following genealogy of the reigning ṅing—

Durgarāja
|
Govindarāja
|
Svāmīkarāja
|
Nannarāja

(known dates A.D. 693 and 709)

Nannarāja seems to have ruled from *circa* A.D. 690 to *circa* A.D. 715. Taking twenty years as the approximate duration of a reign, we may place his great-grandfather Durgarāja in *circa* A.D. 630-650. His accession, therefore, comes close to A.D. 620,¹⁰ the approximate date of the defeat and overthrow of the Kaṭachchuri king Buddharāja. He may, therefore, have been the prince placed in charge of Vidarbha by Pulakēśin after he added that country to his dominion.

Nannarāja does not acknowledge the suzerainty of any contemporary ruler in his grants, but his ancestor's submission to Pulakēśin II seems to be indicated by his adoption of the Śaka era in dating his grants. It is well known that the Early Chalukyas used the Śaka era in dating their records. Just as Svāmīrāja adopted the Ābhīra era in dating his Nagardhan plates because his suzerain Kalachuri Kṛishṇarāja used it in his home province, so Durgarāja seems to have done in adopting the Śaka era for his grants as his suzerain Pulakēśin II was using it in Karnāṭaka. His successors seem to have followed him in this respect.

So the Muṇḍa family cannot be accommodated in this period also. We cannot also suppose that the Muṇḍas and the aforementioned feudatory Rāshṭrakūṭas were ruling in different parts of Vidarbha in the same period; for the grants of both have been

found in the same part of the country—the Malhārā plates recording the grant of the Muṇḍa king Ādityarāja in the Amraoti district, and the two grants of the Rāshṭrakūṭa prince Nannarāja in the adjoining Akola and Betul districts.

Besides, we find that the Muṇḍa family dated its grants in regnal years. This would be inexplicable if it flourished in the post-Vākāṭaka period. If it had succeeded Svāmīrāja, it would have used the Ābhīra era like him. If it was placed in charge of Vidarbha by Pulakēśin, it would have used the śaka era like him. We find that it did neither of these, but dated its records in regnal years. Regnal years are noticed in early inscriptions when the different eras were not in vogue. When an era became current in any part of the country, it was adopted even by an invader unless he was accustomed to use another era in his home province. This is shown by several instances in the history of Mahārāshṭra. The Traikūṭakas who followed the Ābhīras used the latter's era¹¹ which had become well established in Northern Mahārāshṭra and Koṅkaṇ. The Sēndrakas did the same when they occupied Southern Gujarat.¹² If the Muṇḍas had come to power soon after Svāmīrāja, they would have used the Ābhīra era like the latter. If they had been the feudatories of the Early Chalukyas, they would have used the Śaka era of their suzerains as the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Vidarbha seem to have done. In no case they would have dated their records in their regnal years if they flourished in the post-Vākāṭaka age. There is not a single instance of a regnal year in any grant of Mahārāshṭra, including Vidarbha and Koṅkaṇ, in the sixth and subsequent centuries. Add to this the dating

in season, fortnight and day¹³, and the use of Prakrit in recording the date seen in the Malhārā plates.¹⁴ These should clinch the issue. They should leave no doubt that those plates are of the pre-Vākāṭaka age.

We have placed the Muṇḍa royal family in the period A. D. 230-270. It may, therefore, be asked if there is any evidence of a political revolution in this period. We have already stated that according to the Purāṇas, the Sātavāhanas ceased to rule in *circa* A. D. 230. This has now been corroborated by some new evidence which has recently come to notice and which we now proceed to state.

There were three main provinces of the Sātavāhana kingdom in Mahārāshṭra, *viz.* (1) North Koṅkaṇ, (2) Western Mahārāshṭra, and (3) Vidarbha. In all these provinces there was a political revolution in *circa* A. D. 230 as shown below.

North Koṅkaṇ:—The Purāṇas give a list of thirty Andhra (Sātavāhana) kings. The last of the kings whose inscriptions have been found in North Koṅkaṇ is Māḍhari-putra Śakasēna.¹⁵ After his reign there seems to have been a political revolution there. An inscription in a cave at Kanheri mentions the mother of the Yuvarāja Khada-Nāga-Sātaka (*i.e.* Skanda-Nāga-Sātakarṇi).¹⁶ A closely similar description of a queen occurs in a pillar inscription at Vanavāsī (North Kanara District), which belongs to the reign of Hāritiputra Viṇhukaḍa Sātakarṇi.¹⁷ It shows that the rule of this Sātakarṇi extended from Vanavāsī to Kanheri. Thereafter the country round Vanavāsī was conquered by the Kadambas, while that in North Koṅkaṇ was occupied by the Ābhīras, who rose to power in A. D. 250. This, therefore, is

the date of the second political revolution in North Koṅkaṇ.

Western Mahārāshṭra :—In this province we do not get any inscriptions or coins of any Sātavāhana king after Yajñaśrī, as the centre of Sātavāhana power seems to have been shifted to the Andhra country where we find Vijaya Sātakarṇi, the successor of Māḍharīputra Śakasēna ruling from his capital Vijayapurī [modern Nāgārjunakoṇḍa].¹⁸ We have, however, some hoards of Kshatrapa coins discovered at places like Karhād and Rānjanḡaon. We cannot, however, infer from them that the rule of the Kshatrapas had extended to western Mahārāshṭra. Similar hoards have been found in Vidarbha also. As the Ābhīras and the Vākāṭakas had no currency of their own, they seem to have allowed these Kshatrapa coins to circulate in their territories.

There is, however, one coin which tells a different tale. It is a silver coin of Mahākshatrapa Īśvaradatta found at Indore, which Mrs. Gokhale has recently published.¹⁹ Īśvaradatta's coins have indeed been found previously at several places such as Sarvāṇī in the former Banswada State [Rajputana], Vāsō in the former Junāgaḍh State and Rānjanḡaon in the Poona District, but unlike the coins of the Western Kshatrapas found with them, they were not known to have had any year of the Śaka era incised behind the ruler's ear on the obverse. Rapson and others noticed only the unit figures one or two denoted by small horizontal lines on the obverse signifying the first or the second regnal year, which was also stated explicitly in words in the legend on the reverse of the coins.²⁰ Īśvaradatta was, therefore, supposed to have ruled for one or two years in a gap in the dates of the Western Kshatrapas.

Bhagvanlal Indrajī placed Īśvaradatta in the gap between Śaka 171 and 176, for which no coins had been recovered till then. He also suggested that Īśvaradatta was the founder of the Traikūṭaka (*i. e.* the Ābhīra or Kalachuri) era, commencing in A. D. 250. This theory was disproved later by the discovery of the coins of Kshatrapa Vijayasēna which filled the gap. Rapson placed Īśvaradatta in the gap between Śaka 158 and 160, for which no Kshatrapa coins were known²¹. But D. R. Bhandarkar found a coin dated Śaka 160 of Yaśōdāman, which rendered Rapson's theory untenable. Bhandarkar himself suggested the gap between Śaka 110 and 113 as the period of Īśvaradatta's rule, but Mrs. Gokhale has noticed a coin dated Śaka 110 in the Rānjanḡaon hoard,²² So that gap also is virtually nonexistent.

The Indore coin has put an end to this wild goose chase of Īśvaradatta's reign-period. In none of the coins of Īśvaradatta deciphered so far any year of the Śaka era was noticed recorded on the obverse behind the Kshatrapa's ear. In fact, Rapson stated that only 'the year of his reign' was recorded there which was also stated in words in the legend on the reverse²³. The present Indore coin, however, has clear symbols denoting the year 154 behind the Kshatrapa's ear on the obverse. Like similar years on other Western Kshatrapa coins, this year must be referred to the Śaka era and becomes equivalent to A. D. 232-233. Similar Śaka years must have been incised on other coins of Īśvaradatta. If we examine closely the obverse of coins Nos. 472 and 475 in Plate XIII of Rapson's *Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhras*, etc., we shall notice the symbol for fifty behind the king's head. The legend on their reverse clearly mentioned the first regnal year. So coins No. 472 and

475 had the date Śaka 151 on the obverse and the regnal year first (Prathama) on the reverse. The Indore coin has the Śaka year 154 on the obverse. It must be having the regnal year 4 on the reverse. Mrs. Gokhale, however, read *varshē d* on the reverse, which suggested the second (*dvitīya*) regnal year. At my request she kindly sent me a copy of the photograph of the Indore coin, which is reproduced here.

It will be noticed that the letter following *varshē* on the reverse is clearly *cha*. So the regnal year was undoubtedly *chaturtha* or fourth. If Śaka 154 was the fourth regnal year of Īśvaradatta, he must have commenced his reign in Śaka 151 or A.D. 229-30.

We do not know where exactly Īśvaradatta was ruling. His coins have been noticed in the hoards of Kshatrapa coins discovered in Kāṭhiāwāḍ, Rajputana, Gujarat and Mahārāshṭra. His title *Mahākshatrapa* shows that like the western Kshatrapas, he acknowledged the suzerainty of the contemporary Kushāṇa king; But, unlike them, he was not a Śaka or Scythian. His name is purely Indian. Mrs. Gokhale noticed coins of Mahākshatrapa Dāmasēna bearing Śaka dates from 149 to 156 in the Rānjanḡaon hoard. There were coins dated Śaka 150 to 155 of *Mahākshatrapa* Dāmasēna in the Sarvāṇjā hoard¹⁴. So Īśvaradatta could not have been ruling north of the Narmadā in that period. He was probably holding Northern Mahārāshṭra, from where he raided Mālwā and Kāṭhiāwāḍ, which he seems to have occupied for a few years. Hence his coins have been found mixed with those of the Western Kshatrapas. Mrs. Gokhale identified him with the Ābhīra king (*rājan*) Īśvarasēna, son of Śivadatta, of the Nāsik cave

inscription¹⁵, but this identification has no basis. *Mahākshatrapa* Īśvaradatta of the coins is not likely to be identical with *Rājan* Īśvarasēna of the Nāsik cave inscription. The former was ruling as the satrap of the contemporary Kushāṇa king, while the latter did not acknowledge anybody's suzerainty. As we have seen, the former was ruling at least in the period Śaka 151 to 154 (A. D. 229 to 232). The latter was the founder of the Ābhīra era commencing in A. D. 250.

There were thus two political revolutions in Western Mahārāshṭra in that age. In A. D. 229 Īśvaradatta seems to have conquered Western Mahārāshṭra from the Sātavāhanas. Like the Western Kshatrapas of Malwa and Kāṭhiāwāḍ, he did not assume a higher title than *Mahākshatrapa* or Satrap of the contemporary Kushāṇa king. Later, he seems to have raided the country north of the Narmadā, which he seems to have occupied for a few years. So his coins have been found in the hoards discovered at Sarvāṇjā and Vāsō. Either he or his successor seems to have been overthrown by the Ābhīra king Īśvarasēna, son of Śivadatta. This second revolution seems to have occurred in A. D. 250. Īśvarasēna or his successors (there were ten of them) extended their rule to North Koṅkaṇ, Gujarat, Khandesh and the Anūpa country [modern Nemaḍ District].¹⁶ This is shown by the spread of the Ābhīra era four led by Īśvarasēna to these parts of the country. As we have shown elsewhere, ten Ābhīra kings ruled for 167 years. The name of one of them, *viz.* Rudrasēna, and that of his family, *viz.* *Kathika* have become known from an inscription on a casket discovered in the excavation at Dēvnī Mōri.¹⁷

As in Western Mahārāshṭra so in Vidarbha, there were two revolutions. The first

occurred in *circa* A.D. 230 after the death of the last Sātavāhana king, *viz.* Puṣumāvi. There were then confusion and chaos in Vidarbha. Then a son of the pious and learned Brāhmana Muṇḍa came forward and established peace and order in the country. He thereafter assumed the significant name of *Rāshṭra-mahārāja* as he had come to the rescue of the *rāshṭra*. He was followed by his son Rājakula-mahārāja, who performed an Aśvamēdha sacrifice to proclaim his supremacy in the country. His son was Ādityarāja, who seems to have had a short reign; for he was soon overthrown by the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna I. The reigns of these three Muṇḍa kings covered a period of about forty years [A.D. 230-270].

It was believed till now that the Vākāṭakas occupied Vidarbha in *circa* A. D. 250. Vindhyaśakti I was supposed to have raided Vidarbha probably from Vallūra, which was his home town.²⁸ The discovery of the Malhārā plates has necessitated a slight revision of this view. It seems that it was Pravarasēna I, not Vindhyaśakti I, who founded the Vākāṭaka kingdom of Vidarbha. Vindhyaśakti's name occurs only in one inscription, *viz.* that in cave XVI at Ajaṅṭā,²⁹ as the progenitor of the family. It is not

mentioned in the land-grants of the Vākāṭakas, which invariably commence with the description of the sacrifices performed by Pravarasēna I.³⁰ The Purāṇas also mention Pravarasēna as the founder of the Vākāṭaka kingdom of Vidarbha.³¹ He seems to have defeated Ādityarāja of the Muṇḍa family in *circa* A.D. 270, and laid the foundation of the Vākāṭaka kingdom, which was destined to have a brilliant future. His father Vindhyaśakti I was, no doubt, an intrepid warrior who won laurels in several battles and performed many sacrifices as mentioned in the Ajaṅṭā inscription, but he did not probably come to the throne in Vidarbha. His son Pravarasēna I was the first ruler of the Vākāṭaka dynasty of Vidarbha as stated in the Purāṇas and suggested by Vākāṭaka inscriptions which invariably begin with the description of his Vedic sacrifices including four Aśvamēdhas.

The date of the Malhārā plates of the Muṇḍa king Ādityarāja is thus *circa* A. D. 270. This is the earliest known copper-plate grant discovered so far in South India. It shows that the Vedic religion also was flourishing under the rule of the Sātavāhanas. It is of unique importance for the pre-Vākāṭaka history of Vidarbha.

Foot--Notes :

1. Śastraṁ dvi-jātibhir=grāhyaṁ dharmō yatr-oparudhyatē | *Manusmṛiti*, VIII, 340.
2. Shastri has shown that season-dates occur in some Vākāṭaka records and even the Māṅḍhal plates of Pṛithivishēṇa II (close of the fifth cen. A. D) show 'influence of Prakrit' (not Prakrit passages). These can at most indicate that the Malhārā plates may be of the Vākāṭaka age. But he has himself admitted that the Muṇḍa family could not have flourished in the Vākāṭaka age. The above mentioned features of the Vākāṭaka records do not prove that the Malhārā plates are of the post-Vākāṭaka age.
3. *JESI*, IV, pp. 2 ff.
4. *CII*, IV, p. xlvii.
5. Mitashi, *Literary and Historical Studies in Indology*, pp. 125 ff.

6. *CII.*, IV, p. clxxxii. His copper coins have recently been found at the Elephanta Caves near Bombay.
7. *CII.*, IV, p. 1.
8. These plates were actually found at the village Sangalooda in the Akola District. *EI.*, XXIX, p. 109.
9. *IA.*, XVIII, p. 230 ff. The Tivarakheḍ plates of this king, dated Śaka 553 (A. D. 631) have been shown to be spurious. See our *Studies in Indology*, I, pp. 25 ff.
10. Dates calculated on the basis of an average reign-period are only approximate. So this date may well be A. D. 620.
11. *CII.*, IV, pp. 22 ff.
12. *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 110 ff.
13. In the Vākāṭaka age, the prevailing custom was to cite the lunar month like Chaitra, the bright or dark fortnight and the *tithi* in regnal dates. The season-dates are very rarely noticed. They are not noticed in any post-Vākāṭaka records.
14. The Malhārā plates do not show 'mere influence of Prakrit' but give a complete date in Prakrit. This is not noticed in any post-Vākāṭaka record.
15. *ASWI.*, V, pp. 79 f.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 86; Rapson, *BMC.* (Andhra), p. liii.
17. *EI.*, XXXIV, pp. 333 ff.
18. *Ibid.*, XXXVI, p. 274.
19. *Vārshika* (Annual) of the Marāṭhawāḍā Saṁśhōdhan Maṇḍal for 1976.
20. *BMC.* (Andhra etc.), pp. 124 f.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. cxxxiii f.
22. *JNSI.*, XXXVIII, pp. 27 f.
23. *BMC.* (Andhra etc.), p. 124.
24. *ASIAR.*, (1913-14), p. 245.
25. *CII.*, IV, pp. 1 f.
26. The reading in *DKA.*, p. 46, giving the period as 67 years is probably wrong. That in *e Vayu* which gives it as *sapta-shashṭi-satān-īha* (167 years) seems to be correct. *CII.*, IV, p. xxvi.
27. Mirashi, *Studies in Indology*, IV, pp. 120 ff.
28. Some scholars maintained that the Vākāṭakas had their original home in North India; but this is incorrect. *CII.*, V, pp. xi f. The recent discovery of the first plate of the Indore copper-plate grant shows that they extended their rule north of the Narmadā first in the reign of Pravarasēna II.
29. *CII.*, V, pp. 103 f.
30. See e. g. *CII.*, V, pp. 10 f.
31. See *DKA.*, p. 50 :-

Vindhyaśakti-sutaś=ch=āpi Pravīrō nāma vīryavān |
bhōkshyatē cha samāsh-shashṭim Purikām Chanakām cha vai |
yakshyatē vājapēyaiś=cha samāpta-vara-dakshinaiḥ |
tasya putrāś=cha chatvārō bhavishyanti nar-ādhipāḥ |

2. EPIGRAPHICAL HOWLERS

D.C. Sircar

A copper-plate grant of king of Śūrapāla I [c. 850-58 A. D.], son of Dēvapāla [c. 812-50 A.D.] of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal and Bihar, was dug up in a village in the Mirzapur District, U.P., and was secured by the U. P. State Museum, Lucknow.¹ A note on the inscription appeared in the *Sampupā* [Bulletin of Museums and Archaeology in U.P.], Lucknow, Nos. 5-6, pp. 67-70. According to this note, the inscription registers the grant of some villages in favour of the Śaiv-āchāryas of Vārāṇasī at the behest of Queen Mahēshō-bhaṭṭārikā by king Śūrapāla, born of Queen Bhavadēvī, the *Dūtaka* or executor of the grant being Yudhishṭhira and the recorder being *Sāmanta* Dakkadāsa-Vairōchanadāsa. On an examination of the inscription, however, it was found that the above notice of the record contains the following errors:

[1] Śūrapāla's queen had nothing to do with the grant and is not mentioned in the epigraph while *Mahēshō-bhaṭṭārikā* is a wrong reading for *Māhaṭā-bhaṭṭārikā* to whom reference is made below.

[2] The name of Śūrapāla's mother, at whose request the grant was really made, was not Bhavadēvī but Māhaṭā.

[3] The executor of the charter was not Yudhishṭhira but Balavarman.

[4] All the villages were not granted in favour of the Śaiv-āchāryas. Of the

four gift villages, viz. Āmragartikā, Vāsantī or Vāsantikā, Kulaputra or Kulaputraka and Navallikā, the first and second were granted to the god Māhaṭēśvara installed by the queen-mother at Vārāṇasī, the other two having been granted in favour of the Śaiv-āchāryas probably in charge of the worship of the said god.

[5] Dakkadāsa and Vairōchanadāsa are two different persons who are stated to have engraved the charter.

The text of verse 14 of the inscription runs as follows:—

*Śrīmad-Durllabharāja-rāja-tanayā śrī-Māhaṭ -
ākhy = ābhavad =*

*dēvī tasya kara - graha - praṇayini ślāghyā
dvitīy = ēva bhūh'*

*pratyētavya-pativratā-guṇa-kathāḥ Sailātmaj-
Āruṃdhatī*

*Sāvitṛr = api yā chakāra charitaiḥ puṇy-
āmṛita-syandibhiḥ'*

It is strange that the name Bhavadēvī has been imagined to be mentioned in the two words *ābhavad = dēvī* [literally, 'became the queen'] of the passage *śrī-Māhaṭ-ākhy = ābhavad = dēvī tasya* in the first half of the verse, which tells us that the lady named Māhaṭā became the queen of Dēvapāla.

In the same way, verse 31 which reads as follows:

*Srīmān sri Sūrapālēna nṛipa-chandramasā
kṛitah¹*

*Harir = Yudhishṭhirēṇ = ēva Balavarmm = ātra
dūtakah¹¹*

simply says that king Sūrapāla made Balavarman the *Dūtaka* of the charter just as Yudhishṭhira had sent Hari [i.e. Vāsudēva-Kṛishṇa] as his *Dūtaka* or messenger to the Kaurava court in his eagerness to settle the Kuru-Pāṇḍava dispute. An equally strange fact, as in the case of the creation of the personal name Bhavadēvi out of the words *abhavad = dēvi*, is that the words *Yudhishṭhirēṇ = ēva* [i.e. 'just as by Yudhishṭhira'] have been imagined to contain the *Dūtaka's* name in spite of the words *Balavarmm-ātra dūtakah¹¹* [i.e. Balavarman is made the *Dūtaka* in respect of this grant] as well as of the fact that the same Balavarman, the ruler of the Vyāghrataṭi-maṇḍala, is already known to have been the executor of the Nālandā plate⁴ of Sūrapāla's father.

Likewise the dual number in the expression *Dakkadāsa-Vairōchanadāsabhyām* shows that Dakkadāsa and Vairōchanadāsa were two different persons so that a single personal name cannot be traced in it.

Recently a copper-plate grant of king Balavarman, who was the great-grandson of Harjaravarman [829 A.D.] of the Sālastambha dynasty of Prāgjyōtisha-Kāmarūpa and flourished about the close of the ninth century A.D., was discovered at the village of Ulubari in the Darrang District of Assam. In May, 1977, a note on the inscription appeared in the *Assam Tribune*, a daily newspaper published from Gauhati, and its authors state that the charter registers the

grant of a village called Pātidikkūra which was situated in the Mañjai-vishaya of the Uttarakūla, i.e. the region lying to the north of the Brahmaputrā river. Fortunately, the face of the plate containing the reference to the gift village was illustrated along with the article, and the passage in question could be easily read as *Uttarakūlē Mañjai-vishay-āntaḥpāti-Dikkūrātō = pakṛishṭa-dhānya - dvi-sahasr-ōtpattika-bhūmau*. Thus the name of the locality where the gift land was situated was not Pātidikkūra but Dikkūra, the letter, *pāti* really forming the concluding part of the previous expression *Vishay-āntaḥpāti* [i.e. 'situated in the district of'] generally found in hundreds of epigraphic records discovered in all parts of India including a large number from Assam itself. It is strange that the authors of the article in the *Assam Tribune* do not appear to have noted that the expression *vishay-āntaḥpāti* occurs in many records edited by P.N. Bhattacharya in his *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvali*, e.g. at pp. 98 [text line 52], 111, 122 [text line 35], 136 [text line 34], 154 [text line 31]. Even in the Nowgong plates of Balavarman, the donor of the Ulubari plates, the expression used as an adjective of the word *bhūmiḥ* in the feminine gender is *Dijjinnā-vishay-āntaḥpātini³* while the same king's Howraghat plates⁴ have the passage *Vārāsēpattana - vishay - āntaḥpāti - Bapradēvapāṭakād = apakṛishṭa - dhānya-dvi-sahasr - ōtpattika - bhūmau* which is exactly similar to that in the Ulubari plates.

As regards the meaning 'inferior [land]' [i.e. *nikṛishṭa*] applied to the word *apakṛishṭa* in the context of the passage quoted above from the Ulubari plates, reference may also be made to the interpretation of the same word in the Gachtal plates of Gōpāla in the

Journal of the Assam Research Society, Vol. XVIII, 1968, p. 54. It appears rather strange that recent writers do not know that the absurdity of such an interpretation was pointed out nearly half a century ago by P.N. Bhattacharya in his well-known *Kāmarūpa-sāsanāvalī*, p. 107, note 7. He rightly pointed out that the word *apakṛishṭa* in the said context occurs in most of the charters issued by kings of the Brahmapāla dynasty and that, by making grants of land of an inferior quality, the donors could hardly expect any religious merit at all though that was exactly the avowed purpose for making such grants of land. Bhattacharya suggested on the basis of the said word that the land was taken out from the possession of others for the purpose of creating a rent-free holding. That, however, the word *apakṛishṭa* means 'taken out [i.e. separated] [from the village or district]' seems to be clear from passages like *Dikkūrātō = pakṛishṭa* in the Ulubari plates and *Bappadēvapāṭakād = apakṛishṭa*, in the Howraghat plates, both issued by king Balavarman and quoted above,⁵ in which it is not compounded with but separated from the previous expression ending in the fifth case-ending or *tas* in the same sense. We are therefore not inclined to accept Bhattacharya's interpretation and would suggest that the idea was to indicate the separate status of the gift land which was made a rent-free holding forming no longer any part of the revenue-paying areas of the village or district. While editing the Howraghat plates two decades ago, we observed that "the piece of land was singled out from Bappadēvapāṭaka". This idea of separation is emphasised in the records of certain areas of our country by expressions like *samasta rājakīyānām = a-hasta-prakshēpaṇīya*, *rājakīyānām = anaṅguli-prēkshaṇīya*,

rāja - rājapurushair = apy = anaṅguli - nirdēśya, etc.⁶ In a few areas, the idea is more explicitly indicated mentioning the gift land as *vishayād = uddhṛita-piṇḍa* [i.e. as 'a piece taken out of the district] [to which it belonged]⁷ which is obviously the same as *vishayād = apakṛishṭa*.

The learned editor of the Gachtal plates of Gōpāla assigns the record to the eleventh century A.D. following the views of earlier writers including P.N. Bhattacharya⁸ and also K.L. Barua⁹ who placed the reigns of the rules of the Brahmapāla dynasty in the following periods: [1] Brahmapāla, c. 985-1000 A.D., [2] his son Ratnapāla, c. 1000-30 A.D., [3] his grandson Indrapāla, c. 1030-55 A.D., [4] his son Gōpāla, c. 1055-75 A.D., [5] his son Harshapāla, c. 1075-1090 A.D., and [6] his son Dharmapāla, c. 1090-1115 A.D. As regards the reign of 30 years ascribed to Ratnapāla by Barua, he seems to have missed Bhattacharya's correction of the date of the same king's Soalkuchi plates from his original reading of the 26th regnal year to 36th regnal year.¹⁰ However, what is strange is that the editor of the Gachtal plates, which refer to Indrapāla's marriage with Rājyadēvī of the Rāshtrakūṭa family, thinks that the said matrimonial alliance proves how Kāmarūpa played a part in the tripartite struggle among the Rāshtrakūṭas, the Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Pālas of Bengal. What a great pity! Even a school boy is expected to know that the imperial houses of the Rāshtrakūṭas and Gurjara-Pratihāras ceased to rule respectively before the last quarter of the tenth century and during the first quarter of the eleventh considerably before the middle of the eleventh century to which the editor would ascribe Indrapāla's reign. During the period in question, the Pāla kings Mahīpāla I [c. 977-

1027 A.D.] and Nayapāla [c. 1027-43 A.D.] of Bengal and Bihar were struggling respectively with the Kalachuri kings Gāṅgeya [c. 1015-41 A.D.] and Karṇa [1041-71 A.D.] of Tripurī.

It also strikes us as strange that the editor fails miserably to note that the most significant contribution of the Gachtal copper-plate inscription is the light it throws on the chronology of the kings, all of whom are now found to have ruled about seventy years earlier than the periods so long assigned to them on palaeographical grounds.

The following stanza occurs in the Gachtal plates in the description of Ratnapāla :—

*Dōrddarppa-durllalitam= ājishu Gauḍa-rājām
yō Rājyapālam= avajitya bhujā-dvayēna'
manyē gajendra-mada-chandraka-sāndra-tōyām
Mandākinim= api Kalindasutān= chakāra!'*

This shows that king Ratnapāla of Assam defeated the Gauḍa King Rājyapāla and, in the course of the conflict, reached the bank of the Mandākinī [Ganges] in the heart of the Gauḍa country. Now, King Rājyapāla of Bengal ruled in c. 908-40 A.D., an inscription of his great-grandson being dated in 1026 A.D.¹¹ Thus his Assam contemporary Ratnapāla, whose reign is assigned to c. 1000-30 A.D. [better probably c. 1000-40 A.D.], must have ruled about the first half of the tenth century, say c. 920-60 A.D., about three quarters of a century earlier.

Likewise, the description of Indrapāla in the Gachtal plates contains the following passage :

*Mādyad-Gauḍa-vimardda-bhujāḥ - Śrīchandra-
sūnuḥ-svayam*

*-pūrptaḥ saṅgara - sīmni Vaṅga - nṛipatiḥ
Kalyānachandrō bali!'*

showing that Indrapāla, whose reign is assigned to c. 1030-55 A.D. [better probably c. 1040-65 A.D.], was a contemporary of the Vaṅga king Kalyānachandra, the son of Śrīchandra. Since Kalyānachandra's grandson Gōvindachandra was defeated by Rājēndrachōḷa's forces shortly before 1025 A.D.,¹² the reigns of these two Bengal kings may be assigned respectively to c. 975-95 A.D. and 925-75 A.D., so that Kalyānachandra's contemporary Indrapāla must have ruled not in c. 1040-65 A.D., but about 660-90 A.D., nearly three quarters of a century earlier.

Another important passage in the Gachtal plates that has escaped the attention of the editor is the following in the description of the donor of the grant, i.e. King Gōpāla :—

*tasy= ābhavan= nṛipavarasya Haḍappak = ēti
puṇyā purī sunṛipatēr= Amarāvat= iva!'*

This shows that King Gōpāla had his capital at the city of Haḍappakā which appears to be the same as Haḍappēśvara [named after the Īśvara or Śivaliṅga worshipped at Haḍappā or Haḍappakā] which had been previously the capital of the kings of the Sālastambha dynasty. Inscriptions of the 25th and 36th regnal years of Ratnapāla¹³ as well as the two charters of Indrapāla¹⁴ show that the said kings were ruling from the city of Durjayā; but the Saratbari plates of Ratnapāla, issued in the king's 12th regnal year and recently examined by me, speak of the city of Haḍappakā as the king's capital. Thus Durjayā seems to have been founded by Ratnapāla and remained the capital of the family from the later years of that king's

reign till at least the reign of his grandson and successor Indrapāla. Under what circumstances, Durjayā, located by scholars near Gauhati, was discarded in favour of Haḍappakā or Haḍappēśvara near Tezpur cannot be determined without further evidence.

It should not be forgotten that the determination of the historical value of an inscription is an essential part of an epigraphist's work.

- 1 See now Sircar in *Journ Bih. Res. Soc.*, Vol. LXI, pp. 131ff.
- 2 *El.*, XVII, pp. 310 ff.
- 3 P.N. Bhattacharya, *op. cit.*, p. 78, text line 33.
- 4 *El.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 290-91, text lines 36-37.
- 5 Cf. *Paṇḍarī-bhūmitō = pakṛishṭa* in the Guakuchi plates of Indrapāla (P.N. Bhattacharya, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-37).
- 6 See *CH.*, III, p. 171, note 1.
- 7 *El.*, XXXI, pp. 28 (text line 22), 283, 288 (text line 24), 290 (text line 36).
- 8 *Op. cit.*, p. xiv.
- 9 *Early History of Kāmarūpa*, p. 149.
- 10 *Op. cit.*, p. 210.
- 11 See *JAIH.*, IX, p. 209; Maitreya, *Gauḍalēkhamālā*, p. 108.
- 12 For the reign period of Gōvindachandra, see *Ind. Cult.*, VII, pp. 405 ff.
- 13 Cf. *Prāgjyōtishēshu Durjay-ākhyā-puram = adhyuvāsa* (Bhattacharya, *op. cit.*, p. 97 (text line 40); cf. p. 111.
- 14 Cf. *rājñas = tasy = ā...nagarī Durjayā nāma* [*ibid.*, pp. 122, 136—verse 19].

3. ART OF DANCE IN THE TEMPLES OF TAMIL NADU-EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

A. N. PERUMAL

1. *Dance in Earlier Literatures :*

Dance as an art was not alien to the ancient Tamils. Many forms of dances in the name of küttus were in constant practice among them. Their ancient literary treasures reveal this fact by referring to them in ever so many places. As it is known from Saṅgam literature küttus like kuravai, tuṇṇakai, veṇṇi, veṇi, vaḷḷi, etc., were performed by them mostly during festive occasions. They were designed to honour the gods they were worshipping.

Śilappatikāram gives a vivid account of the dances to mark the prevalence of such performances among the various sets of people and to emphasize their importance in the society. The famous Eleven Atals and Śākkaikkūttu extolled in this epic deserve sufficient mention. Aḍiyārku-nallār, the renowned commentator to this epic, shows himself an exponent in giving detailed pieces of informations regarding the art of dance which were all in vogue during those times. The main division of the dances into vēttiyal and poduviyal is given with a stress in a suggestive manner. What Aḍiyārku-nallār gives in his commentary would help us to make out clearly what are succinctly referred to in the inscriptions.

2. *Epigraphical Evidences :*

During the Middle Ages Kings used to inscribe the important features of their

life and roles on stones. As dance was one of the items of life held in high esteem, it was referred to in many inscriptions. The different kinds of dance popularly performed in temples during festival days find expression in them. They serve as a useful source of information to know something about the art of dance during those times.

3. *Muttamiḷ :*

From Saṅgam Age onwards Tamil has been honoured as Muttamiḷ in consideration to its tripartite classification as Iyal, Iśai and Nāṭakam. As the last one includes Naṭaṇam in its fold, the references to Muttamiḷ call the attention of our enquiry about dances. The Tirukkōyilūr inscription of 'Kampaṇ Mūvēnda Vēḷāṇ' speaks about the proficiency of Kapilar in Muttamiḷ. Further it states about the talents of the dancing girls in addition to an account of the musical instruments they had used.¹ This inscription leaves sufficient room to think that dance occupied an important position among Muttamiḷ. The inscription of Śōṇāḍu Vaḷaṅgiyaruḷiya Sundara Pāṇḍiyaṇ found in the Pudukōṭṭai district also remarks about Muttamiḷ.² It is to be known that a person proficient in Muttamiḷ was highly respected by the king. According to one inscription the competence of Kōchchaḍaiyaparmarāṇa Tiripuvaṇachakkaravarttiḡaḷ Kulaśēkarattēvar in Iyal, Iśai and Nāṭakam is pointed out as something

praiseworthy.³ Nāṭakattamiḷ which includes dance was kept in par with the others if not more.

Śāntikkūttu :

The inscription of Tiruvēṅgaivāśal dated 1132 A. D. which falls in the fourteenth year of Vikkīramaśōḷaṅ's reign refers to Śāntikkūttu conducted nine times a year by Ēḷunāṭṭu Maṅgai. The dance was to be performed before the temple of Tiruvēṅgaivāyil Āṇḍār in Chittirai when the chief festival was in celebration. For the purpose, the dancing girl was given lands free of tax and, furthermore, in case of crop failures, it was ordered to give her grains and other materials through other sources.⁴ Such was the respect given to dance. It seems, the king had felt that the dance performances in the temple should not suffer under any circumstance.

In the same temple king Rājādhīrāja II states in another inscription that in order to perform Śāntikkūttu six times in the Tiruvādirai festival conducted in Vaikāśi, two dancing girls were given lands.⁵

The inscription of Sundarapāṇḍiyaṅ of the tenth year of his reign proclaims an allotment to a śāntikkūttāṅ called Aṇāchi Ariṭṭāṅ.⁶ Sundara Pāṇḍiyadēvar's inscription at Tiruveṅṅiyūr states about a kūttu called Śāntikkūṇippam.⁷ There may be some difference between this and śāntikkūttu. Perhaps this would be a developed form of the former one. When changes creep in, new forms can be evolved.

Śāntikkūttu as explained by Aḍiyārkkunallār is of four kinds namely Śokkam, Mey, Aṇṇayam and Nāṭakam. All these

aim at the successful progress of the hero. Aṇṇayam encompasses many forms of dance which give out certain emotional themes. Significant movements of the hands otherwise called 'Mudrās' specify the emotional outpour of the action. Aṇṇayam needs only a song for its presentation whereas Nāṭakam wants a story to play on the stage.

5. *Śākkaikkūttu :*

Śākkaikkūttu was very popular in Tamil Nadu till the end of Middle Ages. Many inscriptions in the famous temples refer to its presentation. The inscription of Rājēndra I, in his twentyninth year of reign at Kīḷappāvūr states that Śākkaikkūttu was conducted in the temple.⁸

The inscription of Kāmaraśavalli refers to Śākkai Mārāyaṅ Vikrama Śōḷaṅ who had received lands for performing Śākkai-kkūttu thrice in each of the Tiruvādirai festivals conducted in Mārgaḷi and Vaikāśi. The Kūttu was to be played before the Tirukkārkoṭṭiśvaramuḍaiyār temple.⁹

Another inscription in Kīḷappāvūr mentions that Ālaiyūr Śākkaiyaṅ was given gold and land to perform Śākkaikkūttu thrice a year.¹⁰

According to certain inscriptional evidences Śākkaikkūttar had played Āriya-kkūttu in various temples. For that they were given lands in the name of Śākkai-kkāṇi. This may give place to infer that both these dances would have been related with each other at least in certain respects.

During the reign of Āḍitya II it is stated in the Tiruviḍaimarudūr inscription

that the Tiruvellārai Sākkai had played Āriyakkūttu seven times a year in the presence of the king.¹¹ According to the Tiruvāḍuturai inscription of Rājarāja's ninth year of reign it is to be known that Sākkaikāṇi was given for a dancer to perform Āriyakkūttu before the king.¹² The epigraphical testimony given by Parakēśari Rājendra Śōḷaṅ states that Āraṅkam Āriyakkūttu was the representation of certain incidents of the puranic stories which were being played by a Sākkaiyaṅ called Kumāraṅ Śikaṅṅa during Puratṭāśi festival in the temple of Tiruvāḍuturai Ālvār. The dancer was given Sākkaikāṇi as a means to his livelihood.¹³

Sākkaikkūttu is more or less related to Koṭṭiśētam or Koṭukōṭṭi the celestial dance of Lord Śiva and Goddess Umā, performed to extol the burning of Tripura. The main purpose of Sākkaikkūttu was to please the king and the people. The best of the dancers was conferred the title of 'Sākkaimāraṅ'. Pirapantakkūttu, Naṅkiyārkūttu and Kūḍiyāṭṭam are three other famous forms of dance developed out of Sākkaikkūttu. Katakali which is very famous in Kerala may well be considered as an issue of Sākkaikkūttu.

6. Agamārggam or Meykkūttu :

According to the inscription of Rājarāja III in the Tiruverriyūr temple which falls in the 19th year of his reign, Agamārggam or Meykkūttu was conducted in the Rājarāja Tirumaṅṅapam on the eighth day of the Āvaṇi Festival.¹⁴ It is also specially pointed out that the performance was so fascinating and attractive that

the king was loud in his praises for the actor. The same kind of performance was also referred to in another inscription in the same temple by Vijayarājendra.¹⁵

7. Tamiḷkkūttu :

In an inscription of Kulōttuṅga I at Māṅampāḍi, we find a reference to Tamiḷkkūttu by Kūttukkāṇi.¹⁶ Nothing more can be evolved out of this inscription about Tamiḷkkūttu. A Tamil verse is seen inscribed in the Śikkanatasvāmi temple at Kuḍumiyāmalai which contains poetic imagery that may serve as material for a piece of enactment.¹⁷

8. Nāṭakam :

There are a few epigraphical instances which give evidence to the enactments of dramas in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Rājarāja I, in one of his inscriptions of the ninth year of his reign, refers to the enactment of Tirumūla Nāṭakam and also Āriyakkūttu. It is stated that Āriyakkūttu has seven features of its own.¹⁸

The Tiruppandaṅainallūr Paśupatiśvarar Temple inscription of Rājendra II in his tenth year mentions about a play called Rājarāja Nāṭakam. It is stated that Vikramādittaṅ Achchaṅṅa Rājarāja Nāṭakapperiyaṅ had inaugurated the play. 'Rājarāja Nāṭakapperiyaṅ' was the title conferred upon him considering his merits in conducting plays.¹⁹

From an inscription found in the Northern wall of the Taṅjāvūr Brihadīśvarar Temple, it is known that Rājarājēśvara Nāṭakam was enacted every year during the Vaikāśi Festivals. For enacting

the play Vijayarājendra and his troupe were paid in kind. This inscription is dated in 984 A. D. when Rājendra II was the ruler.²⁰

According to the Kaḍalūr inscription of 1119 A. D., Kamalālayapaṭṭar was allowed to enjoy some lands for performing Pūmpuliyūr Nāṭakam.²¹

As inscribed at Pattamaḍai in Tirunelveli district, a group of Dēvadāsigaḷ under Yaśodā enacted a play every year in the temple at Śrīvalliśvaram. For this they were given lands free of tax.²² The inscriptions at Tiruvalliśvaram, Tirukkaḷuṅkuṅṅam, Tirupādirippuliyūr and Āttūr also contain good evidences for dramatic performances in those temples.

9. Nāṭakachchālai :

During the Saṅgam period and epic age the stages were called as āḍukaḷam, araṅgam and avai. Peruṅkatai calls it as Kūttappaḷli or Kūttāḍum Iḍam.²³ In the Tiruviḍaimarudūr inscription theatres are mentioned as 'Nāṭakachchālai'.²⁴ Chōḷa rule was not an insular one. It was characterised by cultural contacts with several parts of India and even lands outside. During this period there are references to various types of theatres called 'Nāṅāvida-nāṭakachchālai'. It was possible for them to erect theatres on the standards prescribed in the books like Nāṭya Śāstra.²⁵ The Pāṇḍya kings also encouraged dances and constructed theatres called 'Nāṭakaśālai'.²⁶ Further there are dancing halls found in the famous temples. In the Ēkāmra-nāṭha temple at Kāñchīpuram it is called 'Nirutta-maṅṭapam' and at Tirukkuṅṅālam it is named 'Chittiraśālai'. At Suchindram

space inside the temple is called Nāṭakaśālai. It can be noticed that the dancing halls are located in such a place which can be easily accessible through the main gōpura-vāyil. Further there is sufficient space for the selected audience who were allowed to witness the performance.

10. Dancing Figures :

All round the temples there are sculptures exposing the various dance postures. The east and west gōpurams situated in the outer prākāra of the Chidambaram temple bear figures posing the 108 postures of dance with their names inscribed above each in grantha. These figures seem to have been engraved during the time of Kōpperuñjiṅgaṅ in the middle of the thirteenth century A. D.²⁷ In the Vimāṅam of the Big Temple at Tañjāvūr only 84 such figures are found while the others are left incomplete.

11. Conclusion :

From these epigraphical evidences, it is quite clear that the art of dance was held in high esteem both by the king and the people. Titles were conferred upon the best dancers. Tirunelvēli Uḍaiyār temple inscription speaks of a dancing girl known as Aḷagiya Perumāḷ Talaikkōli.²⁸ Here it is seen that the title 'Talaikkōli' is added with the name of the dancer. Royal patronage had fed the art sufficiently well and so it had thrived fully well. Various kūttus were in vogue, perhaps more developed and sophisticated than those mentioned in the earlier literatures. The themes of the dance performances were mostly puranic and they were ordinarily conducted in temples during festival times as part of the customary items in the celebration.

Foot-Notes:

1. *SII.*, III, No. 863, line 69-70 and 92-102.
2. *Ibid.*, V, No. 250.
3. *Ibid.*, V, No. 302.
4. Pudukkottai Inscriptions, 253 of 1914, No. 128.
5. *Ibid.*, 254 of 1914, No. 139.
6. *Ibid.*, 275.
7. *A.R.Ep.*, 1913, P. 127; 212 of 1912, No. 525.
8. 65 of 1914.
9. The Kāmarāṣavalli Inscriptions, 1915.
10. Inscription of Parakēsarivarmaṇ, 250 of 1926.
11. *SII.*, V, No. 718.
12. 120 of 1925.
13. Inscription of Parakēsari Rājendra Śōjaṇ, 120 of 1925.
14. *SII.*, I, 211 of 1912, No. 520.
15. *Ibid.*, 128 of 1912.
16. 90 of 1932.
17. 361 of 1930.
18. *SII.*, IV, Part V.
19. *A.R.Ep.*, 1931, 1932.
20. *SII.*, II, 67.
21. *A.R.Ep.*, 128 of 1995.
22. Pammal Sambanda Mudaliyar. Nāṭakattamiḷ, (1962) p. 51.
23. Peruṅkatai, Vattavakāṇḍam, 15 : 4, 147.
Naravāṇakāṇḍam, 15, 109.
24. Tiruviḍaimarudūr Inscription, *SII.*, III, No. 213.
25. Adya Rangacharya, Drama in Sanskrit Literature, p. 213.
26. Subject Index to the Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy
From 1887 to 1936, C.R. Krishnamacharlu, 30, 12.
27. *SITI.*, III, Para II, p. 185.
28. *SII.*, V, No. 430.

4. WERE MADHAVAVARMAN I AND TIVARADEVA CONTEMPORARIES?

Ajay Mitra Shastri

In a paper entitled 'The Date of Tivāradēva' published in an earlier volume of this journal¹ V.V. Mirashi has taken exception to some of my observations on the question of the supposed contemporaneity of the Pāṇḍuvarṁśī king Tivāradēva and the Vishṇukunḍin ruler Mādhavarman I.² While doing so he has only reiterated his earlier views without citing any new evidence and giving thought to the points made out by me on the basis of some new evidence that has come to light of late. It has to be pointed out that in my paper 'A Note on the Ipur and Polamuru Plates of Vishṇukunḍin Mādhavarman I' published in the *Srī Mallampalli Somashekhara Sarma Commemoration Volume*,³ which is the target of Mirashi's criticism, my object was only to ascertain if the expression *Trivara-nagara* occurring in these epigraphs could be interpreted to mean 'the city of Tivāradēva' and it was in this connection that, on the basis of the evidence afforded by the Tummalagudem plates of Vikramēndravarmān II, I had invited attention to the difficulties involved in accepting the contemporaneity of Tivāradēva and Mādhavarman I and while doing so I had taken for granted the date for the former proposed by Mirashi. It was not my intention to go into the question of the date of Tivāradēva. However, now that the question has been raised again, it will be desirable to discuss the issue at some length.

Mirashi has discussed the date of Tivāradēva at several places and suggested various dates, viz., 534-550,⁴ 560-575,⁵ 550-565⁶ and 535-555 A.D.⁷ He is now in favour of the view that Tivāradēva's reign commenced in 520 A.D.⁸ This antedating is due to his anxiety to reinforce his position that Tivāradēva and Mādhavarman I were contemporaries. But, while suggesting this new date Mirashi seems to have ignored most of the new material bearing on the question that has come to light in recent years. It is therefore proposed to dilate upon the question in the light of this new evidence. First, let us try to ascertain when Mādhavarman I flourished.

All the records of the Vishṇukunḍins with the solitary exception of the Tummalagudem plates of Vikramēndravarmān II, the last known member of the dynasty, are dated in the regnal years of the issuing chiefs and as such the dates of the different members of the family were fixed tentatively on the basis of some extraneous considerations prior to the discovery of the Tummalagudem plates. The discovery of the Tummalagudem plates issued by Vikramēndravarmān II in Śaka 488 expired or 566-67 A.D. has put Vishṇukunḍin chronology on a more solid basis. As Śaka 488 is said to have been the 11th year of Vikramēndravarmān's reign his accession evidently took place sometime in

555-556 A.D. He was preceded on the throne by his father Indravarman whose latest known date is the 27th year of his reign when he issued his Ramatirtham plates. Even if it is held that his reign did not extend beyond the 27th year, his accession cannot be dated later than 528-529 A.D. Some scholars are of the opinion that his father Vikramēndravarman I did not rule as he predeceased his father who had a rather long reign of over forty years.⁹ But this surmise cannot be taken seriously in view of the fact that in the records of his successors Vikramēndravarman I is given the regal titles *Rājan*¹⁰ and *Mahārāja*¹¹ which should leave no doubt about his accession even though no record of his own reign has been reported so far.¹² Even assuming that he had a short reign of about a decade, his accession could not have taken place later than 518-519 A.D. His father Mādhavavarman I ruled for at least forty or forty-eight years depending upon the reading of the date of the Polamuru plates.¹³ His accession therefore cannot be placed later than 478-479 or 470 A.D.¹⁴ In any case it is apparent that the close of his reign cannot be dated later than 518-519 A.D.¹⁵ The allusion to his dalliances with the ladies at *trivara-nagara* is first met with in his Ipur plates issued in the 37th year of his reign. This event therefore must have taken place in or prior to 515-516 A.D. If the expression *trivara-nagara* has to be taken as referring to Tivaradēva the latter will have to be shown to have assumed regal power before this date. Let us therefore examine the evidence for the date of Tivaradēva.

It must be admitted at the very outset that the evidence bearing on this question available at present is not of such a nature as to allow us to fix an exact date. No record of either Tivaradēva himself or any of his

successors dated in any well-known reckoning has been found so far. All these rulers dated their records in regnal years without reference to any era. We have therefore to depend on some extraneous considerations while dealing with the present issue. It is now admitted that the Pāṇḍava family, to which Tivaradēva belonged, came to power in South Kōsala after the Śarabhapurīyas. We must therefore first ascertain the period of the rule of the Śarabhapura kings. The first member of the dynasty known from its records was Śarabha who founded its early capital and named the same after himself. He is generally identified with Śarabharāja, the maternal grandfather of Goparāja who, according to an Ēraṇ inscription dated 510 A.D., died in a fierce battle fighting for his friend Bhānugupta¹⁶. Śarabha may therefore be placed in the last quarter of the fifth century A.D. Śarabha's son Narēndra ruled for about twenty-five years, the latest known years of his reign being 24th.¹⁷ His reign may therefore be placed from c. 500 to 525 A.D. The next known member of the family is Prasanna or Prasannamātra who issued repousse coins and is also mentioned in the seal-inscriptions of his son Jayarāja and grandson Sudēvarāja. As no record of his own reign has been found so far, it is difficult to ascertain the length of his reign. But assuming that he was the immediate successor of Narēndra and had a reign of some twenty-five years, his reign may be dated in 525-550 A.D. The latest known date of Prasannamātra's son and successor Jayarāja is his 9th regnal year. His reign may therefore be justifiably supposed to have lasted for about ten years from c. 550 to c. 560 A.D. Jayarāja appears to have been followed by his brother Mānamātra alias Durgarāja who is known from the Mahasamund¹⁸ and Kauvatal¹⁹ plates of his son and

successor Sudēvarāja as well as from the inscriptions on the seals attached to the same monarch's Nahna²⁰ and Arang plates.²¹ The employment of the prefix *mahat* to his name in the Mahasamund and Kouvatal plates should leave no room for doubt that he did ascend the throne. But as no record of his own reign has been reported so far, it is not possible to ascertain the exact length of his reign. However, assuming that he too ruled for about ten years, his reign may be supposed to have terminated about 570 A.D. Sudēvarāja, son and successor of Mānamātra-Durgarāja, is known from numerous records of his own reign and his latest known date is the tenth year of his reign when his Raipur plates were issued.²² Even if it is supposed that this was the closing year of his reign, he could not have ceased to rule before 580 A.D. Sudēvarāja was succeeded by his brother Pravaraarāja who is known from two copper-plate charters both of which were issued in the third year of his reign.²³ If he, too, is taken to have ruled for a short period of ten years, the end of his regnal period may be placed around 590 A.D.²⁴ Pravaraarāja is the last known member of the dynasty and nothing is known about the history of the Śarabhapuriyas thereafter. Even assuming that the rule of the family ended with Pravaraarāja who was overthrown by Pāṇḍuvamśa and that the Pāṇḍava king who ousted Pravaraarāja was none else than Tīvaradēva, the commencement of the latter's reign cannot be dated before the closing years of the 6th century A.D. It seems, however, that Tīvaradēva did not come to the throne immediately after Pravaraarāja and that the two were separated from each other by a sufficiently long interval of time.

There is sufficient evidence to show that members of the Pāṇḍava dynasty

ruled over South Kōsala for quite some time before Tīvaradēva. Reference must be made in this connection to the afore-said Mahasamund and Kouvatal grants of Sudēvarāja wherein a certain Indrabalarāja, styled *mahāsāmanta*, figures as occupying the office of *Sarvādhikārādhikṛita*. It is not possible in the present state of insufficient information to ascertain the identity of this Indrabalarāja. But he is generally identified with Indrabala, son of the first known Pāṇḍavavamśī ruler Udayana and grandfather of Tīvaradēva. In case this identification is accepted, Tīvaradēva's grandfather Indrabala will have to be regarded as occupying a subordinate though important position under Sudēvarāja till the latter's closing years. But we have enough evidence to prove that he also ruled as a sovereign ruler for some time in South Kōsala. In a fragmentary lithic record put up by Īśānadēva in the Lakshmaṇēśvara temple at Kharod, about two miles to the north of Sheorinarayan in the Bilaspur District of Madhya Pradesh, his father Indrabala is described as one whose lotus-feet were adorned with the crest-jewels of all the monarchs.²⁵ He founded a town, christened Indrapura after his own name, which is spoken of as the headquarters of a district (*vishaya*) in the same record. His son Īśānadēva erected the temple of Lakshmaṇēśvara (now known as Lakhanēśvara) at Kharod and gave a few villages for its maintenace.²⁶ It will thus follow that Indrabala began his career as a subordinate chief under Sudēvarāja and ruled as a sovereign ruler after Pravaraarāja, and that he was succeeded by his son Īśānadēva. Another son of Indrabala, Nannarāja, is also known to have ruled in South Kōsala. There is

considerable difference of opinion about the exact findspot of the Raipur Museum stone inscription²⁷ of Nannarāja (called Nannarājādhirāja), some holding that it was found at Bhandak (modern Bhadrāvati) in the Chanda District of the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra and others regarding Ratanpur in the Bilaspur District or Arang in the Raipur District of Madhya Pradesh as its provenance. But it appears from Vinayakrao Aurangabadkar's testimony that the record was in all probability found at Arang.²⁸ This inscription was put up during the reign of Nannarāja, styled Nannarājādhirāja, who is undoubtedly the same as the homonymous grandson of Udayana and father of Tivaradēva. The record further shows that another grandson of Udayana, Bhavadēva Raṇakēśarin, also ruled in Kōsala. We may reasonably assign a period of a minimum of about forty years for the rule of Indrabala, Īśānadēva and Nannarāja, the latter's reign terminating around 630 A.D.²⁹

Attention may be invited to a few other points which may lead one to date the accession of Tivaradēva still later. The Mallar plates of Vyāghrarāja show that a family known as Amarārya-kula ruled in South Kōsala for some time after the Śarabhauriyas. Three members of this family are known, viz., Jayabhāṭṭāraka and his sons Pravara-bhāṭṭāraka and Vyāghrarāja. The plates were issued by Vyāghrarāja, but the wording of the record seems to indicate that his elder brother Pravara-bhāṭṭāraka was the ruler at the time. The date of the record has been variously read as year 41 or 4. The title *bhāṭṭāraka* suffixed to the name of

Jaya shows that he preceded Pravara in the rule over South Kōsala.³⁰ Provision will have to be made for the rule of these two chiefs before the reigns of the members of Udayana's line.

Of late, a copper-plate charter of Śūrabala,³¹ the Pāṇḍuvamśi king of Mēkalā, and a stray plate of another charter of the same dynasty³² have been reported from Malhar in the Bilaspur District of Madhya Pradesh where a large number of Śarabhauriya and Pāṇḍuvamśi charters have also been found. One of the villages referred to in the stray plate has also been located in the surrounding area.³³ This should leave no room for doubt that South Kōsala passed on to the Pāṇḍuvamśis of Mēkalā during the reign of the last known member of the family, Śūrabala Udīrṇavaira. In all likelihood this event took place before South Kōsala came under the possession of the Pāṇḍavas of Udayana's line.

If we make a provision of a period of about thirty years for the rule of the Amarārya-kula and Śūrabala also, the beginning of the reign of Tivaradēva would have to be dated in the second half of the seventh century A.D.³⁴

It will follow from the foregoing discussion that Tivaradēva and Vishṇukunḍin Mādhavavarman I could not be contemporaries as they were removed from each other by a long period of more than a century. For, while the latest date for the close of Mādhavavarman's reign is, as shown above, 518-19 A.D., the reign of Tivaradeva could not have commenced prior to the latter half of the seventh century A.D. And as such

the expression *Trivara-nagara* met with in the Vishṇukuṇḍin record cannot be construed as referring to Tīvaradēva.³⁵

Even if we were to accept Mirashi's date for the close of Mādhavarman's rule and share his view that Tīvaradēva came to power immediately after the Śarabhapuriya chief Pravara-rāja, Tīvaradēva cannot be brought so early as to become a contemporary of Mādhavarman I if only we were to take into account the known regnal years of the Śarabhapuriya chiefs altogether ignoring the possibility of the continuation of the reigns beyond recorded years and make only a nominal provision for the reigns of those chiefs whose dated records have yet to be found. Mirashi places the first known Śarabhapura chief Śarabha or Śarabharāja in *circa*

460-480 A.D., which, though much too early, may be accepted for argument's sake. The recorded reigns of his descendants amount to fortysix years (Narēndra 24, Jayarāja 9, Sudēvarāja 10 and Pravara-rāja 3). We know of two more Śarabhapuriya chiefs, viz., Prasannamātra and Mānamātra-Durgarāja, who certainly ruled but whose records have not been reported so far. If they are assigned a reign of ten years each, we get in all sixtysix years which intervened between Śarabharāja and Tīvaradēva. The accession of the latter, therefore, cannot be placed prior to 546 A.D. It is thus obvious that a considerably long period of time intervened between the end of Mādhavarman's reign and the commencement of Tīvaradēva's.

Foot Notes

1. *JESI.*, iv, pp. 1-5.
2. *Sri Mallampalli Somashekhara Sarma Commemoration Volume (JAHS, xxxv)*, pp. 165-168.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *EL.*, xxii, p. 19. In *Studies in Indology*, i (2nd ed., 1967), p. 251, fn. 2, however, this date is given as 500-550 A. D.
5. *EL.*, xxvi, p. 229. Also see *Studies in Indology*, i (1st ed., 1960), p. 234, fn. 2.
6. *Ganganatha Jha Commemoration Volume*, pp. 223 ff. ; *Studies in Indology*, i (2nd ed.), p. 240.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
8. *JESI.*, iv, pp. 1-5.
9. According to K. V. Lakshman Rao (*Journal of the Department of Letters*, xi, p. 61, text—line 41) and R. Subba Rao (*JAHS.*, vi, p. 22) the year mentioned in the Polamuru plates of Mādhavarman I is 48, whereas D. C. Sircar (*Successors of the Satavahanas in the Deccan*, p. 339) is in favour of reading it as 40. Sircar's reading is followed by Mirashi.
10. In the Ramatirtham grant of his son Indrabhattāarakavarman.
11. In Vikramēndravarman's Tummalagudem plates. See *JIH.*, xliii, p. 734, text line 10.
12. Mirashi (*EL.*, xxii, p. 20; *Studies in Indology*, i, pp. 212-13) believes that Vikramēndravarman I did not rule and thinks that the regal titles may have been used for him by way of courtesy (*JESI.*, iv, p. 5, fn. 24). This insistence, which is motivated by his anxiety to establish the contemporaneity of Mādhavarman I and Tīvaradēva, has no place in any scientific discussion.
13. For the difference of opinion about the reading of the year, see note 9 above.

14. In my paper in *JAHRS.*, xxxv these dates are wrongly printed as 489-90 and 482 respectively (*ibid.*, p. 167). There are a few other misprints also.
15. Mirashi brings down this date by omitting the reign of Vikramēndravarma I, which is unwarranted. In case some margin is made for the continuation of the reign of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman beyond his latest known date, the termination of the reign of Mādhavavarman I will have to be placed a few years earlier.
16. *CII.*, iii, pp. 91-93.
17. His Kurud plates were issued in this year. See *EI.*, xxxi, pp. 263-66.
18. Information about these plates, which are yet to be published, has been kindly supplied by my friend Shri B. C. Jain, Dy. Director of Archaeology, Madhya Pradesh.
19. *EI.*, xxxi, pp. 314-16.
20. These plates are commonly called Khariar plates. But as they are known to have been found at Nahna (or Naina), we prefer to call them Nahna plates. See *ibid.*, xxix, pp. 170-73.
21. *Ibid.*, xxxiii, pp. 18-22.
22. *CII.*, iii, pp. 196-200.
23. *EI.*, xxii, pp. 15-23; xxxiv, pp. 51-52.
24. While calculating the reigns of the Śarabhapura kings, we have ignored the reigns of the Amarāryakula kings known from the Mallar plates of Vyāghrarāja (*ibid.*, xxxiv, pp. 45-50), for in our opinion these rulers belonged to a different family.
25. Line 22 of this unpublished record is transcribed by Mirashi (*Studies in Indology*, i. p. 258, fn. 1) as follows :- *sarvv-āvan-iśvara-śirō-maṇi-rāji-rājat=pād-āmbujaḥ śaśi-kul-āmbara-pūrṇa-chandraḥ Āsīd=bhuvah patih.....pāstā-ripur=Indrabal=ābhidhanāḥ*. Also see Hira Lal, *Inscriptions in the Central Provinces and Berar*, 2nd ed., 1932, p. 125, no. 208.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Kielhorn called it Nagpur Museum inscription; but it is now deposited in the M.G.M. Museum, Raipur.
28. We propose to discuss this and allied questions elsewhere.
29. Once Mirashi also realised the necessity of assigning a few years (about 30 years) to the reigns of Tivaradēva's predecessors; but now he has altogether ignored it. See *EI.*, xxvi, p. 229 and *JESI.*, iv, pp. 1-2.
30. We do not accept the view that Jaya-bhaṭṭāraka and Pravara-bhaṭṭāraka are the same as the Śarabhapura kings Jayarāja and Pravararāja.
31. *Studies in Indian Epigraphy*, (*JESI.*), iii, pp. 183-89.
32. *ABORI.*, *Diamond Jubilee Volume*, pp. 433-437.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 435.
34. If Bhīmasēna II of the Rājarshitulya-kula, known from his Arang plates, issued in the Gupta year 282 (= 601), also ruled in South Kōsala, some provision will have to be made for his reign also. For his record, see *EI.*, ix, pp. 342 ff.
35. For other points in support of this position, see *JAHRS.*, xxxv., pp. 165-68.

5. ANATOMY OF POLITICAL ALLIANCE FROM TEMPLE RECORDS OF TIRUNAVALUR AND TIRUVORRIYUR

M.G.S. Narayanan

It is well known that by the tenth century the most significant factor in South Indian history was the Chōḷa empire. Every other power in this region had to define its relations with the Chōḷas, and the fortunes of others depended largely on the nature of this relationship. During the first half of the tenth century when the expanding Chōḷa empire swallowed the Pallava and Pāṇḍya kingdoms and confronted the Rāshtrakūṭas of Deccan, the Chēras of Makōtai on the West coast maintained friendly political relations with the Chōḷa power. This relation was further cemented by a royal marriage and put to test in the joint military action against a common enemy in the form of the Rāshtrakūṭa empire.

Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri's work on the Chōḷas remains the standard work of reference on the subject even to this day. However, it may be noted that Prof. Sastri knew practically nothing about the existence of the Chēra kingdom of Makōtai. Although a few Chēra inscriptions were published in the *Travancore Archaeological Series* and *South Indian Inscriptions*, they had not been studied properly at the time when Prof. Sastri prepared his monumental volumes on the Pāṇḍyas and Chōḷas and the History of South India as a whole.¹ In spite of this difficulty Prof. Sastri has been able to bring to notice a few important inscriptions which reveal the

significance of the Chēra-Chōḷa relationship of the tenth century, but a clear picture of the alliance could not be presented in his works in the absence of details on the history of Kerala. The present paper attempts to put together the evidence of these inscriptions in order to have a fresh view of the situation. Collectively they are able to provide a glimpse of the anatomy of Chēra-Chōḷa alliance in the period of the ill-fated conflict with the Rāshtrakūṭa empire.

The earliest record pointing to the Chēra-Chōḷa friendship is an undated inscription from Tillaisthānam temple.² This records a gift by Kadamba Mādēvi, on whose husband Vikki Aṅṅan, the two monarchs jointly conferred the personal privileges of the throne, chauri, palanquine, drum, a palace, ponakam (?) bugle, elephant corps and the hereditary title of "Sembiyan Tamiḷavēḷ". Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri had identified the Chōḷa counterpart of the Chēra king Sthāṇu Ravi of this period as Āditya Chōḷa.³ However the discovery of the name and titles of Śrikanṭha Chōḷa of the Pottapi line by Prof. T.V. Mahalingam has enabled us to see that the Chōḷa partner was not Āditya Chōḷa but Śrikanṭha Chōḷa since the Tillaisthānam record clearly mentions him as "Rājakēsari" and "Toṇḍaināḍu-pāvina Chōḷan Palyānai Kōkkaṇḍan".⁴ Incidentally we know from other sources that the regnal period of Sthāṇu Ravi

begins in 844 A.D. while that of Śrīkaṅṭha Chōḷa ends in 845 A.D. Therefore it is now possible to pin down the joint military action mentioned in the undated Tillaisthānam record to 844-45 A.D.⁵

In this connection, the next thing that we know about is marriage between Vīra Chōḷa or Parāntaka Chōḷa (907-55 A.D.) and a Chēra princess called Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ. This marriage is celebrated in the Udayendiram plates of Pṛithvīpathi II Hastimalla⁶. Kō Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ is distinctly mentioned as the mother of Rājāditya Chōḷa, who was crown prince under Parāntaka Chōḷa, in an inscription of the 28th year of Parāntaka from Tirunāmanallūr temple⁷.

Prof. K.A.N. Sastri has taken Kō Kiḷān to be the personal name of the queen of Parāntaka Chōḷa⁸. This does not appear to be true. Another Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ is mentioned as the daughter of Chēra king Kulaśēkhara-dēva and wife of his successor Vijayarāga-dēva in a record of this period from Tirunandikkara⁹.

Another person called Perumāṭṭiyār Chatiraśikhāmaṇi alias Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ is mentioned as the royal donor in a record of Tikkakara temple in Kerala.¹⁰ From these it may be safely inferred that Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ was a common title of Chēra princesses in Kerala. In the light of this knowledge we may suggest that Kō Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ, mother of Rājāditya mentioned in the Tirunāmanallūr inscription of the 28th year of Parāntaka Chōḷa, was identical with Ravi Nīli, daughter of Kēraḷarāja Vijayarāga or Chēramānār Vijayarāgadēva, who appears as the donor in a Tiruvorriyūr inscription of the 29th year of Parāntaka Chōḷa.¹¹ Thus we derive the information that Parāntaka Chōḷa had married Ravi Nīli alias Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ,

daughter of the Chēra king Vijayarāga (883-c 913 A.D.) and granddaughter of the Chēra king Sthāṇu Ravi Kulaśēkhara (844-883 A.D.) quite early in his life and that the crown prince Rājāditya was an offspring of this Chēra-Chōḷa matrimonial alliance. It is now clear that military collaboration between the Chēras and the Chōḷas in the time of Sthāṇu Ravi had been strengthened by a marriage alliance in the time of his successor Vijayarāga. It is not surprising that in the absence of detailed information regarding the Chēras of Makōtai, Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri was unable to place this relationship in perspective. He could not see the identity of Ravi Nīli and Kō Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ and he considered as "doubtful" Gopinatha Rao's view that Parāntaka and his Chēra queen are named as Vīra Chōḷa and Kiḷān Aḍigaḷ in the Huzur Treasury Plates of Tiruvalla.¹² In fact the new facts which came to light subsequently have provided support to Gopinatha Rao's inference.

In spite of incorrect identification of Chēra Princesses and inadequate information regarding the fortunes of the Chēra kingdom Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri has pointed out, with brilliant insight, the fact that the Chēra-Chōḷa marriage alliance, "contracted possibly in Āditya's life time, not only gave proof of the friendly political relations that obtained between the Chōḷa and Kerala rulers, but apparently furnished the occasion for a large influx of Malaiyāḷis into the Chōḷa country in search of service under the king and his sons." He also remarked correctly that "Veḷḷan Kumaran, the Kerala general of Rājāditya, who built a temple at Grāmam was only the leading example of a large class of less known immigrants figuring as donors of small chartiable gifts in the inscriptions of

the period.¹³ Again, with more informations about the Kerala side from the epigraphic records of the Chēras of Makōtai, we are now enabled to comprehend better the political and social implications of the names of these Malaiyāḷi donors in Chōḷa temples. They really offer something more than a picture of a large influx of Malaiyāḷis into the Chōḷa country in search of service under the king and his sons. They show that the Chēra king had not only given his daughter in marriage to the Chōḷa king but also sent a selected band of princelings from the families of his feudatories who were Nāḍuvāḷis in the different districts of Kerala to serve as companions for his grandson Rājāditya who became the Chōḷa crown prince. These people were not seeking an opportunity for service under the Chōḷa king as we understand the search for employment in the modern sense. They were not even adventurers who found a place in the Chōḷa military organisation. As members of the aristocratic ruling families of Kerala, they were probably fulfilling their hereditary feudal obligations towards their own sovereign, the Chēra king, who nominated them as the companions of his grandson, so that they may serve him in war and peace.

The leader of this group was evidently Veḷḷan Kumaran. As pointed out already by Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri earlier, this Kerala general of Rājāditya was present at Grāmam as early as 936 A.D. where seven years later he constructed a stone temple to Śiva on the banks of the Peṇṇār.¹⁴ Tirunāvalūr, a village near Grāmam, was the headquarters of Rājāditya for many years and it was called Rājādittapuram till about A.D. 1140 in records.¹⁵ This is also the place where we come across a large group of

inscriptions in which Malaiyāḷi officers figure as donors to the temple.

Prof. V. Raghavan has placed the students of South Indian history under a debt of obligation by proving the identity of Veḷḷan Kumaran of the two Grāmam records, the Kerala general of Rājāditya, with Chaturānana Paṇḍita I of Tiruvorṅgiyūr who figures in two inscriptions of that place.¹⁶ With this achievement we have got a rare opportunity to follow the strange career of a warrior-turned-ascetic through the records of different stages in his life. The first record of Grāmam, dated in the 29th year of Parāntaka, registers a gift of sheep for lamp in the shrine of Śrīmūlasthānattu Mahādēva at Āṅṅuttalī in Tirumuṭṭiyūr, by Veḷḷan Kumaran of Nandikkarai Puttūr in Malaināḍu, a general of Rājāditya.¹⁷ The second record from Grāmam dated in the 36th year of Parāntaka, (Kali year 4044, Kali day 1477037) states that Veḷḷan Kumaran, the Kerala general of prince Rājāditya, built a stone temple of Śiva (Āṅṅuttalī Mahādēva) at Mauligrāma (Tirumuṭṭiyūr) on the river Peṇṇai. Terms like “Chamūnāyaka”, “Chōḷargaḷ Mūlabhṛitya” and “Perumpaḍai Nāyaka” are used as titles of Veḷḷan Kumaran. He is also called “Uttamaḷ Kēraḷānām” or the best of Keralites. His birth place is mentioned as Puttūr.¹⁸ This Nandikkarai Puttūr may be identified as Nandikkara, near Irinjālakkūḍa in the old Vaḷḷuvanāḍ district of the Chēra country or Kerala.

The third record from Tiruvorṅgiyūr near Madras simply mentions Chaturānana Paṇḍita as the recipient of a donation to the local temple in the 18th year of Kṛishṇa III Rāshṭrakūṭa.¹⁹ The fourth record, also from Tiruvorṅgiyūr, is dated in the 20th year of

Krishna III (959 A.D.) and gives the autobiography of Veḷḷan Kumaran composed long after he had become an ascetic under the adopted name of Chaturānana Paṇḍita.¹⁰ The meaning of certain passages in this record was completely misunderstood by some early scholars who took the term "Vallabha Rāshṭrānātha" to indicate the Rāshṭrakuta ruler and inferred that a certain Chōḷa general of Rājāditya betrayed his masters and went over to the Rāshṭrakūṭa (Vallabha) side.¹¹

Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri came nearer to the truth when he emphasised the term Kerala in the Paṇḍita's autobiography and assumed that he was born in a family of local chieftains in Kerala.¹² Evidently he did not grasp the fact that the name of the donor as mentioned in this record, i.e. "Vallabhō Guhābha" was a Sanskritised and poetic expression for the name "Veḷḷan Kumaran". He did not have materials before him to show that Vaḷḷuvanāḍ was a Nāḍu or Rāshṭra in the Kerala kingdom of that period, that it was governed by a family of hereditary chieftains under the Chēra king, and that these chieftains had the hereditary title of Rāyira or Rājaśekhara which is mentioned in this particular inscription.¹³ However, with the unerring instinct of a great historian he observed in a foot note that "one wonders if this man was the same as Veḷḷan Kumaran, the Kerala general of Rājāditya, who built the Śiva temple at Grāmam, and was the most prominent among the numberless Kerala servants of Rājāditya."¹⁴ The text of the inscription has subsequently been properly edited and the controversial points clarified by Dr. V. Raghavan.¹⁵ When we remember that a village called Nandikkārai Puttūr existed in Vaḷḷuvanāḍ in Kerala and that the Nāḍuvāḷi of Vaḷḷuvanāḍ under the

Chēra sovereigns possessed the hereditary title of Rājaśekhara we have to agree that Dr. V. Raghavan's identification of Veḷḷan Kumaran as Chaturānana Paṇḍita is fully confirmed by clear epigraphic evidence. This incidentally reveals the feudal character of the political structure and political relations of the period under discussion. It was evidently the feudatory status of the ruler of Vaḷḷuvanāḍ under the Chēra king that required him to send his son to the court of the Chēra-Chōḷa prince Rājāditya at a very young age.

This Tiruvorriyūr inscription of the 20th year of Kṛishṇa III says that Vallabha, resembling Guha (Kumaran or Subrahmaṇya) son of Rajaśekhara (this applies to the ruler of Vaḷḷuvanāḍ as well as to Śiva) who was governor of Vallabha-rāshṭra in Kerala, went to Chōḷadēśa after learning all that was to be learnt (samasta-vidyā) and became the loyal servant of prince Rājāditya. He is described as a favourite of the goddess of prosperity and a well wisher of all the people. He offered high devotion and loyalty (Gurusēvā and Sāmantabhāva) in the service of the prince. He was unable to achieve the bliss of death in the company of his master (Sahamaraṇa-sukham) on account of his absence. This is obviously a reference to the tragic circumstances of the death of prince Rājāditya at the battle of Takkōlam (949 A.D.) where the Ganga prince Būtuga jumped on to the back of his elephant and killed him by surprise. The following sentence reflects the intense frustration of a loyal companion of honour who was duty-bound to die with his master on the field of battle.¹⁶

The old general recalls in one pithy sentence that he was upset because his action was unbecoming of his caste (jāti), family

(anvaya), father (tāta) and master (bhartā). Most probably this son of the Vaḷḷuvanāḍ Rāja hailed from an aristocratic Nāyar family which supplied wives to the governing families and companions of honour to the princes according to the practice which was common in medieval Kerala. This event was a turning point in the career of the general who had reached the top of his profession. At this point his natural piety which had expressed itself in the construction of temples earlier, came to his rescue. He renounced the world (Virāgatām-upagataḥ), purified himself by a trip to Prayāga (snātas-trimārgāmbhasi) and finally accepted the discipleship of Nirañjana Guru the lord of Ādhigrāma (Orriyūr) and the name of Chaturānana. He reveals all these facts on the occasion of a gift of 100 nishkas of gold to Narasimhamāṅgala-sabhā on his birthday on Dhanisṭhā nakshatra.

This unusual autobiographical record of the former Kerala general turned into ascetic, expressed in four elegant ślōkas in Sanskrit, throws a flood of light into the process of recruitment of the generals and the conditions of their service. At least in the case of two other Malaiyāḷi military officers attached to Rājāditya, we know that they were similarly drawn from the aristocratic ruling elite of Kerala. The names found in a group are those of Malaiyāḷan Māḷuvachchār Aṭṭan-kan Chāttan, Malaiyāḷan Neḍuṅkālāināṭṭu Īśānamaṅgalattu Mānavallan Kaṇṇan, Malaiyāḷan Iravi kōdai, Malaiyāḷan Neḍumpuraiyūr Nāṭṭil Vakkanāṭṭu Mankarai Kaṇṭan Kāman, Malaināṭṭu Kaṇṭiyūr Vēḷkulasundaran, Malaiyāḷa-parivārattu Chēvakan Tirukkuṅṅappaḷa Chēnta Kumaran, and

Malaināṭṭu Maḍaivāḷkai Iyakkan Irāman.⁸⁷ The title Māḷuvachchār is reminiscent of the title Maluvakkan used by the hereditary governors of Kīḷmalaināḍ in Kerala.⁸⁸ The title of Vēḷkulasundaram appears in the signature of the Vēnāḍ governor in the Syriyan Christian copper plates.⁸⁹ These two persons also must be sons of the feudatories of Kīḷmalaināḍ and Vēnāḍ respectively. There is no information about the status of others but the three cases would indicate that the Chēra king had organised a few selected young men of aristocratic birth to act as the companions and servants (Sāmantas and Sēvakas) of the Chōḷa prince. That they proved their merit in faithful service for long years may be deduced from the high rank of Veḷḷan Kumaran and the rich donations offered by the other Malaiyāḷis to the temple. Besides these, Kīḷān Aḍigaḷ, mother of Rājāditya built the stone temple (Kaṅṅaḷi) of Tiruttoṅṅiśvara.⁹⁰ Her female servant (Parivārattā) Chitrakōmaḷam donated 90 sheep and an Īḷa-viḷakku to the temple.

It may be gathered from this brief survey of epigraphic records that Rājāditya's retinue included a good number of Malaiyāḷis who were selected from among the feudatories of the kings of Kerala. This complex of temple records would show how the feudal political hierarchy operated in the organisation of the army in the context of the Chōḷa-Chēra alliance. They also reveal partly the complicated matrix of loyalty and service in which royal matrimonial relations, piety, feudal obligations, military needs and personal sense of honour played their part in conformity with the accepted values of the age.

Foot Notes

1. It is only in the fifties and sixties of the present century that Prof. Elamkulam P.N. Kunjan Pillai brought out his papers on the later Chēra period which were translated into English later under the title "*Studies in Kerala History*", Kottayam, 1970.
2. 286 of 1911; *AREp.*, 1912, II, 11.
3. *The Chōlas*, p. 115. See Also T.A. Gopinath Rao, *T.A.S.*, II pp 76-77; Elamkulam, *Ēṭukaḷ*, p. 99.
4. T.V. Mahalingam "An Interregnum in Palliava History" *Journal of Indian History*, XLI-I, pp. 297-303.
5. M.G.S. Narayanan, "Political and Social Conditions of Kerala-c. 800-1124 A.D." (Unpublished Thesis, Kerala University, 1973). *Political History, Chēra-Chōḷa entente.*
6. *South Indian Inscriptions*, II, III, No. 76, Verse 8, pp. 383.
7. 335 of 1902; *EI.*, VII, p. 133.
8. *The Chōlas*, p 134.
9. *TAS.*, IV, No. 36, pp. 144-145. The relationship probably suggests the matrilineal form of succession as the nephew might have married his uncle's daughter following as old custom in Kerala.
10. *TAS.*, III, No 36, pp. 169-171
11. No. 169 of 1912; *SII*, III, No. 103, pp. 235-236.
12. *The Chōlas*, pp. 134-139:
13. *The Chōlas*, pp. 139.
14. No. 739 of 1905; *The Chōlas*, p. 129; No. 732 of 1905 dated Saturday 14th January, A. D. 943
The Chōlas, pp. 129:
15. No. 374 of 1902.
16. *E.I.* XXVI, pp. 239 ff
17. See Note 14 above.
18. See Note 12 above.
19. No. 177 of 1912.
20. No. 181 of 1912.
21. *ARSIE.*, 1913, pp. 93-94; *MJOR*, VI, pp. 229-532.
22. *The Chōlas*. pp. 649.
23. The matters are brought out in my unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. See note No. 5 above.
24. *The Chōlas* p. 665.
25. See Note No. 16 above.
26. See M. G. S. Narayanan "The Institution of Companions of Honour", *Journal of Indian History*, Golden Jubilee Volume, 1973.
27. Nos. 326, 329, 331a, 337, 341, 343 and 346 of 1902; See *SII.*, VII, Nos. 955, 958, 960, 967, 971, 973 and 976, pp 446-471.
28. See Trikkākkara and Trikkāḍittānam inscriptions of Mājuvakkōnār. *TAS.*, III, pp. 188-189. No. 47 and *TAS.*, V, No. 59, pp. 181-183. See also Tiruvalla Copper Plates, *TAS.*, III, 11, 349-360.
29. *TAS.*, II, No. 9 (1), pp. 67-69.
30. See Note 7 above.

6. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF ANCIENT CHAMBA

As Gleaned From its Inscriptions

B. K. Kaul Dembi

Chamba is the north-western most district of Himachal Pradesh situated in the bosom of the Himalaya Mountains between north latitude $32^{\circ} 11' 30''$ and $33^{\circ} 13' 6''$ and last longitude $75^{\circ} 49' 0''$ and $77^{\circ} 3' 30''$. In shape it is more or less of a rough oblong, contracted towards the north. It comprises a section of the Ravi Valley and a section of the Chinab Valley. The territory is wholly mountainous with altitudes ranging from 2000 to 21000 feet above sea level.

Chamba was formerly one of the old hill states of western Himalayas comprising a superficial area of 3,216 square miles. The name Chamba does not occur in early Sanskrit literature. Its earliest mention is found in the Bharamaur copper plate inscription of Yugākaravarman belonging to the 10th century A. D. Here the form of the name given is Chaṇpakā, which changes to Champakā owing to vernacular influence in the copper plate charters of Chamba belonging to the 13th and the subsequent centuries. The name also occurs in the form Champā at several places in the *Rājatarangini*² which refers to a few rulers of this hill state. It is from the latter form that the modern form Chamba is derived.

Sources of Information:

The only reliable and authentic source of information regarding the social and economic conditions of ancient Chamba are the inscriptions dating from the 6th century A.D. These are of diverse types, consisting of rock and stone inscriptions, image inscriptions, copper plate inscriptions and the fountain stone inscriptions. The rock, image and copper plate types of inscriptions are well known and a word may be said about the fountain stone inscriptions which are unique of their type. These are engraved on the elegantly carved fountain slabs discovered from different parts of Chamba and now preserved in the Bhuri Singh Museum, Chamba. These inscribed slabs were erected at springs by the pious donors for earning religious merit. They are generally dedicated to Varuṇa, the god of waters, whose seated figure the stones generally contain in the centre. The other figures carved on these slabs include those of the *nava-grahas* of Vishṇu, sleeping on the Śēshanāga, of his ten incarnations and of the river goddesses Gaṅgā and Yamunā. The stones are elegantly decorated on their borders by various geometrical patterns, floral and vegetal designs.

Society :

Varṇāsrama — The castes and the orders.

The inscriptions of Chamba do not throw much light on the castes and the orders as they existed in ancient Chamba. The copper plate inscriptions only mention the names of the four castes but do not furnish details about all of them. It is only about the Brāhmaṇas that we get some detailed information.

The Brāhmaṇas occupied an honoured place in the social hierarchy in ancient Chamba. They received royal patronage in the form of land grants which bestowed on them several rights and privileges.³ They were granted the ownership of grazing and pasture grounds, kitchen gardens, fruit trees, water courses, channels, the fallow and the cultivable lands which lay within the specified boundaries. The grants were free from all kinds of taxes. The subjects living in the granted area were to pay to the grantee the tax in cash and kind and bring to him every other tribute due to the king. The district and the local officers were ordered not to encamp at the house of the donee nor to demand from him milk, corn, fuel, chaff, furniture, etc. And not to cause vexation to his ploughmen, cowherds, maids and servants. The donations of lands given to them were considered as the means of acquiring religious merit and glory. Thus King Vidagdha granted lands to a Brāhmaṇa named Nanduka for acquiring religious merit, for the increase of the glory of his parents and himself, for the sake of the the bliss of

the next world and in order to cross the ocean of existence.⁴

While the Brāhmaṇas were the recipients of royal charity, they also made gifts for works of public utility. Thus we hear of a Brāhmaṇa constructing a fountain of water at Dadvar.⁵

The Brāhmaṇas in ancient Chamba were known, as in other parts of India, by their particular śākhās and gōtras. Thus the recipients of king Vidagdha's and Sōmavarman's grants were of the Vājasaneyī-śākhā and of the Kaśyapa-gōtra,⁶ and that of king Āsaṭa's grant belonged to the Kaśyapa-gōtra.⁷

Besides the Brāhmaṇas and the other three known castes, we find mention of such low castes as the Mēdās, the Āndhrakas, the Dhīvaras and the Chāṇḍālas in a 10th century copper plate charter issued by king Vidagdha of Chamba.⁸

The Mēdās are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.⁹ According to the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha, they ate the flesh of dead cattle. Manu describes Mēdā as an offspring of a Vaidēhaka male and a Nishāda woman, who dwelt outside the village and whose main business was to kill wild beasts.¹⁰

The Āndhrakas, according to Manu,¹¹ were a mixed caste born of Vaidēhaka father and Kāravāra mother. The functions of the Āndhrakas were the same as those of the Mēdās.

The Dhīvaras according to Gautama¹² were a pratilōma caste born of Vaiśya

male and Kshatriya female. Their main business was to catch fish.

The Chāṇḍālas are widely mentioned in Smṛiti and Kāvya literature and in such early works as Taittreya Brāhmaṇa, Chhāndōgya Upanishad, Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad and the Aṣṭādhyāyī. In the Chhāndōgya Upanishad¹³ they are ranked with the dog and the boar. In Smṛiti works, the Chāṇḍālas are described as a mixed caste born of a Śūdra from a Brāhmaṇa woman.¹⁴ According to Manu, the Chāṇḍālas were to live outside the village, use garments on dead bodies as their clothes and were to act as hangmen when the king so ordered.

The Chāṇḍālas are also described by the Chinese traveller Fahien. According to him, they had to live outside the town and give notice of their approach when entering a town or a market place by striking a piece of wood so that others might not get polluted by their contact.¹⁵ According to Alberuni,¹⁶ the business of the Chāṇḍālas was to hang persons when they were sentenced to death by the judicial authority.

The Chāṇḍālas are also mentioned by Kalhaṇa in his *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. According to him, though Chāṇḍālas were booted down upon by the people¹⁷ they also served as royal body-guards or as watchmen¹⁸ and at times they were engaged by the selfish conspirators as agents for killing their political rivals.¹⁹

The mention of these low castes in a 10th century document, referred to above, would show that they continued to form

part of the social community in ancient Chamba.

Position of Women:

Women in ancient Chamba occupied an honoured position in society. They were the object of highest devotion and love of their husbands who often gave expression to their conjugal devotion by constructing fountains for the attainment of religious merit by their wives in the next world. Thus Rājānaka Gōga, feeling deeply afflicted at the passing away of his wife Sūramatī, had a fountain of clear water constructed to ensure bliss for her in the next world.²⁰ Similarly Rājānaka Dēvaprasāda erected a fountain for the attainment of heavenly bliss by his consort Mēkhalā.²¹ The husband's sincerity of love for his wife is also proved by the Sarahan *Prasasti* which records the erection of a Śiva temple by Sātyaki to perpetuate the memory of his spouse Sōmaprabhā.²²

The conjugal fidelity of Indian women is proverbial and we find women in ancient Chamba never failing in their duty to reciprocate the love and devotion of their husbands by building religious institutions and donating liberally for works of public utility, for ensuring the heavenly bliss of their lords in the next world. Thus we hear of Queen Rārḍhā having constructed a Śiva temple for the attainment of religious merit by her husband Salākaravarman.²³ Another queen, Balhā, erected a fountain for the sake of the bliss of her lord in the next world.²⁴

As regards the custom of *satī* the inscriptions indicate that though it was in vogue it was not universally practised.

The Rājānaka Nāgapāla of Chamba at the death of his father prevented his mother from becoming *sati*.³⁵ Queen Rārḍhā survived her husband Salākaravarman.³⁶

Widows after the death of their husbands led a life of austerity and piety and took part in religious donations. Thus the widowed queen Balhā, after being dissuaded from consigning herself to the flames, emaciated herself by prolonged fasting and increased her charity, her compassion to the poor and devotion to Kṛishṇa.³⁷

Chamba presents a striking contrast to certain parts of Himachal as, for example, Kangra where the plight of women was miserable. Even their chastity was not secure at the hands of the feudal lords. For example, it is stated in the Baijnath *Prasastis* that the rulers thought the sovereignty over a town to yield its legitimate result only by the rape of the wives of their subjects.³⁸ There were noble exceptions too, as we learn that the ruling chief Lakshmaṇachandra of Kīrāgrāma took a vow after his pilgrimage to Kēdāranātha that thenceforth he would treat the wives of others as his own sisters.³⁹

Food And Drinks:

Among the foods and drinks that were popular in ancient Chamba, the inscriptions mention *dhānya* and *gōkshira*. *Dhānya*, of which we find the earliest mention in the *Rigveda*⁴⁰, denotes grain in general. The Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad⁴¹ mentions as many as ten kinds of grain. However, in the hill regions of Kangra, Chamba and Kashmir *dhānya* usually denotes paddy.

Gōkshira means cow's milk which, from Vedic times, has been a favourite diet of

Indians and also a source of income for a villager.

It would seem that the staple food of people in ancient Chamba was rice and that milk was a favourite drink in ancient Chamba as in other parts of India.

House And Furniture:

Houses in ancient Chamba as at present must have been made of wood and stone as these were the most easily available building material. As regards furniture, the most commonly used articles appear to have been *pīṭha*, *pīṭhikā* and *khaṭvā*, mentioned in the Sungal copper plate grant of king Vidagdha.⁴²

The word *pīṭha* of which we find the earliest mention in the Gṛihya-sūtras⁴³ is explained in the Amarakōsha⁴⁴ as seat (*āsanam*, *upavēśanādhāraḥ*) made of metal, stone or wood. *Pīṭha* would thus indicate a stool or a chair.

Pīṭhikā, which also occurs in the Rāmāyaṇa,⁴⁵ is explained by Monier Williams⁴⁶ as a stool or a bench. It is represented by modern *pīṭhī* in Chamayali and Panjabi which denotes a smaller stool with wooden legs and with seat made of strings, cane or wooden planks.

Khaṭvā which is mentioned in such early works as the Ashtādhyāyī,⁴⁷ Mahābhārata,⁴⁸ Manusmṛiti,⁴⁹ etc., is explained in the lexicons as *Khaṭyatē kāṅkshyatē nidrārthibhiḥ*,⁴⁰ that which is desired or sought by the persons going to sleep. In the Amarakōsha⁴¹ it is described as synonym of *paryāṅka* or *palyāṅka* meaning couch. It would thus denote a bedstead, a couch or

a cot. The modern Hindi derivative of it, viz., *khāṭ* means a cot.

It would thus appear that in the 10th century, the common articles of furniture that a villager possessed in Chamba were stool, bench or a smaller stool and cot, all probably made of wood, the only cheaply available material.

Economic Conditions

Agriculture:

Agriculture has been the principal means of livelihood of Indian people from early Vedic times to this day. The copper plate inscriptions of Chamba furnish encouraging information of the land system as it prevailed in ancient Chamba during the 10th, 11th and the 12th centuries.

Lands known by their Names:

In the first instance, we find that the lands in ancient Chamba were given proper names. Thus the two pieces of land donated by king Vidagdha bore the names *Sēri* and *Lavāla*.⁴⁸ Besides the cultivated lands, the fields, kitchen gardens and the pasture grounds also bore special names. We find the mention of *Sabdabagga*, *Prāhabagga* and *Khanibagga* as the names of fields and *Pushkari* as the name of a pasture ground⁴⁹ and *Yamalika* as the name of a kitchen garden.

Types of land:

The two principal types of land were *khila*⁴⁵ and *pōlāchya*.⁴⁶ *Khila* lands were the waste lands which were not under cultivation. The modern derivative of the term, viz., *Khili* in Chamba denotes the same. The term *khila* occurs in such early works as

*Atharvaveda*⁴⁷ and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*⁴⁸ and is explained in the *Amarakōsha*⁴⁹ as uncultivated land. The *Nārada-smṛiti*⁵⁰ explains it as a tract of land which has not been under cultivation for three years,

Pōlāchya were the cultivated lands. According to Vogel⁵¹ the term is preserved in the modern Hindi word *Pōlācha* which means 'land under constant cultivation'. So far as the cultivated lands were concerned, they must have been at least of two types, one used for the cultivation of rice and the other for the cultivation of wheat, maize, sugarcane and such other crops. The former is mentioned in the Brahmor copper plate grant as *Kōlhika*.⁵² Even to-day in Chamba an irrigated piece of land used for the cultivation of rice is called *Kōlhika*. The word *Kōlhika* is obviously derived from the vernacular *Kōhl* which is the corrupt form of Sanskrit *Kulya* meaning 'a channel used for irrigation'.

Besides the two named above, we find mention of a third type of land called *Upakhila*. This term as compared to *Khila* would denote semi or partially waste land.

Ownership of land:

Before we discuss the question of ownership of land in ancient Chamba, it would be worthwhile to have a clear idea of what ownership in its legal sense implies.

The earlier authors of *Smṛtis* make a clear distinction between ownership and possession. Thus Yājñavalkya states that possession acquires validity when it is accompanied by a clear title (*āgamēna viśuddhēna*) and is not valid without the same. According to Bṛihaspati possession becomes valid

when it is accompanied with legitimate title (*sāgamaḥ*).⁵⁴ Nārada, whose view is more explicit, states that, where there is enjoyment but no title of any sort, a title is required in order to produce proprietary right. Mere possession is not sufficient to create proprietary right. A clear title having been established, possession acquires validity. But possession without a clear title does not constitute evidence of ownership.⁵⁵ The distinction between the two terms is made even in respect of terminology. Thus ownership is indicated by the pronoun *svam* and the abstract terms *svatva*, *svāmya*, *svāmitva*, etc., while possession is usually indicated by the verb 'bhuj' (to enjoy) and its derivatives.

The authors of the great medieval Digests of the Sacred Law give clearer and more precise definitions of ownership. Thus according to Jimūtavāhana, the author of the *Dāyabhāga*, "ownership implies the quality in the object owned, of being used by the owner according to his pleasure".⁵⁶ According to Mitramiśra ownership is an "attribute indicative of the quality in the object owned by being used according to pleasure".⁵⁷

The essential qualities associated with ownership as referred to by Gautama⁵⁸ and Manu⁵⁹ are the rights of sale, gift and mortgage.

Thus it is clear from the definitions quoted above that ownership constitutes a proprietary right according to which the owner can use the object according to his will. He may put it on sale, give away as gift or make it over as mortgage. Possession, on the other hand, does not include

any such right. Here it may be mentioned that the *Smṛitis* make it clear that like other objects, movable or immovable, land also can be owned. The *Smṛitis* and the *Arthasāstra* also permit the sale, gift and mortgage of owned lands.

The copper plate grants of Chamba record grants of land by kings Yugākaravarman, Vidagdha, Sōmavarman and Āsaṭa. In the grants of Yugākaravarman, Sōmavarman and Āsaṭa, the names are mentioned of persons occupying the lands at the time of the grants. From what has been said above about the ownership, it is clear that the kings held proprietary rights over the donated lands. The terms 'bhujamāna' 'satka'⁶⁰ and 'sthita'⁶¹ in this connection would denote that these lands at the time of donations, were in the temporary possession of the named individuals.

Though on the basis of these few instances, it would be rash to suggest that the ownership of the entire soil in Chamba vested in the king, it would be far more reasonable to suggest that there did exist some royal fields in ancient Chamba which were owned by the rulers themselves and which were, at times, given by them on lease to tenants.

That kings in ancient India owned lands as personal property is shown by the references to the royal farms in the *Arthasāstra*.⁶² Moreover, there is evidence of the existence of royal farms and allotments in the villages from the Maurya up to the Gupta period.

Agricultural Products:

The principal crops sown in ancient Chamba were paddy and sugarcane, referred

to as *dhānya*⁶³ and *ikshu*.⁶⁴ *Dhānya*, of which we find the earliest mention in the *Ṛigvēda*, usually denotes grain in general. As pointed out above, in hill regions of Kashmir, Chamba and Kangra, the term is used only for paddy. *Ikshu* denotes sugarcane which is even now grown in some parts of Chamba.

The Sungal copper plate grant of Vidagdha mentions *rōchika* and *chitōla*, the exact meaning of which is uncertain. Vogel⁶⁵ takes them to be the names of some agricultural products. According to D. C. Sircar⁶⁶ they denote certain obligations or levies the exact nature of which is not known. However, both the terms are mentioned along with *sasya* (corn), *chāraṇa* (fodder for cattle) and *ikshu* (sugarcane) and, judged from the context, the suggestion of Vogel seems more plausible. The two terms are not known from any literary source and it is difficult to establish their identity.⁶⁷

Methods of Irrigation:

The cultivation of paddy presupposes the existence of a proper system of irrigation. Though, from our records, we do not get evidence of any large scale irrigation works, yet the occurrence of certain words, such as *kōlhika*,⁶⁸ *kullaka*,⁶⁹ *kuppa-ṭṭa*,⁷⁰ *pāniya*⁷¹ and *udakasihāra*⁷¹ enables us to form some idea of the methods of irrigation employed in ancient Chamba.

The word *kōlhika* is derived from *kohl* which is the present name for a channel drawn from the hill stream and used for irrigating the rice fields.

Kullaka is derived from *kulla* or Sanskrit *Kulya* and denotes a canal.

Kuppaṭṭa according to Vogel⁷³ probably denotes a rivulet.

Udakasihāra is not known from any other source and its exact meaning doubtful. According to Vogel⁷⁴ it means a water course, but it is not possible to explain it etymologically.

Pāniya appears to be the same as *pāna* which denotes a canal.⁷⁵

It would thus seem that in ancient Chamba, irrigation was effected mainly by channels, canals or miniature cuts drawn from the hill streams and rivulets. Even now, the channels drawn from the hill streams and generally known as *Kuhl* form the main source of artificial irrigation in Chamba.

Land Survey

Land being the main source of subsistence of the people in ancient Chamba, need seems to have been keenly felt for the proper survey of lands and the demarcation of their boundaries. This avoided the quarrels arising out of land disputes, besides facilitating the location of different pieces of land situated in different localities.

Thus in order to give specific location of two pieces of land named *Sērī* and *Lavāla* donated by king Vidagdha, the Sungal copper plate grant gives the following detailed description of their boundaries:⁷⁶ (The boundaries of *Sērī*): "on the east the limit of the rent free land (*agrahāra*) of

(the village of) Pāṭala; on the south the limit known as 'the great slope'; on the west, the limit of the slope of the *Khanibagga* (field), on the north the limit known as *Prāhabagga*".

(The boundaries of *Lavāla*): "on the east side the precipice; on the south side the large rock; on the west side the rivulet(?), *Majvalikā* by name; on the north side the limit of the path to the pasture ground of *Pushkarī*."

Besides, the cultivated lands had their own limits or *sīmas*. These limits usually consisted of (1) *trīṇa* (2) *gōyūthī* and (3) *gōchāra*.⁷⁷

Trīṇa which literally means grass seems to stand for a stretch of grass near the cultivated fields. The meaning of *gōyūthī* is not definite. The word *yūtha* is often met with in Sanskrit literature and denotes 'a herd'. Therefore, *gōyūthī* can be explained as, "the meeting place of the herds of cattle." Vogel⁷⁸ equates it with 'gavyūti' frequently met with in the copper plate inscriptions and renders it as 'grazing ground for cattle'.

Gōchāra which occurs in the *Āpastambīya Śrautasūtra*⁷⁹ and the *Rāmāyaṇa*⁸⁰ and which is commonly met with in the copper plate grants, means a pasture.

Besides the limits noted above a cultivated field was bounded by two passages, one for entrance and the other for exit. *Nirgama* and *pravēsa* are mentioned in this connection. It had also a kitchen garden or a *sāka-vāṭikā* attached to it, which was used for producing vegetables. The men-

tion of *Ārāma*⁸¹ and *visrāma* within the boundaries of the cultivated fields would show that a cultivated field also contained parks and dwellings, which were used by villagers as meeting and resting places.

Land Measures :

The standard land measure in ancient Chamba was *bhū* or *bhūmi*. One *bhū* consisted of four sub-measures called *bhū-māshkas*.⁸² The land measure *bhū* was in vogue in several other parts of India as well, as is indicated by its frequent mention in copper plate inscriptions. Its value, however, differed in different localities. In Chamba its value was equivalent to 17 acres. Vogel, calculating the measure of land donated by king Āsaṭa, remarks, "The land granted in Āsaṭa's charter, which is stated to be 1 *bhū* 6 *bhūmāshka*, in other words 2½ *bhū*, has an area of 14 *lahris* or 42 acres. From which it would follow that one *bhū* of land corresponds with nearly 5½ *lahris* or nearly 17 acres."⁸³

The area of land was also determined according to the quantity of seed required for sowing it. We find the mention of *piṭaka* in this connection. It is mentioned in the Brahmor copper plate grant of Yugākaravarman⁸⁴ where the area of the granted land is expressed in *piṭaka*. The land measure *piṭaka* is also mentioned in the Sankheda plate of Dadda II of the (Kalachuri) year 392,⁸⁵ but its exact significance is uncertain. Vogel⁸⁶ suggests that it may be equated with modern *piṭā* which is equal to 40 seers. In the Gupta age also, we find that the area of land was determined according to the measure of grain with which it could be sown. Thus we

have references to *adhavāpa*, *drōṇavāpa*, *kulyavāpa* in the Damodarapur copper plates.⁸⁷ In the Gunaigarh plate of Vainyagupta, dated A. D. 507-08, we find the area of land measured in terms of *pāṭakas*. According to the calculations of Dr. Sircar⁸⁸ one *pāṭaka* is equal to 40 *drōṇavāpas* and according to the references given by him, one *drōṇavāpa* is equal to 48 acres in certain cases and 25 in others which thus gives the value of one *pāṭaka* as 1920 acres and 1000 acres respectively. Dr. Maittey, on the other hand, calculates the area of one *pāṭaka* as varying between 72 to 88 acres.⁸⁹

It seems likely though not quite definite that the *piṭaka* of our record is the same as *pāṭaka* of the Gunaigarh plate. The modern Bengali term for *pāṭaka* is *pārā* which closely agrees with *pīrā* the modern equivalent of *piṭaka* in Chamba.

Besides the *piṭaka* noted above, the other important grain measure was *khāri*. It is mentioned in the Chamba copper plate grant⁹¹ where Sōmavarman is stated to have granted annually one *khāri* of grain from the granary (*Kōshṭhāgāra*) of Bhadravarman (modern Bhadrana) to a Vishṇu temple.

Khāri, of which we find the earliest mention in the *Ṛigveda*,⁹² is explained in the *Arthasāstra*⁹³ as equivalent to 16 *drōṇas*. D. C. Sircar, quoting Bengali authors, remarks that the value of one *drōṇa* lies between one maund fourteen seers and two maunds⁹⁴. *Khāri* is also mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*⁹⁵ and this grain measure has been in use in Kashmir from early times to this day⁹⁶. It consists of 16 *traks* or *pacca* seers. Since the value of *khāri* and *drōṇa* differed in different localities in ancient

India, it is not known what exact value the two measures had in ancient Chamba and Kangra. They are no longer used now in the two hill districts.

Revenue System :

The copper plate inscriptions do not furnish any direct evidence of taxation in ancient Chamba but the indirect reference in the Sungal copper plate grant to certain royal dues which the subjects, resident in the enjoyed land were to deliver to the grantee, enable us to form some idea of the revenue system as it was in practice in ancient Chamba.

The royal dues mentioned in this connection are :

1) *bhāga*, 2) *bhōga*, 3) *kara* and 4) *hiraṇya*.

The terms *bhāga* and *bhōga*, frequently met with in copper plate inscriptions were at first taken by Fleet and Kielhorn as one fiscal expression and translated as 'enjoyment of taxes'⁹⁸ and 'share of the produce'⁹⁹ respectively. But now they are taken as two distinct fiscal terms and are explained as such.

Bhāga is mentioned in the *Arthasāstra*¹⁰⁰ along with *sītā*, *bali*, *kara*, *vaṇik*, etc. T. Ganapati Shastri, commenting on the term, explains it as '*dhānya-shaḍ-bhāgaḥ*,¹⁰¹ i.e., share of produce amounting to one-sixth. Maittey,¹⁰² however, points out that the king's share of the produce did not universally amount to one-sixth. He refers to Bhaṭṭasvāmin who, commenting on the above cited passage of *Arthasāstra*, explains *shaḍbhāga* in the general sense of royal share (*rāja-bhāga*) and adds that the term one-sixth includes by implication other rates,

such as, one-third and one-fourth prevailing in different tracts.¹⁰⁸ According to Dr. U.N. Ghoshal, *bhāga* may be taken to be the king's customary share of the produce levied on the ordinary revenue paying lands which normally though not universally amounted to one-sixth.¹⁰⁴

It would thus seem that in ancient Chamba, the cultivators had to pay a regular share of their produce to the king, as was the custom in other parts of India. Whether the royal share amounted to normal one-sixth of the produce or less, we do not know. It seems to have been also paid in kind and stored in the royal store houses called *kōshṭāgāras* located at the district headquarters. This is indicated by the mention of *kōshṭāgara* in the Chamba copper plate grant¹⁰⁵ from which one *khāri* of paddy was to be delivered to the grantee annually in addition to the other privileges connected with the grant.

Bhōga is explained by Mēdātithi¹⁰⁶ as *phalabhara nikadyupayanau* or the presents of fruits, firewood, etc. Bühler, evidently on the basis of Mēdātithi's rendering of the term, explains it as "the periodical supplies of fruits, firewood, flowers and the like which the villagers had to furnish to the king."¹⁰⁷

Kara as a term of revenue is frequently mentioned in the copper plate inscriptions and it also occurs in the Girnar rock inscription of Rudradāman.¹⁰⁸ It is a familiar term in the Dharamasāstras and in the Arthasāstra of Kautilya. In the *Manu*,¹⁰⁹ its significance is interpreted differently by different commentators. Thus Mēdātithi renders it as 'gift of commodities' (*dravyā-*

dīnam). Sarvajñanārāyaṇa interprets it as a 'fixed gold payment on land' (*bhūmi-niyatam dēyam hiraṇyam*). Rāmachandra explains it as 'contribution in the form of grass, wood etc.' (*gulmadēyādhikam*). Kulluka renders it as 'contribution from villagers and townsmen either monthly or at Bhādrapada and Pausha.' Rāghavānanda interprets it similarly as monthly payment by villagers. Bhaṭṭasvāmin, a commentator of Arthasāstra, explains it as the royal due payable annually during the month of *Bhādrapada*, *Vasanta* and the like.¹¹⁰ Kshīrasvāmin, another commentator of *Arthasāstra*, interprets the term as a tax on all movable and immovable articles.¹¹¹ On the basis of these interpretations Dr. Maittey explains the term as 'a periodical tax levied more or less universally on villagers',¹¹² while Dr. Ghoshal takes it to be a 'general property tax levied periodically.'¹¹³ Ghoshal also refers to a passage of *Arthasāstra*¹¹⁴ where the term seems to have been used in the specific sense of an emergency tax levied upon dealers, artisans and the like.¹¹⁵

However, the exact nature of this tax or royal due does not become quite clear from the interpretations cited above. It is not definitely known whether it was monthly, annual or an emergency tax. But that it was oppressive in nature is indicated by the Girnar rock inscription of Rudradāman where the term occurs along with *vishṭi* or forced labour and *praṇaya* or emergency levy and where it is stated that the king constructed the dam of Sudarśana lake without oppressing the people by means of *kara*, *vishṭi* and *praṇaya*.

Hiraṇya, which literary means gold; occurs with such fiscal terms as *bhāgā*, *bhōga*,

kara in the copper plate inscriptions and evidently denotes some tax. Being mentioned along with *bhāga* and *dhānya*¹¹⁷ it is usually interpreted as the king's share of produce paid in kind; the term may be taken to denote tax in cash levied upon certain crops where assessment in kind was not possible. According to Dr. Ghoshal, "in the medieval period of Indian history, while the land revenue, before the revenue reforms of Todarmal, was paid mostly in kind, there were certain classes of crops called *zabti*, the levy of which was always assessed in cash since it was very difficult to divide it into shares and, as such, *hiranya* may be taken to denote a levy or tax of this nature."¹¹⁸

Another important source of revenue was *Śulka*, the officer responsible for the collection of which was called *Śaulkika* frequently mentioned in our copper plate grants *Śulka* as a fiscal term occurs in such early works as *Atharvavēda* Dharmasūtras¹²⁰ and the *Ashṭādhyāyī*.¹²¹ In the *Amarakōsha*¹²² it is explained as *ghaṭṭādīdēya*, i. e., duties paid at the ferries, etc. Kshīrasvāmin, commenting on the expression *ghaṭṭādīdēya* takes *Śulka* to denote the ferry duties, the tolls paid at the military or police stations and the transit duties paid by the merchants. The term also occurs in *Manu*¹²³ and is explained by the commentators as duties paid by the merchants. *The Arthasāstra*¹²⁴ mentions the term quite frequently and from several references to it in the said text it may be explained as custom or toll duties levied on merchants and collected at the ferries, at the custom houses or octroi posts located at the main gate of the town, at the ports and at the frontier stations.

From what has been said above, it

would appear that the main sources of revenue in ancient Chamba were: 1) land-revenue paid in kind or cash; 2) custom and toll duties and 3) certain periodical taxes called *kara*. Besides, the villagers were expected to make frequent supplies of flowers, fruits, firewood and the like to the king.

Coins:

The coin denomination prevalent in Chamba and Kangra in the 12th and the 13th centuries A.D. was *dramma*. It is mentioned in the Luj fountain inscription of the first year of Jāsaṭa dated 1105-06¹²⁵. The language of the epigraph being extremely corrupt, it is not exactly known in what connection it is mentioned. Vogel thinks that the expression *mūla* (*mūlya*) 20 *dramma* occurring in the record denotes the cost of grain (mentioned as *dhamika* or *dhānya*), supplied by the donor for a feast held on the occasion of the erection of the fountain slab.¹²⁶

The term *dramma* which is generally believed to be the derivative of Greek *drachma*, was, according to D.R. Bhandarkar, a coin denomination prevalent all over Northern India 'in the late mediaeval period, that is from 9th to the 13th centuries.'¹²⁷

In his opinion, 'the earliest record where this word has been traced is the Gwalior inscription of Bhōjadēva of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty and dated 875 A.D.'¹²⁸ However, the term occurs even earlier in a Yaudhēya coin of 3rd century A.D.¹²⁹ which bears the legend '*dēvasya drama Brahmana* which according to S.K. Chakraborty¹³⁰ may be construed as "*Brahmanyadēvasya drama*' meaning the coin dedicated to Brahmanyadēva or Kārttikēya, the tutelary deity of the Yaudhēya tribe. The name *dramma*

according to Bhandarkar¹⁸¹ signified only the coins in silver and it would thus appear that the coinage used in ancient Chamba was of silver. This also reflects the prosperous economic conditions prevailing in the hill district in the 12th century.

Industry :

The only industry of which we get ample evidence in the inscriptions is stone-work. Stone work appears to have been a very popular industry in ancient Chamba. People engaged in this industry were called *sūtra-*

dhāra.¹⁸² Though this term is intimately associated with the ancient Indian Dramatic literature, denoting a person in charge of the stage performance, it is also met with frequently in the inscriptions and usually signifies persons engaged in the construction of stone temples or images. In the inscriptions of Chamba, however, they mostly figure as the builders of water fountains. Their extraordinary skill in stone work in Chamba is amply testified by a number of extant profusely carved fountain slabs which display craftsmanship of unique character.

Foot-Notes :

1. Vogel, J. Ph. *Antiquities of Chamba State*, Vol. I, pp. 159 ff.
2. Kalhaṇa, *Rājataranṅī*, vii, 218, 588; viii, 323, 538, 1083, 1443, 1531.
3. These are given in detail in the Sungal copper plate inscription of King Vidagdha, Vogel, Op. cit., p. 167.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, p. 177
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 167 and 185.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 165-67.
9. *Anuśāsana Parvan*, xxii.
10. *Manu Smṛiti*, x. 36.
11. *Ibid.*, X. 36, 48.
12. *Gautama-Dharma-sūtra*, iv. 17.
13. *Chhāndōgya Upanishad*, v. 10. 7.
14. *Manu Smṛiti*, v. 131; x. 12, 16. xi. 175 etc., *Yājñavalkya Smṛiti*, I. 93.
15. *Record of Buddhist Kingdoms*, Trans. Legge, p. 43.
16. *India*, Trans. Sachau, Vol. I. p. 102.
17. *Rājataranṅī*. v 77; vi 79, 192.
18. *Ibid.*, iv. 516; vii. 309.
19. *Ibid.*, viii. 304, 325, 1103.
20. Vogel, op. cit., pp. 229-30.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
28. Baijnath Praśastis. No. 1, line 20, *EL.*, I, pp. 97 ff.
29. *Ibid.*, line. 19.
30. *Ṛigvēda*, viii. 97. 10.
31. vi. 3. 22.
32. Vogel, op. cit. p. 167.
33. *Vaikhānasa Gṛihya-sūtra*, 4. 13. 10. 11.
34. II, 6. 138.
35. V. 3. 153.
36. Sanskrit English Dictionary, p. 629.
37. II, 1. 126.
38. V. 1474.
39. VIII, 357.
40. *Vāchaspatyam*, p. 94.
41. II. 6. 138.
42. Vogel, op cit., p. 167.
43. *Sabdabagga* is mentioned in the Brahmor Grant of Yugākaravarman, Vogel, op. cit., p. 163 and *Prāhabagga* and *Khanibagga* in the Sungal Grant of Vidagda, *Ibid.*, p. 167. *Bagga* obviously denotes a vernacular term *bāg* meaning a field.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 185, 193, 199.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
47. VII. 115, 4.
48. VIII. 3. 4. 1.
49. II, 1. 5.
50. XI. 26.
51. Vogel, op. cit., p. 168, fn. 2.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
53. *Yājñavalkya Smṛiti*, II. 29
54. *Bṛihaspati Smṛiti*, vij. 24-25, 30.
55. *Nārada Smṛiti*, I. 84, 85.

56. *Dāyabhāga* quoted in *Vyavahāramayūkha*, Trans. V.N. Mandlik, p. 31 n. Also see U. N. Ghoshal, *The Agrarian system in Ancient India*, p. 85 and fn. 21.
57. *Vīramitrōdaya*, quoted in *Vyavahāramayūkha*, p. 89; also see Ghoshal, op. cit., p. 86 and fn. 23.
58. X. 39.
59. VIII. 199.
60. *Satka*, which is frequently mentioned in the copper plate inscriptions, is explained by D.C. Sircar (*Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, p. 306) as the Sanskritised form of Prakrit *Santaka*, meaning 'the holding of', 'belong to...'
61. It is mentioned in the Chamba copper plate inscription of Sōmavarman and Āsaṭa, Vogel, op. cit., p. 193, and has been translated by Vogel as 'held by', Ibid. p. 196. One of the meanings of the word given in Monier Williams' *Sanskrit English Dictionary* p. 1274 is 'belonging to'. Both *Satka* and *Sthita* would in our case denote temporary belonging or possession.
62. II. 15.
63. Vogel, op. cit., p. 194.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
66. Sircar. D.C., op. cit., pp. 75, 281.
67. *Rōchika* may be the same as *rōchaka*, one of the meanings of which given by Monier Williams, op. cit., p. 888, is 'a kind of onion', *grantha-parṇa bhēda*.
68. Vogel, op. cit., p. 160.
69. *Ibid.* p. 164.
70. *Ibid.*
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. *Ibid.*, p. 168. *Kūpaka* in Sanskrit means a small pit or a hole dug in the dry bed of a rivulet for the collection of water: Monier Williams' *Dictionary*, p. 300. It is possible that *Kuppaṭṭa* also may stand for such a pool or depression where water is collected.
74. *Ibid.*
75. Monier Williams, op. cit., p. 613.
76. Vogel, op. cit., p. 167.
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 168.
79. I. 2. 4.
80. IV. 44. 80.
81. *Ārāma* which also occurs in the Aśōkan inscriptions is explained by Lüders as a 'Park', vide his *Glossary of Asokan Inscriptions*, p. 149. In the title deeds of Chamba it is generally accompanied by the word *vṛiksha* and is, as such, variously rendered by Vogel as 'garden' and 'orchard' (Op. cit., pp. 187, 196, 200). However, it may denote a grassy plot of land surrounded by trees and used by villagers as a meeting place. Cf. Monier Williams, op. cit., p. 150.
82. This is indicated by the Chamba copper plate grant, op. cit., which records the total grant of 15 *bhū* of land, divided into two portions, one consisting of 2 *bhūmāshkas* and the other of 14 *bhū* and 2 *bhūmāshkas*.

83. Op. cit., p. 191.
84. Op. cit.
85. *CII.*, IV, p. 77.
86. Op. cit., p. 160.
87. *EL.*, XV, pp. 130 ff.
88. *IHQ.*, 1930, pp. 45 ff.
89. Select Inscriptions, p. 342, fn. 7.
90. Maittey, S. K., Economic Life of Northern India, pp. 40-41.
91. Op. cit.
92. IV. 32. 17.
93. II. 19.
94. Sircar, D.C., op. cit., p. 101.
95. V. 71; also cf. Stein, trans. vol. I, p. 196 n.
96. Modern Kashmiri equivalent of *khārī* is *khār*.
97. Op. cit.
98. Fleet: *CII.*, III, p. 254, fn. 4.
99. *EL.*, VII, p. 160.
100. II. 6.
101. Arthaśāstra (edited by I. Ganapati Shastri), p. 186.
102. Maittey, op. cit., p. 57.
103. *Ibid.*
104. Ghoshal, U.N., History of Revenue system, pp. 34-35.
105. Op. cit.
106. *Vide* his commentary on Manusmṛiti, VIII. 307.
107. *EL.*, I, p. 75. n.
108. *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 44.
109. VIII. 307.
110. Karaḥ varsha-dēyaḥ Bhādrapadika-Vāsantikādy-upādānam, *vide* Bhaṭṭasvāmin's commentary on Arthaśāstra, II. 15.
111. *Pratyēkam sthāvara-jaṅgamādi-dēyaḥ karaḥ*.
112. Economic Life of Northern India, p. 59. Maittey's explanation is the same as given by Ghoshal in his Historiography, p. 173.
113. History of Revenue system, p. 36.
114. V. 2.
115. Op. cit.
116. *Apīḍayitvā kara-viṣṭi-praṇaya-kriyābhiḥ paura-janapadam*

117. *El.*, I, p. 13; IV, p. 8; VI, p. 28, etc.
118. Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61.
119. III. 29. 3.
120. *Gautama Dharma-sūtra*, X. 25; *Āpastamba Dharma-sūtra*, II. 26. 9.
121. V. 1. 47.
122. II. 8. 27.
123. VIII. 307.
124. II. 6, 16, 21, 28, 35, etc.
125. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 205.
126. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
127. *Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics*, p. 206.
128. *Ibid.*
129. Smith, *Catalogue of coins in the Indian Museum*, p. 186.
130. *IHQ.*, 1939, Vol. XV, p. 70.
131. *Op. cit.*, p. 207.
132. The term occurs at the end of most of the fountain inscriptions of Chamba and figures as the designation of a person who prepared the fountain slab. It is also mentioned in the Baijnath Prasasti, No. 1, line. 30 where certain Nāyaka is described as a *sūtradhāra* and as one who, along with certain Thodduka, is stated to have fashioned with the chisel, the Śiva temple along with its *maṇḍapas*.

7. EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI

J. Karthikeya Sarma

Guntupalli (Lat. 17° 0' N., Long. 81°8', District West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh) is well known for its rare rock-cut architectural ventures.¹ The credit of first discovery of the caves and publication of an inscription in first century A.D. characters goes to Robert Sewell.² Alexander Rea³ excavated many votive *stūpas*, a brick *chaitya*, etc., but no epigraph was found by him. A. H. Longhurst⁴ visited in 1916 and reported a fragmentary inscription on one of the broken steps leading to the circular brick *chaitya-griha* at the eastern end of the middle terrace. Much later (late) M. Venkataramayya and K. Raghavachary⁵ undertook a small-scale clearance work on the middle terrace and brought to light brick and stone-built *stūpas* with paved platforms. Inside one of the circular *chaitya-grihas*, lime stone Buddha images, all in round, in *abhaya-mudrā*, standing in *samapāda* over lotus-pedestals and robed in a heavy lower cloth and a *Sanghaṭi* which leaves their right chest bare, were found installed in a later phase. The *stūpa* was also found embellished with lime stone crescentic slab veneer with *padmapīṭha* as the base. Besides, pottery wares of Black-and-Red and Red slipped wares, a few reliquaries were found. Most remarkable, however, was the discovery of identical *maṇḍapa* pillar records of the time of a Mahāmēghavāhana king by (late) M. Venkataramayya and R. Subrahmanyam⁶ in the year 1968.

With a view to initiate proper conservation measures, the author planned a systematic study and exposition of the various structural units, rock-cut *chaityas*, etc., in their chronological sequence. These operations were spread over two seasons, during the years 1974-75 and 1975-76. A wealth of inscribed architectural members, minor antiquities, besides a smaller cave at the lower terrace overhead of the ravine, contributed substantially rich information on the religious history and architecture of this unique site. In this paper, all the epigraphs⁷ so obtained are noticed, for the first time, with the kind permission of the Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India, besides reviewing the older published records from the site.

Location and Details of Discovery (Pl. I) :

Before each record is dealt with in detail their find-spots and sequence need be stated (Pl. I). Pillar inscriptions grouped under no. 1 are found on the south-east platform adjacent to the bigger stone *stūpa* leading to the circular brick *chaitya-griha* at the eastern entrance (not covered in Pl. I).

A new cave of smaller dimensions with a rectangular opening measuring 4 metres north-south and 3.60 metres east-west was brought to light. Its side walls had arched niches, plain and empty. The open court is

separated from the inner chambers by massive rectangular pillars and series of walls. The frontage had originally a paving of slate and lime-stone slabs. Several among these early floor slabs were found disturbed and reused also by the medieval occupants who not only levelled the area but raised the ground floor, built platforms and bounded the edges of the terrace with massive brick-veneered mud walls. The clearance of brick debris in this area revealed a few inscribed floor slabs (nos. 3, 9 and 11) of the earlier period, and an inscribed bronze image of Bōdhisattva Padmapāṇi (no. 14) from the later occupational phase of the medieval period. Nos. 4A, 5 and 6 (a stone reliquary), were found in the *pradakṣhiṇā-patha* area of the bigger stone *stūpa* near the standing columns of the *maṇḍapa*. It may be noted that this railed *stūpa* and the Khondalite stone pillared hall were unearthed by A. Rea. Again from the very same place a stone plaque containing a four-lined inscription (no. 13) was found.

The records nos. 7, 8, 10 and 12 were found engraved over the border facets of the lime-stone pillars of the usual Amaravati class, simple square shafts with octagonal mid-region, chamfered at the sides and containing half-lotus medallions. The maximum length of the pillar is 4.43 meters from top to toe. The squarish base, however, measures 40x37 cms. All the pillars were found fallen to the ground in the southern frontage of the bigger *maṇḍapa* whose pillars are still in position. These weather-beaten blackish Khondalite shafts are crude and comparable to the ones in the Orissan caves at Khandagiri and Udayagiri⁸ and datable to 2nd century B.C. The lime-stone examples, as the inscriptions on them reveal, were meant for the expanded *maṇḍapa* set-up during first century A.D.

I. Inscription Assigned to 2nd-1st century B.C. :

No. 1/B 7: It is a pillar record of the time of a Mahāmēghavāhana ruler. An identical⁹ text was found engraved on four ashy grey lime-stone pillars of the usual Amarāvati type. R. Subrahmanyam¹⁰ dated the record to 2nd century B.C. and identified the Mahāmēghavāhana king referred to as *Kaliga-Mahishakādhipati*, as none other than *Mahārāja Khāravēla* of the Hathigumpha inscription, whereas D.C. Sircar¹¹ read the king's name as *Siri-Sāda*, placed him as a distant successor of the Kalinga king and related him to the Aira king *Mānasada* of the Velpuru inscription (district Guntur) dated to 2nd-3rd century A.D.¹² I shall state in brief my reading and interpretation of the record. A fresh estampage of the first pillar is published here (Pl. II-1).

1. *Mahārājasa Kaliga-[Ma]-*
2. *hisakādhipatisa Mahā-*
3. *Mekhāvāhanasa Siri Sā-*
4. *dasa lēkhakasa Chula-Gō*
5. *masa maḍapō dānaṃ*

"Gift of *maṇḍapa*¹³ by Mahārāja Śrī Sāta i.e., Saptī, Lord of the Kalinga-Mahishaka countries (and) belonging to Mahāmēghavāhana dynasty. The scribe (of the record) is *Kshudra Gōma* i.e., Gōma, the younger." The characters are closely comparable to *Khāravēla*'s Hathigumpha *prasasti* as well as the Naneghat record of the early Sātavāhana rulers. The letters *la* and *ha* are peculiarly written, the former like the inverted english letter 'L', whereas *ha* is horizontally laid. The vowel marks are faint and even omitted in some cases. The interchange of letters *ta* for *da*,

kha for *ga* could be seen. The palaeography clearly points to a date of 2nd century or early first century B.C. In no case this inscription can be assigned to 2nd century A.D. in the light of the numerous records from the same place noticed below. The epigraphical wealth of Guntupalli presents a sumptuous material for a closer and critical study of script styles in a sequential and chronological order. The associated structural vestiges stylistically warrant a date not later than 1st century B.C.

R. Subrahmanyam reads line-4, as *Siri Samdēsa lēkhakasa*, meaning as "the recorder of the royal message or orders" of the Mahāmēghavāhana king. D.C. Sircar's amendment of the passage as *Siri Sādasa lēkhakasa* is clearly acceptable. The name of the king is undoubtedly *Siri Sāda* or *Śrī Sāta*, but basing on this proper name no relationship need be assumed with the *Sātavāhanas*. *Sāta*, *Sātakarṇi*, etc. were popular personal¹⁴ names during the period like *vāhana*-ending family names. The king is described in the record as *Kaliṅga-mahishakādhipati* i.e., the lord of both *Kaliṅga* and *Mahishaka* countries; and he belonged to the *Mahāmēghavāhana* family. The donee of the *maṇḍapa* appears to be the king himself and the qualifying phrase *maṇḍapo dānam* should be applied to *Sāda*. The writer of the record (here he is only a scribe) is one *Chula-Gōma*. In many of the royal grants we usually find the name of *lēkhaka* mentioned at the end but instances are not altogether absent when the writer as well as the scribe are separately mentioned irregularly in the text. In the present record this could be an error of the scribe though not of the writer (*lēkhaka*) or composer (*rachayitā*).

The proper identification of the *Mahishaka* country is very vital to solve many historical and cultural events. We get a glimpse of *Mahārāja Khāravēla*'s political ambitions from his *Hathigumpha Prasasti*.¹⁵ In the eleventh regnal year *Mahārāja Khāravēla* made a dent into the *Andhra* country; the market town *Pithuṇḍa* founded by an *Ava* king was ploughed. This invasion of coastal *Andhra* by the *Kaliṅga* ruler was after his unsuccessful bid over *Siri Sātakarṇi* (*achitayitā Sātakarṇim*), who was then ruling west of the *Kaliṅga* country in the *Vidarbha* region of *Maharashtra*, the capital city being *Musikanagara*.¹⁶ *Sylvain Levi*¹⁷ identified the market town *Pithuṇḍa* with *Pihundra*, the ancient metropolis designated by *Ptolemy* as the capital of the country of *Maisoloi*. In *Jaina Uttarādhyayana-sūtra*, *Pihunḍa* is stated to be a sea coast town and sea-faring merchants are cited to be travelling by boat from *Champa* to *Pihunḍa* even in the days of *Mahāvira*. *Kudura* (*Kodur* or *Gudur*) is also an important centre mentioned by *Ptolemy* as in the country of *Maisolia*. *Dubruiel*¹⁸ takes the entire coast between *Gōdāvarī* and *Kṛishṇā* as 'Maisolos'. *R. Subrahmanyam* located the 'Mahishaka' country as the region comprising the southern districts of the former *Hyderabad State* and upheld *Mirashi's*¹⁹ view that the region was under *Māna-Mahisha* kings; but this territory cannot be regarded as contiguous to *Kaliṅga*. The coins of *Māna-Mahisha* kings are known only from *Karimnagar-Khammam-Medak-Kondapur-Nalgonda* regions and none was reported from coastal *Andhra* so far. In the absence of any other evidence, it is difficult to locate the *Mahishaka* territory of the present record in the southern *Mysore*



15845

or Hyderabad area. Several other views exist on the location of Mahisha²⁰ and if we have to trace the origin of this territorial name to the family name or group of people living in that country, we may expect various Mahishaka countries. Basing on our inscription, during the period the Mahishaka country appears to have been a contiguous territory to Kaliṅga (see the single compound expression: *Kaliṅga - Mahishakādhipati*) and we identify this Mahishaka with the Maisolia (perhaps a territory named after the river) mentioned in the geography of Ptolemy. It is quite reasonable that the royal house of Kaliṅga held this rich coastal Andhra territory and made a dent farther into the Tamil and Pāṇḍyan kingdoms through this. The Kaliṅga power, at no time, appears to have come into contact with Karnataka or western and southern Maharashtra.

King Siri Sāta also pursued the religious policy of his illustrious predecessor. We hear that Khāravēla, during the 13th and 14th regnal years, caused the codification of Jaina *aṅgas* and raised buildings for the ascetics with stones and columns brought from many miles. King Sāta of our record thus actually accomplished the tasks initiated by his illustrious predecessor *Mahārāja* Khāravēla and justly added to his title *Mahishakādhipati* also. In the absence of any clear proof, the relationship of the former with the latter remains to be a speculation. Since the place was anciently known through the records (see below) as Mahānāgaparvata, the linguistic derivation attempted by R. Subrahmanyam²¹ for the origin of the place name Guntupalli as 'Guḍḍu=palle' Pṛithu-aṅḍa and its identification with Pitundra of Ptolemy appears to be improbable.

No. 2: Longhurst²² found an inscription engraved in very early Brāhmī script on one of the broken steps leading to the circular brick *chaitya-gṛiha* at the eastern end of the middle terrace. According to Longhurst, Krishna Sastry supplied him an English translation. He quotes him "Sānāda, the (female) pupil, who obeyed the orders of the (Buddhist) monk 'Suyajñanātha' (made these) steps." He also held that the Brāhmī characters are similar to those employed in about the 2nd century B.C.

But a perusal of the report of H. Krishna Sastry²³ with the accompanying illustration (Pl. II-2) clearly reveals that the record is of later date and Longhurst's reporting was erroneous. The text of the published estampage is reproduced here.

15845 *Thērasa bhayatā Nadasa atēvāsika*
Sānādasa
dānaṁ sōvā [naṁ]

"Gift of (the) step(s) by Sānāda, the disciple (*atēvāsika*), of the elder (*thēra*)²⁴ venerable (*bhayata*), Nāinda.

The characters also call for a few observations. As in the pillar record noted above, the letters *ka*, *ra* and *da* retain the archaic shape with long vertical endings. But the emergence of the head-marks can be clearly noted. Further the letter forms of *va*, *na*, *ta*, and *bha* are somewhat developed. The record could be assigned to about the close of 1st century B.C.

Apparently basing on Longhurst's rendering of the monk's name as *Suyajñanātha*, R. Subrahmanyam and, after him, H.D. Sankalia²⁵ held that the name sounds like that of a Jaina teacher and consequently Jaina occu-



15845

pation and influence in the area was considerable. But, as stated earlier, Jainism at this site was merely of a passing nature like the Kaliṅga power in this region which was soon overwhelmed by the Buddhist influence.

In passing, however, we may state that in medieval period Jainism reappeared at this place too, though not in the Buddhist site proper. In the Śivāru lands of Kaṇṭhamanē-nivārigūḍem, a hamlet of Jilakarragudem, about one km. west, an extensive habitational site was found. A granite image of a seated Jaina *tīrthaṅkara*²⁶ was found in the field called Gangadēvipāḍu here.

II. Inscriptions of 1st-2nd century A.D.
No. 3: GT-1/74; no. B 8 of ARIE., 1974-75.²⁷

This single line inscription (Pl. III-3) was found on a linear slab of grey lime stone, very much weathered and flaking off. The extant length is 95 cms., width 54 cms. and thickness 9 cms. The letters are somewhat cursive and the characters are datable to early 1st century A.D. The letter *na* is peculiar, both the horizontal strokes terminating with the left vertical. The same form of *na* is also noticeable in no. 10, line 4 (*Mahānāga*). The same form of letter survives for a long period as it appears again in record no. 12, line-1 of the Sālaṅkāyana times.²⁸

Mahānāgapavata-nivāsisa
mahānāvi(kasa) . .

“(Gift) of a Master-mariner (*mahānāvika*), resident of the great Nāgaparvata.” The record is fragmentary and the gift might reasonably be taken as the very floor slab.

Nos. 4A and 4B: Both are fragmentary in nature and datable to 1st century A.D.

No. 4A: (GTI-4/74: B 11 of ARIE., 1974-75): Found on a lime-stone fragment it reads . . *Sāmisa vi*. This is not illustrated.

No. 4B: On the eastern flank of the ravine, the rock face has revealed the existence of caves and shelters, besides structural votive *stūpas* amidst the scrub jungle. However, the rock face is in utterly bad state due to weathering, the architectural features such as the partition walls, screens, windows, etc. inside some of these caves and open shelters having almost disappeared. But in the present example (first one in the series from west), a plain horse-shoe shaped facade (Pl. IV-A) is prominently seen from a considerable distance. The cave faces south and is characterized by a long barrel-vaulted passage sidereally cut along the scarp. The interior is plain and inaccessible with debris, the frontage is partly levelled and banded also and existence of thatched canopy was evident from the grooves and sockets cut into the rock face above the *prastara* level and correspondingly on the floor. Its sides are also dressed and on the right lower region close to the small *kuḍu* type niche, meant for lamp, a few inscribed letters, in two sets, were noticed one below the other (Pl. IV-B). The first set reads *kaksha leṇa* and the lower one *bhudhi*.

The meaning of the first word is not clear and also its reading is tentative. The letter *ksha* could well be *pō* and the form of *la* is peculiarly written, a type, however, common in Guntupalli records. If the last letter is taken as *ṇa*, it may perhaps stand for *leṇa*, i.e., cave. Such expressions are of common occurrence in western Indian caves. *Budhi* is obviously a personal name, perhaps that of the donee who caused the *leṇa* to be

made. These labels help us to date the cave to early first century A.D. and from its severely plain nature we can infer that this was a Hīnayāna retreat.

No. 5 : (GT1-4/76).

This is also on a slab of weathered limestone broken at either ends and contained a single line inscription in the mid-region. (Pl. III-5).

Text : [Bu]dhiṇō atēvāsinēna
bhikunēnadāna [m]

“Gift of...by Budhi a resident monk”.

No. 6 (GT1-5/74 : B 12 of ARIE., 1974-75) :

This is engraved clock-wise [Pl. III-6] around the broader section of a sandstone cylindrical casket [lower portion]. Such caskets resembling the *stūpa* in architectural detail, together with the lid portion, were found in large numbers from the site, and a few among them contained reliquaries but mostly they were votive offerings.

The right loop is joined in the case of *sa* in *nikāyasa*. The letters are squarish; very little distinction exists between *ta* and *na* and the vertical ends have no curves. The characters are assignable to early 1st century A.D.

Text : Sidha Kōṭi Gahapati Kētilanākha
nikāyasa karam

“[This gift] at the Buddhist community was caused to be done by Kētilanākha, the householder from Kōṭi”.

Sidha stands for the auspicious word *Siddham*. *Karam* stands for *kāritam*, absolute for *kṛitvā*. *Kōṭi* stands for the place-name

and the expression *nikāya*²⁸ might relate to the reliquary itself.

No. 7 [GT1-3/76] :

The record is in five lines over the mid-region of the lime-stone pillar [Pl. V]. The writing commences just below the lotus medallion as in the case of no. 8 [below] and the alphabet is alike closer to this example. The engraver has omitted the vowel marks at various places and mistakes have crept in. The letter forms *ta* and *ga* are identical.

Text : 1. [Sē]ṭagiriba gahapati putasa
Nāmda ga
2. yacha Chadhapavaka Saghasa
Gagana
3. [Ga] jahusayā imam yacha dēṇō
jita-
4. patākānam Mahānāgapavata
Sēla [ma]-
5. [ḍha]vē thabhō dēyadhama
Saghasa dāna[m]

The inscription registers donations at different places by one Nandayajña, son of a householder hailing from Sēṭagiri. The first one is a gift of a decorative object described as “*Gagana-Gajahusaya*”²⁹, perhaps a *paṭa* sculptured with elephant’s descent from heaven, to the Saṁgha at *Chandakapavata*. The other is a pious gift of a *Jita-patākā* (might stand also for *chitra-patākā*), a victorious flag or *dhvaja* to the pillar at the *Śaila-maṇḍapa* on *Mahānāgapavata*.

No. 8 : (GT1-2/76) :

This pillar record (Pl. VI) is in 8 lines, the last line having only three letters at the extreme right. The engraving is somewhat

deeper, characters are stumpy, head-marks vaguely indicated by thickened tops. The vowel marks are not prominent in some cases. *Ya* is peculiar, a shallow trough type, the medial line joined sideways to the left vertical; *ha* is horizontally laid; *gha* is almost like *ya* but for the central partition and *ga* is like *ta*. The short form of verticals without the curls, together with the above palaeographical features suggest a date of early first century A.D.

Text:

1. *Vēḍhagiriyasa gahapatinō Bu-*
2. *dhinō putasa Iṇi Surakasa*
3. *gahapatinō Alahakasa A-*
4. *irayasa saputakasa Saja-*
5. *hutukasa cha dēyadhama Mahā-*
6. *nāga pavatē maḍavē thabhō chaka-*
7. *raja anumagaḍha tārija paṭa*
8. *Sagha dāna*

The record states about the two pious gifts made to the Buddhist Saṃgha at Mahānāgaparvata jointly by one Iṇi, son of Budhī, a householder hailing from Vēḍhagiri, and another householder Alahaka Śaurya (Sayiraya) hailing from distant Suraka along with his sons-in-law. The gifts are—1) *maṇḍapa* pillar (*maḍavē tabhō*) (2) a circular encasement slab (like a dome-slab) sculptured with the *dharma-chakra* in motion (*chakaraja anumagaḍha-tārija-paṭa*).

No. 9: [GT1-2/74; B 9-ARIE., 1974-75]:

A broken slab of lime stone, greyish brown, contained a single line inscription recording the gift[s] made by several persons. It measures 1.48x.39 and 8 cms. in thickness;

the incomplete inscription occupies the mid-region. The portion detailing the nature of each donation is damaged. The characters resemble no. 10 below though somewhat cursive. A tendency to end the verticals incurved could be seen in the letters *a* and *ka*, etc. The *anusvāra* and vowel marks are missing and even originally perhaps not properly followed.

Text: (Pl. VII-9).

.. [pa]vata nivas[i]sa gharan[i]
 Agahitanaṃdā[di] kānaṃ
 Ayadhama Sēnanī atevāsa . . .

“[Gift] by a house lady [*gharaṇi*] named Agahitanaṃdī, resident of [Nāga]parvata; a person named Āryadharmā; a soldier resident - - etc. [lost].

No. 10: [GT1-1/76].

The pillar has two inscriptions of different dates one below the other. The latter one is dealt with under no. 12, while the former, the earlier in date, is in six lines [Pl. VIII, 10] below the half lotus marking the terminal of the octagonal mid-region of pillar-shaft. The characters of the epigraph belong to the Kushāṇa-Sātavāhana alphabet dated to mid-second century A.D. The writing displays an improvement—the letters are now squarish, the verticals and vowel marks in *a*, *ka*, *ra* end in fine curls, the form of letter *na* in line-5, *Mahānāgaparvata*, merits special attention as both the horizontal lines terminate at the left vertical. This form of *na* seems to be a peculiarity of the region, as also other letters like *ba* and *la* in records nos. 1 and 2 and differs from the usual script. style of the century.

Text :

1. *Sidham gahapata(ti)nō Hamghasa*
2. *bharyāya Upāsikāya Budha(dhi)-*
3. *ya dēyadhama inam mi mahā-*
4. *sēla maḍhavējasa khambhā*
5. *Māhānāgapavata Ariya sam-*
6. *ghasa patiḥhapitam*

The inscription begins with the auspicious *siddham* [*dha* twice written, the first one erased and followed by punctuation mark], and records the pious installation [*pratishṭhā-pitam*] of the pillar at the big stone hall [*mahāsailamaṇḍapa*] belonging to the [*Ārya Saṁgha*] on Mahānāgaparvata by a lay disciple [*upāsika*], named Budhi, wife of householder Hamgha.

No. 11: [GT1-3/74; B 10 of *ARIE*, 1974-75]:

The record is on a rectangular slab [Pl. VII-II] measuring 54 x 50 cms. and of 9 cms. thick, broken at either ends. The extant letters read "*duhuta yā cha Saṁghī dā[nam]*" [gift of the daughter Saṁghī- -]. The first letter *ta* and the last letter *da*, a sickle type, were written upside down. The alphabets recall late Sātavāhana-Ikshvāku cursive forms datable to 3rd century A.D.

Importance of the records 3 to 10 :

The geographical names mentioned in the above records require detailed study and identification. We come to know, for the first time, that the ancient name of the hill-range containing Buddhist vestiges at Guntupalli was Mahānāgaparvata (nos. 3, 7-8, 10). It is of interest to note that a closeby depopulated village has the name Nāgulapallitōṭa³⁰ perhaps after this great Nāgaparvata. Incidentally, the identification of Guntupalli or

Guḍḍupalli by R. Subrahmanyam with *Pṛithu-aṇḍa*, i.e., Pitundra of Ptolemy is unfounded. An Amarāvati inscription of 1st-2nd century A.D. mentions one Ārya Āditya as a great supervisor of renovator works at Nāgaparvata³¹ and quite reasonably the various donatory records noted above confirm such an activity at this place during the period.

Other sacred Buddhist places that find mention are Sētādri located at the north-east corner of the Nāgārjunakoṇḍa³² valley and also mentioned in the Nasik³³ record of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi.

Vēḍagiri or *Vēṭagiri* (no. 8) might be Velagiri,³⁴ the monastery over a hillock at Jaggayyapeta, Krishna District. Alternately this could be Vēdaśaila or Vēdaparvata,³⁵ i.e., Pakshīrtham in the Chengalpattu District of Tamil Nadu. If this latter identification is correct, we could expect a Buddhist³⁶ base at this place too like in Kāñchīpuram, a closeby sacred place.

Chandakapavata (no. 7) might be the hill named after the great charioteer Chandaka. We find mention of a Śrēshṭhi from Syandakapavata³⁷ in a Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription of the time of Ehavula Chāntamula. This hill name is also found in another Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription.³⁸ An inscription from Amarāvati, of the same period, refers to the inhabitants of Chandakapavata and Chadaka respectively.³⁹ The exact location of this hill is uncertain but in every likelihood it might be near Nāgārjunakoṇḍa-Amarāvati in Guntur District.

Suraka (no. 8) might be a contraction for Śūrpāraka or Soparaka i.e., Sopara in

the Thana⁴⁰ District, about 60 kms. north of Bombay, a famous port town on the west coast during the Sātavāhana period. The contact line between the Eastern and Western coastal Buddhist centres seems to be more favourably a cross-country route, along the great Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī rivers, rather than marine.

Mahānāvika (no. 3) : In the inscription no. 3, a *mahānāvika*, i. e., a master mariner (name portion lost), residing at Mahānāgaparvata finds mention. That these mariners were Buddhists and occasionally made gifts to the *vihāras* is beyond doubt. A Ghantasala (District Krishna) record of 2nd century A.D.⁴¹ states the gift of an Āyaka pillar by the wife of a Mahānāvika. Again we get the name of a master mariner Budhagupta, native of Raktamṛittikā-Mahāvihāra going to the Malay⁴² Peninsula in 3rd-4th century A.D. Such evidences again confirm the brisk maritime activity on the East Coast linked with the expansion of Buddhism, during early centuries of the Christian era, towards the South-East Asian countries.

The gifts include architectural and sculptural members and precious reliquaries. Quite usual are the pillar donations for the *maṇḍapa* (*Sēla-maḍavē-thabhō*, nos. 7 to 10); steps (*Sōvānaṃ*, no. 2); pavement slabs (nos. 3, 9, 11) to the monastic units etc. Interesting of course are (1) a sculptured wheel slab to the *Samgha* (no. 8 lines 6-7: *Chakaraja anumagaḍha - tārija-paṭa*). This is something like the *Sōthika paṭa* (*svastika* bearing circular medallion), or *dharma-chakra dhvaja*) as at Amarāvati⁴³ (2) a circular decorative slab sculptured with

elephant's descent (no. 7: *Gagana-gajahusaya imam*) to the *Samgha* at Chandakaparvata and (3) a victorious flag or *dhvaja* (no. 7, line-4, *Jitapatākā*) to the pillar at the *Sailamaṇḍapa*. The above terms occur, for the first time, and not found mentioned anywhere even at the prolifically rich sites like Amarāvati and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.

The personal names for both males and females often seem to be identical, like Saṃghi (no. 11), Nandi (no. 9), Kētilanākha (no. 6), Haṃgha, Budhī or Budhya (no. 8), etc.

From the above, it is clear that Mahānāgaparvata regained its prestine position as a Buddhist centre from early first century A.D., and renovation works went on briskly perhaps after a temporary spell of aggrandizement by the Jains. Even some new *vihāra* caves were established (3, 4B, 9 and 11). The later inscriptions listed hereunder not only indicate Mahāyāna-Vajrayāna affiliation of the establishment but proclaim the continuance of Mahānāgaparvata as a great Buddhist centre in the ancient Vēṅgi country right upto 11th century A.D.

III Inscriptions of early 5th and 6th centuries A.D.

No. 12: *Pillar Record of the time of Sālankāyana king Vijaya Nandivarman (II)*, (Pl. VIII). The full text of the record is being edited separately by my learned colleagues K.V. Ramesh and S.S. Ramachandramurthy of the Epigraphy Branch of the Archaeological Survey of India. To complete the sequence, however, I shall state here the main contents of the record as tentatively read by me.

This lengthy inscription, in 23 lines, was found engraved below the record no. 10 above. The characters of the epigraph are Brāhmī of the post-Ikshvāku period and the language is Sanskrit. The writing is set in neat horizontal lines but the preservation of the record is far from satisfactory. While the beginning of each line is clear, the endings are invariably missing due to the exfoliation of the pillar surface. In the mid-region some letters are worn-out, presenting great difficulties in making out the text fully.

This is the only known stone inscription issued by the Śālaṅkāyana kings. The palaeography of the record betrays the curly flourishes of the post-Ikshvāku script with box-head marks and is closer to the Kadamba grant of Mṛigēśavarman, year-2. In the present record we can see definite advancement over the Ikshvāku script with the consonant signs getting externally looped and curving as in the endings like *sya*, *dya*, etc.

A distinctive feature, however, lies in the script style which markedly differs from the well known copper plate grants of this very dynasty obtained from the Vēṅgī region. This then clearly demonstrates as to how the writing style changes when the media and technique differ, albeit the scribe or engraver, his patron, place and period being identical. The 'urban' and 'rural' strains in palaeographical studies as upheld by K.V. Ramesh⁴⁶ might not hold good in such circumstances. Little difference exists in the letter forms *na* and *ta*, so also *śa* and *ga* (lines 1 and 2). In words like *Vēṅgī*, *Śālaṅku*, the usual

anunāsika has taken the place of *anusvāra*. Reduplicated consonants are generally used as in *chatur-vvidya*, *Varmma*, *dharṁma*, etc.

The record was issued by the Śālaṅkāyana king Vijayanandivarman (II) (400-430 A.D.) from the victorious city of Vēṅgī. He is the eldest son of Achaṇḍavarman known from the copper plate charters obtained from Kollair and Peddavegi. He has the usual epithets (lines 8-9), here as *Chitrarathasvāmi-pādānudhyātaḥ*, *Parama-Bhāgavataḥ*, *Bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādabhaktaḥ*, etc. The record gives us the pedigree from the time of Hastivarman (I), and four generations of rulers are cited. Interestingly the family name is stated as *Śālaṅku(ka)kula* (line-1) instead of the common expression Śālaṅkāyana as in the copper plates. This dynastic name owes its origin perhaps to the *Sagōtra ṛishi Śālaṅka* or *Śālaṅku* and, in the Dhārikaṭūra grant (lines 3-4), Achaṇḍavarman is described as belonging to Śālaṅkāyana-sagōtra.

Several covetous titles are mentioned for Hastivarman, the first ruler. He is described (lines 1 to 3) as *Śālaṅku(ka)-kulāmalākāśa-Śasāṅkaḥ*, *Vishṇugṛiha-chatur-vvidyā - sālādyanēka - vivataḥ*, *sadṛiṣa - vana-visargaḥ*, *Dharma-mahārājaḥ*, etc., whereas the Kanukollu plates describe him as *anēka-samara - mukha - vikhyāta - karmā* and the Peddavēgi charter as *anēka - samarāvāpta-vijayin*. Therefore, it appears that Hastivarman's alleged defeat⁴⁹ at the hands of Samudragupta may not be a fact but a mere boast of the latter.

As regards their personal religion: the first ruler of the dynasty, Vijayadēvavarma

was a *parama-māhēśvara* (Kanukollu plates), his son Hastivarma I, a *paramabhāgavata* and *Bhagavan - Nārāyaṇa - charaṇāravinda* (Penugonda plates); while Achaṇḍavarman and his son Vijaya Nandivarman were *parama - bhāgavatas* and *Chitrarathasvāmi-pādabhaktaḥ*. The Sālaṅkāyanas were undoubtedly followers of Viṣṇu, more appropriately devoted to Sūryanārāyaṇa, and the Peddavegi grant registers the gift of the village for the Trailōkyanātha Viṣṇu-grihasvāmi temple by Nandivarman (II) himself.

The present record appears to register a major donation to the Buddhist establishment flourishing at the place. Unfortunately the portion detailing this is illegible, but the description of a *Mahāvihāra* in lines 11, 15 and 16 is noticeable. The date portion also could not be clearly read.

It is held that the Sālaṅkāyanas were instrumental for the spread of Buddhism to Burma—also southwards to Kāñchīpuram and elsewhere and the Peddavegi grant styles Nandivarman I as *vividha-dharma-pradhānasya*. That Mahānāgaparvata was connected to Kāñchī—and its neighbourhood is established by the reference to Vēdaśaila in no. 8 above as early as in 1st century A.D. The tribe of Salaenkanoi referred by Ptolemy⁵¹ as rulers of the northern country of Maisola (now identified as Mahishaka, vide no. 1) were also described by Pāṇini as a *gaṇa* (republic). According to a Burmese tradition, the Sālaṅkāyanas were responsible for the spread of Buddhism to that land and the present record substantiates their patronage to Buddhist *Samghas*.

No. 13 (GT1-6/74; B-13, ARIE., 1974-75):

This inscription, in four lines, was found on a brown slate squarish tablet (Pl. IX-B) with raised borders. The characters are quite deep and boldly incised and display closeness to the Viṣṇukuṇḍi and Sālaṅkāyana copper plate grants. The language is Prakrit mixed with Sanskrit. The text reveals a Buddhist creed *i.e.*, exposition of four noble truths⁵² (*chatvāri ārya-satyāni*). These are *duḥkha* (suffering), *samudāya* (the causes of suffering), *nirōdha* (the removal of the cause) and the *mārga* (the way leading to the removal of the cause). Clay tablets containing the Buddhist creed from Sankaram⁵⁴ (District Vizag) are of the same period, but the present example is a stone plaque with a formula not met with so far in any Buddhist site of this region.

Text:

1. *Dukha Dukhi samutpādam*
2. *Dukhasya⁵⁵ vā(ē)tikkrāmam*
3. *Ariyañcha Ajāṅgikam ma-*
4. *tiṃ Dukhōpasama sāmikam*

No. 14: (GT 1-5/76):

The inscription (Pl. IX-14) in Nāgarī characters assignable to circa. 9th-10th century A.D. was found engraved on the lotus flower base of a bronze image of Bōdhisattva Padmapāṇi. The figure measures 23½ cms. in height, the *Padma* base 4 cms. in diameter and *Prabhāvali* 8 cms. in width. Gold inlay is seen over the *Kirīṭa* and the necklace decor. A worshipper with folded hands is shown at the right lower edge of the *pīṭha*.

The language of the record is Sanskrit and the text reads clockwise over the lotus

petals revealing the usual Buddhist formula.

Text :

*Yē dharmā hētu prabhavā hētum
tēshām tathāgatō hyavadat
Tēshāncha yō nirōdha ēvam vādi
Mahā Śramaṇaḥ.*

The image is an object of personal worship and found associated with the later occupational phase inside the newly exposed cave at the eastern slope of the terrace.

The above epigraphical wealth is the result of a very limited clearance work and there is little doubt in the fact that a more planned extensive clearance of the jungle-clad caves and open high mounds northwards would yield richer dividends. The inscriptions edited above possess certain


intrinsic merits. They refurbish the value of palaeography for closer dating. This is possible because they are considerable in number and are found associated with a compact monastic unit in all its structural phases, actively involved in the sectarian growth of the site. Similar epigraphical wealth exists at the famous sites of Amarāvati, Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and Sankaram, all in Andhra Pradesh but scant attention is paid for undertaking closer palaeographical studies.

The place was finally usurped by the Śaivaites and the oldest circular *chaitya* cave was named as Dharmalingēśvara and a *nandi* was placed in its front. The place is venerated as a great living *kshētra* by the locals and on Śivarātri days, particularly the female folk worship the *chaitya* as a bestower of fecundity.

Foot-Notes :

1. This picturesque hill-range belongs to the village of Jilakarragudem (Kamavarapukota Taluk) which is 45 kms north of Ellore RS.
2. R. Sewell, "Buddhist Remains at Guntupalli", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, XIX (1887), pp. 508-511. But A.H. Longhurst credits Rea with the first visit (See note 4 below).
3. Rea's account-See Government of Madras, G. O. no. 646, 2nd August, 1889; Cf. *South Indian Buddhist Antiquities, Archaeological Survey of India, New Imperial Series*, XV (Madras, 1894).
4. A. H. Longhurst, "The Buddhist Monuments at Guntupalli, Krishna District. *Annual Report, Archaeological Department, Southern Circle*, for the year 1916-17 (March, 1917), pp. 30-35.
5. *Indian Archaeology - A Review*, 1961-62, p. 97; and 1968-69, p. 64.
6. R. Subrahmanyam, "The Guntupalli Brāhmī Inscription of Khāravēla," *Andra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series*, no 3 (Hyderabad, 1968):
7. A few of these have been included in the *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*, 1974-75 as B.7 to B.13, corresponding to nos. 1, 3, 7, 11, 4A, 6 and 13. Information kindly supplied by The Chief Epigraphist, vide D. O. letter no. 383 (7) 78-25 dt. 4-1-78.
8. D. Mitra, *Ujjayagiri and Khandagiri* (New Delhi, 1960), Pl. IX.

9. Inscribed pillar records recording an identical gift of *maṇḍapa* complex are found with the *Mahāvihāra* complex at Nagarjunakonda. See H. Sarkar, in *Epigraphia Indica*, XXXVII, p. 176. Also at the famous Sarvadēva temple, six or seven copies of the same text of the time of Ehalavala Śrī were found on different pillars; *Epigraphia Indica*, XXXII, pp. 147-149. It appears that they were meant for variously located *maṇḍapas* in the same place.
10. R. Subrahmanyam, *Op. cit.*, (1968), p. 2.
11. D.C. Sircar: "An alleged inscription of Kharavela" (Calcutta, 1969-70), *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, III, pp. 30-36.
12. *Epigraphia Indica*, XXXII, pp. 82-86. Prof. Sircar further states that the ruler was born of Sātavāhana princess; hence the name Sāta, *JAIH.*, III, pp. 34, 275.
13. It may be noted that *Maṇḍapa* has several meanings. D. C. Sircar, *Epigraphical Glossary* (New Delhi, 1966), pp. 195-96. But in Guntupalli records it appears to denote a pillared hall on stone columns in a monastic unit for the assemblage of the monks.
14. *Indica*, 9, no. 2 (Bombay, Sept. 1972), pp., 83-88; *JBORS.*, XIII, p. 221.
15. *E.I.*, XIII, pp. 159-67; XX, pp. 71-89; D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, I (Calcutta, 1965), pp. 214-222.
16. We have no evidence, numismatic, epigraphical or whatsoever, to agree with R. Subrahmanyam (*Op.cit.*, pp. 4-6) that the early Sātavāhana rulers of the time prior to Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi held coastal Āndhra, although the contiguous Vidarbha and Telangana regions were within the heart of the empire right from the beginning and Sātavāhanas were undoubtedly Āndhras. Cf. I. K. Sarma, "Fresh light on the History of the Sātavāhanas", *Itihas*, III, pp. 2 and 4. notes 5 and 13. Also his equation of Musikanagara with Kondapuram in Medak District is not sound as there is no river nearby and no evidence is forthcoming to substantiate Khāravēla's expedition into this remote area.
17. *Indian Antiquary*, LV, p. 145.
18. J. Dubrieul, *Ancient History of Deccan*, pp. 84-87.
19. *JNSI.*, XI, pt. 1, p. 4. *EI.*, XXXVIII, p. 45; *JNSI.*, XXXII, (1970), pp. 65-76. For the latest view S. Sankaranarayanan, in *JNSI.* XXXIV (1972), p. 39.
20. P. Gupta, *Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions* (1973), pp. 83, 95. D. C. Sircar, *Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, (New Delhi, 1971), pp. 245-47. Generally Mahishamaṇḍala is located in south Mysore. See for various locations of Mahishaka country, N. L. Dey, *Geographical Dictionary*, p. 20.
21. R. Subrahmanyam, *Op.cit.*, p. 5.
22. A. H. Longhurst, *ARADSC.*, 1916-17 (Madras-1951), p. 35.
23. *Government of Madras G. O. no. 1035, Home (Education), 10th August 1917, Epigraphy*, p. 5.
24. *Sthavira* is an elder among the Buddhist monks and belongs to *Sthaviravāda* school.
25. R. Subrahmanyam, *Op.cit.*, p. 6 and H. D. Sankalia, *Aspects of Indian History and Archaeology* (New Delhi, 1977), pp. 138-39. It may also be noted that no inscription was reported by A. Rao from Guntupalli.
26. I am thankful to Śhri Indukuru Suryanarayana Raju, native of Jilakarragudem for taking me to this site.
27. In all such cases, the first is the field number and the next the number assigned by the Epigraphy Branch, Mysore in their *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy*.



MIDDLE TERRACE, VIEW OF THE STRUCTURAL STUPAS

EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE II




1. Inscription of Siri Sāda.

2. Donatory record on a stone step.




EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE III




3. Inscripton on a Floor slab.
4. Inscription on another Floor slab.
5. Inscription on a stone reliquary.

EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE IV




A. General view of the cave
B. Close view of the inscribed wall face.

EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE V





7. Inscribed *Maṇḍapa* pillar.

EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE VI




8. Another inscribed *Mandapa* pillar.

EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE VII



EPIGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES AT GUNTUPALLI-PLATE VIII



10 and 12. Inscribed pillar




PLATE IX

28. *Epigraphical Glossary* (1966), p. 217. The word is specially used to signify the collection of Buddhist. *Suttas*, the five sections of *Suttanta piṭaka*, viz., *Dīgha*, *Majjhima*, *Sanyutta*, *Anguttara* and *Khudaka*.
29. The meaning of *husaya* is not clear. The slab may have the usual depiction of the scene of Śvētakētu's descent from Tushita heaven and entering Māyādēvi's womb; as at Bharhuth Amarāvati, etc.
30. This is $\frac{1}{2}$ km. south-west of Guntupalli hill and the ancient mound of this place goes with the name Nāgadēvulapāḍu. There is a hooded *nāga* slab of Khondolite which is still in worship in a recently built cell on the road side.
31. C. Srivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Government Museum* (Madras, 1956), p. 278.
32. *E.I.*, XXXIV, p. 203, Inscription no. 4. Also see *Indica*, no. 7 (March, 1971), pp. 6, 14-15.
33. D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions I* (1965), p. 197.
34. D. Mitra, *Op. cit.* (1972), p. 311.
35. D.C. Sircar, *Geography of Ancient and Medieval India* (New Delhi, 1971), p. 336.
36. The place is also known as *Tirukkaukkūṇṇam*: Tiru i.e., *śrī*; *kaḷu* = *Gṛidhra* or vulture; *kuṇṇam* = hill. Perhaps after the famous *Gṛiddhakūṣa śāila* Rājagṛiha. I am grateful to Sri K.R. Srinivasan for this reference.
37. *E.I.*, XXXV, pp. 11-13.
38. *E.I.*, XX, p. 22.
39. Lüders List, no. 1220; Also C. Sivaramamurti (1953), p. 294.
40. P. Gupta, *Geography in Ancient Indian Inscriptions* (New Delhi, 1973), pp. 109-110.
41. *E.I.*, XXVII, (1947-48), p. 4.
42. D. Mitra, *Op. cit.*, p. 236.
43. *E.I.*, XXIV, pp. 258-76 pt. lines 8-9.
44. *Ibid.*, XXXV, p. 152, Pt.
45. Penugonda plates of Hastivarman, *E.I.*, XXXV, pp. 148-49; Konukollu plates, *Ibid.*, XXXI, p. 8. Dharikaṭūra grant of Achaṇḍavarman, *Ibid.*, XXXVI, pp. 4-5. ft. However, the variation is not much in Peddavegi plates of Nandivarman II himself. *JAHRS*, I, pt. II, p. 92, but not the Kollair grant, *Indian Antiquary*, V, p. 175.
46. *Studies in Indian Epigraphy*, III (Mysore, 1976), pp. 156-159.
47. The name of the monarch here is clearly *Rājāchaṇḍavarmaṇaḥ*.
48. Śālaṅkāyana is the name of *ṛishi*. In the Pravarakāṇḍa, Śālaṅkāyanas have two sets of *gōtra ṛishis*, all *Traiyaṛshēya* [1] Bharadvāja, Āngirasa, Bārhaspatya; [2] Viśvāmittra, Śālaṅkā (yana), Kauṣika, etc. Pāṇini's *Ashṭādhyāyī* gives (*sūtra* IV-1-99) the group of words beginning with *nāḍa* all of them taking the *pratyaya* 'Ayāna' (*Nāḍāyana* etc.). I am thankful to Dr. Parabrahma Sastry for this kind information. The family name *Śivalēṅka* is nothing but a colloquialism of Śālaṅka and *ṛishis* of the two *gōtras* are the same.
49. *E.I.*, XXXI, pp. I-11.
50. B. V. Krishna Rao, *A History of the Early Dynasty of Andhra-desa* (Madras, 1942), pp. 380-81.
51. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 13th Section* (Madras, 1930), pp. 64-65 and *Journal of Oriental Research*, II (Madras), pp. 111-112.
52. *E.I.*, XXX, p. 101, Pl. II.
53. Terracotta or stone tablets inscribed with *Dharaṇis*, *pratitya- samutpāda-sūtra* and Buddhist creed were found at Ratnagiri. D. Mitra (1972), pp. 222-228.
54. A. Rea, "A Buddhist Monastery on the Sankaram Hills" *Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of India*, 1907-08 (Calcutta, 1911), pp. 149-80.
55. Dukha-Skandha is also found explained in the Nalanda text of *Pratitya- samutpada- sūtra* *E.I.*, XXI, pp. 20-22, no. 7.

8. SOME EPIGRAPHICAL ECHOES OF THE SANGAM EPOCH

K. V. Raman

The ancient sources for the existence of the Tamil Sangam have been points of interesting discussions among scholars for quite sometime. The tradition of the Tamil Academy had been persistent in the Tamil literary heritage. The tradition is crystallised in the well-known Tamil work, *Iraiyaṅṅar Agapporuḷ* dated 9th or 10th century A.D. But we do get some echoes of this tradition even in the earlier works though they are brief and incidental in nature. For example Āṇḍāl's reference to *Sāṅgattamiḷmālai* in her *Tiruppāvai* and a similar reference in the *Dēvāram* can be cited as two examples. Such references indirectly inform us about the glory of the Tamil language of the Sangam period and present it to us as the supreme touch-stone of the greatness of the language.

In this paper, some epigraphical references concerning the Sangam tradition are briefly presented. The direct reference to the Pāṇḍyan king, Neḍuñjeḷiyan in the short Brāhmī inscription at Māṅguḷam near Madurai and the table of genealogy of the Chēra kings given in the famous Pugaḷūr inscription which tally well with the account given by the Sangam poem, *Paḍiṅruppattu*, constitute important evidence. These serve to corroborate the evidences found in the Sangam anthologies. However, they are not the direct evidence to the Sangam tradition, as such. But there are quite a few references to the Sangam tradition which may briefly be alluded to here. The larger Sinnamanur

copper plates issued by the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha II in the beginning of the 10th century A.D. pays an eloquent tribute to the Pāṇḍya king who founded the city of Madurai and promoted the Sanskrit and Tamil languages, caused *Mahābhārata* to be translated into Tamil and promoted Tamil learning by instituting or patronising a Tamil Academy (Sangam) :

Vaḷamadurai nagarkaṇḍu maṅṅadaṅku
madil vaguttu
uḷamikka madiyadanā leṅḍamiḷum
vaḍamoḷiyum
paludarattā nārāindu
mahābhāratam taṅḷpaḍuttum Madurā-
puri sangam vaittum.

In another context the Pāṇḍya king is praised as the master of Tamil language (*Tēṅ-Tamiḷin karaikaṇḍum*) and calls another Pāṇḍya king as one who studied Tamil along with Agastya, traditions which echo similar sentiments expressed in the Sangam literature.

There was a lively discussion and difference of opinion with regard to the origin of the word, *kūḍal*, which was the alternative name for Madurai in ancient times. All sorts of speculations were made taking *Kūḍal* as indicating the confluence of rivers; writers searched for the non-existent rivers and could not find more than one river there namely Vaigai. But the speculations

are set at rest by an interesting reference that we find in the Sivakasi copper plates¹ which seem to give a correct explanation of the word, Kūḍal for Madurai. It calls Madurai as *Tamiḷkūḍal*, which can be translated as Madurai, the confluence of Tamil scholars or the seat of the Tamil Sangam. The Sivakasi plates are also datable to the 10th or 11th century A.D. It has clearly recorded the tradition that Madurai was also called *Tamiḷkūḍal* or the seat of the Tamil Academy.

Another interesting epigraphical echo of the Sangam poem is found in the Daḷavāy-puram copper plates issued by Parāntaka Vīra-Nārāyaṇa (860-905 A.D.) The opening verses of these copper plates are culled out from the famous Sangam poem, *Madurai-kāñchi* beginning with the words *Ōṅgutirai viyan parappil*, etc.

Another pointed and interesting epigraphical allusion to the Sangam at Madurai is found in an inscription from Ramnad District in the Pāṇḍyanāḍu. It mentions among

other things that the Pāṇḍya king Śaḍaiyan Māran *alias* Śrīvallabha honoured one Etti-Śāttan for the many beneficial acts that he did and conferred the title Iruppaikuḍi-kiḷavan on him. This man is called as a chieftain of Kūḍalkuḍi, Iruppaikuḍi, etc., and described as one who came of the family of poets who had the distinction of being seated on the stone slab at *Kūḍal* or Madurai famous for its Tamil². This inscription clearly shows that the people of the period were well aware of the importance of the Tamil Sangam in the bygone days and the descendants of the Sangam poets were continued to be honoured and held in esteem by the Pāṇḍya kings.

The above cited instances would go to show that the memory of the Tamil Academy at Madurai continued to be fertile in the minds of the later people and the echoes of them are found both in literature and in inscriptions. Many more such instances can be collected and arranged chronologically which would add significance to the subject.

FOOT-NOTES :

¹ Pāṇḍiyar Seppēḍugaḷ Pattu.

² *SII.*, XIV—No. 44.

I

The Aśvī grant of Yādava Āirammadēva, edited by Dr. G. S. Gai in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 249 ff. (with facsimiles), informs us that the king was then encamped at a place known as Narmadāpura. This place is mentioned also in the Bhopal grant of the Paramāra Mahākumāra Udayavarman, dated Vikrama 1256 or 1200 A.D.,¹ and while editing this inscription, I have proposed to identify it with the modern town of Nēmāwar in the Dewas District of Madhya Pradesh. Lying on the Northern bank of the Narmadā, it is an ancient place, possessing, besides some other antiquities, an old temple of Śiva, containing two pilgrims' records dated Vikrama 1253 and 1281,² the first of which was engraved three years earlier than Udayavarman's grant. It may also be noted here that the name Narmadāpura can be philologically connected with Nēmāwar, through the intermediate stage of *Nemma-ā-ūra*.

Āirammadēva is known to have been a zealous feudatory of the Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI (1076-1126 A.D.), and, as is well known, his territory was roughly bounded on the north by the Narmadā. But, since Nēmāwar, where the king was encamped while issuing the grant, is on the north bank of the river, the conclusion is irresistible that he had then conquered some region on its north, around Nēmāwar, snatching it, apparently, from the Paramāras

who were to his immediate north. This incident appears to have taken place during the reign of Paramāra Udayāditya whose earliest inscription is dated 1080 A.D. and who was constantly busy with his enemies in the other directions.

We also know that the credit of establishing Vikramāditya in sovereignty is given to Sēūnachandra II, and it is probable that his son Āirammadēva may have fought the battle as a prince.

Here we may notice another grant of Āirammadēva, which I studied from photographs of the inscription incised on three plates, which I owe to Dr. S. K. Bhatt, a friend of mine at Indore. This grant was not so far noticed. The relevant portion of it reads : *Sam(sam)vat nav-ādhika-sahasrē tv-añkatō'pi 1009 Prabhava-samvatsar-āntar-gata Śrāvaṇa-kṛishṇa-pañchadaśyām Ravau Sūrya-grahaṇa-parvvaṇi..... pṛithvivallabhē Bhuvanaikamalla-vijaya-rājyē Sēūnadēsē..... Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara-Śri-Āirammadēva - vijaya-rājyē śri-Āiapakumārēṇa. . śri-Dhavabhadrasya Pimpari-grāmaḥ pradattaḥ....(lines 29-35)*

(From my own Transcript)

The year of the grant is Śaka 1009 (1087 A.D.), which is eleven years earlier than that of the Aśvī grant, showing that the Yādava king occupied the throne rather earlier by so many years. This we know for the first time from this inscription.

In this grant too, the name of the king is spelt as Āirammadēva, which supports what

Dr. Gai has observed, viz., that this was the name of the king, and not Airamma or Paramma, as is given by Hēmādri. But we have also to take into account that the name in the Aśvī grant may have been copied from this grant which gives the spelling of the name, merely because of the fancy of the writer, as it also appears in his spelling of the name of the donor as Āiapakumāra, just after.

To enable us to throw more light on the Yādava-Paramāra struggle in the last quarter of the eleventh century A.D., we may notice here another charter, which has recently been known but is still unpublished. This record consists of three copper plates which are reported to have been found in a field at Rajpur in the Khargone District of Madhya Pradesh and were acquired in the district treasury as a treasure trove and subsequently they were sent to the Indore Museum. I studied the inscription through the kind courtesy of the Curator of the Museum, Shri. R.S. Garg.

The grant mentioned in the plates was made by *Mahāmaṇḍalesvara* Raṇadhavala, a subordinate of the Paramāra king Naravarman; and after some years the same grant was confirmed by the same feudatory himself. The relevant portion, after describing Naravarman with all the epithets of a paramount sovereign, runs as follows :—

..... *tat-pāda-padma-prasād-āvāpta-pūrṇa-pathakaysa chatvāriṃśa-sahasr-ādhipatyam... samasta-prasastōpēta-pāñcha-mahāśabdālam-kāra - virājamāna - Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara - śrī - Raṇadhavaladēvaḥ.....* (lines 8-10)

(From my own transcript)

The grant was originally issued on the fifteenth day of the dark half of Pausha,

Vikrama 1148, which is equivalent to 25th December, 1092 A.D., and it was renewed on the ninth day of the bright half of Chaitra, Vikrama 1177, which regularly corresponds to 10th March, 1120 A.D.

Thus, the Rajpur grant, as we may call it after the findspot of the plates, was held in abeyance for complete twentynine years. It is possible that the grant by a subordinate ruler, Raṇadhavala, would not be valid unless it is confirmed by his feudal lord, but the interval of not less than about thirty years between the two dates seems to be a long one, and the only conclusion that can be drawn on the point is that the territory in which the grant village lay was subsequently occupied by some of the enemies, who could have been, in the present case, either the Chālukya emperor Vikramāditya, probably helped by some of his feudatories, or Chaulukya Jayasīṃha, who too was endeavouring his best to extend his territories towards the east.

It is worth noting here that Rajpur, along with the other places mentioned in the inscription, is situated to the south of the Narmadā, and a study of the inscription shows that the Narmadā region, in as much as it lay in the southern part of Madhya Pradesh, constantly changed hands between the two royal houses.

It is also significant to note here that Raṇadhavala issued this donation from his camp at the holy place known as Amarēśvara, which is to the south of the Narmadā and not far from Rajpur where the plates were obtained. The place contains a Jyōtirliṅga, and is also mentioned in some of the Paramāra inscriptions.³

Here we may also note some other important points from this (Rajpur) grant. It is dated Vikrama 1148, equivalent to 1092 A.D. It gives the epithets of a paramount sovereign to Naravarman in this year. On the other hand, the Dewas grant of the king tells us that he performed his father Udayāditya's first anniversary (*sāmvatsarika*) on a date which is equivalent to 24th August 1094 A.D. ; and, on the basis of this and some other evidences, Naravarman is known to have ascended the throne in 1093-94 A.D. To reconcile both these conflicting evidences, we may suggest that his father Udayāditya may have abdicated at least as early as in 1092 A.D., and not in 1093-94 A.D. as hitherto believed.⁴

Who may have defeated and repelled the Paramāras from the Rajpur region is also a problem to solve in this connection. It is fair to assume that he may have been Āchugi II, the Sinda chief of Yelburga, who is known to have fought several battles of his master and who is mentioned in an inscription as making the king of Mālava, among some others, subject to his sovereign Vikramāditya.⁵

II

Two copper-plate inscriptions of the Chandēlla rulers of the Vindhya region of Madhya Pradesh have come to light within the past few years, and their contents have been briefly noticed in the *Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy*. But they are still unedited, and here we propose to show their historical significance. The first of these, which is engraved on a single plate, is now exhibited in a local Museum at Kuṇḍēśvara, near Ṭikamgaḍh, the headquarters of a district of

that name in Madhya Pradesh. It records a grant issued by the Chandēlla king Vidyādharma, on the *amāvāsya* day of Śrāvaṇa, on a solar eclipse, in [V.] S. 1060, which is equivalent to 20th July, 1004 A.D.⁶

Noticing the historical importance of the inscription, we find that since the latest known year of Vidyādharma's grandfather, Dhaṅga, is 998 A.D. when he issued the Nānyaūra grant, and also since, on the evidence of the present grant we have to take Vidyādharma on the Chandēlla throne in 1004 A.D., we can conclude only that the latter's father Gaṇḍa either did not come to the throne, or, he may have occupied it only for a short period.⁷

Another important point that we note from the study of this inscription is that it solves finally the long-ranging controversy with reference to the name of the enemy of Pratihāra Rājyapāla, who is mentioned as Bidā by Ibn-ul-Asir,⁸ but as Nandā, by Nizamuddin,⁹ Firishta¹⁰, and Gardizi¹¹. Considering these different readings, Cunningham held that Nandā of the writers is a misreading for Gaṇḍa,¹² and this view was accepted by Hultzsch,¹³ Smith,¹⁴ Ray,¹⁵ Tripathy,¹⁶ and some others. But the present inscription, which shows that Dhaṅga was succeeded by Vidyādharma, also suggests that both these names, namely, Nandā and Bidā, should be taken as denoting only Vidyādharma, Bidā being a short and corrupt form of *Vidyā*.

The other inscription, which we may notice here in brief, refers itself to the reign of the Chandēlla king Trailōkyavarman, who, from his capital Ajayagaḍh (Jayapura-durga), donated the village Chachāhi, on the

eleventh day of the bright half of Chaitra, Wednesday, in V. S. 1283, which regularly corresponds to 11th March, 1226 A.D. This inscription also is on a single plate, and at present is exhibited in the Rāmvan Museum near Satnā, in Madhya Pradesh.

The latest known year of Trailōkyavarman is V. S. 1269 or 1212 A.D., supplied by the fragmentary stone inscription from Ajayagadh, and thus the present inscription shows that this ruler continued to be on the throne at least for fourteen years thereafter.

III

The Dhureti (Rewa) copper-plate inscription which gives the name of Trailōkyamalla, was edited by N.P. Chakravarti, with a lithograph, in the *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 1 ff., and subsequently it was also edited by Dr. V.V. Mirashi, in *CII.*, Vol. IV, pp. 369 ff. Both these scholars identified Trailōkyamalla, mentioned therein, with Chandēlla Trailōkyavarman, but this view has now to be dismissed in view of a copper-plate

inscription which has recently been found and is now deposited in the Museum at Maṇḍlā in Madhya Pradesh. The epigraph records the donation made by the Kalachuri king Vijayasimha, son and successor of Gayākarṇa, in the Kalachuri year 949, which is equivalent to 1198 A.D. on the occasion of a birthday ceremony (*jāta-karma*) of the prince (*Mahākumāra*) Trailōkyamalla.

This indeed is a new information, showing that the latter was a son of the former. And since Vijayasimha's last known year is 96x, he appears to have been succeeded by Trailōkyamalla, in whose reign this record seems to have been incised, in the Kalachuri year 963.¹⁷ This view is also consistent with the mention in it of the *Rājaguru* Vimalaśiva, who was a spiritual preceptor of the Kalachuri royal house. Thus we need not assume that after the end of the Kalachuri rule in the Rewa territory, the spiritual Teacher, along with some officers also, may have transferred his faithfulness to the rising power of the Chandēllas.¹⁸

FOOT-NOTES :

1. *IA.*, XVI, pp. 252 ff. It is my No. 46.
2. See *Prog. Rep.*, *W.C.*, for 1920-21, pp. 22 and 55. D. R. Bhandakar's *List of Inscrs.*, No. 479.
3. For example, the Māndhātā grant of Jayasimha, (V.) Year 1112, *EI.*, III, pp. 48 ff. It is our No. 18.
4. Raṇadhavala, known for the first time from this record, may obviously be identified with Rindhuwul, mentioned in the *Rāsamālā* (trans- by Forbes), Vol. I, p. 117.
5. See R. G. Bhandarkar's *History of the Deccan*, p. 151.
6. *A.R. on Epigraphy*, No. A7 of 1971-72.
7. This point has been briefly mentioned in the Report.
8. *Al-Tarikhul*, Bulak, Vol. IX, pp. 115 ff.
9. *Tabaāt-i-Akbarī*, tr. by B. De, Vol. I, p. 12.
10. *Tārikh-i-Firishtā*, Vol. I, pp. 63 ff.
11. *Kitāb Zainul Akhbār*, by al-Gardizi, p. 76.

12. *Arch. Surv. of Ind. Report*, Vol. II, p. 452.
13. *EI.*, I, p. 219.
14. *IA.*, XXXVII, p. 128.
15. *Dy. Hist. Of N. India*, I, p. 606.
16. *History of Kanauj*, p. 285, n. 5.
17. The information of the find and also the conclusion I owe to Shri B. C. Jain, Dy. Director of Arch., M.P.
18. For details, see *CII.*, IV, pp. 370 f.

10. RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN THE TAMIL COUNTRY: A RE-APPRAISAL OF EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

R. Champakalakshmi

In the religious history of the Tamil country, the seventh century A.D. has been generally taken to be a period of serious conflict between the Brahmanical sects of Vaishnavism and Śaivism, on the one hand, and the Buddhist and Jain sects on the other, the former gaining the upper hand through the success of the Bhakti movement headed by the Vaishṇava Ālvārs and Śaiva Nāyaṇārs, who won royal support and patronage. This view is based on traditional accounts in hagiological literature and on certain synchronisms and identifications suggested in them as well as in the *Tēvāram* and *Divyaprabandham* hymns of the *bhakti* exponents. Corroboratory evidence is sought from a few epigraphic records, one of them being the controversial inscription in the Tiruchirapalli cave temple assignable to the period of Mahēndravarman I, the Pallava.

The above view, which has so far provided an acceptable background for writing the history of this region, has been seriously questioned by a recent study on the date of the *Tēvāram* trio, based on a very systematic study of the inscriptions and distribution pattern of the early Chōḷa temples.¹ This study has, however, set aside, quite unjustifiably, all the literary references to certain personalities and their contemporaneity to the authors as entirely unreliable due to their

“legendary” or “mythical” character. While it is true that the aim of this study is ostensibly to provide a more dependable chronology for events of great significance connected with the socio-religious changes brought about by this conflict, it is doubtful whether it has tackled the problem in its entirety or from the point of view of the “opposition”, the opposition in this case being represented by the Jains.

The present paper, it must be stated at the outset, does not aim at questioning the validity of the use of epigraphic evidence as more reliable than literary evidence, but seeks other approaches to the study of the same theme, rather an allied theme, which, while upholding the general trustworthiness and authenticity of epigraphic data, would also show the limitations of its use, especially when one is dealing with complex phenomena determining the course of events or changes. For understanding the origin and nature of this conflict, all the factors involved in it have to be closely examined. To take up only the Śaiva aspects of the picture would, therefore, mean an inadequate or partial approach to the problem. Hence, the endeavour, here, is to look at the other side of the coin *i. e.*, to look at the question from the evidence provided by the Jain inscriptions and to the extent necessary touch upon the

Vaiṣṇava records, both epigraphic and literary. In addition, archaeological and architectural evidence is also drawn upon, wherever possible. It is hoped that in the process, the criteria which determine the correct use of epigraphic and other data would emerge.

Jain inscriptions appear in the Tamil country as early as the second century B.C. in the form of short Tamil Brāhmī inscriptions giving the names of ascetics who occupied natural caverns on hills and lay followers who provided the material basis for their support.² Even the most conservative dating of these records cannot bring any of them down to a period later than the 4th-5th centuries A.D. Though not very large in number, these inscriptions are fairly widely distributed in the whole of Tamilnadu so as to suggest a period of at least two centuries for the spread of this religion in the early Christian era.³ Suddenly, for reasons not clear, there appears a long interval of time before the re-appearance of inscriptions referring to the Jain sect. The pattern of re-appearance, again, is not the same all over, for, in a number of places, particularly in the Madurai region, there is a sudden proliferation of Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions assignable to the 8th-9th centuries A.D. whereas, in certain other areas, as in Sittaṇṇavāśal, Śingavaram and Tiruchirappalli, there are some stray inscriptions in Grantha and 'archaic' characters recording some more names, assignable to the 6th-7th centuries A.D. If the dating of the Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions is reasonably certain, one is inclined to ask the question 'what happened in this interval of silence from inscriptions or what caused this gap in inscriptions? It may be

suggested that some of the Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions are earlier in date, which can be checked by working out a dependable palaeographical table for the Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions with the help of dated ones, also available in the same region.

A more curious but interesting phenomenon is observed in the Jain inscriptions coming from the regions occupied by the Chōḷas of the Vijayālaya line. They are datable in the ninth-tenth centuries A.D. and belong to the reigns of the same early Chōḷa rulers, Āditya I and Parāntaka I, to whose period the new theory assigns the *Tēvāram* trio. These two rulers are found to be invariably patronising or at least viewing with favour the endowments made to a considerable number of Jain temples and monasteries.

In the North Arcot district alone, four important Jain centres⁵ received patronage in the time of Rājakēsari Āditya I and Parakēsari Parāntaka I (871-955 A.D.). Other centres in the same district were in existence from Pallava times, the earliest records being those of Nandivarman II (730-795 A.D.).⁶ Three important Jain centres in the South Arcot district are known only through the inscriptions of the period of Āditya I and Parāntaka I.⁷ A fourth one in the same district may be assigned to the same period on palaeographic grounds.⁸

Tirunaṅṅonḍai in South Arcot Dt. was already an important centre of Jain worship from the ninth century A. D.⁹ and Chōḷa inscriptions in the Appāṇḍa Jain temple date from the period of Rājārāja I.¹⁰ Similarly the Perumandur Jain temple in the same district has ninth century inscriptions¹¹

but Chōḷa patronage was extended to it only in the 12th-13th centuries A.D.¹⁸

Ānandamaṅgalam in the Chingleput district flourished as an important Jain centre in the time of Parāntaka I.¹⁸

In the heart of the Chōḷa country Tirunāgēśvaram in the Tanjavur district seems to have had a Jain temple called the Milāḍuḍaiyārpaḷḷi, to which a pillared verandah (*tiruchchurṅālai*) and gateway (*gōpura*) were added in the time of Āditya I.¹⁴ Under Parāntaka, Sendalai was associated with the Jains.¹⁵

In Poṅṇiḷaindānpaṭṭi near Sendalai and Niyamam, the wife of Kuvavan, a Muttaraiya chieftain and contemporary of Nandivarman II, made grants to a Jain *paḷḷi*, of which there is no trace now.¹⁶

The new date assigned to the *Tēvāram* trio would suggest that these *nāyaṅārs* toured the same regions in the tenth century singing the praise of Śiva in those temples believed to have been erected under Āditya I and Parāntaka I. It would also mean that the religious conflict was acute in the tenth century and probably resulted in the decline of the Jain faith. On the other hand, the Jain inscriptions would seem to provide evidence to the contrary, particularly in the Chōḷa occupied regions. It is precisely in this period that many centres appear to have come up or were patronised. Some of them continued to flourish under the successors of these early Chōḷas, such as Rājarāja I and Rājēndra I and even later.

A regionwise survey of the Jain inscriptions in other parts of Tamil Nadu also reveals a similar picture. The hill at

Triruchirapalli contains a natural cavern in a rather inaccessible spot, apart from two rock-cut caves at more convenient spots. The cavern has a series of short inscriptions, one in Brāhmī reading *Chira*, and others in a script similar to the Pallava - Grantha and archaic Tamil, giving various names and titles,¹⁷ two of which have been connected with Pallava Mahēndravarmān I.¹⁸ In one of the Śaiva cave temples is found the well-known but controversial Sanskrit inscription believed to be of the same king and referring to his supposed conversion from Jainism to Śaivism.¹⁹ If this hill was one of those occupied by the Jains early, as the word *Chira* is said to represent a Jain name and *Chirāpaḷḷi*, the name of the place, is said to be derived from it,²⁰ then the seventh century cave temple would indicate its appropriation by Śaivas or change over to Śaivism.

Sivaram in the same district seems to have been a Jain centre around 8th-9th centuries or earlier as seen from the "archaic" inscriptions and Jain sculptures on the *Ṣuṅḍakkāpārai*, a huge boulder, which also contains several rock-cut beds.²¹

In the Pudukkottai region, the hilly area of Ammāchatram provided the background for a big Jain monastery and temple at Tiruppaḷḷimalai or Tirumāṅmalai, which received endowments in the reign of Rājākēsari, identifiable with Āditya I.²² The inscriptions referring to these grants are in very early characters assignable to the 9th century A.D. It continued to flourish in the period of Rājarāja I²³ and later and began to decline due to a dispute between two sections of the monastic establishment under the later Pāṇḍavas.²⁴ The *Aiṅṅūṅṅuvapperumpaḷḷi* at Tiruvenṅayil, which owed its construction

to the merchant corporation "the Five Hundred", dating from about the 9th century, was evidently liberally endowed under Rājarāja I.²⁵ Now in ruins, the remains of this temple show clear similarities with the early Chōḷa temple at Koḍumbāḷūr. Tēṇimalai or Tēnūrmalai has a cavern and Jain sculptures and early inscriptions, one of which records that, on seeing Malayadhvajān, a Jaina teacher performing penance, an Irukkuvēl chieftain instituted a *paḷḷichchandam*.²⁶ Tēnūr seems to be mentioned in a Brāhmī record from Māmaṇḍūr.²⁷

The evidence from other parts of the Pāṇḍya country is equally significant. The Kuṟaṇḍi Irukkaṭṭāmpaḷli, perhaps the biggest Jain monastery in Tamil Nadu, enjoyed patronage under Māraṇjaḍaiyan, probably Varaguṇa I (768-815), as seen in the three inscriptions²⁸ on stones now found built into the Kālanāthasvāmi Śiva temple in Paḷḷimaḍam, a hamlet of Tiruchchuliyal in the Ramanathapuram district. A succession of Jain teachers of this monastery is known through several records in the hills surrounding Madurai²⁹ and in Kaḷugumalai³⁰ and Chitral,³¹ indicating that it was perhaps the centre of a well-knit organisation in the 8th and 9th centuries A.D. It was visited by teachers from Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa as late as the twelfth century A.D.³² It was known as the 'monastery of the southern circle'.³³

Ajjaṇandi, a great Jain teacher of the 8th-9th centuries A.D., was himself revered by the Kuṟaṇḍi teachers as shown by an inscription recording the setting up of his image at Koṅgar Puḷiyāṅuḷam.³⁴ He is known to have visited several Jain centres in the Tamil country from Vaḷḷimalai in the

North Arcot district to Chitral in former Travancore including all important centres in the Madurai and Tirunelveli districts.³⁵ The hills around Madurai contain numerous caverns with beds and Brāhmī inscriptions assigned to the period between the 2nd century B.C. and 3rd century A.D. All of them are invariably found to contain also a series of Jain sculptures and a large number of Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions of the 8th-9th centuries A.D. While most of them record names of Jain monks including Ajjaṇandi, some also refer to endowments in the period of the early Pāṇḍyas. In Tirupparaṅkuṇṅam, Pāṇḍya Māraṇjaḍaiyan (Varaguṇa I) is referred to in an inscription of c. A.D. 784³⁶ and an officer of the Pāṇḍya king Vaḷudi Miṇavan, figures as the donor in another record from Karuṅgalakkuḍi.³⁷ Other centres with similar Jain vestiges are Āṇamalai, Aḷagarmalai, Sāmaṇarmalai (Koṅgar Puḷiyāṅuḷam, Kīḷakkuyilkuḍi, Muttuppaṭṭi and Kīḷavaḷavu), Kuppalanattam, Uttamapāḷaiyam and Aiyampāḷaiyam (Aivarmalai).

Dēvattūr in the Palani taluk contained an early Jain *paḷḷi*, to which a chieftain with the title Pallavaraiyan made grants.³⁸

In the Tirunelveli district, Brāhmī inscriptions occur in Vīraśikhāmaṇi, Varichchiyūr and Kuṇṇakkuḍi. Later Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions, however, are found in places like Kaḷugumalai and Ēṟuvāḍi. The Pāṇḍya king Māraṇjaḍaiyan (Varaguṇa I) figures as the patron in an inscription on a boulder at Ēṟuvāḍi³⁹, where a second inscription mentions Ajjaṇandi as the teacher who caused the Jain image to be carved.⁴⁰ The Māraṇjaḍaiyan whose gifts to the Jain *paḷḷi* in Kaḷugumalai are recorded in two inscriptions.

from this hill⁴¹ may also be identified with Varaguṇa I. Kaḷugumalai also abounds in Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions recording the names of several Jain monks and nuns from different parts of the Tamil country, at whose instance images were carved on this hill.⁴² Of the large number of places mentioned here Kuṇṇḍi, Kōṭṭāru, Tiruchchāraṇam, Tirunaṇuṅṇḍai, Tirumalai, Tiruppaṇṇutti and Perūr have been known as Jain centres from inscriptions of different periods, earlier and later than those at Kaḷugumalai. The name Paḷayirai, another centre mentioned in one of these inscriptions, is suggestive of Paḷaiyārai, which figures in Appar's *Tēvāram*⁴³ and *Periya Purāṇam*⁴⁴ as the scene of a Jain-Śaiva conflict out of which the latter emerged successful.

It is perhaps at Śittaṇṇavāśal that there is a more or less continuous series of epigraphic records to show that the Jains must have occupied it almost continuously from the beginning of the Christian era down to the 9th or 10th century A.D. For, after the single Brāhmī inscription on one of the stone beds in the Ēḷaḍipāṭṭam cavern, there are a number of short inscriptions in early characters of about the 6th-7th centuries A.D. in the same place perhaps referring to the occupants of the cavern.⁴⁵ These are followed by the cave temple of Pārśvanātha assignable to the seventh century on stylistic grounds. This cave temple was renovated by a Jain teacher from Madurai in the period of Śrīmāra Śrīvallbha (815-862 A.D.), when a structural *maṇḍapa* was also added to it.⁴⁶

Caverns with Brāhmī inscriptions have also been located in Pugaḷūr in the Karur

taluk of the Tiruchirapalli district and Arachchalūr near Erode. A number of such caverns with beds but without Brāhmī records are found in the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam region such as Sedarampattu (North Arcot),⁴⁷ Nagari and Kaṇṇikāpuram (Chittoor District).⁴⁸ In places like Veḍāl, Toṇḍūr, Tiruppāṇmalai, Vaḷḷimalai (North Arcot District) and Karuppaṅkuṇṇu (Chingleput District)⁴⁹ the caverns with beds seem to have served as monasteries and nunneries in the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries. The occurrence of caverns with beds and subsequent addition of structural edifices around rock sculptures are a common feature in all the major Jain centres in this region as in Tirumalai, Tirunaṇuṅṇḍai, Tirakkōl and Chittāmūr.

Śiṅgavaram or Tirunātharkuṇṇu in the South Arcot district has a cavern and a series of Tirthaṅkara Sculptures. The two inscriptions found here, recording the *niśidi-gai* of Jain *āchāryas* who fasted unto death, are dated in the 5th-6th and 10th centuries respectively.⁵⁰

The above survey is by no means exhaustive, for there are quite a few centres of the same period in the Koṅgu region and Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, where inscriptions assignable to the same period on palaeographic grounds, are found. In Karuppaṅkuṇṇu near Periya Venmaṇi in the Chingleput district, apart from a cavern with beds, there are Jain sculptures, one of which, representing Pārśvanātha with attendants, is carved on a boulder within a shrine-like niche which resembles very closely the Māmallapuram niches in the open air rock

sculpture.⁵¹ The inscription that accompanies it records the setting up of the 'Tēvāram' (*Dēvaḡṛiḥa*) by one Vāsudēva - Siddhānta-bhaṭṭāra in characters assignable to the eighth century A.D.⁵²

Many of these centres thus seem to have existed before the early Chōḷa times and quite a few continued to flourish right through to the 12th-13th centuries and some down to the 17th century and to the present day.

The evidence thus obtained is hardly uniform and at times even disparate. It does not seem to indicate a conflict in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. or later for it is precisely in this period that Jain inscriptions in the Chōḷa occupied areas increased, new temples came up in several places, while structural additions were made to existing rock sculptures on hillocks or boulders to expand them into larger temple complexes, with monastic establishments attached to them. In the period of Rājārāja I, in particular, almost all Jain centres in Toṇḍaināḍu received patronage. The Tirumalai temple was named Kundavai Jinālaya with structural additions⁵³ and a new one was built in Dācāpuram in the South Arcot district under the patronage of Kundavai, sister of Rājārāja I.⁵⁴ The latter is not extant now.

The epigraphic evidence coming up from those centres, where literary tradition locates the stories of conflict between the Śaivas and Jains, presents a different picture, hardly even indicating the nature or results of the conflict. In Tiruppāpuliyūr, where Appar is said to have been the head of a Jain monastery before his conversion to

Śaivism, there seems to have existed a monastic establishment as early as the middle of the fifth century A.D. as seen from the *Lōkavibhāga* datum giving the date Śaka 358=436 A.D., equivalent to 22nd regnal year of Simhavarman.⁵⁵ At this monastery, this original Prakrit work was copied by Sarvaṇandi after it was translated into Sanskrit. The later destruction of the establishment by a Kāḍava who also built out of the materials thus obtained the Śiva temple called Guṇadaravīchchuram at Tiruvadigai, is referred to in the *Periya Purāṇam*.⁵⁶ This Śiva temple is certainly not the same as the Tiruvadigai Vīraṭṭāṇam, sung by Appar after his conversion, but is represented by a ruined brick structure enshrining a fairly big *dhārā liṅga*, locally known as Guṇadaravīchchuram. Again it must be noted that the bigger Śiva temple i.e., the Vīraṭṭāṇam is also mainly a brick structure, with stone used for certain portions of the shrine and for later additions. It does not enshrine a *liṅga* but contains the seated images of Śiva and his consort in its *garbha-ḡṛiḥa*, a feature also met with in the Vēdapuriśvara temple at Tiruvērkkāḍu (near Madras), where local tradition assigns the construction of its apsidal shrine to a Pallava king. The Vīraṭṭāṇam's earliest inscriptions are those of Pallava Nṛipatuṅga and Kampavarman i.e., the latter half of the 9th century A.D.⁵⁷ They are found on the doorjambs leading to the shrine. But an earlier inscription assignable to Paramēśvaravarman II, son of Rājasimha (728-32 A.D.) is also found on a slab lying in front of this temple registering a gift of gold.⁵⁸ Chōḷa inscriptions are found only in the *maṇḍapa* and other parts of the temple and date only from the time of

Rājēndra I,⁶⁰ with a Chaturmukhalinga also assignable to the period of Rājēndra I.

In Tiruppādirippuliyūr, the Śiva temple has Chōḷa inscriptions of the the time of Parāntaka I,⁶⁰ recording grants. Hence, it is reasonable to suppose that the Jain monastery existed before the time of the Chōḷas and perhaps even before the Vīra-ṭṭānēśvara came up in Tiruvadigai. There is nothing inherently impossible in Appar's association with this *maṭha*. Further, a later Jain tradition tries to bring Appar back into the Jain fold by connecting him with the Appāṇḍanātha temple at Tirunaṅṅonḍai not far from here.⁶¹ In this Jain temple the earliest inscriptions are of the 9th century A. D.⁶² and the name Appāṇḍa seems to have been in use from the time of Chōḷa Rājarāja I.⁶³ Appar's connection in another conflict with the Jains at Paḷaiyārai⁶⁴ also stands uncorroborated by epigraphic evidence. Yet, there is a *māḍakkōyil* called Paḷaiyārai Veḍutaḷi near Dārāsaram believed to have been built by a Chōḷa king, to whom Appar revealed a *Liṅga* hidden by the rival Jains. This temple seems to have undergone renovation at later periods and is now a brick structure with partial use of stone. There is no inscription here but the presence of a Dakṣiṇāmurti image of the early Chōḷa style would suggest a connection with 10th or 11th century Chōḷa temples. There is a possible reference to this place in a Chitral inscription of the ninth century A. D. referring to Paḷaiyīḷai-kuratti, a Jain lady teacher from Paḷaiyīḷai.⁶⁵

In Tiruvārūr, where the Śaiva-Jain conflict is connected with the story of

Daṇḍi Aḍigaḷ, who is earlier in time than Appar according to tradition,⁶⁶ the local Śiva temple of Tyāgarāja contains Chōḷa inscriptions from the time of Uttama Chōḷa and Rājēndra I,⁶⁷ while two inscriptions of a Rājakēsari, identified with Āditya I, are in characters of the 12th century A. D. and believed to be copies of earlier inscriptions.⁶⁸

The Kūrruva-nāyaṅār story at Chidambaram,⁶⁹ though not connected with the Jains, seems to suggest that the Kaḷabhras were followers of non-Brahmanical religions and hence the orthodox brāhmaṇas of Chidambaram refused to crown him. The temple here hardly provides any evidence of a struggle by way of epigraphic records. Similarly for the later Śaiva-Vaiṣṇava conflict referred to only in literature, there is no direct evidence in the inscriptions of the Gōvindarāja shrine.⁷⁰ The Mūrti-nāyaṅār episode at Madurai is somewhat similar.⁷¹ In fact, none of the important centres of conflict known from literary evidence is seen to contain any epigraphic or even architectural evidence of a struggle and displacement of one by the other. There is perhaps one indirect evidence of a Jain cave temple deliberately converted into a Śaiva one in the case of the Malaiyaḍikkuḷichchi cave temple where an inscription of Śēndan Māṅṅan (645-695 A. D.) records the excavation of the cave under his orders.⁷² The cave temple itself contains traces of older Jain sculptures and evidences of remodelling of the cave to convert it into a Śaiva one.⁷³ Would it be correct to identify this Pāṇḍya king with the Neḍumāṅṅan said to have been converted from Jainism to Śaivism by Sambandar? Or, would

Śrī Māra Śrīvallabha of the 9th century A.D., who also bore the title Neḍumāraṇ, be a more acceptable candidate? We have already drawn attention to the renovation of the Śittanāvāsal Jain temple under this ruler suggesting some obscurity or neglect of this centre before the 9th century.

Thus, if we are left with only epigraphic material to discuss the religious history of this region, we would hardly be in a position to present the correct or even complete picture. Neglect and deliberate attempts at destruction of Jain and perhaps also Buddhist monuments seem to have taken place at various stages in the history of Tamil Nadu, while periods of acute conflict are perhaps reflected in the hymns of the most important trio. Some of these episodes could thus have occurred earlier and some during the 10th century and much later. Yet, in not a single hymn of the trio do we have any reference to the name of a Chōḷa king with the exception of Kōcheṅgaṇān,⁷⁴ who has recently been proved to have been a historical figure, as the grandfather of Vijayālaya, the first of the imperial Chōḷas.⁷⁵ Further, there is also no indication in their emotional outpourings that any Chōḷa king of the eminence of Parāntaka I or Āditya I was the author of the temples they were visiting. In this connection, it is pertinent to draw attention to the reference to *tiruppadiyam* singing and grants made for it under Parāntaka I⁷⁶ or even earlier under Āditya I,⁷⁷ suggesting that the hymns were already popular or were being popularised and were being included as part of the daily worship. An earlier reference to *Tiruppadiyam* singing as part of the

daily worship occurs in an inscription of Vijayanandivikramavarman from Tiruvallam, probably of Nandivarman III(A.D.846-869).⁷⁸

Problems of a similar kind confront us when dealing with the Vaishṇava literary tradition and epigraphic records. It is perhaps even more difficult to date any of the Vaishṇava Ālvārs with any amount of certainty with the help of epigraphic evidence. For, in most cases, the temples sung by them do not contain inscriptions of a period earlier than the middle Chōḷa or later Chōḷa kings. In a few cases, as in Śrīraṅgam,⁷⁹ inscriptions of the early Chōḷas are found to occur on the doorjambs of the shrines or in other parts of the temple. There is hardly any foundation inscription which would fix the exact date of their construction. Further, this is also true of a number of Śiva temples where the early Chōḷa inscriptions are not foundation inscriptions but merely records of grants. The specific references to stone temples, *kaṇṇaḷi*, erected in this period are also somewhat curious, for they may also indicate the re-erection in stone of earlier brick temples and, occasionally, an entirely new temple in stone.

It may be useful at this point to quote evidence from archaeological excavations, such as those of Kāvērippattiṅam, Uṇaiyūr, Kāñchīpuram,⁸⁰ to show that brick structures were very common in this region at least from the 3rd century B.C. If one adds to it several later references to erection of brick structures as in the Kūram Plates⁸¹ and also the significant Maṇḍaga-ppaṭṭu record⁸² pointedly referring to the non-use of brick, etc., it is not difficult to see that brick was the common material

of construction with the possible use of stone at key points in a structure from very early times and continued to be so even after the use of stone became the more regular practice. A period of more than 600 years would otherwise remain completely unaccounted for by way of secular and religious edifices, while all over India and much nearer home, in the Andhra country, a series of Buddhist and Brahmanical structures were erected in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and other places, including the Aṣṭābhūja Viṣṇu temple,⁸³ not to speak of several Viṣṇukoṇḍin structures of the fifth century A.D. referred to in their copper plates including a shrine for Gaṇeśa.⁸⁴

The tradition of using stone must have begun with the Buddhists and Jains for whose habitation the natural caverns were cut and made suitable. It is also significant that in these caverns the Brāhmī inscriptions contain distinct architectural terminology for the drip ledge, roof, fronts, etc.,⁸⁵ indicating structural additions to the caverns, apart from carving the stone into different shapes. Hence, it would be wrong to assume that none of the temples in the Chōḷa country is earlier than the 10th century A.D. Some at least must have come up in the period of Kōchcheṅgaṇān. Architecturally, and if one examines the size and style of the early Chōḷa temples more closely, it would become clear that the uniformity in size and style was due not particularly to the prevalence of a single style leading to a homogeneous group of temples but also to many of the earlier unpretentious structures being remodelled in stone. This would explain the fact that no Chōḷa shrine sung by either the *nāyaṅārs* or *āḷvārs* has claim to imposing

size or design for none of them is more than 20 feet square or rises to a height of more than two storeys.⁸⁶ This is particularly true of even those central shrines in huge temple complexes, where there is hardly any evidence of inscriptions earlier than the middle or late Chōḷa period when the *drāviḍa* style of architecture had reached its optimum development.

Looked at from all these angles epigraphic evidence by itself is inadequate for explaining the diverse factors and elements involved in a process of change in the socio-religious organisation of a people. Historical writing has necessarily to take into account all kinds of evidence and correlate them by way of cross-checking and verifying data from different sources. Again, it would be highly unscientific to treat any part of this subcontinent in isolation and disregard the general trends in historical development while trying to throw light on a few opaque phases.

On the basis of all available evidences taken together, a tentative reconstruction of the course of events may be offered. After the initial spread of the Jain faith as represented in the period of the Brāhmī inscriptions, the Jains increased in strength and influence around the 5th century A.D., when the the Drāviḍa Saṅgha was established in Madurai in 470 A.D.⁸⁷ by one Vajraṇandi, probably as the centre of a network of proselytisation, supported by rulers of "non-orthodox", non-Brahmanical predilections, i.e. the Kaḷabhras. The Pāṭaliputra Jain monastery evidently formed one of the early Jain establishments for the work of propagation.

If the absence of epigraphic records after 5th-6th centuries and before 8th-9th centuries is any indication, then the period before the 8th-9th centuries must have witnessed a period of great changes due to the renewed attempts at the spread of a Brahmanical socio-religious order as seen from the Pallava copper plate records, followed by those of the Pāṇḍyas some of which seem to indicate a clear revival of patronage to Brāhmaṇa settlements. The main difference was that it was not through Vedic religion that Brahmanism assumed ascendancy as a result of a process of acculturation and assimilation. The *Tēvāram* represents only one element, although a major one, for the popularisation of Puranic lore through the concept of *bhakti* which resulted in the temple developing into the pivotal institution of the socio-religious life of the people. This development was but gradual and apparently reached its culmination in the 9th-10th centuries when all religious activity was oriented towards the puranic religion and agamic worship. In this process the rich variety of local and popular cults got assimilated in the capacious fold of the Śaiva-Vaiṣṇava sects of the Brahmanical order. The *Tēvāram* and *Divyaprabandham* reflect this process of assimilation and the leading role played by the Bhakti movement in it, without which it could not have reached a successful end.

The same process affected the Jain religion deeply, firstly by relegating it to the background and secondly by influencing what began as a non-believing or atheistic religion into a highly theistic cult adopting puranic elements in its worship and the temple as its central institution. The Jains became as much a part of the new order as other sects by adopting the same stratification in their socio-economic organisation and became indistinguishable except by their scriptures and mythology from their brahmanical counterparts.

Jainism took a second lease of life as it were from about the 8th-9th centuries A.D. and received re-inforcements from time to time from Karnataka. In the earlier period they seem to have wielded considerable influence in urban areas such as Kāñchī, Kāvērippaṭṭiṇam, Karūr and Madurai. In the later period they retired to the rural areas, to be content with the benefits of royal patronage but with no political influence.

Conflicts, however, did not cease altogether, for, with every re-inforcement from Karnataka, followed by a fresh endowment from a local patron or a mightier power, the rival Brahmanical sects must have opposed the Jains with a fresh attempt at supercedence.

Foot-Notes :

1. B.G.L. Swamy, 'The Date of the Tēvāram Trio : An Analysis and Re-appraisal' *Bulletin of the Institute of Traditional Cultures, Madras, 1975, pp. 119-179.*
2. I., Mahadevan, "Corpus of Tamil-Brāhmī Inscriptions", *Seminar on Inscriptions, Ed. R. Nagaswamy, Madras 1966, pp. 57-73.* Wherever Tamil-Brāhmī inscriptions are mentioned in this paper, the reading and dating of I. Mahadevan have been followed:

3. *Ibid.*, map.
4. R. Champakalakshmi, 'Kuṇṇḍi - Tirukkāṭṭāmpaḷli: an ancient Jaina monastery of Tamil Nadu', *Studies in Indian Epigraphy*, Vol. II, 1975 p. 89.
5. Veḍāḷ (*SII.*, III, 92); Viḷappākkam (*SII.*, VII, 56); Tirakkol (*SII.*, XIII, 297); Tirumalai (*SII.*, XIX, 89).
6. Kīḷṣāttamaṅgalam (M. D. Sampath, "Jaina Inscriptions of Śāttamaṅgalam" in *Seminar on Inscriptions*), pp. 157-159 Pañcha Pāṇḍavamalai (*EI.*, IV, pp. 136-37).
7. Toṇḍūr (*SII.*, XIX, 80 and 81); Paḷlichchandal (446 of 1937-38); Chittāmūr (201 of 1902).
8. Śōḷavāṇḍipuram (251 of 1936-37).
9. 306 of 1936-40.
10. *SII.*, VII, 1015, 300 ff. of 1939-40.
11. *Ibid.*, VII, 847 (Nandivikramavarman)
12. *Ibid.*, 846 and 848 (Kulōttuṅga III).
13. 403 of 1922.
14. 222 of 1911.
15. 7 of 1899.
16. Natana Kasinathan, *Muttaraiyar* (in tamil), Madras, 1976, pp. 80-82.
17. 139 of 1937-38; 132-138, 140, 141 of 1937-38.
18. *ARSIE.*, 1937-38, Part II, Para 3.
19. *SII.*, I, 13.
20. *ARSIE.*, 1937-38, Part II, para 3.
21. 50 of 1913; *ARSIE.*, 1912-13, Part II.
22. 209, 210 of 1941-42.
23. K R. Venkatarama Ayyer, The Forgotten Jain Monastery at Tiruppaḷlimalai, *Proc. of Indian History Congress*, 1948, p. 140.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *IPS.*, 1083 (from Kayampatti).
26. *IPS.*, 9; K.V. Ramesh, Ed. *Jaina Literature in Tamil*, New Delhi, 1974, Ins. No. 13.
27. I. Mahadevan, *op. cit.*, No. 71.
28. *SII.*, XIV, 35/39 (428 and 431 of 1914); K.V. Ramesh *op. cit.*, Nos. 10 & 11; also No. 23 for another 9th century Vaṭṭeḷuttu Inscription.
29. 330 to 332 of 1908; 63 of 1610; 725 to 732 of 1905 [*SII.*, XIV, 120-128]; K.V. Ramesh, *op. cit.*, Nos. 29-32.
30. *SII.*, V, 341; see also R. Champakalakshmi, *op. cit.*
31. *TAS.*, I, pp. 193-195.
32. 244 of 1950-51.
33. Champakalakshmi, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
34. 54 of 1910.
35. *ARSIE.*, 1908-09, part II, para 5.

36. 37 of 1908.
37. 563 of 1911.
38. 59 of 1931-32.
39. *SII.*, XIV, 41; K.V. Ramesh, *op cit.*, No 12.
40. *SII.*, XIV, 129; K.V. Ramesh, *op.cit.* No. 16.
41. *SII.*, V, 405 & 406; K.V. Ramesh identifies him with Varaguṇa II, of. No 18.
42. *SII.*, V, 310 of 1960-61.
43. Appar, *Tēvāram*, Paḷaiyāṅgai, Verse 1.
44. *Periya Purāṇam. Tirunāvukkarasār Purāṇam*, V. 294.
45. *IPS.*, 1 and 7. (388 of 1914; 324 to 326 of 1960-61; 327 to 331 of 1960-61).
46. *SII.*, XV, 45 (215 of 1940-41); K.V. Ramesh, *op. cit.*, No. 22.
47. *ARSIE.*, 1942-43, Part I.
48. *Ibid.*
49. R. Champakalakshmi, "An Unnoticed Jain Cavern near Madurantakam", *Journal of the Madras University*.
50. I. Mahadevan, *op. cit.*, No. 76 & App; K. V. Ramesh. *op. cit.*, Nos. 6 and 45.
51. R. Champakalakshmi, *JMU.*, Vol. XLI, 1969, fig. 3.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Et.*, IX, pp. 229 ff.
54. 8 of 1919.
55. T.V. Mahalingam, *Kanchipuram in Early South Indian History*, Madras, 1969, p. 42.
56. *Periya Purāṇam*.
57. 36 of 1903 *SII.*, VIII, 309; 35 of 1903. *SII.*, VIII, 308; See also R. Champa kalakshmi, "the Bhakti movement and Religious Persecution in Tamil Nadu" Indian History Congress, Calicut, 1976.
58. *SII.*, II, p. 357; T.V. Mahalingam, *op. cit.*, p. 133
59. *SII.*, II, p. 172.
60. S. R. Balasubramaniam, *Early Chola Temples*, 1971 p. 242-43.
61. *Mackenzie Manuscripts*, Vol. I, Ed. T.V. Mahalingam, Madras, 1972, Ms. No. 19-Section 7.
62. 306 of 1939-40.
63. 300 to 305 and 307-310 of 1939-40.
64. *Periya purāṇam. Tirunāvukkarasār Purāṇam*, V-162.
65. *SII.*, V, 320.
66. *Periya Purāṇam, Daṇḍi Aḍigaḷ Purāṇam*, VV. 4-18.
67. S. Ponnusamy, *The Thyagaraja Temple-Ti 1072*, pp. 29, 30, Madras.
68. *Idid.*, p. 30.

69. *Periya Purāṇam, Kūrṅuva Nāyaṇār Purāṇam.*
70. B. Natarajan, *The city of the Cosmic Dance.*
71. *Periya Purāṇam, Mūrti Nāyaṇār Purāṇam, Vv. 9ff.*
72. 358 of 1959-60.
73. K.R. Srinivasan in *Jaina Art and Architecture*, Vol II, Ed. A Ghosh, New Delhi, 1975, p. 208.
74. Appar, *Tēvāram; Sambandar, Tēvāram.* Also Tirumaṅgai Āḷvār.
75. Velanjeri Copper Plate of Parāntaka I, recently discovered by the Tamil Nadu State Dept. of Archaeology.
76. 373 of 1925, 99 of 1929 and 139 of 1935.
77. Veḷḷaivāraṇan, *Panṇiru Tirumuṇḍai Varalāru*, Annamalainagar, 1962
78. *SII.*, III, p. 93. 32-3.
80. *Indian Archaeology, A Review.*
81. *SII.*, I, pp. 144-155.
82. K.R. Srinivasan, *Cave Temple of the Pallavas.*
83. *Indian Archaeology, A Review.*
84. S. Sankaratarayanan, *The Vishṇukunṇḍis and their times*, Delhi, 1977, p. 147.
85. I. Mahadevan, *op. cit.*, Nos. 10, 11, 40; Also K.V. Raman and Y. Subbarayalu.
86. See S.R. Balasubramaniam, *op. cit.*, for a description of all the early Chola Temples. Also Douglas Barrett, *Early Chola Architecture and Sculpture*, London, 1974, pp. 37 and 39.

11. A HERO-STONE INSCRIPTION FROM MADAVALAM

C.R. Srinivasan

Great impetus is being given in recent days to the study of Epigraphy. The efforts which are being made to popularise this subject by the Department of Archaeology, Madras are highly commendable. As a result of this, a number of hero-stones strewn all over Tamil Nadu have come to lime light. Even non-departmental men like teachers have taken a keen interest to promote the study of Epigraphy in their own limited way. Thus I had the opportunity of coming across the present inscription from a school teacher who was also kind enough to supply me the photograph of the inscription on my request. The inscription under review is engraved on a hero-stone found near the Aṅgakāriśvaram-udaiyār temple in Maḍavālam, Tiruppattur Taluk, North Arcot District. The two records¹ which were copied here by the Epigraphy branch of the Archaeological Survey in 1957 belong to Bukka II and Bhūpati-Uḍaiyār of the Vijayanagara dynasty and they are dated in Śaka 1319 and 1337 respectively. One of them mentions that the temple served as *añjiṇān-pugaliḍam* (refugee colony) to the temple servants, etc. These two records are in no way helpful either in interpreting or understanding the record under discussion.

The slab bearing the inscription is stated to measure 805 cms. in length, 90

cms. in height. There are only nine lines of writing. The first five lines are engraved above the sculptural representation of a warrior in basrelief in a defiant attitude, holding probably a bow in his left hand, the uplifted right hand holding a dagger or an arrow. The other four lines are written to the right side of the warrior. There seems to be no writing at all on the left side. The left leg is slightly bent at the knee-cap and it seems to have been placed on a raised position in order to afford a firm grip on the ground to wield the weapon. The trunk which is bent at the hip is stooping towards left and indicates the action. The warrior faces front with a slight right side profile. There are some unidentified articles at the sides of both the feet of the warrior. The figure closely resembles the figures carved in some of the hero-stones of Chengam which are illustrated in 'Chengam Naḍu-kaṅkaḷ'.

The language of the inscription is Tamil and the alphabet Vaṭṭeḷuttu. Palaeographically the record is assignable to the 7th century A.D. Some palaeographical features deserve mention here. The consonants in *Visaiya* (lines 1), *Kūlampāḍiyār* (line 4) and *ḷ* in *Maṇḍapaḷḷi* (lines 2-3), *Kūlampāḍiyār*, *Vēḷān* (line 4) and *Āḷvāriḷamakkaḷ* (lines 7-8) remind us of the respective modern Tamil characters. Consonants *m*, *p*

and *ch* (line 1), which are comparable with those found in similar early inscriptions, may be instanced to prove that the record actually belongs to the 7th century A.D. Some close affinities are evidently seen between this record and the Bairakūru epigraph of the same ruler.

The inscription is dated in the 12th regnal year of the king Vijaya Īchchuvaramparumar (Īśvaravarman) and records the death of Vēḷā[ṇ], a servant of Kūḷampāḍiyār in a cattle-raid at Maṇḍapaḷḷi and the setting up of the hero-stone by the heroes (Iḷamakkal) of Toḍāvāḷ Āḷvār.

Two inscriptions³ from Chengam Taluk, one belonging to Mahēndravarman and dated in his 11th year and the other belonging to the reign of Īśvaravarman, with its date portion damaged, though written in different hands, both mention a certain Perumpōttaraśar, clearly indicating thereby that these two rulers were not far removed in time. Chalukya Vikramāditya names the three Pallava rulers defeated by him as Narasiṃha, Mahēndra and Īśvara, the last name being mentioned once as Īśvarapōtarāja. The insistence of the Chalukya sources in naming the ruler only as Īśvara and the provenance of inscriptions independently referring to Īśvaravarman and Paramēśvaravarman in the same Chengam Taluk show that Īśvara and Paramēśvara were two different Pallava rulers. In the light of this recent evidence, the identification of Īśvara with Paramēśvara by earlier historians should be viewed with caution. It is likely, as suggested by Dr. R. Nagaswami, that Mahēndravarman entertained Īśvaravarman as his joint ruler during the latter part of his reign.

Dr. Nagaswami, who has edited these two inscriptions, further holds the view⁴ that Īśvaravarman and Paramēśvaravarman are different kings as inscriptions of these kings are distinctly and differently named after them and also on the grounds of availability of records of Īśvaravarman from Hanumantapuram in the Salem District. Regarding the date of Īśvaravarman, Dr. Nagaswami is of the opinion that Īśvaravarman and Mahēndravarman of the Pallava dynasty were very close in point of time and he admits the possibility of their ruling the region either jointly or successively.

While editing the Vēḷūr inscription of Vijaya Narasimhavarman, K. D. Swaminathan comments that the existence of a number of similar hero-stones in and around North Arcot testifies to the disturbed state of the region during the 8th-9th century". The present record is certainly datable to the 7th century and is much earlier to the Vēḷūr inscription of Narasimhavarman edited by him. Needless to say, we have to admit the theory that these Vaṭṭeḷuttu records do belong to the imperial Pallavas and not to the Gaṅga, Noḷamba or Bāṇa subordinates of the Pallavas. Until we get more evidences, we have no other alternative except to assign these records to the imperial Pallavas and, in doing so, the present record has to be either assigned to Paramēśvaravarman or we must accept the theory that Īśvaravarman was one of the co-regents of the under-aged ruling king, a feature that is commonly seen in the Chōḷa house.

The two place names Maṇḍapaḷḷi and Kūḷampāḍi cannot be identified. Maḍavāḷam,⁵ the find-spot of the inscription is undoubtedly a later name derived from Maḍaviḷāgam.

A provisional reading of the text is given below :-

- 1 Kō-Viśaiya Īchchubaraparumaṅku padi-
- 2 ṅ iraṅḍāvadu Maṅḍapaḷ-
- 3 ḷiṅ-ṅasuk-koṅḍa ṅāṅṅuk-
- 4 Kūḷambāḍiyār śēvakar Vēḷā[ṅ]
- 5 eḍu[ttā] toru iḍuvittup-paṭṭā[ṅ]
- 6 To[ḍāvā]-
- 7 ḷ Āḷvār=i
- 8 ḷamakaḷ
- 9 [kaḷ]


Foot Notes :-

- 1 *A. R. Ep.*, 1957, Nos. B 129-30.
- 2 *EC.*, X, Mulubagal, No. 211.
- 3 *Chengam Naḍu Kaṅkaḷ*, 1971 Nos. 97 and 78.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp. IV-V.
- 5 *E I.*, XXXII, p. 120.
- 6 Maṅḍapaḷḷi is possibly the same as modern Maḍavāḷam, the findspot of the above epigraph.

MADAVALAM INSCRIPTION



A CHALUKYA-ALUPA INSCRIPTION FROM JAMBANI



12. A NEW CHALUKYA-ALUPA INSCRIPTION FROM JAMBANI

M. J. Sharma

This interesting Kannada inscription of the second half of the 7th century A.D., which is being brought to the notice of the scholars for the first time here, was discovered by the late Dr. P. Gururaja Bhat who had kindly supplied me with an estampage and a few photographs.

This undated inscription is engraved on a rectangular stone surface, the text being written in 18 irregularly formed lines; even the letters are not of uniform size. On the top of the slab, just above line 1 of the text, are engraved the figure of a twin fish facing right, the twin fish being the family symbol of the Ālupa dynasty whose members describe themselves as scions of the Pāṇḍyan stock right from the beginnings of the 8th century A.D. onwards.

The inscribed slab was discovered near a ruined Śiva temple in a forest not far from Jambāni, a village in the Sagar Taluk of Shimoga District, Karnataka. The record is engraved in archaic Kannada characters and language which are regular for the period to which the inscription belongs, namely the *second half of the 7th century A.D.* Though, as stated above, the top of the slab carries the "*Mīna-lāṅghana*" of the Ālupas of South Kanara, the inscription actually refers itself to the universal reign (*prithivī-rājya*) of the Badami Chalukya

emperor Vinayāditya Satyāśraya, who is described in the usual lithic style as '*Prithivivallabha - mahārājādhirāja - paramēśvara-bhaṭṭārar*'. Next is mentioned his feudatory Ālupēndra-Chitravāhana's rule over 'Banavāsi' (*Banavāsi-rājyakeye*). Since we already know from a couple of Badami Chalukya copper-plates' as well as two Ālupa stone inscriptions from Kigga,² (Chikamagalur District) that not only Chitravāhana but also his father Guṇasāgara were placed in charge of the Kadamba-maṇḍala by their Chalukya overlords, we can safely conclude that by 'Banavāsi' the present inscription refers in fact to the well-known Banavāsi 12,000 division which is the same as Kadamba-maṇḍala.

We know from the Shiggaon plates of Chalukya Vijayāditya issued in 707 A.D. and edited by my revered teacher Dr. G.S. Gai that Chitravāhana-Ālupēndra had married Kumkumadēvī, the sister of Vijayāditya. The Jambāni inscription is the only known inscription of Chalukya Vinayāditya containing a reference to his son-in-law Chitravāhana Ālupēndra. It is, however, not known whether Chitravāhana had married Kumkumadēvī at the time the present inscription was caused to be engraved.

Immediately after referring to Chitravāhana the inscription mentions a certain

Babhruvāhana as the administrator of Koḍala which is most probably the same as modern Mangalore which even today bears the second name Kuḍla. If the “vāhana” ending in the name of Babhruvāhana is any indication, he may be taken as being a junior prince of the Āḷupa house.

It is not possible to make out with certainty the purport of the inscription with the help of the available estampage and photographs. There is a reference to a certain Pāṇḍi Viṅarasa of Pubaiṭṭyura, who bears a second name (*dvitīya-nāmadhēyan*) as Dharma-Gōsāsiga. Gōsāsi was commonly appended to the names of those persons who had performed the *gōsahasra* ceremony. The inscription seems to register a gift of some lands at the village Jabeni which is the same as Jambāṇi, the findspot. The donors were the residents of Pannirpaḷli which could either stand for the name of a village or refer to a unit consisting of 12 villages.

Interestingly enough it is stated in the imprecatory passage that those who flout the provisions of the grant recorded in the slab would have destroyed in effect the four villages of Tāṅagundūra, Isavura, Gauḍa and Bādavi. Of these places, Tāṅagundūra is the same as the ancient Sthānakunduru, the modern Tāḷagunda which has yielded interesting 5th century Kadamba inscriptions written in chaste classical Sanskrit. Bādavi is the same as Vātāpi-adhishṭhāna, the well-known capital of the Chalukyas in the Bijapur District of Karnataka. The other two places, Isavura and Gauḍa, cannot be identified in the present state of our knowledge. The record ends with the usual imprecation in Kannada that the flouters of the grant would incur the sin of having destroyed one thousand brāhmaṇas and one thousand tawny cows at the holy place of Vārāṇasi.

Text

- 1 Svasti[*]Śrī-Vinayāditya-Satyā[śra]-
- 2 ya śrī-pṛithivī-vallabha mahārā[jā]-
- 3 dhirāja-paramēśvara-bhaṭārar [pṛi]-
- 4 thivī rājya keye Āḷupēndra-Chitravā[ha]-
- 5 nar-ā Banavāsi-rājya keye Ba[bhru]vāha-
- 6 nar-ā Koḍal-āḷe Pubaiṭṭiyurara Pāṇḍi Viṅa-
- 7 rasa Dharmma-gōsāsiga-dvitīya-nāmadhēyan tamma
- 8 temuḷtiya rā ..mati koṇḍu Puṭṭi-
- 9 lagereya keḷagam mūru baḷiyu
- 10 tamma pukoḷiyumam Jabeni[ḷalgu]-mā-
- 11 ḍi legga-niṅisi koṭṭar-ppanni-

- 12 rppaḷḷiya aṅivokkalo[!]
 13 Tāṇagundura Isavura Gauḍada
 14 Bādaviya nālku-grāmavan-aḷida [ma]-
 15 hāpātaka
 16 Bāraṇāśiya sāsirvva-pārvvaru
 17 sāsira-kavileyuma konda dōsha [pā]-
 18 taka pañcha-mahāpātaka

Foot-Notes :

1. Soraba Plates (*JA.*, XIX, pp. 146 ff.) and Shiggaon Plates (*EI.*, XXXII, pp. 317 ff. and plates).
2. *EC.*, VI, Kp. 37-38.
3. *EI.*, XXXII, pp. 317 ff. and plates.

13. JAUNPUR STONE INSCRIPTION OF ISVARAVARMAN

S. R. Goyal

The stone slab bearing this inscription was found in the outer wall of the southern gate of the Jama Masjid of Jaunpur. It was discovered and first published by General Cunningham in his *Archaeological Survey Reports*, Vol. XI, pp. 124 f., Plate XXXVII, No. 1, and was re-edited by J.F. Fleet in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, pp. 228 ff., Plate XXXII-A. The inscription is in a fairly good state of preservation but it is only a fragment of a much larger inscription. Nothing has been lost at the top and at the ends of the lines. However, "from thirty-eight to seventy-two *aksharas*—probably the larger number,—are lost at the beginning of each line; and also an indefinite number of lines below the last line that is extant."¹ The available portion of the record does not contain any date.

Line 2 of the Jaunpur inscription refers to the lineage of Mukhara (i. e., Maukhari) kings (*Mukharāṇām bhūbhujām=anvavāyē*) and line 4 speaks of the king Īśvaravarman as the son of his predecessor whose name is lost (*tasya dikshu vitatāmalakīrttēr=ātmaṅ nṛipatir=Īśvaravarmma*). However, it is definitely known from the Asirgadh seal of Mahārājādhirāja Śarvavarman² that Īśvaravarman was the son of Mahārāja Ādityavarman and the grandson of Mahā-

rāja Harivarman while Īśānavarman (known date: M. E. 611=554 A. D.), the son of Īśvaravarman and father of Śarvavarman, was the first Mahārājādhirāja of the family. The dynasty of the Maukharis was evidently a sept of the Mālavas, for, according to the *Mahābhārata* the Madra king Aśvapati got one hundred sons, called the Mālavas, through his queen Mālavi as a result of the boon granted by Yama Vaivasvata to the king's daughter Sāvitrī,³ while, according to the Haraha inscription,⁴ the Maukharis were the descendants of the hundred sons whom the king Aśvapati obtained through the grace of Vaivasvata.⁵

Since the fragmentary portion of the Jaunpur record does not contain any name except that of Īśvaravarman Fleet assigned it to that ruler, though it is only fair to add that he was somewhat doubtful on this point. For he also states that the lacunae in the inscription "are so extensive, that it is impossible to say whether the historical information given in them refers to Īśvaravarman or one of his descendant." Some years ago D. C. Sircar expressed his disagreement with this view. He argues that as the victory over the Āndhra kings narrated in the extant portions of the lines 7 and 8 of the Jaunpur record has been ascribed to Īśānavarman in the verse 13

of the Haraha inscription, the victories of the former document should be assigned to Īśānavarman or one of his successors.⁷ We disagree. Though we admit that the incomplete nature of the Jaunpur record makes it likely that it was engraved during the reign of Īśānavarman or one of his successors, yet we feel that, so far as the achievements described in the extant portions of lines 5 ff. are concerned, they should be assigned to Īśvaravarman only.

Firstly, it is true that, according to the Haraha inscription, the Āndhras were defeated by Īśānavarman, but it does not necessarily follow that this victory did not take place during the reign of king Īśvaravarman. The Haraha record⁸ itself expressly states that Īśānavarman "occupied the throne *after* conquering the lord of the Āndhras" etc. (*Jitv=Āndhrādhipatim* etc.) It means that this event occurred during the reign of Īśvaravarman and Īśānavarman fought the Āndhra king only as a prince. The author of the Jaunpur record, therefore, could very well assign this achievement to Īśvaravarman, the king in whose reign this victory was achieved. The history of Āndhra is also in perfect agreement with this conclusion. There, the ruler who extended his influence upto the river Narmadā was Mādhavarman Janāśraya, the great monarch of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty. According to the Polamuru grant,⁹ in his 48th regnal year he crossed the river Gōdāvarī with a desire to conquer the eastern regions. The first Indrapalapur charter¹⁰ also informs us that he ruled upto the river Rēvā or Narmadā (*Rēvā-sarit-salilavalaya-bhūshaṇāyā bhuvō bharttur-Mādhavarmanah*). According to the chronology proposed by D.C. Sircar, Mādhavarman

flourished in the middle of the sixth century A.D. But the discovery of the Indrapalapur records has proved that the last known member of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty, viz. Vikramēndravarman II Uttamāśraya was ruling in the Śaka year 488 (=565 A.D.). Therefore, after analysing the whole data of the Viṣṇukunḍin records, Rama Rao¹¹ has placed the death of Mādhavarman Janāśraya in 518 A.D. And as this ruler crossed the Gōdāvarī in his 48th regnal year (Polamuru grant) this event should also be placed in or about 518 A.D. It fits well with the suggestion that the Maukhari-Viṣṇukunḍin clash took place in the reign of Īśvaravarman (who may be placed in c. 510-35 A.D.) and not after the accession of Īśānavarman (whose known date is 554 A.D.).

Secondly, the Jaunpur inscription describes two other achievements of the Maukhari king (apparently the same who defeated the Āndhra invader) both of which indicate the same period for him. In line 5 it is said that he allayed the troubles caused by the approach of cruel (*krūra*) people while lines 9 and 10 speak of his success in the Himalayan region which was full of swollen 'mountain streams' (*giri-sarit*), 'cool waters of the mountain of snow' (*prālēy-ādribhuvas=cha śita-payasaḥ*) and waters 'fragrant with benzoin' (*prapāta-salilaiḥ snātam śilā-gandhibhiḥ*). The phrase *dhārā-mārgga-vinirgat-āgni-kaṇikā* occurring in line 6 is of no historical importance, for, the view of Fleet that it contains a reference to the city of Dhārā is not correct. Probably the phrase only means 'the spark of fire issuing from the sword.'¹² But the Maukhari victory in the Himalayan

region is important. It reminds one of a similar achievement of Jīvitagupta I, the third king of the Later Gupta dynasty, of the Mālava-janapada of Rajasthan.¹³ As Īśānavarman, the son of Īśvaravarman, fought against Kumāragupta, the son of Jīvitagupta I, Īśvaravarman and Jīvitagupta I must have been contemporaries. Now, about Jīvitagupta I the Apsad inscription of Ādityasēna states that his enemies were afraid of him 'even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of rushing and waving torrents full of snow'¹⁴. Significantly Jīvitagupta I is also credited with success against some enemies who "stood on seaside shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water (and) were covered with the branches of plantain-trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra-palms."¹⁵ The Maukharis are also known to have obtained some success against people living on the seashore during the reign of Īśvaravarman, for the Haraha inscription boasts that among the enemies who were defeated by Īśānavarman before he occupied the throne were also the Gauḍas who were compelled by him "to leave (dry) land for all time to come and to take shelter in (the waters of) the sea."¹⁶ Thus several significant accomplishments of the Later Guptas and the Maukharis in the first half of the sixth century were similar. But that is not all. Another ruler of the same period, namely Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana (known date: 532 A.D.) not only defeated Mihirakula, the king of the Hūṇas (whose arrival in the *antarvēdi* could easily be described as the approach of a *krūra* people who affected the happiness of mankind) but also extended

his sway "from the neighbourhood of the (river) Lauhitya up to (the mountain) Mahēndra, the lands at the foot of which are impenetrable through the groves of palmyra trees (and) from (Himālaya) the mountain of snow, the table-lands of which are embraced by the (river) Gaṅgā, up to the western ocean."¹⁷ As he reached up to the Lauhitya i.e., the Brahmaputrā as well as the mountain Mahēndra i.e., the Eastern Ghats¹⁸, it is quite likely that he conquered the Bengal coastal region also; it is not mentioned in his *prasasti* separately probably because its author wanted to describe only the limits of the conquests of his patron in the four directions.

The similarity between the achievements of Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana, Jīvitagupta I and Īśvaravarman, as described respectively in the Mandasor, Apsad and Jaunpur inscriptions, is too striking to be ignored. In view of the contemporaneity of these rulers and the fact that two of them viz., Jīvitagupta I and Īśvaravarman were ordinary kings enjoying the titles *Kshitiśa-chūḍāmaṇi* and *Mahārāja* respectively while Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana was a *Samrāt*, this may be best explained by the assumption that emperor Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana was the overlord of Īśvaravarman and Jīvitagupta I and that Later Gupta and Maukhari rulers participated in the campaigns of the Mālava emperor when he fought against the Hūṇas (the *krūra* people of the Jaunpur inscription and probably the Sūlikas of the Haraha record), invaded the Himalayan region (mentioned both in the Jaunpur and the Apsad inscriptions) and conquered the eastern coastal region (either on his way to Kāmarūpa or

during his march towards the mountain Mahēndra). It is significant that the Āndhras are conspicuous by their absence both in the Apsad and Mandasor records. It is also, therefore, quite likely that they were defeated by the prince Īśānavarman after the collapse of the empire of Yaśōdharman-Vishṇuvardhana.

Thus there appears to be nothing in the Jaunpur inscription which cannot be explained by the assumptions that the victories described in its extant portion were achieved during the reign of Īśvaravarman (whether it was written and engraved during his reign or not) and that Īśvaravarman was the feudatory of the Mālava emperor. Same was the status of Jivitagupta I of the Later Gupta dynasty. These assumptions also explain how these petty rulers

could go on military expeditions to far distant regions. In later times, when their respective successors attained imperial status, these victories could easily be described as won by them in their own capacity. Such examples are not altogether unknown to history. According to the *Prithivirājajaya*, Durlabharāja - Chāhamāna bathed his sword at the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the ocean and enjoyed the Gauḍa land. As shown by Daśaratha Sharma this should be taken as a reference to the success achieved by the Chāhamānas in Bengal under the banner of their overlord Vatsarāja-Pratihāra.¹⁹ Similar seems to have been the case of Īśvaravarman (and also of Jivitagupta I). This suggestion, if correct, would necessitate a thorough revision of the early history of the Maukhari and the Later Gupta dynasties.

Foot-Notes:

1. Fleet, *CII.*, III, p. 228.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
3. *Mahābhārata* (BORI), III, 281. 58.
4. Sircar, D.C., *Select Inscriptions*, p. 386.
5. For a detailed study of this problem vide, Goyal, S.R., 'Were the Maukharis an Off-shoot of the Mālavas of the Punjab and Rajasthan', *Proceedings of the Rajasthan History Congress*, Ajmer session, 1972, pp. 16 ff.
6. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 229.
7. Sircar D.C., 'Maukhari Inscription from Jaunpur', *Journal of Indian History*, XLII, pp. 127 ff.
8. *EI.*, XIV, pp. 115 ff.
9. *JAHS.*, VI, pp. 17 ff.
10. Cf. *JIH.*, XLIII, pp. 733 ff., XLIV, pp. 683 ff., *PIHC*, 1965, pp. 78 ff.
11. *PIHC.*, 1965, p. 79.
12. This was suggested first by R.G. Basak (*History of North-Eastern India*, p. 109). D.C. Sircar gives same translation (*JIH.*, XLII, p. 130). U.N. Roy also takes the word *dhārā* in this sense (*Studies in Ancient History and Culture*, pp. 67 ff.) without making any reference to either Basak or Sircar. Recently, V.C. Pandey has translated the passage thus: "the sparks of fire issuing (from the hooves) of horses of manifold speed and gate" (*PIHC.*, I, 1973, p. 339) and has connected it with some military action taken by or against the Sūlikas.

13. The author of this paper locates the Mālava-janapada of the Later Guptas in Rajasthan. Vide 'Rajasthan: the Original Home of the Later Guptas', *Proceedings of Rajasthan History Congress*, Ajmer 1975, pp. 24-32.
14. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 205
15. *Ibid*,
16. Sircar, *JIH.*, XLII, p. 129. Cf. also *Select Inscriptions* p 388, fn 1.
17. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
18. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p 419, n. 3.
19. Sharma, D., *Early Chauhan Dynasties*, pp. 2526

14. MAHASAMUND PLATES OF SUDEVARAJA: YEAR 3

Balchandra Jain

The plates published here are at present with Shri S.S. Pujari, Additional Tahsildar of Mahasamund Tahsil of the Raipur district in Madhya Pradesh. They are said to have been purchased by him from a smith of Dhamatari in the same district. The plates came to me through Shri S.S. Yadav, Registering Officer (Archaeology) of Raipur, for examination and study. They are edited here with the kind permission of both the officers mentioned above.

The charter consists of three rectangular copper plates, each measuring 9 cm in breadth and 7.5 cm in height. These plates are held together by a copper ring passing through a square hole of about 1 cm in the middle of the plates at a distance of about 4 cm from the left side. A bronze seal is attached to the copper-ring. The seal is circular in shape and measures 7.5 cm in diameter. Unfortunately, the figure and the legend on the seal have been damaged due to unskilled cleaning. The seal shows goddess Lakshmī standing, facing front, on lotus, flanked by elephants pouring water over her; to the left and right sides are a *chakra* and a *saṅkha*. In the lower half of the seal is the legend in two lines and perhaps the representation of a *kumbha* which is not clear.

The weight of the three plates is 692 gms and that of the ring and seal is 505 gms. The total weight of the plates with ring and seal is 1197 gms.

There are in all 28 lines of writing on the three plates. The outer side of the first plate is blank, while that side of the third has only two lines of writing. The inner side of the first plate and the first side of the second plate have seven lines each as against the second side of the second plate and the first side of the third plate containing six lines each.

The plates are smooth; their edges are neither thickened nor raised to give protection to the writing. The record is in a very good state of preservation. It is neatly written and carefully engraved. The characters are of the box-headed variety of the Brāhmī script of the fifth century A.D. The average size of the letters, which are well-formed, is about 1 cm. Medial *au* is tripartite; medial *i* is denoted by a semicircle and adding of a dot makes it *ī*; the final form of *t* occurs in lines 20 and 22. As regards orthography, the consonants following *r* are doubled in some cases as in *chaturvveda* in line 11 and *dharmma* in line 15; *ṛi* is denoted by *ri* as in *dhikrita* in line 26; the writer has used *s* for *ś* and *sh*, and *ṭ* for *ṭh* in some cases.

Tāmbra is written for *tāmra* and *siṅha* for *siṃha* in lines 11 and 28 respectively.

The *language* of the record is Sanskrit. Except the benedictory and the imprecatory verses at the end, the composition is in prose.

The charter was issued from Śrīpura, by the king Sudēvarāja, son of Durgarāja, described as a *paramabhāgavata*, on the ninth day of the month of Kārttika in the third year of his reign and records the royal grant of the village Khalapadraka situated in the *bhōga* of Ḍakarī to a *chaturvēdin* Brāhmaṇa, Mādhasvāmin of the Kāśyapa *gōtra* and the Vājasanēya *sākhā* for the merits of his parents and himself. The donated village was made free from all taxes. It was granted with all its *nidhis* and *upanidhis*, not to be transgressed by regular and irregular troops. The residents of the village were asked to pay the *bhōga* and the *bhāga* to the donee accordingly.


The inscription was engraved on the plates by Gōlasimha described as an *akshasālika* (keeper of the records) who is also known to have engraved the Kauvatal¹ plates of this king and the Thakurdiā² and the Mallar³ plates of Pravara-rāja.

It is noteworthy that the donation was made to a Brāhmaṇa of the Kāśyapa *gōtra* which does not find mention in any other record of this family. Similarly, the record gives interesting information regarding the habitation of the *chaturvēdin* Brāhmaṇas in South Kōsala in the fifth century A.D.

The name of *mahāsāmanta* Indrabalarāja, the Chief Minister (*sarvādhikārādhikṛita*) of king Sudēvarāja, is mentioned in line 26, but unlike in the Kauvatal plates, he is not styled as a *dūtaka* in the present record. The legend on the seal attached to the plates does not mention the name of the father of the donor-king nor his *kula*.

Eight records (including the present one) of King Sudēvarāja have come to light so far out of which two are known to have been issued from Śrīpura and five from Śarabhapura; one record is incomplete. The seals of the Khariar and Arang plates inform that he was the son of Mānamātra and grandson of Prasanna (or Prasannamātra as known from coins). The present plates and the Kauvatal plates state that his father's name was Durgarāja. Hence, it was suggested by scholars that Mānamātra and Durgarāja are identical.⁴ King Mānamātra had a second son named Pravara-rāja known from the Thakurdiya⁵ and Mallar⁶ plates of the latter while the Mallar plates of Vyāghrarāja clearly state that Pravara was a son of Jaya. Because the plates of the king Vyāghrarāja, younger brother of Pravara, were issued from Prasannapura, this Jaya is identifiable with Jayarāja, son of Prasanna and issuer of four sets of copper plates discovered from Arang, Amgura and Mallar. He is further identifiable with Mānamātra *alias* Durgarāja; father of Sudēvarāja and Pravara-rāja. The genealogy of the family can be tabulated as below:

1. Śarabha
2. Narēndra
3. Prasanna or Prasannamātra
4. Jayarāja or Mānamātra Durgarāja



The family was ruling from Śarabhapura, Śrīpura and Prasannapura. The name of the family was Amarārya-kula as mentioned in the Mallar plates of Vyāghrarāja. Possibly the queen of Bharatabala⁸ was born in this family (Āmaraja-kula-jā).

Mahāsāmanta Indrabalarāja, the *sarvādhikārādhikṛita* of king Sudēvarāja has been identified with Pāṇḍuvaṁśī Indrabala, grandfather of Tīvararāja known from his

three charters issued from Śrīpura⁹.

Of the geographical names mentioned in this inscription, Śrīpura is modern Sirpur in the Mahasamund tahsil of the Raipur district of Madhya Pradesh. The location of the Ḍakarī *bhōga* could not be determined.¹⁰ Khalapadraka may be identified with modern Khalari in the Raipur district. The place was known as Khalvāṭikā or Khalavāṭikā in the 14th-15th century A.D.¹¹

Text¹²

Seal

1. Kram-ādhigata-rājyasya vikram-ōtkhāta-vidvishaḥ[1*]
2. Śrīmat-[Sudēva]rājasya [sthiram jagati śāsanam (nam) [11*]

First Plate

1. Ōm!¹³ svasti [1*] Śrīpurād-vikram-ōpanata-sāmanta-makuṭa-chu(chū)ḍamaṇi-pra-
2. bhā-prasēk-āmva(mbu)-dhauta-pāda-yugalō ripu vilāsinī-sīma[m*]t-ō[d*]dhara-
3. ṇa-hētur-vvasu-vasudhā-gō-prada[h*] parama-bhāgavatō mātā-pitṛi-pād-ā-
4. nuddhyātaḥ śrī-Mahā-Durgarājah(ja)-putra-śrī-Mahā¹⁴-Sudēvarāja[h*]
5. Ḍakarī-bhōgi(gī)ya Khalapadrakē prativāsinas= samājñāpa-
6. yati viditam = astu vō yath = āsmābhir = ayam grāma[h*]Tṛi (Tri)dasa(śa)pati-
7. sadana-sukha-pratisṭhā(ṭhā)karō yāvad = ravi-śāsi-tārā-kiraṇa-

Second Plate : First side

8. pratihata-ghōr-āndhakāraṁ jagad = avatishṭa(shṭha)tē tāvad = upabhōgyaḥ
9. sa-nidhi[s*] = s = opanidhir = a-chāṭa-bhaṭa-prāvēśya[s*] = sarvva-kara-visarjji-
10. ta[ḥ*] mātā-pitrōr = puṇy-ābhivṛiddhayē Kāśya(śya)pa-gōtra-
11. Vājasanēyi-Mādhava - chaturvēda - svāminē tāmbra(mra)-śāsanē-
12. n = ātisri(sṛi)shṭhaḥ(shṭaḥ) [l*]tē yū¹⁵yam = ēvam = upalabhya a(ā)jñā-śravaṇa-vidhēya(yā)
13. bhūtva yath-ōcha(chi)taṁ bhōga-bhāgam = upanayamta[ḥ*] sukhaṁ prati-vats[y*]atha [l*]
14. bhavishya¹⁶taś = cha bhūmipālān = anudarśayati [l*] Dānād = viśiṣṭam = anupā-

Second Plate : Second Side

15. lanaja[m̄] pura(rā)ṇā dharmmēsu(shu) niśchita-dhiya[ḥ*] pravadanti dharmmam̄ (rmam) [l*] tasmā[l*] = dvijā-
16. ya suvisu(śu)dha(ddha)-kula-śrutāya datā(ttām) bhuva(vaṁ) bhavatu vō matir = ēva gō-
17. stu(ptum) [|| 1*] Tad = bhavadbhir = apy = eśā(shā) dattir = anupālayitavyāḥ(vyā)[l*] Vyāsa-gīta (tām)-
18. ś = ch = ātra ślō[kā]n = udāharanti [||*] Agnēr - apatyam̄ prathamam̄ su-
19. varṇṇa[m̄*] bhūr = vvaishṇavi sūryya-sutāś = cha gāva[ḥ*] dattās = trayas = tēna
20. bhavanti lōka(kā) yaḥ = kāñchana[m̄*] gāñ = cha mahiñ = cha dadyāt ||[2*]

Third Plate : First Side


21. [Sha]shṭim̄ varsha-sahasra(srā)ṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmidaḥ [l*] āchchhē-
22. ttā chchā(ch = ā)numantā chcha(cha) to(tā)ny = ēva narakē vasēt ||[3*] Bahubhir = vvasu-
23. dhā dattā rājabhis = Sagar-ādibhiḥ [l*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis = ta-
24. sya tasya tadā phalam̄ (lam) [|| 4*] Svadattām̄ paradattām̄ = vā yatnād = raksha yu-
25. dhishṭhira [l*] mahi[m̄*] mahimatām̄ śrēshṭha dānāch = chhrēy = ōnupālanami (m || [5*] i)ti ||
26. Sarvva(rvva)dhikārādhikṛita-śrī-mahā sāmanta-Indrarāja ||

Third Plate : Second Side


27. Pa(Pra)varddhamāna-vijaya-rājyē samvatsara(rē) 3 Kārttika dina 9
28. śāśa(sa)nam = utkīrṇam̄ akkaśālika Gōlasiṅghēna ||

MAHASAMUND PLATES OF SUDEVARAJA


SEAL




FIRST PLATE




MAHASAMUND PLATES OF SUDEVARAJA
SECOND PLATE: FIRST SIDE




SECOND PLATE: SECOND SIDE



MAHASAMUND PLATES OF SUDEVARAJA
THIRD PLATE : FIRST SIDE



THIRD PLATE : SECOND SIDE



THE DATE OF THE MALHARA PLATES OF ADITYARAJA

Indore Coin - Śaka 154-Year 4



(See Page 6 above)

1. *EI.*, XXXI, pp. 314-16
2. *Ibid.*, XXII, pp. 15-23.
3. *Ibid.*, XXXIV, pp. 53-54.
4. *Ibid.*, XXXI, p. 315.
5. *Ibid.*, XXII, pp. 15 ff.
6. *JOIH.*, XXXIV, pp. 216 ff.; *EI.*, XXXIV, pp. 53-54.
7. *EI.*, XXXIV, pp. 47 ff.
8. Bamhani plates (*EI.*, XXVII, pp. 132 ff.; *CII.*, V, pp. 82 ff.); Mallar Plates (*Bhāratīya Purābhilēkha Patrikā*, III, pp. 183-192); one copper plate containing the incomplete charter of the family of Bharatabala is in possession of Shri CL. Pande of Mallar.
9. Bonda, Rajim and Baloda plates.
10. The name of the *Bhōga* mentioned in the Kāvatal plates is written on an erasure. It was read as Hakiṛī, but the correct name may be Ḍakarī as in the present charter.
11. Khalari stone inscription of Hari-Brahmadēva, VS 1470 (*CII.*, IV, pp. 575 ff.).
12. From original plates and photograph.
13. Expressed by symbol.
14. The reading in the original is *Mā* which has to be corrected to *Ma*.—[AMS].
15. The reading in the original is *yu*.—[AMS].
16. The reading in the original is *sya*.—[AMS].

15. NOTE ON THE INDORE PLATES OF PRAVARASENA II

G.S. Gai

In the August issue of the Marāṭhī Journal 'Navabhārata', Mm. Dr. V.V. Mirashi has published an article entitled 'Fresh Light on Gupta History' based on the recent discovery of a single copper-plate of the Vākāṭaka dynasty by Dr. Nagu, Indore. It has been shown that this single plate forms the first plate of the incomplete set of the Indore plates¹ of Vākāṭaka king Pravarasēna II dated in his 23rd regnal year. This first plate supplies the early portion of the Vākāṭaka genealogy describing Pravarasēna I and Bhavanāga, the chief of the Bhāraśivas, and states that the grant was issued from the camp at Tripurī (*Tripurī-vāsakāt*) which is identified with modern Tewar situated at a distance of 6 miles from Jabalpur, th headquarters of the district of the same name in Madhya Pradesh. From the other plates of the set we learn that the object of the inscription was to record the grant of a village (possibly *Viśākhāryavāṭaka*) to certain Brāhmaṇas residing at Ārāmaka and, while describing the boundaries of the gift-village, the places Gēpūraka, Ārāmaka, Kōbidārika, Kōśambaka and Añjanavāṭaka are mentioned. Of these, Dr. Mirashi has identified two places, viz. Kōśambaka and Añjanavāṭaka with modern Kōsamba which is situated 6 miles to the south of Tirōḍī in the Bālāghāṭ District of Madhya Pradesh² and Añjanwāḍī, 5 miles to the south-east of Kōsamba respectively. So Pravarasēna II, while camping at Tripurī or Tewar, which

was located to the north of Narmadā and which was not included in his territory, made the gift of a village which was situated in his own territory in Vidarbha. Dr. Mirashi states that this gift was made by Pravarasēna II when he had invaded the territory of his enemy and when he was camping there after conquering it. He further states that the Vākāṭakas and the Guptas rose to power about the same time and while the empire of the Guptas was to the north of Narmadā, that of the Vākāṭakas was to the south of that river. The two families were on friendly terms in the beginning and had even established matrimonial relationship in that Prabhāvati-guptā, daughter of Chandragupta II, was married to Vākāṭaka Rudrasēna II. But, towards the end of the reign of Kumāragupta I (c. 414-455 A.D.), son of Chandragupta II, there was estrangement between the two families and Pravarasēna II (c. 420-50 A.D.) invaded the Gupta territory in the Ḍāhaḷa or Chēdi region, north of Narmadā, and, after registering a victory over him, issued the present Indore plates in his 23rd regnal year i.e., in *circa* 443 A.D. And, in order to support his view that the authority of Pravarasēna II extended to the north of Narmadā, Dr. Mirashi refers to the two stone inscriptions,³ found at Nāchnē-kī-Talāi and Gañj, north of Narmadā in Madhya Pradesh, which refer to Vyāghradēva, a subordinate of Vākāṭaka Pṛithivīshēṇa II (c. 470-90 A.D.),

son of Narēndrasēna and grandson of Pravarasēna II. The Bālāghāṭ plates⁴ of Pṛithivīshēṇa also state that the commands of Narēndrasēna were honoured by the rulers of Kōsalā, Mēkalā and Mālava. So, according to Dr. Mirashi, all the three kings of the Vākāṭaka dynasty, viz. Pravarasēna II, Narēndrasēna and Pṛithivīshēṇa II invaded the Gupta territory to the north of the Narmadā and established their authority over some part of it. And he states that a veiled reference to this conflict is to be found in the Bhitari stone pillar inscription⁵ of Skandagupta which has the following two verses as read by Fleet :-

Vichalita-kula-lakshmī-stambhanāy =
ōdyatēna

kshiti-tala-śayanīyē yēna nītās = tri-yāmā¹
samudita-bala - kōshā[n-Pushya]mitrāmś
= cha jivā

kshitipa-charaṇa-pīṭhē sthāpitō vāma-
pādaḥ ॥

.....

Pitari divam = upētē viplutām vaiśa-
lakshmīm

bhuja-bala-vijit-ārīr = yyaḥ pratishṭhāpya
bhūyaḥ¹

jitam = iti paritōshān = mātaram sāsra-
nētrām

hata ripur = iva Kṛishṇō Dēvakīm =
abhyupētaḥ ॥

.....

In addition to these two verses, there is a third verse (partly preserved) in the same record which refers to the conflict and evidently the defeat of the Hūṇas by Skandagupta and which reads as follows :-

Hūṇair = yyasya samāgatasya samarē
dōrbhyām dharā kampitā

bhīm - āvartta-karasya śatrushu.....

Dr. Mirashi states that the above three verses refer to three victories achieved by Skandagupta. In the first verse he prefers the reading *yuddhy = amitrāmś = cha jivā* suggested by Dr. H.R. Divekar⁶ in place of *Pushyamitrāmś = cha jivā* read by Fleet. And, according to him, this verse states that, when Skandagupta tried to restore the fallen fortunes of his family, he had to spend a whole night lying on the bare ground but ultimately he conquered the enemies who had power and wealth and placed his left foot on the foot-stool in the form of the heads of the enemy kings. The second verse states that when his (i.e., Skandagupta's) father had died, he re-established the ruined fortunes of his lineage by conquering the enemies with the strength of his arms and in order to convey this news of victory, he went to see his mother who was in tears just as Kṛishṇa, when he had slain his enemy (i.e. Kaṁsa) betook himself to see his mother Dēvakī. Since this verse refers to the death of his father, i.e., Kumāragupta I, Dr. Mirashi thinks that the event described in the first verse must have taken place earlier, i.e., towards the end of Kumāragupta's reign, while this second verse describes about Skandagupta's obtaining the kingdom after his father's death. The third verse, which is badly damaged, refers to Skandagupta's conflict with the Hūṇas.

Posing the question as to who the enemy mentioned in the first verse could be, Dr. Mirashi says that the present plates of Pravarasēna II provide the answer, since, as

stated by him, this Pravarasēna had invaded the Gupta territory north of Narmadā towards the end of the reign of Kumāragupta I and while his military camp was fixed at Tripurī or Tewar, he issued the present grant. Thus, according to him, the discovery of the present single plate at Indore, forming the first plate of the set of Pravarasēna II, throws valuable light on Gupta-Vākāṭaka history.

We are sorry that it is not possible to agree with Dr. Mirashi's view mentioned above, either with regard to his interpretation of the expression *Tripurī-vāsakāt* found in the newly discovered plate or with his interpretation of the two verses from the Bhitari stone pillar inscription referred to by him to support his view. Let us examine the same.

In the first place, the mere fact that the grant of Pravarasēna II was issued when he was staying at Tripurī or modern Tewar to the north of the Narmadā is not enough to say that he had conquered that region from the Gupta king Kumāragupta I and that they were on inimical terms at the time of the grant. There is absolutely no evidence either in any records of Kumāragupta I or of Pravarasēna II to indicate that there was rivalry between them. On the other hand, the Vākāṭakas were on extremely good terms with the Guptas from the time of Samudragupta till at least the end of the reign of Kumarāgupta I, though they enjoyed some sort of subordinate position under the Guptas. Even the records⁷ of Pṛithivīshēṇa II, grandson of Pravarasēna II, show that it was Narēndrasēna (son of Pravarasēna II) and Pṛithivīshēṇa II who occupied some territory to the north of the Narmadā belonging to the Guptas and exercised their authority in

that region and they do not attribute any victory to Pravarasēna II in that area, much less against Kumāragupta I as thought of by Dr. Mirashi. And none of the records of Pravarasēna II himself mentions about his conquests. Therefore, we have to infer from the expression *Tripurī-vāsakāt* that Pravarasēna II had gone to Tripurī which was an ancient and holy place of pilgrimage, as pointed out by Dr. Mirashi himself, and which was located in the territory of his relative Kumāragupta I and, while staying there, issued the present grant registering the gift of a village in his own territory. This view is strengthened by lines 11 and 12 of the grant which state, according to Dr. Mirashi, that the grant was made at the victorious place of religious worship (*vaijayikē dharmasthānē*).⁸ Hence his view that Pravarasēna II invaded and conquered the territory of Kumāragupta I to the north of the Narmadā comprising Ḍāhaḷa or Chēdī and, while his military camp was at Tripurī, he issued the present grant, is not tenable. Had it been a military camp in the enemy's territory, an expression like *vijaya-skandhāvārē*, *jaya-skandhāvārē*, or *vijaya-kaṭakē*, would have been used instead of *dharmasthānē*. In the very example given by Dr. Mirashi from the Karhāḍ plates⁹ of Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa III to support his view, the expression used is *Mēlpāṭi-samāvāsita-srīmad-vijaya-kaṭakēnamayā* which shows that Mēlpāṭi was a military camp (*vijaya-kaṭaka*) unlike Tripurī which was *vijaya-dharma-sthāna*. In the Taḷegaon plates¹⁰ of Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa I, who was camping at Maṇṇe after invading the Gaṅga territory, the expression used is *Gāṅgānām=upari vijaya-skandhāvārē Maṇṇanagarē*. Therefore, the expression *Tripurī-vāsakāt* used in the present Indore plates of

Pravarasēna II does not mean that he conquered the territory of the Guptas. The conquest of Gupta territory north of the Narmadā must have taken place only after Pravarasēna II, i. e., during the period of Narēndrasēna and Pṛithivishēṇa II as evidenced by the records of the latter.

Secondly, Dr. Mirashi's interpretation of the two verses from the Bhitari stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta quoted by him to support his view is also not acceptable. According to the late Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar,¹¹ the first two verses mentioned above from the Bhitari inscription refer to one and the same event or victory of Skandagupta and his ascending the royal throne after subduing the enemies, who, among others, included the Hūṇas who formed a formidable force as mentioned in the third verse quoted above. Dr. Bhandarkar has dispelled the notion held by some scholars that the reign of Kumāragupta I ended in disaster. The misfortune overtook the family only after his death as clearly stated in the second verse (*pitari divam=upētē*) and not during his lifetime. He has shown that this disaster must have taken place during the brief rule of Ghaṭōt-kachagupta who succeeded Kumāragupta I on the throne and who seems to have met with his death in the battle fought with the enemies including the Hūṇas. And, in this battle, his younger brother Skandagupta who had to flee and even sleep on bare ground for some nights fought bravely on behalf of his brother and ultimately achieved victory. Besides the Hūṇas, one of the principal enemy of Skandagupta appears to have been a near relative of his on his mother's side, possibly a Nāga ruler of importance who revolted against the imperial rulers on the

death of Kumāragupta I. If the comparison of Skandagupta and his mother to Kṛishṇa and Dēvakī given in the second verse quoted above has any meaning at all, the enemy who had arisen against the Gupta power after the death of Kumāragupta I and made it totter to its foundations must have been some relative of Skandagupta through his mother, possibly her brother. Since the expression *amitrāms=cha* used in the first verse is in plural, this enemy seems to have invited the Hūṇas to help him in his attempt. But who could this relative of Skandagupta be? In this connection Dr. Bhandarkar invites our attention to a stanza in the Junāgaḍh inscription of this Skandagupta in which it is stated that "he forged an order with an effigy, viz. Garuḍa, which rendered devoid of poison the Serpent (*bhujaga*) Rulers" (*bhujagānām māna-darpōtphaṇānām pratikṛiti-Garuḍ-ājñām nirvviṣhīm ch = āvakarttā*). As *bhujaga* is synonymous with *nāga*, both meaning 'serpent' and as royal Nāga families were in existence during the Gupta period and as Garuḍa was an insignia of the Gupta dynasty, one comes to the irresistible conclusion that there was a rebellion set up by the Nāga rulers which was quelled by Skandagupta. We know that one of the queens of Chandragupta II was Kubēra-Nāgā of the Nāga family and similarly the queen of Kumāragupta I might have been a Nāga princess whose brother might have revolted after the death of Kumāragupta I. This would explain why Skandagupta is stated to have impressed his Garuḍa signet on the *bhujaga* rulers or Nāgas and also to have gone to his mother who was in tears just as Kṛishṇa repaired to his mother Dēvakī after slaying his enemy, i. e., Kāṁsa. Thus Skandagupta ascended the throne after re-establishing

the fortunes of his family which had fallen when his elder brother succeeded Kumāragupta I. It may also be pointed out that the last line of the first verse quoted above, viz. *kshitipa-charaṇa-pīṭhē sthāpitō vāma-pādaḥ* has to be interpreted, following Dr. Bhandarkar, as 'his (i.e. Skandagupta's) left foot was placed on the royal-stool', i.e., he occupied the throne and rested his left foot on the foot-stool which forms an integral part of the throne. This differs from Fleet's interpretation which is followed by Dr. Mirashi. So this verse also refers to Skandagupta's obtaining the sovereignty as in the case of the second verse quoted above.

From the above discussion, it would be clear that there is nothing in the inscriptions of Skandagupta to show about the tragic end of Kumāragupta I, that the Gupta power was tottering after his death only when Ghaṭōtkachagupta came to the throne and that the fortunes of the family were restored by Skandagupta. And, therefore, it is not possible to agree with Dr. Mirashi's view that the first verse quoted above from the Bhitari inscription refers to the event which took place during the reign of Kumāragupta I and that the enemy referred to therein was Pravarasēna II.

Foot-Notes :-

- 1 *CII.*, V, pp. 38 ff. and plate IX.
- 2 Kōśambaka seems to be the same as Kōśāmba mentioned in the Tirōḍī plates of Pravarasēna II (*ibid.*, pp. 48 ff.).
- 3 *Ibid.*, pp. 89 ff.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp. 79 ff.
- 5 *Ibid.*, III, 1888, pp. 52 ff. and plate VII.
- 6 *An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, Vol. I, pp. 99 ff.
- 7 *CII.*, V, pp. 79 ff.; *ibid.*, pp. 89 ff. Dr. Mirashi's suggestion about a veiled reference to the authority of Vākāṭaka Narēndrasēna in the Bamhani plates of Bharatabala (*ibid.*, pp. 82 ff.) is no longer tenable in view of the recently discovered Malhar plates of Śūrabala (*Journ. Ep. Soc.*, Vol. III, pp. 183 ff.) wherein the expression *narēndra* clearly refers to king Udīrṇavaira which was another name of Śūrabala and not to Vākāṭaka Narēndrasēna.
- 8 *CII.*, V, p. 38.
- 9 *EI.*, IV, pp. 278 ff.
- 10 *Ibid.*, XIII, pp. 275 ff.
- 11 Dr. Bhandarkar's views are expressed in the forthcoming revised volume of Gupta Inscriptions edited jointly by Dr. B.Ch. Chhabra and myself.

16. A KANNADA HERO-STONE INSCRIPTION IN MADRAS CITY

Madhav N. Katti

The hero-stone inscription was discovered by me in the Kalakshetra Campus, Adyar within the Madras city¹. The hero-stone itself is a dressed, sculptured and inscribed sandstone slab measuring about 2.5 m in height, 1 m in width and 0.10 m in thickness. The slab contains three panels one below the other, the first from the top bearing the inscription and the second which is larger containing the sculptured scene. The third which is undressed is meant to be buried under ground as it presently is. The inscribed portion occupies a space of about 1 m x 0.20 m.

At the first instance, I would place below the descriptive particulars of the sculpture as it provides a rare specimen. The hero in whose memory the stone was set up is portrayed standing with a bow in his left hand, his right hand holding a dagger tied to his waist. His legs indicate firmness. The face wearing moustach and beard has a majestic appearance. The hair of the head is tied into a knot. The quiver with arrows is tied to his right shoulder from behind. There is a cross strap on the chest. The body is bare except for a tight lower garment which is the regular pattern of the period. The figure, on the whole, appears to be that of a very dynamic and strong person. Enemy's arrows are also shown piercing his body, head, left arm, etc., indicating that the hero resisted much before he collapsed. There are seven more figures

sculptured on the same panel along with the hero and the entire scene is very impressive and of a rare type. From bottom upwards, near the hero's right leg, an animal (ox) is shown with the mouth open as if crying on the death of its master. There are two more animals (oxen) one to the right side above the animal first mentioned and one near his left knee. Evidently, this depicts that the hero died after rescuing the cattle, in a cattle-raid.

In between his two legs, near the feet there is a kneeling figure with a downcast face. It is not clear if it is of a female. If it is of a female, it is possible that it represents the wife of the hero who must have committed *sati* after the death of her husband. It could also be of his attendant, if it is male. This type of portrayal is unique and probably is the first of its type amongst the hero-stones discovered so far. Near the left foot, there is one more figure, probably of a male, indicating the servant of the hero who also must have died after the death of his master. Innumerable inscriptions provide evidence of the fact that in a number of cases the servants also died after the death of their masters. Near the shoulder on both sides, there are two figures (apparently male). The figure on the right side has a *chauri* in its right hand. The figure on the left side has its left hand no more preserved, which probably also held a *chauri*. The entire sculptured panel is

portrayed extremely well and provides a very rare example of the hero-stone sculptures of the period. By its features it can be assigned to a period from the latter half of the 9th century to the first half of the 10th century A.D.

The inscription contains three lines of writing in Kannada characters and language and can by itself be assigned to the same period.¹

The record states that ... yara, son of Sandeyasetṭi, described as *palarodegaṇḍa* died in a cattle-raid at Poṛiyamgāḍu which was situated in Kannaḍa [m]baḷḷi, after reaching Kottaḷi (*Kottaḷi-muṭṭi*). The fight must have taken place in the Poṛiyamgāḍu area within the jurisdiction of Kannaḍambaḷḷi and the hero must have continued his fight till he reached Kottaḷi, where he must have collapsed after much resistance.

As the hero is described as *palarodegaṇḍa* (*palar-oḍe-gaṇḍa*)² he must have been a person of considerable importance, a leader

and probably a local administrator. Kannaḍambaḷḷi was evidently a settlement of the Kannaḍa speaking people, in the Tamil country and has come to light for the first time through this record. It can be identified with the present day Kannaḍa-haḷḷi (also called Kannaḍa-paḷḷi) in Krishnagiri Taluk, Dharmapuri District.⁴ Poṛiyam-gāḍu must have been a foresty area near the village Kannaḍa-haḷḷi, as suggested by the term *kāḍu* (in *Poṛiyam-gāḍu*), and must have been situated within the jurisdiction of the latter. There could have been a village by this name but its identity is uncertain. Kottaḷi must have been a hamlet in the vicinity of Kannaḍa-haḷḷi in the same District⁵. It may be recalled that the inscribed slab was collected from Dharmapuri District and set up in its present place (in the Kalakshetra campus). The area comprising North Arcot, Salem and Dharmapuri Districts has yielded several Kannaḍa inscriptions of the Rāshṭrakūṭa rulers and their feudatories who had their sway over this area, during this period.

Text

1. Svasti[!]*Sṛī ...⁶ yara Sandeya-seṭṭiya ma[gan*]'
2. Kannaḍa[m]ba[ḷ]ḷiya Poṛiyamgāḍo[ḷ] tu[rū*]go[ḷo][!]*'
3. satta Palarode-gaṇḍa Kottaḷi muṭṭi⁸

Foot-Notes:

1. I am thankful to Shri Menon, Director, Kalakshetra, Adyar, Madras.
2. The letters can be compared with Māvaḷḷi inscription of the Rāchchaya-Kaḍambā and a number of inscriptions of the period of Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa III, vide *EL.*, Vol. XXXVII, p 336.
3. In this word, *oḍe* may denote the same meaning as *oḍeya*.
4. *Alphabeticalist of villages*, Govt of Madras 1972, p. 227.
5. Though it is not found in the *Alphabetical List of Villages* or cannot be located in the available maps, the representatives of the Dharmapuri District, who attended the conference, reported about the existence of the village Kottaḷam near Kannaḍa-haḷḷi in the same District, which could be the village Kottaḷi mentioned in the record.
6. The first part of the word is damaged and the letters could be read as *Chetṭi* or *Beji*. Thus the name could be Chetṭiyara or Bejiyara.
7. The entire expression could also be split as '*...yarasā Deya-seṭṭiyamaḡan*,' in which case the name of the father of the hero could be Deya(Dēya)-seṭṭi also.
8. Drs. G.S. Gai, K.V. Ramesh, S.H. Ritti and Shri K. R. Srinivasan offered some very useful suggestions, while the paper was presented, for which I am thankful to them.

A HERO-STONE INSCRIPTION FROM MADRAS CITY



(FULL SLAB)

A HERO-STONE INSCRIPTION FROM MADRAS CITY



(INSCRIBED PORTION)

17. THE REGNAL YEAR

N. Sethuraman

A king ascends the throne. He rules for some years. A few years before his death he anoints either his son or his brother or a near relative (normally his sister's son) heir-apparent. The heir-apparent is called the crown prince or *yuvarāja*. When the senior king dies, the *yuvarāja* becomes the monarch of the kingdom. He too follows his predecessor. This system was practised by the South Indian kings like the Pallavas, Chālukyas, Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas, Hoysaḷas and the Vijayanagara kings.

The inscriptions belonging to these kings furnish valuable information regarding their reigns. Some of the inscriptions contain the Śaka or cyclic years, astronomical data, etc. The inscriptions of the Pallavas, Chālukyas, Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas and the Hoysaḷas furnish the regnal years also. With the help of the astronomical data, the equivalent Christian date of the respective inscription can be found. If the regnal year is given, then we deduct the same from the date of the inscription and determine the accession year of the king.

The Hindu kings followed the Indian calendar system based on the position of the planets like Sun, Moon, Earth and the Star. The method of converting the astronomical data into equivalent Christian date was first employed by the German scholars like Warrens, Kielhorn, Hultsch and Jacobi. This was later followed by Robert Sewell and Swami-

kannu Pillai. In the year 1922 Swamikannu Pillai published the Indian Ephemeris which is a valuable book to find the equivalent Christian dates from 1st century A.D. to 2000 A. D.

The earlier scholars consulted the Ephemeris and found the dates of the inscriptions. With the help of the regnal years, mentioned in the records, they fixed the accession year of the king. For the purpose of calculating the date of the inscriptions, they followed the Indian calendar system. However, to fix the *accession date*, the scholars followed the Christian calendar system in which one year is equal to 365 days. The scholars thought that the length of one ruling year was equal to that of a Christian calendar year or one solar year. On this basis the accession dates of the Chōla and Pāṇḍya king and of the kings of other dynasties were worked out and published.

Later discoveries of inscriptions prove that the Hindu kings did not follow the Christian year or the solar year for the purpose of calculating their *regnal years*. The Hindu king counted his regnal year on the basis of his accession star. For example, suppose a king ascends the throne on 1st January, 1001 A. D. As per the Christian calendar system or the solar year (as employed by earlier scholars) the king's second year begins on 1st January, 1002 A. D. Hindu kings did not follow this method.

On the day of 1st January 1001, star *Uttiraṭṭādi* was current in the *śuklapaksha* of the Tamil month Tai. As per the Indian calendar system, the king's second regnal year must begin in the next year from the date on which the same star *Uttiraṭṭādi* is current in the *śukla-paksha* of the Tamil month Tai. The date falls on 20th January, 1002 A. D. Thus instead of 365 days, the first year of his reign contains 384 days. Similarly his third year begins on 9th January, 1003 A. D. and thus the second year of his reign contains 354 days only. Hindu kings followed

this system in which one regnal year contained approximately 354 to 384 days depending upon the occurrence of the accession star in the respective years. Following examples support this theory.

Kielhorn determined the accession date of *Kulōttuṅgachōḷa* between the 14th March and the 8th October, 1070.³ In all his calculations, he applied the Christian calendar system or the solar year for necessary deductions to fix the accession date of the king. Let us see some examples of the later discoveries of inscriptions.

1) An inscription³ from *Srirāṅgam* which belongs to this king is dated 352nd day of his 41st regnal year. The astronomical data as worked out in the *AREp.* correspond to 6th June, 1111 A.D.

Year 41, day 352=6th June, 1111 A.D.

Therefore Year 41, day 1=20th June, 1110 A.D.

Therefore Year 1, day 1=20th June, 1070 A.D.

As per the Christian calendar system, 20th June 1070 is the first day of the first year which is the accessson date of the king.

2) The *Pennaḍam*⁴ inscription belongs to the king's 29th year, day 382 corresponding to 18th June, 1099 A.D.

Year 29, day 382=18th June, 1099 A.D.

Therefore Year 29, day 1=2nd June, 1098 A.D.

Therefore Year 1, day 1=2nd June, 1070 A.D.

If we apply the Christian calendar system then the second case furnishes 2nd June 1070 A.D. as the accession date of the king. But the first case supplies 20th June 1070 A.D. Thus there is discrepancy. This proves that, for necessary deductions, the Christian calendar system or the solar year must not be employed. Now, let us apply the Indian calendar system.

As per the *Srirāṅgam* inscription :

Year 41, day 352=6th June, 1111 A.D.

Therefore Year 41 day 1—20th June, 1110 A.D.

This proves that his 41st year started from 20th June 1110. On this date star Pushya was current in the Tamil month of Aṇi. It means that the first day of the 41st year corresponds to the occurrence of star Pushya in the month of Āṇi of 1110. Similarly the first day of the first year must correspond to the occurrence of star Pushya in the month of Āṇi of 1070. The data fall on 13th June, 1070 which is the correct accession date of the king⁵.

As per the Pennaḍam inscription, the first day of his 29th year falls on 2nd June 1098. On this date star Punarvasu ended and star Pushya started. Star Punarvasu was also current on the previous day *i. e.*, 1st June. But Kulōttuṅga counts the beginning of his 29th year from the next day *i. e.*, the 2nd June only on which date Punarvasu ended and star Pushya commenced. This proves that the 29th regnal year starts from the star

Pushya which was current in the month of Āṇi.

Year 29, day 1 = Star Pushya in the month of Āṇi of 1098. Therefore Year 1, day 1 = Star Pushya in the month of Āṇi of 1070. The latter data fall on 13th June, 1070 which is the accession date. Both records confirm that 13th June, 1070 was the accession date of Kulōtungachōḷa I and Pushya was his accession star. The records prove that the Indian calendar system alone must be employed to fix the accession date of a Hindu king.

We will also see another example related to the accession date of Rājēndrachōḷa I. Kulōttuṅga fixed the accession date of this king between the 27th March and the 7th July, 1012⁶. With the help of the later discoveries of inscriptions we can find out his exact accession date. Enṇāyiram inscription⁷ belongs to the king's 30th year, 27th day. The *AREp.* equated the data of this record to 25th June, 1041. Accordingly

Year 30, day 27 = 25th June, 1041

Therefore Year 30, day 1 = 30th May, 1041

Therefore Year 1, day 1—30th May, 1012.

If we apply the Christian calendar system, then the first day of the first year falls on 30th May, 1012 which must be the accession date.

His other inscription⁸ from Enṇāyiram itself belongs to year 25, day 112. The *AREp.* equated the data to 16th September, 1036. Accordingly.

Year 25, 112=16th September, 1036

Therefore Year 25, day 1=28th May, 1036

Therefore Year 1, day 1=28th May, 1012

As per the previous record, the king's accession date falls on 30th May, 1012 whereas the second record supplies 28th May of the same year. Thus there is discrepancy. This again proves that the Christian calendar system or the solar year is not useful to find the accession date. Now let us apply the Indian calendar system. As per the former record

Year 30, day 27=25th June, 1041

Therefore Year 30, day 1=30th May, 1041

30th May of 1041 belongs to the month of Āṇi on which date star Rōhiṇī ends and Mṛigaśirā begins. Therefore, the first day of 30th year is equal to the ending of Rōhiṇī and the beginning of Mṛigaśirā in the month Āṇi of 1041. Similarly the first day of the first year is equal to the ending of Rōhiṇī and the beginning of Mṛigaśirā in the month Āṇi of 1012. The data fall on 19th June, 1012 which is the accession date of the king. As per the latter record:

Year 25, day 112=16th September, 1036

Therefore Year 25, day 1=28th May, 1036

In the year 1036, May 28th belongs to the month of Āṇi and on that date star Rōhiṇī ends and Mṛigaśirā begins. Similarly the ending of Rōhiṇī and the beginning of Mṛigaśirā in the month Āṇi of 1012 is the first day of the first year which corresponds to 19th June, 1012, the accession date of the king. This agrees with the previous case.

In both the cases star Rōhiṇī was current even on the previous day of the respective first day. But Rājēndrachōḷa counts only from the junction of Rōhiṇī and Mṛigaśirā. This proves that the accession star of Rājēndrachōḷa was Mṛigaśirā only. This can also be verified with the aid of another inscription.

An inscription from Kālahasti belongs to Rājēndrachōḷa's regnal year 23 and day 4. The other data are star Pushya and Thursday. From this record we come to know that the 4th day of his 23rd year was a Thursday on which date star Pushya was current. His 23rd year must begin in the month Āṇi of 1034 and also from a day in which the ending of Rōhiṇī and the beginning of Mṛigaśirā must occur. It occurred in the early morning of Monday the 17th June, 1034 which was the first day of the 23rd year. The fourth day was Thursday the 20th June on which date star Pushya was current. This agrees with the Kālahasti record. In all the above cases we are supplied with the following details:

- a) The regnal year and the day of the record,
- b) Astronomical data.

These are straight cases where we are able to find out the first day of the first year i. e., the accession date. Here the day of the record in the respective regnal year helped us to find the accession date of the king. In the cases where we do not have the day of the regnal year we have to make necessary deductions in such a way so that we can get the shortest interval in which the accession date occurs. For example let us take the case of Kulōttuṅga II:

Robert Sewell fixed the accession date of Kulōttuṅga II between the 26th March and the 14th July, 1133.¹⁰ Swamikannu Pillai surmised that Kulōttuṅga's reign commenced between the 9th May and the 17th August¹¹ Robert Sewell and Swamikannu Pillai applied the Christian calendar system for necessary deductions. Let us revise the accession date in the light of the later discoveries of inscriptions, applying the Indian calendar system.

The Bāpaṭḷa inscription¹² belongs to this king's 11th year. The data are Śaka year 1065, Āshāḍha Amāvāsyā, Wednesday. Robert Sewell equated this data to 14th July, 1143. The data are given as per the Telugu calendar system i.e., lunar system. Accordingly Āshāḍha Amāvāsyā in Telugu is equal to the New

Moon of Tamil month Āḍi. New Moon in the month Āḍi of 1143 belongs to the king's 11th year. Therefore, Āḍi New Moon of 1133 is equal to the 1st year and it falls on 4th July, 1133.

2. The Thirukkoḍikāval inscription¹³ belongs to Kulōttuṅga II and is dated in the 7th year, Karkaṭaka ba. 7, Monday and Aśvati. The equivalent date as reported by *AREp.* perfectly agrees with 5th July, 1140. The star Aśvati occurred after Mithuna New Moon, but in Karkaṭaka apara-paksha. Accordingly Aśvati in Karkaṭaka apara-paksha of 1133 must be in the 0th regnal year. As per *Ephemeris*, Mithuna ended and Karkaṭaka commenced on 26.15 June of 1133. Aśvati was current upto 26.57. Therefore 26th June is the equivalent date.

26-6-1133=0th regnal year

4-7-1133=1st regnal year

Kulōttuṅgachōḷa II ascended the throne between the 27th June and the 4th July, 1133 A.D., both days inclusive.

The above examples prove that the Hindu kings followed the occurrence of the accession star to count their regnal years.

In my book *The Cholas* recently published, I have reconstructed the dates of the Chōḷa kings on the basis of the Indian calendar system. The reconstruction helped me to identify the Chōḷa-Pāṇḍyas, Rājamahēndra, Rājādhirāja II, etc. For more details the above book may be referred.

Foot-Notes :-

- 1 Even today the Hindu families adopt this system to celebrate the birth day when the occurrence of the natal star is counted to calculate the age of a person. In the case of the death day the *tithi* is followed instead of the star.
- 2 *EI.*, IX, p 218.
- 3 *AREp.*, 1947-48, No. 108.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 1928-29, No. 234.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 1947-48, p. 3 confirms this.
- 6 *EI.*, IX, p. 217.
- 7 *AREp.*, 1917, No. 341.
- 8 *Ibid.*, No. 335.
- 9 *SII.*, XVII, No. 326.
- 10 *EI.*, X, p. 138.
- 11 *Ibid.*, XI, p. 291.
- 12 *Ibid.*, X, p. 137.
- 13 *AREp.*, 1930-31, No. 61.

18. NEW INSCRIPTIONS FROM KANHERI

Shobhana Gokhale

Kanheri is approximately 10 kms. to the east of Borivali, the suburb of metropolitan Bombay. There are nearly 100 Buddhist caves. The architecture and inscriptions therein have contributed very interesting information about the Buddhist activities in western India. Here was a great Buddhist establishment and the new inscriptions which have come to light prove that Kanheri was an important seat of learning. It is for the first time that we get nearly about fifteen names of teachers in whose memory the commemorative *stūpas* were erected. At Kanheri there is a large cemetery cave where there is a large number of *stūpas* in dilapidated conditions. This large cemetery cave is facing west-ward. Due to heavy rains the front portion of the cave is seriously damaged. Palaeographically these Brāhmī inscriptions may be dated between 550 A.D. and 700 A.D. As regards the palaeography of these inscriptions, it is worth noting that *a* is written in the latter southern variety with the right vertical with angular bend. Medial *i* is shown by a ring. Medial *u* is also ornamental. The letter *jha* is shown with an angular stem; *na* is of the looped southern variety. The medial *ē* is indicated with its upper curve extended.

In 1975, when I visited Kanheri, I observed that a large number of well-cut

slabs was lying in the valley in front of the cemetery. I, therefore, suggested to the care-taker of the caves Mr. V.M. Vani to explore the valley with a view to *discover* new inscriptions and surprisingly, it was found that the efforts of Mr. Vani were fruitful and nearly 15 new inscriptions of historical value have come to light.

The inscriptions commemorate the famous teachers of Kanheri. Out of fifteen inscriptions, only six or seven could be read satisfactorily. They not only throw light on the ancient Buddhist monastic institution but it is for the first time that we get evidence for the teachers' tradition in Western Indian caves. Western India is honey-combed by caves but so far we had got only five names of teachers; three from Kuda,¹ one from Kondane, one from Karle. It is noteworthy that the Kuda inscription mentions one female teacher *Pavajitā Padumanikā*. She was the sister's daughter of *Thēra Bhadanta Sātimita*, and *Bhadanta Agimita*.

Four of the newly discovered Kanheri inscriptions are taken up here for discussion.

I

At Kanheri one inscription records that *Thēra Ārya Vijayasēna* was a *Tēvija*. The inscription is as follows:

1. Thērāṇam Ā[r]yya-Vijaya-
2. sēṇāṇam tēvijāṇam
3. arahamtāṇam thūbha 111

In the Brahmanic tradition a Brahmin who is well-versed in two Vēdas is named as *Dvivēdi* and a Brahmin who knows three Vēdas is called as a *Trivēdi*, and a *Chaturvēdi* Brahmin is an expert in four Vēdas. In Buddhistic tradition, a monk who has attained three knowledges is named as *Tēvijja* (Vinaya 2. 1. 16). One of the Junnar inscriptions also refers to a *Tēvijja*.

According to *Vinaya* Text, the following are the six knowledges :

1. *Iddhi* = levitation
2. The heavenly Ear
3. Knowing others' thought (thought-reading)
4. Recollecting one's previous births
5. Knowing other people's rebirths
6. Certainty of emancipation already attained.

According to *Aṅguttara Nikāya*² a monk who knows his former three births is called a *Tēvijja*.

II

Another inscription which is broken reads as follows :

1.(la)ṇam
2. [ara]hantāṇam jhāyīṇam thūbham 11

According to Buddhist philosophy *Jñāna* never means vaguely meditation. It is the technical term for a special religious experience reached in a certain order of

mental states. It may be described as *Pañchāṅgika Jñāna* :

- 1) *Vitarka*, 2) *Vichāra*, 3) *Priti*,
- 4) *Sukha*, 5) *Ēkāgratā*.

III

The third inscription records that one monk was not only an *Āryya*, *Mahān* and *Arhat* but he was well-versed in *Shaḍabhiñāna* and *Pratisambhidā*. The inscription reads as :

1. Thērāṇam Āryya Mahāṇam ara-
2. hantāṇam chhalabhiñāṇam paṭi-
3. [saṁ]bhīḍa - pāttāṇam thūbham

Shaḍabhiñāna, as discussed above, is of six kinds.

The *Dhammapada* describes that a monk achieves the final emancipation not only by six knowledges but also by seeing *Jātikkhaya*. Freedom from a sore constitutes Arhatship (26. 41. 423).

The same monk is not only well-versed in six knowledges but he has been described as *Paṭisambhidupāṭṭa*, i.e., one who has attained four kinds of *Paṭisambhidā*.³ There are four kinds of *Paṭisambhidā* 1) *Athapaṭisambhidā* (analysis of meaning); 2) *Dhammapaṭisambhidā* (reasoning of text); 3) *Nirutipāṭisambhidā* (interpretation of religious texts); 4) *Pratibhāna-paṭisambhidā* (illumination).

These are the four powers of penetration into the hearts of people and could be achieved by *Arhats* only.

IV

The fourth inscription reads as follows :

1. Thēraṇām Bhadanta Dāmā-
2. ṇam aṇāgāmiṇam thūbha

The inscriptions thus provide the earliest and unique evidence in the history of Buddhism in western India. The words *Shaḍabhijñāna*, *Paṭisambhidā*, *Jhāyi* and *Aṇāgāmin*⁴ indicate the establishment of a great teachers' tradition at Kanheri. The Jain tradition⁵ of teachers from the Mathurā Inscriptions is too well known to be discussed here, but here is for the first time that we get a reference to the teachers' tradition in western India. The teachers were great scholars in different branches of Buddhist studies and a noteworthy feature is that all the teachers are having the honorific title *Arhat*.

There is a reference to different Buddhist sects like *Aparaviniseliya* and *Bhadravaniya*, in western Indian caves. The inscriptions at Kanheri record the construction of *chaitya*, *vihāra*, paths, *poḍhi*, doors, etc. Some of them have been donated by ordinary people of different occupations such as traders, goldsmiths and even blacksmiths, etc. But there was so far no reference to teachers' tradition.


Palaeographically the inscriptions may be dated between 550 A.D. and 700 A.D. It is worth examining the causes for the upheaval of Buddhism in this particular period.

The majority of the inscriptions of Kanheri belong to 2nd-3rd century A.D. A few of them are of the 5th century A.D. and a small number of inscriptions belong to a later period. These new inscriptions suggest that Buddhism might have received the royal patronage to continue its religious activities and it might be due to the eclectic spirit of the early Rāshṭrakūṭas.


The Kanheri inscription of Pullasakti who was a feudatory of Amoghavarsha I records a donation to the Buddhist *Vihāra* at Kanheri, a part of which was utilized for purchasing books. This fact indicates the continuity of educational tradition at Kanheri and therefore we get names of teachers of high religious rank in Buddhist hierarchy.


Foot-Notes :

1. Lüders' List, Nos. 1060, 1045, 1065, 1041.
2. *Aṅguttara Nikāya* - Pali Edition, Nalanda (1958), P. 184.
3. Davids, T.S.R.S., *Pali English Dictionary*. According to Buddhist philosophy, the word *aṇāgāmin* denotes the attainment of Arhatship, and is the third of the four different stages to be undergone by a *bhikshu*. It is believed that a *bhikshu* who attains the stage of *aṇāgāmin* will merit Arhatship in one of the highest heavens and will be freed from rebirth as a human being.
4. *EL.*, I, p. 371; *Ibid.*, II, p. 192.



INSCRIPTIONS FROM KANHERI - No. I





INSCRIPTIONS FROM KANHERI - No. IV

19. GARHI MATANI INSCRIPTION OF KANISHKA (I)

B. N. Mukherjee

A Kharoshthī¹ epigraph, inscribed on a block of stone, was found sometime back in a mound at Garhi Matani, 13 miles east of Campbellpur (Pakistan). Prof. A.H. Dani is reported to have studied this record. A photograph of this epigraph and some information about it were kindly supplied to the present author by Prof. A.L. Basham. It is now being edited with the help of this photograph.

The language of this epigraph is North-Western Prakrit in which are written the great majority of Kharoshthī inscriptions of the north-western part of the Indian subcontinent. The palaeography of the script may be favourably compared with that of the Manikiala inscription of the year 18.² Angularity seems to be the most important feature of the style of writing betrayed by the inscription in question.

The inscription consists of three lines, which can be read as follows :-

1. Saṃ 20 Maharayosa (should be Maharayasa) Rayatirayasa Deva-putrasa Kaṇishkasa
2. Jeṭhamasa divase prathame Buṭha-varumasa shamanasa Bosavala-pu-

3. trasa Majilakasa Kimaṇosha-putrasa Rovimasa [dānamukhe*?]

The above text may be translated as follows :-

“Year 20, of the Great King, King of Kings, Son of God, Kaṇishka; on the first day of the month of Jyeshṭha (May-June), (this is the main gift?) of monk Buddhavarma (?), Bosavala’s son Majilaka, and Kimaṇosha’s son Rovima.

The object of the inscription is not clearly stated. It might have, as indicated above by us, recorded some gift of merit.

The epigraph attributes full imperial titles to Kanishka. The record, dated on the first of Jyeshṭha of the year 20, is the first known Kharoshthī inscription referring to Kanishka dated in that year. There is a Brāhmī record dated in the same year of his reign. Moreover, Kanishka (I) is already known to have reigned for at least 23 years. Hence the information furnished by our epigraph does not by itself add anything to our knowledge about the duration of the period of his reign. Nevertheless its date, First Jyeshṭha of the year 20, may be of some interest if it is compared

with the date of the Kamra inscription referring to the rule of Vāsishka. This inscription is dated on the 13th of Jyeshṭha

of the same year (i.e., year 20 of the era of Kanishka). Thus in the year 20 Kanishka (I) had a co-ruler in Vāsishka.³

Foot-Notes:

1. Macron over e and o is not used in this article.
2. S. Konow, *CIH.*, II, pt. I, - *Kharoshṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Asoka*, pl. XXVII, no. 1.
3. B.N. Mukherjee, "Kamra Inscription of Vajheshka (Vāsishka)", *Indian Museum Bulletin*, 1973, vol. VIII, no. 2, pp. 114f.

GARHI MATANI INSCRIPTION
PART I



GARHI MATANI INSCRIPTION
PARTS II and III



20. PHULBANI COPPER PLATE GRANT OF SRI RANABHANJADEVA; YEAR-9.

Smt. S. Tripathy

This set of three thick, oblong copper plates was discovered while digging earth at the village Harēkṛishṇapur in the district of Phulbāni. The Headmaster of the Gopabandhu M. E. School at the said village handed over the plate to the Orissa State Museum for preservation, through the District Welfare Officer, Phulbāni. The text of the Inscription is given in the Inscriptions of Orissa, vol. vi, which contains the Bhañja inscriptions compiled by me.

The measurement of the first and second plates are 17cm x 10cm each. The third plate is comparatively smaller in size and measures 16cm x 10cm. The three plates are held together by a copper ring to which a royal seal measuring 4.5cm is soldered. The diameter of the ring is 8cm. The oval shaped seal bears the emblem of a crescent moon, a couchant bull and between these two emblems the legend is written as *Śrī Raṇabhañjadēvasya*. There are altogether 60 lines of writing on the plates which are distributed as follows: the first plate is inscribed on the inner side only, containing 14 lines; the second plate has 13 lines on each side, the third plate, first side, 22 lines and the second side, 9 lines of writing. The writing on the whole is neatly carved and clear and there are a number of mistakes due both to the composer and the

engraver. The legend on the seal is well preserved.

The script used in the plates belongs to the eastern variety of the N. Indian alphabet and similar to those of the other records of the donor Śrī Raṇabhañjadēva of the Bhañja dynasty of Kṣiṅjali-maṇḍala.¹ The language is incorrect Sanskrit, written partly in verse and partly in prose. The introductory portion of the inscription is in verse. These verses are also found in the other grants of the donor and also in his predecessor's charter. The fashion of quoting verses from the introduction of one's predecessor's charter became conventional in the Bhañja family. The most interesting point in regard to its palaeography is the confusion between the medial sign of *u* and *ū*, *i* and *ī* which is characteristic of not only the record under notice but also of practically all Orissan inscriptions of the mediaeval period. The form of medial *u* is written in many places of the plates for medial *ū*. Similar is the case with medial *i* and *ī*. There is no distinction between *b* and *v*. *Taḥ* occurs for final *t* in lines 6 and 24 and *ta* for *t* in lines 10 and 14. Final *t* occurs in line 51. We find two different forms of *ā*, one by a small stroke on the right side of the alphabet, e.g. *sammāna dānānādita* (L. 16) and also by a full stroke parallel to the alphabet e.g., *Samhārakāla* (L.1).


In point of Orthography the inscription closely resembles the Orissa Museum plates of the same donor². *Kṛitānta* (L.1), *Chitāṅghri* (L.5) and *kṛitām* (L.39) are written as *Kritānta*, *Chi:āṅghri* and *kritām*. Similarly *sambhrānta* has been written as *saṁbhānta* (L.1), *vaṁsa* as *vansa* (L.16), *vīchī* as *viji* (L.24+), *Tāmra* as *Tāmvra* (L.31), *Navamē* as *Namamē* (L.58) and *utkīrṇa* as *utkirna* (L.58). There are some errors such as *kshī* for *ksha* (L.3), *si* for *si* (L.6), *si* for *śi* (L.9), *tta* for final *t* (L.13) *ta* for *tta* (L.16), *śrī* for *sri* (L.56). *Anusvāra* has been written for final *n* in line 40. *Visarga* is used many times wrongly.

The date of the issue of the grant is given in the regnal year of the king Raṇabhañjadēva as *Vijayarājyē Samvatsarē Namamē*.

The inscription opens with an invocation to Hara and then describes the genealogy of the Bhañja kings who ruled from their capital at Dhṛitipura. It records the grant of a village named Kōkaṭi, situated in Tulasidga *Vishaya* on the bank of the river Amvāḍa comprised in Khiñjali-maṇḍala. The village was granted by Rāṇaka Raṇabhañja to a Brāhmaṇa named Bhaṭṭaputra Dāmuṇi Ghōsha son

of A[?]ghōsha and grandson of Tōsāvēṇa Ghōsha. The donee belonged to Bārhaspatya *gōtra* (?) and Panchārshēya *Pravara* and is said to have migrated from Barendri-maṇḍala. He resided at first in Puṇḍravardhana and became a resident of *Drōṇiālapuṇḍara*. The grant was made in the ninth regnal year of the king Raṇabhañja. It was inscribed by the goldsmith and merchant Jayanāga, son of Pāṇḍi, and sealed with the royal seal. The occasion of the grant was Vishuva *saṁkrānti*. Another charter of the donor's 9th regnal year was issued on the occasion of Sōma-grahaṇa (Lunar eclipse) which has been wrongly interpreted by the authors as Samagrēṇa³.

There are altogether 13 copper plate charters issued from Dhṛitipura so far discovered. Out of these, eleven including the present charter were issued by Raṇabhañja. During his 9th regnal year he granted three copper plates including the present one. It is interesting to note that these grants were engraved by three different engravers who belonged to one and the same family. Their genealogy may be drawn as follows:—



Śivanāga, who might be the eldest son of Pāṇḍi, engraved an undated grant of Śatrubhañja, the father of the donor of the present charter and the grants of Raṇabhañja's

16th, 22nd, 24th and 26th regnal years. There was another goldsmith named Dēvala who engraved the grant issued in the 58th regnal year of Raṇabhañja and whose genealogy is

not known. He was also the engraver of the charter issued by Raṇabhañja's father Śatrubhañja in his 15th regnal year. Gōnā or Gōnāka, the *Akshasālin*, who was the father of Pāṇḍi, also served Śatrubhañja. He engraved the Baud grant of Raṇabhañja which was issued in his 54th regnal year.

The genealogical list of the royal family mentioned in this grant is the same as in other records of the donor. We get the following genealogy:—

Śrī Śīlābhañja

Śrī Śatrubhañja

Rāṇaka Śrī Raṇabhañja

Raṇabhañja used the title of *Rāṇaka* upto his 28th regnal year. After his 28th regnal year we do not find any records or other evidence of his rule till his 54th regnal year.⁹ This, indicates that there was some sort of political trouble from outside his kingdom during these years. Probably he was busy in fighting with some neighbouring kings and the Sōmavaṁśis who were then extending their kingdom towards Baud-Sonepur regions. He was also to some extent successful in his struggle and extended his kingdom which is proved by the fact that he used the royal title of *Mahārāja* and declared himself a sovereign in his two grants issued in 54th and the 58th regnal years. His last grant was issued in his 58th regnal year which shows that he ruled atleast for 58-years. His kingdom comprised the Baud-Sonepur and Daspalla regions of Orissa as known from his inscriptions. The charters of his family are all discovered from these regions. He has been described as Ubhaya-Khiñjalyadhipati, the


lord of Ubhaya-Khiñjali which has been interpreted by scholars as the northern and southern banks of the river Mahānadī.

The chronology of the Bhañjas of Khiñjali-maṇḍala still remains a subject of great controversy and the date of the Bhañjas who ruled from Dhṛitipura has not yet been determined properly. Records of two kings of this branch of the dynasty are so far known to us. It seems probable that this branch was wiped out from the Baud-Sonepur region by the Sōmavaṁśis within a century.


There are some peculiarities regarding the religious leanings of Raṇabhañja. Originally the Bhañjas were Śaivites. The earlier records of the Bhañjas contain the invocation of Śiva and the rulers assumed the religious title of *Paramamāhēśvara*. But the Bhañja rulers of Khiñjali-maṇḍala embraced Vaishṇavism although the traditional invocation to Śiva in their records continued. Raṇabhañja has used both religious titles of *Paramāmahēśvara* and *Paramavaishṇava* in his charters. The peculiarity is that he changed his faith from Śaivism to Vaishṇavism and reversed to the faith of his forefathers who were Śaivites, at the end. In two of his grants issued in his 9th regnal year he has been described as *Paramamāhēśvara*, while the present grant issued in the same year reveals that he embraced Vaishṇavism during this year. Towards the close of his reign, that is in his 54th and 58th years, he was again *Paramamāhēśvara*. But he has used the conventional invocatory verses in praise of Śiva-Naṭarāja in all of his grants. The rulers of Khiñjali-maṇḍala, who ruled from Dhṛitipura, had the same invocatory verses in praise of Śiva-Naṭarāja except one by Śatrubhañja, father of Raṇabhañja, who was a *Paramavaishṇava*. Although he embraced

PHULBANI COPPER PLATE GRANT OF RANABHANJADEVA - YEAR 9

SEAL



FIRST PLATE : INNER SIDE



Vaishṇavism he used the conventional invocatory verses in praise of Śiva in his other grant. In fact, these kings were not antagonistic to Vaishṇavism or Śaivism and patronized all the religious sects prevalent during that period. They were also highly respected by both these religious communities. So they did not give up these conventional verses in their documents even after they embraced Vaishṇavism.

The river Amvāḍa mentioned in this inscription cannot be identified correctly as

there seems to be no river of this name at present in the districts of Bolangir or Baud-Phulbāni. The other place names mentioned in this charter are Tullasidga *Vishaya* and Kōkaṭi *Grāma*. Tullasidga or Tullaśṛiṅga has been mentioned as a *vishaya* in other charters of Raṇabhañja. He granted at least three villages within this *vishaya*. This may be identified with Tutursingā in the Baud P.S. of the District of Phulbāni. There is a village called Kulukoṭi in Phiriṅgiā P.S. near Baud which may be identified with Kōkaṭi *grāma* of our inscription. I edit the plates below from the original.

Text

First Plate : Inner Side

1. Ōm⁴ svasti ॥ Saṁhāra-kāla-hutabhug-vikarāla-ghōra - saṁbhā(mbhrā)nta - kiṅkara-kri(kṛi)tānta-
2. [nitānta*]-bhinnam(nnam) 1 bhinn-Āndhak-āsura-mahā - gahan-ātapatraḥ(m) 1⁵ tad = bhairava[m*] Hara-vapurabha (r=bha)vataḥ 1⁵ pra-
3. pātuḥ⁶ 1 Durvāra-vāraṇa-raṇa-pratipakshī(ksha)-[paksha*]-lākshmī-haṭha - grahaṇa-suprasṛita-pra-
4. tāpāḥ Bha[ṅ*]jā - narādhipatayō va(ba)havō va(ba)bhu(bhū)vur = udbhu(dbhū) tayō(yē)=tra bhuvī bhū(bhū)ri saha-
5. sra-saṁkhyāḥ [1*] Teshā[m*] kulē sakala - bhu(bhū)tala-pāla - maul i- mal-ārchchit-āmghri(ṅghri)-yuga-
6. lō va(ba)lavā[n*] = nṛipō = bhūtaḥ(bhūt) Śri-Si (Śi)lābh ṅjadēva[h*] prakāṭa-pauru-
7. sha-raśmī(śmi)-chakra - nirdda(rddā)rit-āri - hṛidyō=smiḥ(sya) pitā nri[pa*] syaḥ⁷ 1 Gāmbhi(bhī)ryeṇa
8. payōnidhiḥ [s*]thiratayā bhū(bhū)miḥ va(ba)lēn = ānila[h*] tē[jō*]bhi[r*] =ja(jva) lanō = pamā sa-
9. matayāḥ¹ 1⁵ śubhri (bhrai) r = yaśōbhi[h*] śasi(śi) ॥ (1) ātmā sarva-jagan-mana[h*-] sthitatayā datt-a(ā)va-
10. kāśō vī(vi)ya[j*]-jātaḥ 1⁵ Śri-Śatrubhañja ity = atula - dhīḥ tasy = ātmaja[h*] Sva (Śa)mbhuvata(t) 1[1*]

11. Anyōnya - mada - māna - milita - samuddhata - nṛipa - chakra - chaturaṅga - va(ba)lakshōbha-chali-
12. ta-dharā-maṇḍa[la*]-gaja-turaga-khura-nirdda(rddā)raṇa-prasarad-atula - dhu(dhū)līvitām* na-saṁchcha-
13. nna-jany-āṅgaṇa-gaja-skandha-vēdikā-svayamvar-āyāta #⁶ pariṇi(ṇī)ta-jaya-

Second Plate : First Side

14. lakshmī - samānandita - paura - jana-ma(mā)nasah śrīmad-Bhañja - bhu(bhū)patiḥ [I* purād = Dhṛiti-
15. pura-nāmnaḥ [I*] Sa(Śa)rad-amala-dhavala-kara - yaśah - paṭala-dhavalī(li)ta - digvadanō(na)-
16. ḥ I* Anavarata-pravṛit[t*]a-sammāna - dān-ānandita-sakala-jano(naḥ) Aṇḍaja-vaśā(mśa)-
17. prabhavaḥ Parama-Vaishṇava⁹va(vō) mātā-pitṛi - pādānudhyāta[ḥ*] Bhañj-āmala-kula-
18. tilaka[ḥ*] Ubhaya - Khiñjali - adhipati[ḥ*] samadhigata - pañcha - mahā-śavda(bdō)
19. māhasāmanta - vandita Stambhēśvari - lavdha (bdha) - vara - prasādaḥ I⁵ Rāṇaka-Śrī-Raṇabhañjadēva[ḥ*]
20. kuśalī [I*] Ih = aiva Khiñjali-maṇḍalē bhavishyaḍ-rāja-rāja(jā)nak-ānta-
21. raṅga - kumāra(rā)mātya - mahāsāmanta - vrā(brā)bmaṇa - pradhānā[n*] - anyāś(mś) = cha
22. daṇḍapāsika - chāṭa-bhaṭṭa(ṭa) - vallabha - jātiyānaḥ(n) I⁵ yath-ā[r*]ham mānaya¹⁰-tī(ti) vō(bō) dha-
23. yati samādiśayati(śati) ch = ānyataḥ I⁵ sarvataḥ śivam - asmākamḥ⁶ vī(vi)dī(di)-tam = a-
24. stu bhavatāḥ(tam) [I*] Tulasidga - visa(sha)ya - prati(ti)va(ba)ddha Amvāḍa - na dī(dī)-vimala-jala-vī(vi)-
25. ji (chi)-prakshālita-taṭa-Kōkaṭi-grāma[ś = *] chcha (cha)atu[ḥ*] simā - pra(par)yantaḥ nidhya upa-¹³
26. nī(ni)dhi - sahī(hi)taṁ(taḥ) #⁵ Visuvaśamkrātō¹² #⁵ mātā - pitrā-atmōjasva¹³puṇy - ā-

Second Plate : Second side

27. bhiva(vṛi)ddhayē salī(li)la-dhārā #⁵ pura #⁵ ssarēṇa vī(vi)dhinā # Vārispa -
28. tyēnagotra¹⁴ #⁵ Pamñchārisaya-pravara¹⁵ #⁵ Varēndrī - maṇḍala-vī(vi)nī(ni)rggata-

29. Puṇḍa(ṇḍra)varddhana - vāstavya(vyā)[ya*] ॥⁵ puna[ḥ*] ॥⁵ Drōṇiālapuṇḍara-vāstavya (vyā)[ya*] ॥⁵
30. Bhaṭa(ṭṭa)-putra-Dāmunighōsha Śrī A[?] ghosha-suta Tosāvēṇaghō-
31. sha-napṭraktēna¹⁶ ॥⁵ vidhi-vidhānēna savidhēya[m*] tāmvrā(mra)-śāsana[m]pratipādi-
32. to=ya[m] ॥ Pāram̐parya-kul-āvatārēṇa yāvad = Vēd-ārtha-vachanēna yathā Kāṇḍā [t] =
33. kāṇḍā[t] ॥⁵ prarōhati(nti) ॥⁵ sā(śā)sanēna pa(pra)ti(ta)nā(nō)si(shi) sahasrēṇa virōhasi ॥ tāva-
34. [d]=vu(bu)dhā (dhvā) parārddhañ=cha parato(taḥ) vaś-āvatārēṇ = āpy = asmad= attarōdhād¹⁷ = dharmma-gauravāch = cha na
35. kēnachit = sṛiṇy = api¹⁸ vā(bā)dhā karaṇīyā ॥ Tathā ch = ōktaṁ dharmma-śāstrēshu ॥ Pālam̐kṛishṭā¹⁹ mahīm da-
36. dyāt = sa - vi(bī)jam̐ sa(śa)sya - mēdini(nī)[m] ॥ (I) Yāvat = sūrya-kṛitālōkē tāvat = svarggam(rggē) mahīyatē ॥ (II)
37. Vēda-vākyasmayō jihvā vadanti ri(ṛi)shi-dēvatāḥ ॥ (I) Bhu(bhū)mi-harttā tath-ānyach = cha ā-
38. hō mā hara mā hara [II] Yath = āpsu pati(ti)ta[m]śakraṁ⁸ tau(tai)la-vindu[r]= visarpati ēvaṁ
39. bhu(bhū)mī mi)-kri(kṛi)tam dāna[m] sa(śa)syē sa(śa)syē prarōhati (ti) [II] Ādityō Varuṇō Vī-Vi)shṇu[r] =

Third Plate: First Side

40. Vra(Bra)hmā Sōma(mō)-Hutāśana[ḥ*] Su(Śū)lapāṇis= tu bhāgavām(vān)= abhinanda-nti bhu(bhū)mida[m*] ॥ (II)
41. [Ā]sphōṭayanti pitara[ḥ]⁵ pravalgantī(ti) pitāmaha(hā) [ḥ] ॥ Bhu(bhū)mi-dātā kulē jātā(taḥ)
42. [sa] [nas=]trātā bhavishyati(ti)[II] Va(Ba)hubhī (bhi)r= vasudhā dā(da)tā(ttā) rājanai²⁰ Sagar-ādī(di)bhi[ḥ] [I]
43. Mā rudaphalasakāya paradattēshu pālita ॥²¹ [I] Yasya yasya yadā bhu(bhū)-
44. mī(mi)s=tasya tasya tadā phala[m] [II] Sva-dattā[m] para-dattām= vā yō harēd= vasundharā[m] [I]
45. vī(vi)shṭhāyā[m] kṛimī(mi)[r]=bhu(bhū)tvā pitṛibhi[ḥ] saha pachyatēḥ²² ॥ (II) Hiraṇyam= ēkaṁ gā-
46. m= ēkāṁ bhu(bhū)mi(mē)m(r) = apy = arddham= aṅgulam̐[1] hara[n = narakam = āyātiḥ²³ yāva-
47. d = āhuta(bhūta)-sam̐plavaḥ(vaṁ) ॥ (II) Bhu(Bhū)mi(mi)[m] yaḥ pratigrihnā(hṇā)ti yach(yaś)= cha bhu(bhū)miṁ praya-

48. chchhati[1]Ubhō(au) tō(tau) puṇya-karmāṇō(ṇau) nī(ni)yatō(tam) sa(sva)rga-
gāminōḥ(nau) [11] Haratē hāra-
49. yatē bhū(bhū)mī(mi)[m*] manda-vu(bu)ddhis=tamāvṛitaḥ[1*]sa va(ba)ddhau(ddhō)
vāruṇaiḥ pāśais= tiryag-yō-
50. nī(ni)su(shu) jāyatēḥ [11*] Mā pārthivaḥ kadāchī(chi)[t*] [=tvaṁ] vra(bha)hmā
(hma)svaṁ manasā=d= apī (pi) [1*] anō(nau)sha-
51. dham = abhau(bhāi)shajyam ētat hālāhalaṁ vī(vi)sham[11*] Avisham vishamī
(m= i)ty=āhu[h*] vra(bra)-

Third Plate : Second Side

52. hmasvaṁ visha[m*] uchyatē[1] Visham=ēkākinam hanti vra(bra)hmasvaṁ putra-
pautri(tra)ka[m] 11 Lō-
53. ha-chu(chū)rṇṇ-ās(ś)ma-chūrṇṇañ=cha vishañ= cha jarayē[n*]= naraḥ [1] Brahmasvaṁ
54. trī(tri)shu lōkēshu ka[h*] pumā[n*] jva(ja)ramī(yi)shyatiḥ* [11*] Vājapēya-sahasrāṇi
Aśvamēdha-śatānī(ni) cha[1*]
55. gavām-kōṭi(ṭi) - pradānēna bhū(bhū)mi-harttā na śudhyatiḥ(ti)[11*] Iti kamala - dal-
āmvu-
56. vindu-lōlā[m*]śrī(śri)yam-anuchi(chi)ntya manushya-ji(jī)vitañ =cha[1]sakalam ī(m=i)-
57. dam = udāhṛi[ta]ñ = cha vu(bu)dhaiḥ(dhvā) na hi purushauḥ(shaiḥ) para-ki(kī)[r]
ttayau (yō) vilau(lō)pyā[h] [11]
58. Vijaya-rājyē samvatsarē nama(va)mē utki(tkī)rna(rṇṇa)ñ=cha Vaṇika(k)-suvarṇṇa-
59. kāra-Jaiṇāgakēna Pāṇḍi-suta(tēna)[1] lāñchhitam mahārājakiya-
60. mudrēṇa**

Foot-Notes :-

1. Orissa Historical Research Journal, vol.xi, pp. 152-59.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Recently a grant of Raṇabhaṇja's 28th regnal year has been discovered from the village Kankalā in the Phulbāni District and acquired for the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar. We do not find any new information from the reading of the grant except the grant portion.
4. Expressed by a symbol.
5. Punctuation is superfluous.
6. Delete *Visarga*.
7. Do.
8. Delete *Anusvāra*.

9. The second letter *ṇa* is superfluous.
10. *Ya* is inserted below.
11. Read *nidhy- upa*.
12. Read *Vishuva-saṁkrāntyām*.
13. Read *mātā-pitrōr= ātmanaś=cha*.
14. Read *Bārhaspatya-gōtrāya*.
15. Read *Pañchārshēya-pravarāya*.
16. Read *napitrē*.
17. Read *asmad= uparōdhād*.
18. Read *kēnachit svalp= āpi*.
19. Read *Phalakrishṭām*.
20. Read *rājabhiḥ*.
21. Read *bhūd =aphala-saṁkā vaḥ paradatt = ēti Pārthivāḥ*.
22. After *mudrēṇa* there is a floral design followed by the two *daṇḍas*.

21. THE PALAEOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF THE ARANG COPPER PLATE OF BHIMASENA II

Nisar Ahmad

The Sūras are known only by this copper plate which is one in number and measures $10\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". It is issued by Bhīmasēna II, the sixth king of the dynasty, in 182 Gupta year (501 A.D.).¹ The plate was found at Ārang which is 22 miles east of Raipur. This place also yields the documented relics of the other dynasties. The copper plate "contains 13 lines, 9 on the obverse and 4 on the reverse side. The average size of letters is $3/16$ ".²

In the opinion of Hiralal, the characters of this epigraph "belong to the Northern class of alphabets of the type, which, according to Fleet, may be called the standard alphabet, with northern characteristics, of central India from towards the end of the 5th to the middle of the 6th century A.D." For the palaeographical peculiarities, he merely writes: "The vowel sign for \bar{i} occurs in $\bar{s}r\bar{i}$ (line.2) and \bar{a} is sometimes denoted by a short vertical stroke after the consonant to which it is joined, at other times by a top curve, especially when combined with sa or pa (lines 2,3,5,10 and 12). Final forms of ma occur in lines 6,7 and 11."³

Dani groups the Ārang plate of Bhīmasēna II with the inscriptions of the Parivrājakas and the Uchchhakalpas⁴ discovered "from the Vindhyan belt, where

the series of Khoh copper plates reveal a very similar style of writing."⁵ These epigraphs have "notches or simple lines"⁶ as the head-marks of their characters; the latter characteristic occurs in this epigraph. They show "the change from the Gupta to the Malwa or Rajasthani style of writing. The general palaeographical features of these copper plates marked by Dani are as follows: "These inscriptions preserve the simplified style of the medial vowels and do not show the forms associated with the *kuṭila* writing, though the middle valley forms survive in the open-mouthed $\bar{n}a$, the looped $\bar{n}a$, and the tailed $\bar{m}a$, and bent right verticals are occasionally seen in" $\bar{g}a$, $\bar{p}a$ and $\bar{m}a$.⁸ As regards the palaeographical characteristics of the Ārang copper plate, Dani is also right in his observation that " \bar{U} curves its base downwards to the left"; $\bar{T}a$ "has a flat top" and " $\bar{S}a$ has a hook attached to the left."⁹

But the rest of his findings are not conclusive. He says that " $\bar{C}ha$ has the pointed beak as well as the broad type" but there is not a single letter which can be called as the real 'broad type'. $\bar{D}a$ and $\bar{d}a$ do not "have the rounded backs" as he observes and illustrates but infact they are angularized. Again we do not notice $\bar{t}a$ of "the Deccani type with a curved hook

attached to the right of a sloping vertical" mentioned by him. Also his observation that *dha* "is of the bulged form" is far from the fact; it is of the leaf shape.

We also do not agree with Dani that *pa* "has a slight notch on the base line" and the matter of surprise is that the alphabet *ba* which has a notch in its left vertical is simply said in the text to have 'a square form' but in the plate he illustrates it as notched.¹⁰ He further writes that "*ya* is tripartite with a loop added optionally at the left vertical" but the reality is that the looped *ya* is almost everywhere and not optional. He also points out that "both *la* and *ha* have firm bases with two uprights and a hook, but optionally their bases are rounded" but we can add that sometimes it also has slanting base. Lastly, we do join with him that "*va* is triangular with the base sloping" but with further additions that sometimes it has firm base and sometimes it forms a long loop.

The reason for these lapses was that this copper plate was examined along with the other copper plates bearing similar palaeographical characteristics and hence all the features of the Ārang copper plate are not singled out. Moreover, this "is the only dated inscription of the locality and the period."¹¹ And, therefore, a fresh detailed palaeographical study is made here.

Vowels:

Two vowels are used in this epigraph. They are *ā* and *u*. The former is composed of two curves turned outside at the left and a vertical appended and the left curves are connected by a horizontal bar with

the right vertical; the hook at the foot of the right vertical in the middle is medial *ā* (II. A. 1). For *ū* a hook is added with a slanting stroke (II. A. 2).

Consonants:

Gutturals:

Ka has straight vertical and curved horizontal bars pointed downwards (II. A.3).

Ga is flat-topped with right limb extended downwards and a foot mark at the left; generally foot-mark is extended on both the sides (II. A. 4. iii-v) but sometimes more extended either inwards (II. A. 4. ii) or outwards (II. A. 4. i.).

Palatals:

Cha is beaked type. However, its three varieties can be noticed: (i) both arms join the head mark at one point and beak is formed at the left of the base (II. A. 5. i); (ii) both arms join separately with head mark with the beak at the left base (II. A. 5. iii, iv); and (iii) the left arm joins the right arm which touches the head-mark. It has a rounded body (II. A. 5. ii).

Ja constitutes three arms. Its lower arm slightly bends down. The vertical of *ja* is generally curved (II. A. 6. i, iii) but also, rarely straight. (II. A. 6. ii).

Linguals:

Ta has flat top and tick on the right (II. A. 7). *ḍa* has an angular back-like formation with its curve open to right and the leg lengthened downwards (II. A. 8).

Na has open mouth and outer curves extended. (II. A. 9).

Dentals:

Ta has two arms with its right arm prolonged. Of this at least five varieties

can be marked. They are: (i) Both arms originating from the head mark with left arm straight and the right arm curved (II. A. 10. viii); (ii) both arms are curved and originate from the head-mark, (II.A. 10. i. vi); (iii) right arm joins in the upper part of the left arm and they are straight (II. A. 10. v); (iv) right arm which is curved joins in the upper part of the left drawn straight (II. A. 10. iv. vii) and (v) right arm joins in the the upper part of the left arm and both the arms are curved (II.A.10.ii).

Da has double curves (II.A.11.i, ii, iv, v) except in the case of *du* where it has a single curve (II. A. 11. iii).

Dha is of the leaf shape (II. A. 12. i, ii).

Na is of the looped variety (II. A. 13. i-iv).

Labials:

Pa is angular with equal arms and flat base [II. A. 14. i-vi].

Ba is of square type with the left arm notched [II. A. 15]

Bha is of the angular variety with its double curved left arm and right arm lengthened. Here it is used in two shapes: [i] right arm starts from head-mark [II.A.16. i, iii-vi] and [ii] right arm joins the left limb in the middle of its upper half [II.A.16.ii].

Ma has a tail [II. A. 17. iii-viii]. For final *m* a horizontal stroke is added at the top of the right arm of the letter extending towards left [II. A. 17. ii] and sometimes to the right and left also. [II. A. 17. i].

Semi-Vowels:

Ya is tripartite. But all [II. A. 18. i, iii-viii] except one [II.A.18.ii] have loop at

left arm. Among the looped *ya* two varieties in the right arm can be noticed as [i] curved [II.A.18.i] and [ii] slanting [II.A.18. iii-viii].

Ra is shown by a straight vertical line [II. A. 19. i-v].

La is angular with elongated vertical firm base and hook with equal arms [II. A. 20. i-iii].

Va is of triangular shape [II. A. 21. ii-viii] except that in one case [II. A. 21. i] it has a long loop. The triangular form of *va* has either sloping base [II A. 21. ii, iv] or firm base [II. A. 21. iii, v, vi, vii]. Here again three shapes can be traced out: [i] both verticals meet at a point [II.A.21.ii,vi], [ii] both verticals meet at two points [II.A.21.iii,vi] and [iii] right vertical joins near top of the left vertical [II.A.21.V].

Sibilants:

Ṣa is flat topped with right arm elongated and left arm with foot-mark [II.A.22.ii.]

Sha has equal arms with a horizontal line joining both at the middle [II.A.23.i,ii].

Sa is equal armed. Of this letter four shapes can be marked: [i] both arms meet the head-mark at one point and the left arm with small tail at back [II.A.24.i,v,viii], [ii] right arm joins at the middle of the upper curve of the left arm and the left arm with a small tail at back [II.A.24.iii,vii], [iii] right arm joins at the middle of the upper curve of the left arm and the left arm has an angular back [II.A. 24.iv] and [vi] both arms meet the head-mark at one point and the left arm has an angular back [II. A. 24. ii].

Ha

In this epigraph, this alphabet is characterized to have the broadened hook. Here it is used atleast in four shapes: i] straight left arm and firm base [II.A.25.i], (ii) curved left arm and firm base [II.A.25.ii], [iii] curved left arm with slanting base [II.A.25.iii]; in all these three varieties the hook is not extended down beyond the base, and [iv] round bottom and hook slightly extended down below the base [II.A.25.iv].

Compound Letters*With initial Gutturals:*

The conjuncts made with initial *k* are *kta* [II.B.1.i], *ktva* [II.B.1.ii], *ksha* (II.B.1.iii) and *kshma* (II.B.1.iv).

For *kta* a slanting stroke is added to the right of the lower half of the vertical line of the letter *ka*. To make the conjunct *ktva*, a triangle is attached with *kta*; or, in other words, the stroke, used at the right of the lower half of the vertical line of the alphabet *ka* to convert it into the compound letter *kta*, is extended more downwards than the vertical of *ka* and then two small lines, one horizontal and the other slanting which form an angle, are appended with that stroke. The letter *ksha* has two horizontal strokes joined at the bottom of the vertical line and then both the horizontal strokes are connected by a small vertical line. For *kshma*, the letter *ma* is appended at the right corner of the conjunct *ksha*.

The conjunct *gra* is formed by a slanting stroke attached to its right leg (II. B.2).

With initial Palatals:

They are *chchha* [II.B.3], *ñcha* (II.B.4) and *jña* (II.B.5). For the former a double

loop is joined by a small stem to the letter *cha*. The conjunct *ñcha* is made by an angle opened to left as well as with a rough triangle and an ornamental stroke at the right of the triangle which meet with the base of the angle. To make the compound letter *jña*, two lines originate at one point making an angle from the right end of the bottom horizontal stroke of the letter *ja* and then a hook coming from the right side joins the right slanting line.

With initial N:

The conjuncts formed with *ṅ* as the first element are *ṅḍa* [II.B.6.i] and *ṅya* [II.B.6.ii]. In the former the character *ḍa* is made by two strokes, which form an acute angle opening to right; and the upper stroke is attached with the right corner of the base of *ṅa*. Of the second the letter, *ya* constitutes two curves, the lower one bigger in length and, the upper curve joins the right corner of the base of *ṅa*.

With initial Dentals:

The conjuncts formed with initial *t* are *tka* [II.B.7.i], *tta* (II.B.7.ii), *tna* [II.B.7.iii], *tpa* [II.B.7.iv], *tma* (II.B.7.v), *tya* (II.B.7.vi), *tra* (II.B.7.vii), *tva* (II.B.7.viii), and *tsa* (II.B.7.ix). For all the first five conjuncts the right arm of *ta* is extended downwards which served as one of the constituent parts of the second element of the conjunct and then the remaining components of the same are appended with the extended stroke. Thus for *tka* a cross bar is added to the extended downward limb; *tta* has a slanting stroke coming from the left and that joins the right extended arm forming an acute angle; to make *tna* the extended limb is looped at the bottom; the compound letter *tpa* has an angle added to the base of the extended stroke and

PALAEOGRAPHICAL TABLE

A

B

S.N.	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii		i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix
1	ॐ									ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
2	ॐ									ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
3	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
4	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
5	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ						ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
6	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ							ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
7	ॐ									ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
8	ॐ									ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
9	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ							ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
10	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
11	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
12	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ						ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
13	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ						ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
14	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ				ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
15	ॐ									ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
16	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
17	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
18	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
19	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
20	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ							ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
21	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
22	ॐ	ॐ								ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
23	ॐ	ॐ								ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
24	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ		ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					
25	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ						ॐ	ॐ	ॐ	ॐ					

that opens to head; and for the conjunct *tma* the lower part of the letter *ma* is attached with the extended arm. *Ya* of *tya* is formed by two curves, the lower one bigger in size, which meet at the left point and the upper curve joins *ta*. For *tra*, the right arm of the letter *ta* is turned to left and extended at a length forming an angle of 90°. To make the conjuncts *tva* and *tva*, the letters *va* and *sa* are attached with the right arm of the letter *ta*.

The compound letters beginning with *da* are *ddha* (II.B.8.i), *ddhya* (II.B.8.ii), *dbha* (II.B.8.iii), *dya* [II.B.8.iv], *dra* (II.B.8.vi) and *dva* (II.B.8.vii). Of *ddha*, the letter *dha* is made by a vertical joined at the right end of *da* and an arch added to it at the left. If this element occurs in a conjunct of three letters viz., *ddhya*, it becomes somewhat of a triangular shape. In the compound letter *dbha*, *bha* of both the types is used. With *dra* and *dva*, the letters *ra* and *va* are attached to the right end of the letter *da*. The letter *ya*, represented as the last element of the conjunct is formed by two curves.

The conjuncts with initial *na* are *nka* (II. B. 9. i), *nta* (II. B. 9. ii), *nda* (II.B.9.iii), *nnō* (II. B. 9. iv), *nma*, (II. B. 9. v), *nya* (II.B.9.vi), and *nsya* (II.B.9.vii). For *nka*, the loop of *na* is extended downwards vertically and then a cross bar is added to it. To make the compound *nta* the loop of *na* is extended downwards slantingly in the south-west direction and then an oblique stroke is added at the right. The letter *nda* has its loop extended down making an arch which opens to right. The conjunct *nnā* constitutes double loops. For *nma* the loop is extended downwards and then the

lower part of the letter *ma* is appended to it. In *nya* the loop makes a curve and then an arch - type stroke is added to it. The *ya* of *nsya* is composed of two curves and added to the right arm of *sa* whereas *sa* joins the loop of *na* at the centre of its head.

With initial Labials:

The conjuncts are *pta* [II. B. 10. i], *ppa* [II. B. 10. ii], *pra* [II. B. 10. iii] and *bra* (II. B. 11). For *pta*, *ta* is added to the right corner of the letter *pa*. The *ppa* is inscribed by extending downwards the right limb of the letter *pa* and then an angle is attached to it. In *pra*, the right arm is extended downwards and then a stroke slightly slanting joins it from the left. The letter *ra* as the second element of the compound letter *bra* it drawn in the same way as it has its shape as a semi-vowel.

With initial Semi-vowels:

The conjuncts with initial *r* are *rgga* (II. B. 12.i), *rjja* (II.B.12.ii), *rñna* (II.B.12.iii), *rtha* (II.B.12.iv), *rbha* (II.B.12.v), *rmma* (II.B.12.vi), *rya* (II.B.12.vii), *rvva* (II.B.12.viii) and *rsha* (II.B.12.ix). In all these conjuncts *r* is shown by a small straight vertical line drawn at the head of the second element of the conjunct but in the cases of *rgga* and *rtha*, it is added on the top of the right arm, and for *rjja* it is connected with the right end of the upper horizontal arm.

The compound letters with the first element *l* are *lpa* (II.B.13.i), *lya* (II.B.13.ii) and *lla* (II.B.13.iii). Here the second letter is joined with *l* at its right corner of the base.

The conjuncts with initial *va* are *vya* (II.B.14.i), *vri* (II.B.14.ii), and *vva* (II.B.14.iii). Here again the second letter is appended with the right end of the base.

With initial Sibilants :

The conjuncts with the initial *ś* are *ścha* (II.B.15.i), *śra* (II.B.15.ii) and *ślō* (II.B.15.iii). Also with this element the second letter is connected at the base of its right arm.

The compound letter made with the initial *sh* is *shṭa* (II.B.16), and here, too, the second element is added to the right end of its base.

The conjuncts with *s* as the first element are *sta* [II. B. 17. i], *stha* [II.B.17.ii], *sma* [II. B. 17. iii], *sya* [II. B. 17. iv], *sra* [II.B.17.v] and *sva* [II.B.17.vi]. Here again the second letter is joined with the initial *s* at the lower end of its right arm.

With initial H :

The conjuncts beginning with this letter are *hma* [II.B.18-i], and *hvṛi* [II.B.18-ii] and here also the second letter is added to *h* at its right base.

Medials :

The medial *ā* is added here in five ways: i] a hook added to the base of the right vertical, ii] horizontal bar and a vertical stroke are connected by making an angle of 90° and attached the right and iii] flourishing slant hook open to right directed from north east, and iv] a vertical stroke added according to the shapes of the letters, and v] a bent stroke open to left. The second form is used for *kā* [II. A. 3. ii], *gā* [II.A.4.ii], *ḍā* [II.A.8], *tā* [II.A.10.i], *bhā* [II.A.16.iii], *yā* [II.A.18.iii], *rā* [II.A.19.ii],

tkā [II.B.7.i], *tvā* [II.B.7.viii], *ddhyā* [II.B.8.ii], *dyā* [II.B.8.v], *drā* [II.B.8.vi], *dvā* [II.B.8.vii], *ntā* [II.B.9.ii], *brā* [II.B.11], *rmmā* [II.B.12.vi], *vyā* [II.B.14.i] and *sthā* [II.B.17.ii]. Its third form is preferred for *pā* [II.A.14.ii], *sā* [II. A. 24. v], *tpā* [II. B. 7. iv] and *srā* [II.B.17.v].

The fourth form, a downward vertical, is added on the right of the middle arm of *ja* [II.A.6.iii] and *jña* [II.B.5]. And for *ma* [II.A.17.iv] a stroke, which is directed upward from the base, is added with the right arm. The fifth form, a slightly curved or bent stroke open to left, is added for the letter *ṇḍā* [II.A.6.i].

Here we can also mention that for adding medial *ā* to the conjuncts no single rule was adopted; neither was it based on the initial letter nor on the last letter. We know that for the letter *sā* (II.A.24.v) a flourished slant hook open to right directed from north east is used but for *sthā* [II. B. 17. ii] a horizontal bar and a vertical stroke are attached at the top of the right arm of the letter *sa*. Was the stroke of medial *ā* appended with the conjuncts according to the last letter? But we also find that, although for the conjuncts *srā* [II.B.17.v] and *svā* the medial *ā* stroke is from north-east, for the letters *rā* [II. A. 19. ii] and *vā* (II.A.21.iv) it constitutes a horizontal bar and a vertical stroke attached the right.

For the medial *i* a flourishing curve turned to left and extended downwards was used (II.A.5.iv, II.A.9.ii, II.A.10.iv, II.A.11.ii, II.A.13.ii, II.A.14.iii, II.A.16.iv, II.A.18.iv, II.A.21.vi, II.A.23.ii, II.A.24.vi, II.B.8.iv, II.B.12.ii, ix, II.B.13.iii, II.B.16, II.B.17.iii). The medial *i* is formed by a small circle

and a stroke first going slantingly in the north-west direction and then extended to right roughly horizontally (II. A. 3. iii; II.A.10.v; II.A.14.iv; II.A.16.v; II.A.18.v; II.A.20.ii; II.B.15.ii).

The medial *u* is written in three shapes: i) hook open to left ii) vertical and iii) a curved line. The hook is added with *ku* [II.A.3.iv], *gu* [II.A.4.iii], *tu* [II.A.10.vi], *ru* [II. A. 19. iv], *nku* [II. B. 9. vi]. A small vertical stroke is added at the base of the right vertical of *ma* [II. A. 17. vi], *sa* [II.A.24.vii] and *ddhya* [II.B.8.ii]. We can notice another form of the vertical stroke to be used for *u* in case of *nu* (II.A.13.iii) when the end of the loop is extended down vertically. The curved line is used at the right side of the base of the letter *da* [II. A. 11. iii] for making it *du*. The medial *ū* is formed by a double hook facing in the opposite direction such as in the letters *dū*, [II.A.11.iv] *bhū* [II.A.14.vi], *sū* [II.A.22.ii], *rbhū* [II.B.12.v].

The medial *ē* has two forms: i) an angle of 90° formed by a horizontal bar and a vertical stroke, attached to the left and ii) a flourishing stroke directed from the north west. The first is used for *gē* [II.A.4.iv], *nē* [II.A.13.iv], *pē* [II.A.14.vi], *mē* [II.A.17.vii], *sē* [II.A.24.viii], *chchha* [II.B.3], *tyē* [II.B.7.vi], *nyē* [II.B.9.vi], *rggē* [II.B.12.i] and *rthē* [II.B.12.iv]. The second form is noticed in *ṇē* [II. A. 9. iii], *dhē*

[II.A.12.i] and *yē* [II.A.18.vi]. The medial *ai* is written in three types: with two limbs, one flourishing stroke directed from the north west and an angle of 90° formed by a horizontal bar and vertical stroke, added to left and ii) two flourishing strokes directed from the north west and iii) an angle and a horizontal stroke, both added at the left of the letter. The first form is seen in *kai* [II.A.3.v], *tai* [II.A.10.vi] and *vai* [II. A. 21. vii]. The second shape is noticed in *yai* [II.A.18.vii]. Its third type occurs in the letter *schai* [II.B.15.j].

The medial *ō* has its three forms: 1) two angles each at a side (ii) an angle at right and a flourishing stroke on the head directed from the north-west and (iii) an angle added to left and a hook extended straight towards down attached with the right arm of the letter. The first form is used in letters *gō* (II. A. 4. v), *dō* (II. A. vii.) *tō* (II.A.10.viii), *nnō* (II.B.15.iii). The second shape occurs in *dhō*(II.A.12.ii), *yō* (II.A.18.viii) and *lō* (II.A.20.iii). Third form is known in the letter *ma* [II.A.17.viii]. The medial *au* constitutes three strokes, an angle added at left and two flourishing strokes at the head one directed from the north-east and the other from north-west. This can be marked in the letter *pau* (II.A.14.vi).

The medial *ṛi* is added at the right of the base. It is a hook open to right. It is seen in letters *vṛi*(II.B.14.ii) and *hvṛi* (II.B.18.ii).¹³

Foot-Notes:

1. Vide my paper, 'The Date of Āraṅg Copper Plate Inscription of Bhīmasēna II-A Review, *JOI*, XXIII, No. 4, pp. 335 ff.

2. *El.*, IX, p. 342.
3. *Ibid.*
4. A.H. Dani, *Indian Palaeography*, p. 163.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 163.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 163-4.
10. *Ibid.*, pl. xiv b. 10.
11. *El.*, XXV, p. 268.
12. Thanks to my friend Dr. T. P. Verma for going through this paper.

22. LEGENDS ON THE COINS OF CHIMUKA-SATAVAHANA AND HIS PREDECESSORS

P.V. Parabrahma Sastry

Findspot :

In course of our epigraphical survey in the Karimnagar district, A. P., I had the opportunity to survey the hillock called *Munulaguṭṭa* (—hillock of the sages) on the right bank of Gōdāvarī near the village Kapparaopet in the Peddapalli taluk. Though we could not discover any epigraphic material as such on the flat top of the hillock we could notice four rock-beds in a cavern on the steep edge of the hillock, at an altitude of about hundred metres, facing the river. Very near this cavern we could pick up a few Sātavāhana coins and some microliths. There are some more caverns on that steep edge of the hillock, which we could not reach. These findings, make it clear that the antiquity of the place goes back to the prehistoric period and continued upto the Sātavāhana period, though not later. With regard to the rock-cut beds, on the basis of similar caverns with beds noticed in the districts of Madurai Tinnevely and other places, as reported in the early Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy [1907 to 1910 and 1927], it is assumed that they were retiring places for the ascetics, likely of the Jaina faith and hence its name *Munula-guṭṭa*.

Adjacent to the hillock on its northern side, on the right bank of the Gōdāvarī there is a vast area called Kota-Lingāla, where ancient mounds, pottery, etc. are noticed in abundance. Quite interestingly my friend Sri S.

Narahari, an officer in the Postal Dept., Karimnagar, secured several coins as surface finds in this ancient site. These coins belonged to the Sātavāhana period bearing legends such as *Siri Chhimuka*, *Chhimuka Sātavā*, *Sātavāha* and *Sātakaṁṇi*. Another series with legends *Raṅḡ Gōbhadasa* and *Raṅḡ Sāmagōpasa* is also found in this collection. Excepting a few coins of the last mentioned chief, which are of lead fabric, all the rest, including some of this chief, are of potin and copper. They are either square or rectangular in shape. The present paper is intended to highlight the importance of the coins of Chhimuka-Sātavāhana.

Coins of Chhimuka-Sātavāhana:

They are six in number. Only one coin contains the legend [-ṅḡ] *Siri Chhimuka* and another *ri Chhimuka sātavā*. Therefore the full legend might have been *Raṅḡ Siri Chhimuka-Sātavāhana*. Their measurement on the sides is between 1.4 and 1.6 cms. Their weight varies between 1.25 and 2.13 gms. Out of the six only one coin is of potin and the remaining five of copper fabric.

Physical description:

Obverse :

On the obverse the coins bear the symbols of Elephant facing left, four coins with trunk hanging and two with trunk upraised. The fabric and the size of the former type is slightly different from the latter type.

I. Of the former type one coin contains on the back of the elephant the well developed symbol of śrīvatsa, the remaining three being without that symbol. Only

1. [ñō] <i>Siri Chhimuka</i> ...	1 coin [with tree symbol]; Potin
2. <i>Siri Chhimuka Sā</i>	1 "
3. [<i>Si</i>]ri <i>Chhimuka Sāta[vā]</i>	1 " } copper
4. <i>Siri Chhimu[ka]</i>	1 " } [above Śrīvatsa]

Reverse : Taking the above order

- 1) Three petals of the Ujjain symbol, two svastikas, and another single petal to the right ;
- 2) damaged;but Ujjain symbol and one svastika are noticeable ;
- 3) damaged ; but Ujjain symbol surmounted by crescent and svastikas are noticeable.
- 4) Ujjain symbol and two svastikas.

II. The 5th and 6th coins having the elephant with raised trunk seem to be altogether of a different series as their size and weight (32 grains) and the palaeography of the legend indicate.

5) *Obverse* :

On the back of the elephant some symbol-like triangle with its base upwards. And above it the legend runs in an arch, which reads *Siri Chhimuka Sāta*.

Reverse : Ujjain symbol surmounted by crescent and six svastikas in smaller size than that of the above group.

6) *Obverse*: Same as (5) and legend [*Chhi*]mukasa

Reverse : Ujjain symbol surmounted by crescent and four svastikas.

on the potin coin a tree with three visible branches on the left is noticed before the elephant. The legends on all coins are on the back of the elephant and they read:

Observations: Historians generally hold that palaeography of the legends on stray coins cannot contribute any significant factor in deciding the chronology, although it is possible to some extent in the case of inscriptional palaeography. But when the features appear so conspicuous that they cannot escape even our casual notice there is no reason to ignore them altogether. Even dated records are sometimes to be redated on palaeographic considerations. Now we are having before us the letters of Chhimuka himself. It is needless to state that the words *Chhimuka* or *Chimuka* are the Prakrit variants of Simuka. In the Naneghat label inscription it is found as Simuka'. As these coins are found on the surface of the site, archaeological stratigraphy need not be considered. The other part of their study now remains with the epigraphists. Thus, I justify myself in presenting this paper before eminent epigraphists. The features which call our attention may be stated as follows :

1. The letter *Chhi* in all the six coins is written with two distinct loops in the bottom, with a bold vertical. This feature is noticeable in the Brāhmī characters only upto the beginning of the Christian era.

2. The letter *ma* in *mu* is not so conspicuous even in the Naneghat label inscriptions or that of Nāganikā. It is a late feature of the early Brāhmī characters.
3. In the second group of two coins we notice that the horizontal cross stroke in the letter *ka* exhibits a slight upward bend in one case and a downward bend in the other, which is again a late feature of early Brāhmī.
4. The medial *i* in *si*, *ri* and *chhi* retains the downward elongation with upward curve, a feature assignable to 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. after which it took a leftward curve at the top.
5. Elongated curve to the right of the bottom end of *sa* which is conspicuously noticeable from the 1st century B.C. or even later as in Rudradāman's inscription.

Basing on these palaeographic features which decidedly belong to a latter period than 2nd century B.C. and earlier than 1st century A.D., it is reasonable to ascribe these coins of Simuka Sātavāhana, the first king of the line, to some time later than 50 B.C.

Scholars like Dr. Sircar have already given their opinion in this regard^a. The palaeographic features pointed out above furnish further evidence to the same view. Simuka's period is now wavering between the limits of vast range. Some scholars even now believe that he was a junior contemporary of Aśōka and place him in the first part of 3rd century B.C. Irrespective of the records of known dates comparable in this context, we

are forced to bring down these characters of Chhimuka to the second half of the first century B.C., that is, nearly two centuries later than the Aśōkan edicts.

Secondly, the provenance of these coins of the founder of the dynasty in the Karimnagar district adds one more evidence to the fact that the early kings of the family had their home in this part of Andhra. This fact has already been proved by the discovery of the coins of *Siri Sadavahana*, a predecessor of Simuka, at Kondapur in the Medak district^a, and Hyderabad. That part of Andhra in which the modern districts of Nizamabad, Medak and Karimnagar are spread, along the river Gōdāvārī, seems to be the homeland of the Sātavāhanas.

Coins, which are believed to be of low denomination cannot be supposed to have migrated beyond the territory of their issuing authority. This becomes more so in the case of the founder of a dynasty who must have spent the early part of his career as a subordinate ruler or general under some sovereign king, holding a limited area as his own principality. It is quite reasonable to believe that the present Peddapalli taluk in the Karimnagar district of Andhra Pradesh, the findspot of these coins, was also included in the home territory of Chhimuka Sātavāhana. It is also noteworthy that extensive Sātavāhana sites at places like Pedabankuru, Dhulikaṭṭa and the present Koṭa-Lingala, have been recently discovered and excavations at the former two sites are in progress. Some thousands of Sātavāhana coins have been unearthed at these places and thousands more are likely to come out. As said before, the present collection of sixty coins is only a surface find.

In the present collection there are two more types bearing the legends (a) [Ra]-ñō *Gōbhadasa* and (b) [Ra]ñō *Samagōpasa*

(a) These are of copper fabric and square in shape with side 1.5. cm. and weight approximately 38 grains. All are die-struck.

On the obverse: Three arched hill; bow and arrow; and tree in some cases. Legend [-] ñō *Gōbhadasa*.

Reverse is blank on all these coins. The palaeography of these letters is decidedly earlier than that of the Simuka coins (impression No. 6).

(b) Some copper and some potin; square, 1.5,cm; weight between 50 and 76 grains. These coins are in three kinds according to their obverse symbols. Some contain six-armed circle; triangle-headed symbol ; and arrow. On some coins we notice svastika also in addition to the above. On the third variety we notice six-armed circle, tree and bull


Legend: *Rañō Samagōpasa*.

On the reverse all these coins have four *nandipāda* (or *triratna*) symbols surrounding a double circle in the centre. The palaeography of the legend in this case also is earlier than that on the Simuka coins. The letters *ga* with angular top, *ma* with round bottom and *pa* with long left vertical are some of the early features.


These two types [a] and [b] are ascribable to some rulers who preceded the Sātavāhanas. According to the Purāṇas we know that the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas were their predecessors. Among the former

some later rulers had their capital at Vidiśā as evidenced by the Besnagar Garuḍa pillar inscription set up by Heliodorus, the Messenger of the Yavana king Antialcidas during the reign of Bhāgabhadra⁴. The king is identified with Bhadarghōsha, the fifth king of the Śuṅga family. In addition to these he had the the names of Andhraka, Ādraka, Bhadraka, of which the first name Andhraka significantly indicates his association with the Andhra country. He might have served as viceroy in the Andhra province under his father. Thus I am inclined to identify *Gōbhadra* of our coins with that fifth Śuṅga king Bhadraghōsha or Bhāgabhadra. According to several authorities this king is supposed to have ruled some time before 100 B.C. Although his regnal period is very small according to the Purāṇas, owing to his association with Āndhradēśa and probaly with its contiguous provinces, in his early career he became popular in the Deccan. Secondly, the empty reverse may also indicate that he issued those coins while he was a prince.

About the other series, that is, of *Samagōpa*, we are reminded of another king *Samābhaga*, the penultimate king of the same Śuṅga family, who ruled during the first quarter of the first century B.C. The Purāṇas also state that Simuka came to power after defeating the Kāṇvas and the remaining Śuṅga kings⁵. Therefore it is not unreasonable to assume that Simuka succeeded the last rulers of the Śuṅga family. The Kāṇvas, as held by several scholars, could not establish their authority in the entire Śuṅga kingdom. The latter were still exercising power in the provinces of Vidiśā and the south. These coins of *Gōbhadra*



1



2




3



4



5




6



1



2



3





4



6



5



and Samagōpa thus furnish the numismatic evidence in this regard. Samagōpa, though not identical with Śambhāga, the ninth king, might have been a near successor to him.

We have a still stronger evidence. The coin of Sātavāhana (No. 8) has exactly the same reverse of that of Samagōpa (No.7.) On the obverse also the triangle-headed symbol, Svastika, and a tree before a standing bull are other symbols borrowed by Sātavāhana from the symbolism of Samagōpa. This unique coin of Sātavāhana furnishes the conclusive evidence for the change over of political power from Samagōpa or his immediate successor to Sātavāhana.

Originally the early Sātavāhanas, namely, Siri Sātavāhana of this unique coin and those published by Prof. V. V. Mirashi, and Simuka served the Śuṅgas as subordinates.

They were holding their original principality in the present Karimnagar, Nizamabad, Medak, and Adilabad districts of A.P. with their capital at some place like Kondapur, Bodhan or the present site on the bank of the Gōdāvarī which are about 200 kms apart from each other. It is not unlikely that the coastal-Kṛishṇā-Gōdāvarī region with Dannakaṭa as sub-capital was also included in their territory as indicated by the Guntupalli epigraphs⁶. Subsequent to their becoming sovereign rulers, owing to the increasing needs of the kingdom they might have shifted the capital to Pratiśṭhāna, particularly to check the invasion of the foreign rulers, the Śakas and others. Dhanakaṭaka on the Kṛishṇā bank is about 280 kms from Kōṭa-Liṅgāla, the findspot of these coins whereas Pratiśṭhāna is more than 410 kms distant.

Before concluding this paper it is worth recalling the importance of the hillock called Munula-guṭṭa situated by the side of this site, where, as already said, there are some rock-cut beds in a cavern and some Sātavāhana coins were collected by this author. Unfortunately the coins are not in a state of good preservation and their legends cannot be deciphered properly excepting the letters *Si*, *ri* and *sa*, above the elephant symbol. It is well attested by Jaina literature and tradition,⁷ that the early members of the Sātavāhanas patronized Jainism. It is not unreasonable to ascribe the Jain vestiges of the Munula-guṭṭa to the time of Chimuka, or even earlier. The Telugu name *Munula-guṭṭa* must be also as old as the rock-beds in the cavern.

Conclusion

1. It is for the first time that Simuka, the first sovereign king of the Sātavāhana family, is made known to the scholarly world by his own material.
2. The palaeography of the legend being decidedly of the first century B.C., early theories in this regard, which place him in 3rd or 2nd century B. C., are proved to be untenable. Simuka is to be placed some time after 50 B. C.
- 3) The find - spot of these coins being in the Karimnagar district, the fact that the Sātavāhanas were the indigenous rulers of Andhra is well founded.
- 4) The tradition based on the Jain literature, that the early members of the Sātavāhana rulers patronized Jainism is also proved by the

cavern with rock-cut beds on the Munulaguṭṭa near which these coins are found. These rock beds are supposed to be the retiring places of the Jaina ascetics where they used to practice *Sallēkha* in their last stage of life.

- 5) Gōbhadra of the other series of coins is identifiable with Bhadrāghōsha or Andhraka, the fifth ruler of the Śuṅga family ; similarly

Samagōpa is identifiable with Samābhāga, the ninth Śuṅga king or his near successor. Therefore it seems certain that the Śuṅgas had their authority in Andhra also.

- 6] The similarity of symbolism on the coins of Samagōpa and Siri Sātāvāhana points to the fact that the Sātāvāhanas were the political successors of the family of Samagōpa, very likely the Śuṅgas of Vidiśā.

Foot-Notes :

1. Arch. Sur. W. Ind., V, pp. 60 ff.
2. Select Inscriptions, p. 189.
3. *JNSI.*, Vol. VII, pp. 1-4; *Ibid.*, IX-2, pp. 5ff.
4. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 98.
5. Kāṇvāyanāms = tatō = bhṛityāḥ Suśarmāṇam prasahya tam¹
 Śuṅgānām ch = aiva yach = chhēsham kshapayitvā balam tadā¹¹
 Pargiter, *Dy. of Kali Age*, p. 38.
6. Dr. R. Subramanyam, *Guṇṭupalli Brāhmī Inscription of Khāavela*. (A.P. Epi. Series 3, 1968).
7. *JBBRAS.*, X, pp. 129 ff.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Descriptive Catalogue of the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions in the Epigraphy Gallery, Indian Museum by Shyamalkanti Chakravarti, Indian Museum, Calcutta, 1977; pp. 20; pls. 8. Price Rs. 15.00.

The Indian Museum, which is one of the two largest museums of India, possesses a large number of lithic records and copper-plate charters which are displayed in a re-organised gallery which came into existence in the fifties. The number of seals and sealings runs into thousands. Of those, the present catalogue takes notice of twenty-two inscriptions, seventeen of them stone inscriptions and the rest copper-plate grants, and eleven seals and sealings, four of them being Harappan.

This booklet, running into just twenty pages (inclusive of 6-page bibliography and index), gives a brief account of the epigraphic and glyptic records as displayed in the Museum together with information about the script, language, date where given, provenance, registration number and size. In a few cases short notes showing palaeographical peculiarities and scriptal development are added. The plates are good and the charts showing development of Nāgarī and Bengali scripts given at the end are useful from the point of view of the general readers.

It would have been useful to give references to the Journals or other publications where the inscriptions and seals and sealings in question originally appeared. The

non-inclusion of Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha's *Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā*, which is still the most dependable book on Indian palaeography, in the list of books on palaeography at p. 16 is a serious omission.

The *Catalogue* serves the purpose of illustrating the great value of the epigraphical material deposited in the Indian Museum. The publication of a full catalogue of this material at an early date is the minimum that scholars can rightfully expect from the Indian Museum and the authorities would do well to take it up seriously and place this important material in the hands of scholars before long.

AJAY MITRA SHASTRI

Hindu Iconography by S. P. Tewari. Published by Agam Kala Prakashan, New Delhi, 1979; pp. i-xiv+117 and 38 illustrations; price: Rs. 100.

The publication of *Hindu Iconography*, based on anthological verses, literature, art and epigraphs, heralds the arrival, on the Indian academic arena, of a young and erudite scholar who is happily aware of the need to declare a moratorium on over-indulgence in minute and hair-splitting chronological and genealogical details of Indian history and is keen to break new ground by subjecting the copious epigraphical source-materials available to fresh study and newer interpretations. As the author has himself modestly

pointed out, he has derived his initial inspiration for his maiden venture from an article written many years ago by that veteran Indologist, C. Sivaramamurthi.

In the introductory chapter (pp. 1-5), the author draws the attention of his readers to the rather cryptic invocations which are to be met with in pre-Gupta literature and epigraphs. In chapter 2 (pp. 6-11) are presented the iconographic gleanings we get from the benedictory verses in the epigraphs belonging to the Gupta period. Chapters 3 (pp. 12-59) and 4 (pp. 60-75) are respectively devoted to the copious iconographic details that are available in Hindu inscriptions as far as the principal deities Śiva and Viṣṇu are concerned. In the last chapter (Ch. V; pp. 76-95) the author quotes, translates and discusses a number of verses which stand ample testimony to the ingenuity of poets who exploit the well known iconographic attributes of principal deities for enriching the saga of Sanskrit poetry. A useful bibliography, an equally useful word index and 38 well produced illustrations are appended to the book.

Tewari's book should serve as a beckoner to such scholastic aspirants as are interested in blazing new trails. The author has touched only the periphery of what is certainly an unlimited field. In particular, similar useful works could be and should be written on the regional iconographic information we get in plenty from the regional languages, particularly of the South. The Jaina, Hindu and, to a much lesser degree, the Buddhist inscriptions of the South contain numerous such interesting prose and verse compositions which, when studied in the fashion of Tewari, could well bring to light many significant regional differences and subtleties.

The author Shri Tewari has put the scholarly public in deep debt. The production of the book is of a good standard and does not leave much to be desired. It may, however, be pointed out that diacritical types should have been used to greater perfection and the proofs read more carefully, though these defects have not reduced the intrinsic worth and merit of this laudable venture.

K.V. RAMESH

The Imperial Pāṇḍyas - Mathematics Reconstructs the Chronology : by and published by N. Sethuraman, Kumbhakōṇam, 1978; pp. 252. Price: Not given.

Shri Sethuraman, whose earlier work 'The Cholas-Mathematics Reconstructs the Chronology' the present reviewers had the privilege of reviewing in the previous number of this journal, has brought out another work of great utilitarian value, viz. 'The Imperial Pandyas - Mathematics Reconstructs the Chronology'. The approach here is basically the same as the one so successfully adopted by the author in his efforts to improve upon the earlier contributions to Chōḷa chronology. It must, however, be noted that, unlike in the case of the Chōḷas, the epigraphical material left behind by the later Pāṇḍyas is much less copious and much less helpful; hence, greater credit attaches to Shri Sethuraman's present efforts.

The problems pertaining to the chronology of the later Pāṇḍyas are so very baffling that not many scholars have made bold to tackle the subject after the pioneering efforts of that redoubtable master-historian, Nilakanta Sastry. The present work of Shri

Sethuraman, based as it is on astronomical details furnished by the epigraphs and the unfailing science of Mathematics, is thus a most welcome addition to the meagre research writings available for the history of the Pāṇḍyas.

Shri Sethuraman's main virtue as a historical chronologist lies in his sweeping and comprehensive knowledge of Tamil inscriptions and his readiness to set aside age-old methods of study, wherever they are found to be unhelpful or outmoded, and to adopt uninhibited methods instead. A close scrutiny of his work on the Pāṇḍyas shows that he has factually succeeded in considerably reducing the lower and upper limits of the periods in which the the accessions of the later Pāṇḍya rulers must have occurred.

The author does not deal with the problems of the chronology of the early Pāṇḍyas, obviously because of the scarcity of details of dates; he has, therefore, perforce confined himself to the chronology of the Pāṇḍyas who held sway between 1190 and 1380 A.D. He commences with a discussion on the probable date of the Pāṇḍyan civil war (c.1166 A.D.) and proceeds thence to discuss, reign by reign, the probable dates of accession and termination. All the available information such as *prasastis*, royal titles, astronomical details, etc., are marshalled together in postulating revised dates. The credibility of his findings is further strengthened because of the usage of very recent epigraphical discoveries.

For the convenience of the reader, Shri Sethuraman summarises his discussions in a nut shell at the end of each chapter. Some important episodes such as the

accession of Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara, and the sequence of the occupation of the northern portions of the Tamil country by him, are skillfully dealt with by the author. His arguments in favour of his postulation that the five anointed kings of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom were in concealment at the time of Malik Kafur's invasion of the Tamil Country in 1311 A.D. are persuasive and carry conviction. He is also effective in refuting the theory that Sundarapāṇḍya was a parricide. In fact, his well founded conclusion is that there was cordial relationship between Virapāṇḍya and his brother Sundarapāṇḍya and that the brothers were loyal to their father Māravarman Kulaśēkhara right till the last mentioned ruler's natural death.

In arriving at the conclusion that Rājarājan Sundarapāṇḍya was the illegitimate son of Kulaśēkhara, Shri Sethuraman has critically examined the accounts given by the Muhammadan chroniclers such as Amir Khusru, Ziaud Din Barni and wasaf, pointing out the conflicting and contradictory nature of their statements. He has taken the help of Gaṅgādēvi's *Madhurāvijayam* in order to show that the Pāṇḍyan power was not extinguished even after the Madurai Sultanate was routed by Kampaṇa of Vijayanagara.

The numerous chronological tables, inserted at the appropriate places in the text, as also the appended chronological list of revised dates of the Pāṇḍyan kings add clarity to a subject which is otherwise heavy reading material. Nevertheless, the author does indulge at times in digressions and the narration is sometimes marred by the cluttering of too many facts. But, in


a highly technical work, which deals with such a dry subject as chronology, the absence of style and flourish is no desideratum.

The reviewers would like to stress here the great need for subjecting the inscriptions of other ruling dynasties of the South to similar painstaking scrutiny from a chronological angle. The histories of the South Indian kingdoms are so fatefully intertwined that a partial revision of the dates will render historical correlations more difficult. Scholars working on the chronological history of Karnataka and Andhra would do well to take their cue from Shri

Sethuraman and subject the epigraphs from those regions to a fresh chronological appraisal.

In conclusion, the reviewers would like to congratulate Shri Sethuraman on his painstaking and penetrating analysis of a very difficult subject and for bringing out this reliable source book. He has succeeded in presenting to the world of historians a much better and improved chronological picture of the later Pāṇḍyas.

K. V. Ramesh
C. R. Srinivasan



15845