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EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

SECTION I.

ETYMOLOGY OF THE WORD “DEKKAN” AND ITS DENOTATION.

The word “Dakhan” represents the vernacular pronunciation of the Sanskrit word Dakshaṇa, meaning “southern,” used to designate the portion of the Indian Peninsula lying to the south of the Narmadā. The name more usually met with in Sanskrit works and elsewhere is Dakshināpatha or “the Southern Region.” That its name was in ordinary use in ancient times is shown by the fact that the author of the Periplus calls that portion of the country Dakhinabades. In the vernacular or Prākrit speech of the time, the Sanskrit Dakshināpatha must have become Dakhinābadha or Dakhināvadhya by the usual rules, and the Greek writer must have derived his name from this popular pronunciation. The shorter form of the name also must have been in use, since in the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era, Fah-Hian, the Chinese traveller, was told at Benares that there was a country to the south called Ta-Tsin, which word corresponds to the Sanskrit Dakshaṇa.

Dakshināpatha or Dakshaṇa was the name of the whole peninsula to the south of the Narmadā. Among the countries enumerated in the Mārkandeya, Vāyu, and Mātṣya Parānas as comprised in Dakshināpatha are those of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas and Keralas, which were situated in the extreme south of the peninsula, and correspond to the modern provinces of Tanjor, Madura, and Malabar. In the Mahābhārata, however, Sahadeva, the youngest of the Pāṇḍu princes, is represented in his career of conquest to have gone to Dakshināpatha after having conquered the king of the Pāṇḍyas. This would show that the country of the Pāṇḍyas was not included in Dakshināpatha. Again, the rivers Godāvari and others springing from the Sahyādri are spoken of in the Vāyu Purāṇa as rivers of Dakshināpatha, while the Narmadā and the Tāpī are not so styled; whence it would seem that the valleys of those rivers were not included in Dakshināpatha. The word thus appears not to have been always used in the same sense. In modern times it is the name of the country between the Narmadā on the north and a variable line along the course of the Kṛishṇā to the south, exclusive of the

---

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 143. 2 Travels of Fah-Hian by S. Beal, p. 139.
3 Chap. 57, v. 45, Ed. Bibliotheca Indica. The reading of the second line, however, is wrong. It ought to be, Pāṇḍyaḥ cha Keralāḥ chaiva Cholāḥ Kulyāḥ tathaiva cha, as it is in the MSS. I have consulted.
provinces lying to the extreme east. It is thus almost identical with the country called Mahārāṣṭra or the region in which the Marāṭhī language is spoken, the narrow strip of land between the Western Ghāṭas and the sea being excluded. A still narrower definition is that which excludes from this tract the valleys of the Narmadā and the Tāpī; and to this extent we have seen that there is authority for it in the Vāyu Purāṇa. Thus the word Dekkān expresses the country watered by the upper Godāvarī and that lying between that river and the Krishi. The name Mahārāṣṭra also seems at one time to have been restricted to this tract. For that country is, in the Purāṇas, and other works, distinguished on the one hand from Aparanta or Northern Konka and from the regions on either side of the Narmadā and the Tāpī inhabited by the Pūlindas and Śabaras, as well as from Vidarbha on the other. In a comparatively modern work entitled Raṅnakosa Mahārāṣṭra, Vaidarbha, Tāpī-taṭa-deva and Narmadā-taṭa-deva (i.e., the countries on either side of those rivers), and the Konka are spoken of as distinct from each other. The Dekkān or Mahārāṣṭra in this the narrowest sense of the word forms the subject of the present notice.

SECTION II.

SETTLEMENT OF THE ĀRYAS IN THE DEKKAN.

It is now a recognised fact that the Āryas who came to India were at first confined to eastern Afghanistan and the Panjāb. Thence they emigrated to the east and for a time the easternmost province occupied by them was Brahmagarta or their holy land lying between the rivers Sarasaṅvatī, the modern Sarasutī, and Drishadvatī, a stream in the vicinity, that is, the country about Thanesar. There the system of castes and orders and the sacrificial religion seem to have been fully developed. Thence they spread to the east and the south, and gradually occupied the whole country between the Himalaya and the Vindhyā. This last mountain range must for a long time have formed the southern boundary of their settlements. For the name Āryavarta or the region occupied by the Āryas, as explained by Manu and even by Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhashya on Pāṇini’s grammar, signified exclusively the part of the country situated between those mountain ranges. The Vindhyā, which by its height seemed to obstruct the passage of the sun, was impassable to them. The name Pāriyāta was given to the more northern and western portion of the range from which the rivers Chambal and Betvā take their rise, probably because it was situated on the boundary of their Yātra or range of communication. After a while, however, the sage Agastya, in poetical language, bade the mountain not to grow high, that is, crossed it and established an Āśram or hermitage to the south and thus led the way to other settlements. The first or oldest Āryan province

---

1 See the chapters of the three Purāṇas referred to in the preceding notes.
2 Prof. Aufrecht’s Cat. of MSS. in the Bodleian Library, p. 332.
3 Manu II., 17.
4 Manu II., 23.
5 Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya under Pān. II., 4, 10.
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in the southern country must have been the Vaidarbha or the Berars. For in the Rāmāyana when Sugriva the monkey-king sends his followers to search the different quarters in search of Rāma's wife Sītā and Rāvana her ravisher, he directs them to go among other southern countries to Vidarbhas, Rāchikas, and Mahisikas, and also to Dandakāranyas (the forest of Dandakā) and the river Godāvari. This shows that while the country about the Godāvari, that is, the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra in the narrowest sense of the terms, was a forest, Vidarbha was an inhabited country. In the Mahābhārata also Agastya is represented to have given a girl that he produced by his miraculous powers to the king of Vidarbha, and after she had grown to be a woman demanded her of the king in marriage. In the Rāmāyana, Rāma is represented to have lived for a long time in Dandakāranya, at a place called Pañchavati situated on the banks of the Godāvari about two yojanas from the hermitage of Agastya. That this Dandakāranya was the modern Mahārāṣṭra is shown by the fact stated above, that it was watered by the river Godāvari, and by several others. According to the Hindu ritual it is necessary when beginning any religious ceremony to pronounce the name of the country in which it is performed. The Brāhmans in Mahārāṣṭra do not utter the name Mahārāṣṭra but Dandakāranya with the word desa or "country" attached to it. In the introduction Homādri's Vāratakhaṇḍa, a work written more than six hundred years ago, Devagiri, the modern Daulatabād, is spoken of as situated a district on the confines of Dandakāranya. Nāsik claims to be the Pañchavati where Rāma lived. But the poet could hardly be expected to have brought his hero from the Vindhyā to such a remote westerly place as Nāsik. The river Godāvari must, from the inscription occurring in the Rāmāyana as well as in Bhavabhūti's Vīra Rāmāchārīta, have been wide at Rāma's Pañchavati. It could hardly have been so at Nāsik, which is very near its source.

In the other hand, "the region about the northern part of the Sahyādri through which flowed the river Godāvari and in which Govardhana as situated" is in the Purāṇas represented as "the most charming earth; 'and there, to please Rāma, the sage Bhārandaśa caused eaven, trees and herbs to spring up for his wife's enjoyment, and here a lovely garden came into existence." In the Mārkandeya, "Vardhana is spoken of as a town; but the Vāyu and the Mātysa seem to mean it to be a mountain. This Govardhana must, from the given position, be the same as the village of that name near Nāsik; and thus the three Purānas must be understood as supporting the identification of Pañchavati with Nāsik.

But though Mahārāṣṭra was the last country occupied by the Indian Aryas, their subjugation of it was no less thorough than that of all the northern countries. Here, as there, they drove some of the aborigines to the fastnesses of mountains and jungles and incorporated the rest into their own society. The present Marāṭhī

3 Rāmāy. III., 13, 13, Bom. Ed.
4 Mārkandeya, Chap. 37, vv. 34-35; Vāyu, Chap. 45, vv. 112-114; and Mātysa, Chap. 112, vv. 37-39. The passage, however, is corrupt. The three Purānas evidently derive their reading from the same original, but the text has been greatly corrupted. The most ancient version of it seems to be that in the Vāyu.
language is as much an offshoot of the Sanskrit as the other languages of northern India. The ancient representatives of these dialects—the Mahārāṣṭri, the Sāauraseni and the Māgadhī, as well as an earlier form of speech, the Pālī—show extensive corruptions of Sanskrit sounds, reducible however to a few general laws. These cannot be accounted for by the natural operation of the causes which bring about the decay of a language spoken throughout its history by the same race. For, this operation is slow and must be in continuance for a very long time in order to produce the wide-going phonetic changes which we observe in those Prākrit dialects, as they are called. This long continued process must at the same time give rise to a great many changes in other respects. Such however, we do not find in those dialects, and they do not in those respects show a very wide departure from the Sanskrit. The extensive corruptions of Sanskrit sounds, therefore, must be accounted for by the supposition that the language had to be spoken by races whose original tongue it was not. Those alien races could not properly pronounce the Sanskrit words used by the conqueror, Āryas; and thus the Prākrit forms of Sanskrit words represent their pronunciation of them. A few sounds unknown to Sanskrit as well as some words not traceable to that language are also found in the Prākrits, and these point to the conclusion. It thus appears that the Indian Āryas in their progress through the country came in contact with alien races, which were incorporated in their society and learnt their language at the same time that they preserved some of their original words and phonetic peculiarities. This was the state of things in the north down to the Marāṭhā country. But farther south and on the eastern coast though they penetrated there and communicated their civilization to the aboriginal races inhabiting those parts, they were not able to incorporate them thoroughly into their own society and root out their languages and their peculiar civilization. On the contrary, the Āryas had to learn the languages of those races and adopt a portion at least of their civilization. Thus the Kanares, the Telugu, the Tamil, and the other languages now spoken in Southern India are not derived from the Sanskrit but belong altogether to a different stock, and hence it is also that southern Ārya is so different from the northern. The reason why the result of the Āryan irruption was so different in Southern India from what it was in the north appears to be that when the Āryas penetrated to the south there existed already well-organized communities and kingdoms. In the passage in the Rāmāyāna, referred to above, the monkey-soldiers are directed to go to the countries of the Andhra (Telugu people), the Pāṇḍyas, the Cholas, and the Keralas, in the south, and are told that they will there see the gate of the city of the Pāṇḍyas adorned with gold and jewels. And these races, the country, and their kings are alluded to in other Sanskrit works, as will be noticed hereafter. In the north, however, at the time of the Āryan invasion, the condition of the country must have been similar to that of Dāndakāranya, which is represented in the Rāmāyāna.

1 These points I have developed in my Lectures on the Sanskrit and the Prākrit languages derived from it.
a forest infested by Rākshasas or wild tribes who disturbed the religious rites of the Brāhmaṇ sages. And throughout the older portion of Sanskrit literature, which is to be referred to the times when the Aryas were gradually progressing from the Panjab, the wild tribes they met with are spoken of under the name of Dasyus, Mrākshasas and others.

SECTION III.

APPROXIMATE DATE OF THE ARYAN SETTLEMENT IN THE DEKKAN
AND NOTICES OF SOUTHERN INDIA IN ANCIENT INDIAN
LITERATURE AND INSCRIPTIONS.

We will now endeavour to determine approximately the period when the Aryas settled in Dāndakāranya, and trace the relations between the civilized Arya community of the north and the southern country at different periods of Sanskrit literature and at well known dates in Indian history. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which is anterior to the whole of the so-called classical Sanskrit literature, the sage Visvāmitra is represented to have condemned by a curse the progeny of fifty of his sons to “live on the borders” of the Arya settlements, and these, it is said, “were the Andhras, Pundras, Sābaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas, and the descendants of Visvāmitra formed a large portion of the Dasyus.” Of these the first four are spoken of as people living in the south, the Pundras in the Rāmāyaṇa and the other three in the Purāṇas. From the later literature, the Pulindas and Sābaras appear to have been wild tribes living about the Vindhyas. Ptolemy places the former along the Narmadā. The Andhras, who in these days are identified with the Telugu people, lived about the mouth of the Godāvari or perhaps farther to the north. If these were the positions of the tribes in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, the Indian Aryas must at that time have been acquainted with the whole country to the north of the Vindhyas and a portion to the south-east of that range.

Pāṇini in his Śūtras or grammatical rules shows an extensive knowledge of the geography of India. Of the places and rivers mentioned by him a good many exist in the Panjab and Afghanistan; but the names of countries situated in the eastern portion of Northern India also occur in the Śūtras. The countries farthest to the south mentioned by him are Kachchha (IV., 2, 133), Avanti (IV., 1, 176), Kosala (IV., 1, 171), Karuṣa (IV., 1, 178).

The Aryas acquainted with Northern India in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

Also in Pāṇini’s time.

---

1 Ait. Brāh., VII. 18. 2 See the passages above referred to. 3 In his Kādambari Bāna places the Sābaras in the forest on the Vindhya range. 4 This name does not occur in the Śūtra, but is the second in the list or Gaṇa beginning with Bharga. As regards the words occurring in these Gaṇas, I have on a previous occasion expressed my opinion that though it is not safe to attribute a whole Gaṇa to Pāṇini, (and in several cases we have clear indications that some of the words were inserted in later times), still the first three words might without mistake be taken to be his. This was objected to by Professor Weber. But as my reasons were, as I thought, obvious, I did not think it necessary to defend my view, may, however, here state that since Pāṇini refers to these Gaṇas in his Śūtras by being the first word in the list with idū, equivalent to “and others,” added to it, and since he uses the plural of the noun so formed, and the plural of a noun cannot be used unless three individuals at least of the class are meant, it is proper that we should understand him to be thinking of the first and two words at least more. This observation is meant to be applicable generally. In the present case, however, the expression Bhargīḍi forms a part of the compound, and the plural is not actually used, though it is clearly implied.
and Kålinga (IV., 1, 178). The first is the same as the modern country of that name, Avanti is the district about Ujjayini, and Kålinga corresponds to the modern Northern Circars. Kosala, Kàrâsa, and Avanti are mentioned in the Purânas as countries situated on the back of the Vindhya. In the Rattâvali, a dramatic play, Kosala is also placed near that mountain range. Supposing that the non-occurrence of the name of any country farther south in Pâñini’s work is due to his not having known it, a circumstance which, looking to the many names of places in the north that he gives, appears very probable, the conclusion follows that in his time the Aryas were confined to the north of the Vindhya, but did proceed or communicate with the northernmost portion of the eastern coast not by crossing that range, but avoiding it by taking an easterly course.

Kâtyâyana, however, the object of whose aphorisms called Vârtika is to explain and supplement Pâñini, shows an acquaintance with southern nations. Pâñini gives rules for the formation of derivatives from the names of tribes of warriors which are at the same time the names of the countries inhabited by them, in the sense of “or sprung from an individual belonging to that tribe,” and also, it must be understood, in the sense of “king of the country.” Thus a man sprung from an individual of the tribe of the Pânchâlas, or the king of the country Pânchâla, is to be called Pânchâla; a descendant of Sâlva, or the king of the country of the Sâlves, is to be called Sâlveya &c. Kâtyâyana notices here an omission; the name Pândya is no explained by Pâñini. Kâtyâyana therefore adds, “one sprung from an individual of the tribe of the Pândus or the king of the country, should be called a Pândya.” Similarly, Pâñini tells us that in either of these senses no termination should be appended to the word Kambôja, which was the name of a non-Aryan people in the north-west, nor should any of its vowels be changed, but the word Kambôja itself means “one sprung from an individual of the Kambôja tribe, or the king of the country of the Kambôjas.” Kâtyâyana says that in this rule, the expression “and others” should be added to the word Kambôjas; for the rule applies also to the names Cholas and others,” that is, persons sprung from an individual of the Chola and other tribes, and the kings of the Chola and other countries should be called by the names “Chola and others.” Similarly Pâñini tells us that the countries Kumudvat, Naçvat, and Vetsas are so called because they contain Kumudas or water-lilies, Naça or reeds, and Vetas or canes, respectively. Kâtyâyana adds “Mahishmat is so called because it contains Mahilas or buffaloes.

1 In the so-called Pâñiniya Sûkshâ the expression Saurâshtrikâ nàri or “a woman of Saurâshtrâ” occurs. But this should by no means be regarded as showing that Pâñini was acquainted with Saurâshtrâ. The Pâñiniya Sûkshâ cannot be the work of Pâñini; it is the author of that treatise begins by stating that he is going to explain Sûkshâ according to the views of Pâñini and ends with a few verses in praise of the great grammarian. Besides, the author notices the Prâkrit dialects to which there is no allusion whatever in Pâñini’s great work and writes in verse. Grammatical treatises in verse are later than those in the form of Sûtras. The Pâñiniya Sûkshâ therefore must have been composed long after Pâñini.

2 See the passages cited above.

3 Pândor dyan, which is a Vârtika on Pâñ. IV., 1, 168.

4 Pâñ. IV., 1, 175.

5 Pâñ. IV., 2, 87.
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Now Mahishmat appears to be the same southern country which in the Purânas is associated with Mahārāṣṭra and is called Mahishakas. Mahishmati on the banks of the Narmadâ was probably its capital. Here we may, I think, argue, as Professor Goldstucker has done in many similar cases, that had Pâṇini known the Pâṇḍyas, Cholas, and Mahishmat, he would not have omitted the names from his rules, considering how careful a grammarian he was. Very likely, then, he did not know them, and this supposition is strengthened by the fact alluded to above that the name of no other southern country occurs in his Sûtras. Thus then the Aryas of the north were not familiar with the southern countries and tribes in the time of Pâṇini, but were so in the time of Kâtyâyana. The latter author also mentions a town of the name of Nâsikya, which is very likely the same as our modern Nâsik.

Pâṇini shows an intimate acquaintance with the south. As a grammarian he thinks it his duty to notice the lingual usages in the south and tells us that in Dakhiniapatha the word Sursâ is used to denote large lakes. He mentions Mahishmati, Vadarbha, Ichipurâ—the modern Conjeveram, and Kerala or Malabar. Pâṇini’s date, B.C. 150, may now be relied upon. That author gives variant readings of Kâtyâyana’s Vârtikas as found in the usages by the schools of the Bhâradvâjâyas, Saunâgas, and others. Some of these might be considered as emendations of the Pâṇini’s introduction of them by the verb hantî, “they read,” is an indication that he regarded them as current readings. A sufficiently long time therefore must have passed between Kâtyâyana and Pâṇini to give rise to these variants or emendations. I am therefore inclined to accept the prevalent tradition which refers Kâtyâyana to the time of the Nandas who preceded the Mauryas, and to assign to him the first half of the fourth century before Christ. In this manner the interval between Kâtyâyana and Pâṇini was about two hundred years. 

Now, Professor Goldstucker has shown from an examination of the Vârtikas that certain grammatical forms are not noticed by Pâṇini but are taught by Kâtyâyana, and concludes that they did not exist in the language in Pâṇini’s time. I have followed up the argument my lectures “on the Sanskrit and Prâkrit languages,” and given from the Vârtikas several ordinary instances of such forms. From these one of two conclusions only is possible, viz., either that Pâṇini was a very careless and ignorant grammarian, or that the forms did exist in the language in his time. The first is of course inadmissible, wherefore the second must be accepted. I have also seen from a passage in the introduction to Pâṇini’s Mahâbhâṣya, that verbal forms such as those of the Perfect which are taught Pâṇini as found in the Bhâshâ or current language, not the hindasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Kâtyâyana and Pâṇini, and participles had come to be used read. Professor Goldstucker has also given a list of words used Pâṇini in his Sûtras in a sense which became obsolete in the

---

In a Vârtika on Pân. VI, 1, 63. 2 Mahâbhâṣya on Pân., I., I, 19.
IV., 2, second Âihnika. 6 IV., I, fourth Âihnika.
1 See the passage in the first Âihnika beginning with Astyauprayuktah.
The Āryas penetrated to the Dekkan after the beginning of about the seventh century B.C.

The Aryas penetrated to the Dekkan after the beginning of about the seventh century B.C.

Chronological value of the epics.
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time of Kātyāyana, and shown what portion of Sanskrit literature did not probably exist in Pāṇini's time but was known to Kātyāyana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was so great that certain literary works which either did not exist in Pāṇini's time or were not old to him came to be considered by Kātyāyana to be as old as those which were old to Pāṇini. No less an interval of time than about three centuries can account for all these circumstances. Pāṇini, therefore, must have flourished in the beginning of the seventh century before the Christian era, if not earlier still; and against this conclusion I believe no argument has been or can be brought except a vague prejudice. And now to our point, the Indian Āryas had thus no knowledge of Southern India previous to the seventh century before Christ; they had gone as far as the Northern Circars by the eastern route, but no farther, and the countries directly to the south of the Vindhya they were not familiar with. About that time, however, they must have begun to penetrate still further, since they had already settled in or communication with the countries on the northern skirts of Vindhya and Kalinga, and first settled in Vidarbha or Be, approaching it still, it would appear, by the eastern route; but the course of some time more they crossed the Vindhya and settled in Daṇḍakāryaṇya along the banks of the Godāvari, that is, Mahārāṣṭra or the Dekkan. Before B.C. 350 they had become familiar with the whole country down to Tanjor and Madura.

A chronological conclusion based on the occurrence of certain words or names in the great epics is not likely to be so: though a Mahābhārata existed before Pāṇini and Āśvalāyana, is highly questionable whether our present text is the same as that which existed in their times. On the contrary, the probability that the work has been added to from time to time; and the text it has undergone such corruption that no one can be positively certain that a particular word was not foisted into it in comparison with modern times. The text of the Rāmāyana also has become corrupt, though additions do not seem to have been made to it. Still the Bengali recension of the poem like the Bengali recensions of more recent works does contain additions. The text prevalent in part of the country and in the south is more reliable; and though innumerable differences of reading exist in the different manuscripts even on this side, still there is hardly any material difference. The date of the Rāmāyana is uncertain; the present Hindu belief based on the Purāṇas is that Rāma's incarnation is older than Krishna's, and consequently the Rāmāyana older than Mahābhārata; but it is not a little curious that while there is allusion to Vāsudeva and Arjuna and to Yudhishthira in Pāṇini, Patañjalī frequently brings in Mahābhārata characters in illustrations and examples, there is not one allusion to Rāma or his brothers or their father Daśaratha in the works of those grammarians. Even a much later author, Amarasiṃha, the lexicographer, in his of the synonyms of Viṣṇu, gives a good many names derived from Krishna incarnation, but the name of Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, does not occur, though Rāma or Balabhadra, the brother of Krishna, is mentioned. Still, whatever chronological value may be attached
the circumstance, the occurrence of the names of places in the epics I have already to some extent noticed. Sahadeva is represented to have subdued the Pândyas, Udras, Keralas, and Andhras, and also to have visited Aishkindha, which was probably situated somewhere near Hampi, the site of the Pampâ lake or river, where Râma met Sugrîva the monkey chief, though the country Kaishkindha is placed among those near the Vindhyas. He went also to Surparaka, the modern Supara near Eassein, Dāndaka, the same as Jâjakârânya but not mentioned as a forest, Karahâtaka the modern Khâda on the confines of the Krishnâ and the Koinâ, and others. The countries mentioned in the passage in the Râmâyana, ded to above, as lying to the south are Utkala, probably the modern Ganjam, Kalinga, Daśârna, Avantî, Vidarbha, and others. The district near Bhilsâ must have been called Daśârâna in ancient times; for its capital was Vidiśâ, which was situated, as stated by Pidâsa in the Meghadûta, on the Vetravatî or Betvâ and is thus identified with the modern Bhilsâ. All these are thus in the vicinity of the Vindhyas and nearly in the same line with it farther east. Between these and the southernmost countries of the Cholas, Udyas, and Keralas, the Râmâyana mentions no other place or country but Dândakârânya. This condition of the country, as obtained before, is to be considered as previous to the Aryan settlers in the Dekkan, while that represented by the Mahâbhârata the place indicated seems subsequent, whatever may be the chronological relation between the two epics. One thing is, however, that the name Mahârâṣhtra does not occur in either of them.

In the middle of the third century before Christ, Asoka, the great king of the Maurya dynasty reigning at Pâtaliputra in Magadha, makes in his rock-inscriptions, which are found at Girnâr in Gujârat on the west, and Dhauli in Katak and Jagad in Orissa on the eastern coast, and also at Khalsi in the Himâlaya and Kâhbâz-giri in Afghanistan, of his having sent ministers of religion to the Râṣṭikas and the Petenikas and to the Aparântas, the last which we know best is Northern Konkan, the capital of which was Sûrparaka. Petenikas is not unlikely the same as Paiânakas, i.e., the people or country about Paithana on the Godâvari. The vernacular pronunciation of the name of the city, which in Sanskrit is Pratishtâna, was in those days, as it now is, Paithana Paithana, for both the author of the Periplus and Ptolemy call Paithana or Baithana. The Râṣṭikas, the Sanskrit of which name Râshtrakûtas, were very likely the people of Mahârâṣhtra, for a tribe of that name of Râṭhas has from the remotest times held political premincy in the Dekkan. One branch of it assumed the name of Aushra and governed the country before the Châlukyas acquired power. It re-established itself after about three centuries, but had to yield to the Châlukyas again after some time. In later times, the name of Râṭhas governed Sugandhavarti or Saunstti in the Belgaum districts. In the thirteenth edict the Petenikas are associated with Bhojas instead of Râṣṭikas. Bhojas, we know,

---

1 Sabhap. Chap. 31.
ruled over the country of Vidarbha or Berår¹ and also in other parts of the Dekkan. In the inscriptions in the caves at Kudá,² the name “Mahâbhôja” or Great Bhoja occurs several times, and once in an inscription at Bedâs. Just as the Bhojas called themselves Mahâbhôjas, the Râshâtrikas, Raṭîs, Raṭhîs, or Raṭhas called themselves Mahârâthhis or Mahârâthhas, as will be shown below and thus the country in which they lived came to be called Mahârâththa, the Sanskrit of which is Mahârâshtra. In the second and the thirteenth edicts, the outlying provinces of the Cho Pâudyas, Ketalaputras (Chera or Kerala), and the Andhras and Pulindas are mentioned. Thus about a hundred years bef Patañjali the whole of the southern peninsula up to Cape Comô was in direct communication with the north, and the Dekô or Mahârâshtra had regular kingdoms governed by Raṭtas or Bhojas.

In the Mahâvaîmsô, a Ceylonese chronicle which was written in third quarter of the fifth century of the Christian era, and in Dîpavâîmsô, which is much older, the Buddhist saint Moggalipu, who conducted the proceedings of the third convocation said have been held in the time of Aşoka, is represented to have some missionaries to Mahârâththa, Aparantaka, and Vanavâsi.³ Whet, the name Mahârâththa or Mahârâshtra had come into use in time of Aşoka does not appear clear from this, but that it was used in the early centuries of the Christian era admits of little doubt. In some inscriptions in the cave-temples at Bhâjâ, Bed and Kârli which are to be referred to the second century, male donors are called Mahâraṭhi and the female Mahârâththini, whose names, as observed before, correspond to Mahâbhôja and Mahâbhî and signify the great Raṭhi (man and woman).⁴ Similarly, in the large cave at Nânâghâṭ, a Mahâraṭhi hero is mentioned. Of old Prâkrits the principal one was called Mahârâshtri, because they are told it was the language of Mahârâshtra. We have a poet in this dialect entitled Setubandha attributed to Kâlidâsa, as mentioned by Dândin, and a collection of amorous verses attributed to Śâlavâhana. It is the language of Prâkrit verses put into mouths of women in Sanskrit dramatic plays. Its grammar have in Vararuchi’s Prâkrit Prakāśa, but the date of this author is uncertain. Though the date of Kâlidâsa has not yet been satisfactorily determined, still he is mentioned as a poet of greater

¹ In the Daśakumâraracharita, the family of Bhojas has been represented as having held sway over the Vidarbha country for a long time.
² Kudá inscriptions Nos. 1, 9, 17, 19, 23, and Bedâs No. 2; Arch. Surv. of West Ind., No. 10.
³ Mahâvaîmsô, Turnour’s Ed., pp. 71 and 72, and Dîpavâîmsô, Oldenberg’s Ed. p. 54. The latter however omits Vanavâsi.
⁴ Arch. Surv. of West Ind. No. 10; Bhâjâ No. 2; Bedâs No. 2; Kârli Nos. 10 and 14. Pandit Bhagvânâlî appears to me clearly wrong here in taking Mahârâshtri to be equal to the Sk. Mahârâththi and translating it as “a great warrior,” for in Bed No. 2, a woman is called Mahârâththini where the word certainly cannot mean a great warrior, and to interpret it as “the wife or daughter of a great warrior” is simply begging the question. Mahârâththi appears clearly to be the name of a tribe and the same as our modern Marâthâ. It will appear from this inscription that the intermarriages between the Mahâbhôjas and the Mahârâthhis, for the latter mentioned in this inscription was the daughter of a Mahâbhôja and a Mahârâththi or the wife of a Mahârâththi.
merit in the first half of the seventh century by Bāna in his Harshacharita in the north,1 and in an inscription at Aiholi2 dated 556 Saka in the south. A hundred years is not too long a period to allow for the spread of his fame throughout the country, perhaps is too short. Kālidāsa may therefore be referred to that period of Sanskrit literature in which the nine gems flourished, and which has been placed by Dr. Kern in the first half of the sixth century.3 The Mahārāṣṭra dialect, therefore, in which Kālidāsa wrote the Setubandha and the Prākrit verses in his plays must have undergone a course of cultivation for about two or three centuries earlier and been called by that name, since it has been known by no other in the whole literature. Varāhamihira also, who lived in the beginning of the sixth century, speaks of Mahārāṣṭra as a southern country; and in the Aiholi inscription saihed above Mahārāṣṭra is mentioned as comprising three Dantries and ninety-nine thousand villages. Hwan Thsang, the Chinese traveller, calls the country ruled over by the Chāluikyas in second quarter of the seventh century, Moholocha, which has side properly identified with Mahārāṣṭra. The occurrence of the name of Mahārāṣṭra in the Purānas has already been noticed.

SECTION IV.

POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN OR MAHĀRĀṢṬRA—ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE CAVE-TEMPLES OF WESTERN INDIA.

No clue to the political history of Mahārāṣṭra in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era is now available. The Purānas contain lists of kings and dynasties whose chronology has in some extent determined by their known connection with successors of Alexander the Great; but traces of their occupation the south have not yet been found. Chandragupta, who founded the Maurya dynasty in about B.C. 320, ruled over Northern India far as Kāthiavād, and his grandson Aśoka, who reigned from B.C. 269 to B.C. 227, retained possession of the province.4 The rock-inscriptions of the latter, which were evidently planted on the frontiers his dominions, show that his empire extended to Kalinga or the northern Circars in the east and Kāthiavād in the west. He does not seem to have ruled farther south. For in his inscriptions he speaks of his dominions generally as "the conquered countries," while he gives the names of such as did not acknowledge his sovereignty. Hence the Rāṣṭikas, the Bhojas, the Petroikas, the Volas, the Pandyas, and others were not subject to his power. If he had ruled over Mahārāṣṭra or the Dekkan we should have an inscription of his somewhere.5 But Vidarbha must have been listed as a separate kingdom about that time. For in the

1 Dr. Hall’s Vāsavadattā, Preface, p. 14. 2 Ind. Ant. Vol. VIII., p. 243. 3 Ed. of Varāhamihira, Preface, p. 20. 4 See inscription of Rudradaman; Ind. Ant. Vol. VII, p. 260, line 5. 5 Since this was written the discoveries of Mr. Campbell and Pandit Bhagyālāl at uparā were announced. It would appear from the fragment of the eighth edict found the place that Aśoka’s power extended down the coast up to Suparā, but the statement in the text about Mahārāṣṭra or Dekkan remains true.
been called at the time. There also is given an account of his charities similar to that in the first of his Nâsik inscriptions. In an inscription at Junnar, Ayama, the minister of the lord Nahapâna the great Kshatrapa, is mentioned as having caused a tank to be dug and a hall to be constructed. The minister appears to have been a Brâhman, since he is spoken of as belonging to the Vatsa Gotra.

Next in order come the inscriptions in which certain kings of the names of Gotamiputra Sātakarni and Pulumâyi are mentioned. In the longest of the four occurring in the cave-temple, at one extremity of the hill at Nâsik, we are told that in the nineteenth year of the reign of king Pulumâyi, the son of Vâsi śâthi, the cave was caused to be constructed and dedicated for the use of Buddhist mendicants of the Bhadrâyanâya sect by Gotamâ, the mother of king Sātakarnâ Gotamiputra. She is there called "the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king." Gotamiputra is spoken of as king of kings and ruler of Asîka, Aśmaka, Mâlaka, Surâshṭra, Kukura, Aparânta, Anûpa Vidarbha and Akarâvânti. He was the lord of the mountain Vindhyâvat, Pârijâtra, Sahya, Krishnâgiri, Malaya, Mahendra S'reshthagiri, and Chakora. His orders were obeyed by a large circle of kings, and his feet were adored by them. His burden drank the waters of the three seas. He protected all who sought an asylum with him, and regarded the happiness and misery of his subjects as his own. He paid equal attention to the three objects of human pursuit, viz., duty, worldly prosperity, and the satisfaction of desires, appointing certain times and places for each. He was the abode of learning, the support of good men, the home of glory, the source of good manners, the only person skilled, the only archer, the only hero, the only protector of men. He conferred upon Brâhmans the means of increasing the race, and stemmed the progress of the confusion of castes. His exploits rivalled those of Râma, Keśava, Arjuna, and Bhûmase, and his prowess was equal to that of Nabhâga, Nahusha, Jamâlây, Sagara, Yayâti, Rāma, and Ambarisha. He was descend from a long line of kings. He vanquished the host of his enemies in innumerable battles, quelled the boast and pride of Kshatriyas; destroyed the Sakas, Yavanas, and Palhavas, left no trace of the race of Khagârâta, and re-established the glory of the S'atavahana family. In the last line of the inscription mention is made of the grant of a village for the support of the establishment in the cave-temple.

In a later inscription engraved in smaller characters below the Vâsisthâputra Śrî Pulumâvi, the lord of Navanara, issues orders to his lieutenant in Govardhana, Sarvakshadalana. He calls attention to the fact that the village granted by the "lord of Dha...
Govardhana, informing him that the king has granted a field measuring 200 Nivartanas, which was up to that time in the possession of one Ushabhadâta, for the benefit of recluses. The charter here engraved is represented to have been originally issued in the year 18, that is, in the year preceding that in which the cave-temple was completed and dedicated. Below it is inscribed another charter issued in the form of an order by the Sàtakarni, the governor of Govardhana, by the queen of Gotamiputra, who is also called the royal mother. She therein speaks of a field granted before, probably the one conveyed by the present charter, and says that it measures one hundred Nivartanas, and she assigns another hundred by this charter out of a field belonging to the crown which was her patrimony. It appears that two hundred Nivartanas were granted by the first charter, but probably it turned out that the field measured one hundred only; hence the second now makes it up by granting another hundred out of another field.

The date of this grant is 24, i.e., it was made six years after the first. Besides these, there are two inscriptions at Nâsik recording the donations of private individuals, dated in the second and seventh years of the reign of Siri (Sîra) Pulunâyi, and two in the cave at Kriyâmali, dated in the seventh and twenty-fourth years of his reign. Since Gotâmî is spoken of as the mother of a king and the grandmother of a king, and the wife of her son Gotamiputra Sàtakarni is presented as the mother of a king, and since the only other king besides Sàtakarni mentioned in those inscriptions is Pulumâyi, it seems that this last was the grandson and son respectively of the two ladies. He was therefore the son and his mother Vâsishtî, wife of Gotamiputra Sàtakarni. Sàtakarni issued the charter in the second inscription in the year 18, which must be the sixteenth year of Pulunâyi's reign, since dates referring to his reign are found at Nâsik and Kâlî and not to that of Gotamiputra. The date of the large inscription noticed above in which Gotamiputra's great deeds are recorded is referred to Pulunâyi's reign. And the grant of the village alluded to in that inscription

Pandit Bhágvänlîl and Dr. Bühler, whose transcripts and translations of the two inscriptions have just appeared, read the expression thus understood by me as राजस्वाभिषेक; But what the Sâmanas or Buddhist priests, who, was situated hundreds of miles away on the lower Krishna, have to do with the matter of the granting of a village near Nâsik to the dravyânya mendicants of the place it is impossible to conceive. The expression राजस्वाभिषेक, I think, be taken as प्राचीनस्वाभिषेक for the Sanskrit प्राचीनस्वाभिषेक or प्राचीनवृत्ति, corresponding to महावृत्ति in the first part of No. 23, the Sanskrit of प्राचीनस्वाभिषेक. The form सामनस्वाभिषेक must have come into use on the analogy of प्राचीनस्वाभिषेक for प्राचीनवृत्ति and राजस्वाभिषेक for राजवृत्ति.

1 Nos. 3 and 27, Ibid.
2 No. 25, Ibid.
3 Nos. 14 and 20, Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
and the one below appears to have been made by Gotamiputra, since he is spoken of as "the lord of Dhanakaṭaka," though the portion of the rock containing the words that would have rendered the sense clear has been cut away. Gotami is spoken of as dedicating the cave in the present tense, wherefore it must be understood she was alive at the time. The father and the son appear thus to have reigned at the same time, the son on this side of the country since the inscriptions are dated in his reign, and the father at Dhanakaṭaka, which has been identified with Dharanikot in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency. And this is confirmed by the fact, mentioned above, of Gotami's having been called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

Since the charter of the year 24, intended as supplementary to that 18, was issued by Vāsiṣṭhi, while the first was issued by her husband it appears probable that Gotamiputra had died in the interval at Vāsiṣṭhi reigned as regent at the capital, while Pulumāyi continued to govern the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra. The years given in a charter must be those of Pulumāyi, since even the large inscriptions is dated in the nineteenth year of his reign. These kings belong to the Śatavāhana dynasty.

A large number of coins of copper and lead were discovered a years ago, buried in what appears to have once been a Budd

---

1 Dr. Buhler (Arch, Surv, of West. Ind., Vol. IV., p. 110,) supposes me to rested my conclusion as regards this point on this statement alone, and calls mistake. But he will find my other reasons also stated in the remarks at the end my article in the Transactions of the Oriental Congress of 1874. And even statement has a very high corroborative value. For, if the object of the writer to represent Gotami's "special claim" to honour, that is better served by supposing her son and grandson were great kings at one and the same time. If the son dead, no object is gained as regards this point by saying she was the mother of a son that is not gained by saying she was the grandmother of a living great king. And if it was a fact that Gotamiputra was dead when the cave-temple was dedicated and Pulumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter celebrated in the inscription, but there is not a word in praise of him. If Pulumāyi became king only after Gotamiputra, the latter must have died nineteenth year before the dedication of the temple, and it certainly is not what one would expect that the manner and motive of Hindu inscription-writers would expect that a king had been dead for nineteen years should be highly extolled in the inscription and reigning king altogether passed over in silence.

2 No. 19, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI and Vol. XII., p. 409. In the first copy name is clearly Sakasena, but in the second, which is Pandit Bhagavānī's rub, something like an effaced mark for the vowel ī appears above the first two consonants The Pandit, therefore, reads the name as Sri Sensa for Sri Senaya, but the distinct even in his copy. Śīki cannot mean anything, wherefore it appears that distinct marks which do not occur in the first copy are due to some flaw in the rub and do not represent the vowel ī. Dr. Bhu Daji also read the name as Sakasena That this is the correct reading will appear in the sequel.

3 Nos. 4 and 44, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI.

stūpa at Kolhāpur. Another hoard had been found some time previous in about the same locality. The legends on those coins are in characters the forms of which greatly resemble those in the cave inscriptions above noticed. They are as follows:

- Rāṇī Vasīthiputasa Viṅgivāyakurasa.
- Rāṇī Gotamiputasa Viṅgivāyakurasa.
- Rāṇī Maṣṭhariputasa Sevalakurasa.

Here we have the same names as before; but the words Viṅgivāyakurasa and Sevalakurasa have not yet been interpreted by any student of Indian antiquities. On a former occasion I put forth a conjecture that they were the names of the viceroys of those kings appointed to govern the country about Kolhāpur. For, coins of two of these princes and of a few others belonging to the same dynasty are found near Dharaṇikot in the Gantur district about the site of Dhanakataka, the old capital. The legends on these do not contain those words, and the coins are of a different type from those found at Kolhāpur. In this last, therefore, it appeared to me, were struck on this side of the country, and consequently bore the names of the viceroys under the authority they were issued. The truth of this conjecture I purport to demonstrate further on.

Thus then, from these inscriptions and coins we arrive at the names of the following kings, arranged in the chronological order indicated by the forms of the characters used:

- Krishnarāja.
- Sātakarni.
- Kshaharāta Nahapāna and his son-in-law Ushavadātā.
- Gotamiputra Sātakarni.
- Vāsisthiputra Pulumāyi.
- Gotamiputra Śrī Yajñi Sātakarni.
- Maṣṭhariputra Śakasena.

besides these, we have the name of Simuka Śṭātavāhana, a king who reigned earlier than the second in the above list. We shall assign to him his proper place in the list.

SECTION V.


The first thing that will strike one on looking at the list given at the end of the last section, is that the name Kshaharāta Nahapāna, not Indian but foreign. The title Kshatrāpa or Mahākshatrāpa used in the case of that king, is not Indian, though it is the Skt. form of a foreign one, very likely the Persian Sātrag, from the statement in the inscription of Gotamiputra that he strove the Sakas, Yavana and Palhava, it appears that the country was at that time very much exposed to the inroads of these invaders. Yavana were the Bactrian Greeks, but Kshaharāta Nahapāna does not look a Greek name. He must, therefore, have on either a Śaka or Palhava. Again, we are told, that

Gotamiputra left no remnant of the race of Khagārāta or Khakhārāta which name seems to be the same as Kshalarāta or Khaharatā as it is spelled in the Kārli and Junnar inscriptions. It follows, therefore, that the Sakas or Palhavas made themselves masters of the country some time between the second king in the above list and Gotamiputra Satakarni, and that they were driven out by Gotamiputra who, by thus recovering the provinces lost to his dynasty, re-established, as stated in the inscription, the glory of the Satavahana race to which he belonged. All the other kings named above belonged to that dynasty.

Now, in the Purānas we have lists of kings and dynasties that ruled over the country. The earliest dynasty with which we are here concerned is the Maurya founded by Chandragupta in B.C. 320 as determined by his relations with Seleucus, one of the generals and successors of Alexander the Great. It ruled over Northern India for 137 years according to the Purānas, and the last king Brihadra ṣa was murdered by his general Pushyamitra or Pushpamitra, who founded the Śrīga dynasty. This was in power for 112 years, was succeeded by the Kāṇva family which ruled for forty-five years. The Kāṇvas were overthrown by Sipraka, Sindhuka, or Śisuka, he is variously named, who founded what the Purānas call the dynasty of the Andhrabhṛtyas, that is, Andhrs who were servants or dependents. The second king of this dynasty was Kṛṣṇa, according to all, the third was Śatakarni or Śrīśatakarni according to the Vāyu or Vishnu, while the Bhāgavata corrupts the name slightly to Śātakarnas. The Mātsya interposes three more kings between Śaṅkha and Śatakarni, while the Vishnu has another Śatakarni correspond with that of the Mātsya. Gotamiputra is the thirteenth prince according to the Vāyu, fifteenth according to the Bhāgavata, seventeenth according to the Vishnu, and twenty-second according to the Mātsya. Pulimat, Purimat, or Pulomat was his successor, according to the Vishnu, the Bhāgavata, or the Mātsya. These so many misstatements for the Purāṇas omit his name altogether. His successor was Śiva, according to the Vishnu and the Mātsya, while the Bhāgavata does not notice him. Yajña Śrī was in all, being placed after Śivaskandha, the successor of Śiva Śrī, all except the Vāyu, which assigns to him the next place after Gotamiputra.

Thus then, the names occurring in the inscriptions and on coins as well as the order sufficiently agree with those given in the Purāṇas under the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty to justify us in believing that the kings mentioned in both are the same. The name Madriputra Sakasena does not occur in the Purāṇas; and he appears to have belonged to a branch of the dynasty. We shall here assign to him his place in the list. Simuka, whose name occurs on the Nānāghāṭ inscription, and who, as I have already observed, was an earlier occupant of the throne than the reigning prince Śatakarni, the third in the Purānic list, must be the same Sisuka, the founder of the dynasty. For the Devanāgarī often so carelessly written as to look like sa; hence the name Sisuka was corrupted to Sisuka, Sisuka, or Śisuka, in the course of time. The Sindhuka of the Vāyu and the Sipraka of...
Vishnu are further corruptions. This identification is rendered probable also by the consideration that he who caused the cave to be constructed, and the statues of himself and the younger princes to be carved, might, to give dignity to his race, be expected to get the founder of the dynasty also represented there, especially as he was removed only one degree from him. In this manner, the Andhrabhritiya dynasty of the Purāṇas is the same as the Śātavāhana dynasty of the inscriptions.

SECTION VI.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE ANDHRABHRIYAS OR ŚĀTAVĀHANAS.

The next question we have to consider is as regards the dates of these princes. In my paper on the Nāsik cave inscriptions, I have accepted A. D. 319 as the date of Gotamiputra’s accession, arrived at by taking B. C. 315 as the year in which Chandragupta founded the dynasty of the Mauryas at Pātaliputra, and 664 years to have elapsed between him and Gotamiputra, since the periods assigned in the Purāṇas to that dynasty and the subsequent ones, and the durations of the reigns of the Andhrabhritiya princes who preceded Gotamiputra according to the Mātysya, when added, give 664. The “race of Khağārāta,” which Gotamiputra is, as observed before, represented in one of the Nāsik inscriptions to have exterminated, I identified with the dynasty of the Kshatrapas whose coins are found in Kāṭhiāvād, as well as a few inscriptions, since Kshaharāta or Khağārāta was also a Kshatrapa and had been placed at the head of his dynasty by previous writers. The latest date on the coins of the princes then known was 250, which referred to the Śaka era, p. 328. This comes so close to Gotamiputra’s A. D. 319, that two seemed to corroborate each other. But there are several objections to this view, some of which occurred to me even then.

The inscriptions and coins of the Kshatrapa dynasty concur arguing the genealogy backward to Chashtana and no further, as yet nothing has turned up to show that any connection existed between him and Nahapāna. (2)—If the Kshatrapa or Kshatrapa dynasty held sway over Mahārāṣṭra for about three hundred and eighty years as it did over Kāṭhiāvād, we might reasonably expect to find that country inscriptions or coins of most of the princes, but a few coins of the later ones only have been discovered in a village near Karadh and no inscription whatever. (3)—Rudradāman in his Jāgad inscription calls a Śātakarni, “lord of Dakshināpatha,” which would not have done if he had been the ruler of even a part of the Dekkan. (4)—And the dates occurring on some Satrap coins recently discovered are said to be 300 and 304, which referred to the Śaka are A. D. 378 and 382, that is, the Satraps were in power even after A. D. 340, which is the date of Gotamiputra’s death according to the Purāṇic accounts. For these reasons it would appear that the “race” of Khağārāta or Nahapāna which Gotamiputra put an end to and which ruled over this country before him, could not have been the dynasty of the Satraps. (5)—Besides, according
to my former view, the interval between Nahapāna and Gotamiputra is about 200 years; but the difference in form between the characters in Ushavadāta's and Gotamiputra's inscriptions is not great enough for that period. Hence the two princes must be brought closer together.

From the Greek geographer Ptolemy we learn that in his time the country inland from the western coast was divided into two divisions, of which the northern was governed by Siro Polemios whose capital was Paithyl, and the southern by Baleocuros who lived in Hippocura. Siro Polemios is evidently the same name as the Siri Pulumāyi or Pulumāyi of the inscriptions corresponding to the Pulomat, or Pulimat of the Purānas. But there were two kings who bore that name, one the son of Gotamlputra, mentioned in the inscriptions, and another an earlier prince of the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty. This last does not appear to have been a prince of any note; wherefore very likely the former is the one spoken of by Ptolemy. But the question is almost settled by the mention of Baleocuros as the governor of the southern provinces. We have seen that in the legends on the Kolhāpur coins the name Vilivayakura is associated with that of Pulumayi and of Gotamlputra. Vilivayakura is the same as Baleocura, and I have already stated that the reason why his name, in my opinion, occurs along with those of the two princes of the Sātavāhana dynasty, and on Kolhāpur coins alone while it does not occur on those found in the lower Godārī districts, is that he was the viceroy of those princes ruling over the country about Kolhāpur. This country answers to the south division mentioned by the Greek geographer as being governed by Baleocuros. The Siro Polemios therefore of Ptolemy is the same as the Pulumāyi of the inscriptions and coins.

Ptolemy died in A. D. 163, and is said to have written his last work after A. D. 151. Pulumāyi, therefore, must have been on the throne some time before this last date. We will now proceed to reconcile this date with those mentioned in the inscriptions, and to determine more particularly the date of Pulumāyi's accession. Some of Ushavadāta's benefactions were founded in the years 40, 41, and the latest date connected with Nahapāna is that in the inscription of his minister Ayama at Junnar, viz., 46. These dates show that I think, be referred to the Śaka era. For, we have seen that before the time of Gotamilputra, the country was subject to the inroads of the Šakas and other foreign tribes, and the Scythians who are identified with the Šakas had, according to the Greek geographers, established a kingdom in Sind and even in Rājputanā. The era known by name of the Šaka and referred to in all the early copper-plate grants as the era of the Šaka king or kings must have been established the most powerful of the Šaka invaders,1 who for the first time obt

---

1 Prof. Oldenberg thinks Kanishka to be the founder of the era; but this view I think, untenable. (1)—A dynasty of three kings only cannot perpetuate an era. The dynasty of the Guptas composed of seven kings was in power for more than a hundred and fifty years, but their era died a natural death in the course of a century. (2)—The characters in Kanishka's inscriptions, especially the conjoined with a preceding consonant, are later than those we find in the first centuries. (3)—There is no ground to believe that Kanishka reigned over Gujarāt and Mahārāṣṭra, but the Šaka era began to be used very early, especially in the last count
ed a permanent footing in the country, and Nahapâna and Chashtana\(^1\) or his father must have been his Satraps appointed to rule over Western India, and Mâlvâ. On this supposition the latest date of Nahapâna must correspond to A. D. 124. Gotamiputra or Pulumâyi therefore must have acquired possession of this country after that year. The earliest date of Pulumâyi occurring in the inscriptions is the second year of his reign; and since the inscription could not have borne that date if Nahapâna or his successor had been in power, it is clear that Pulumâyi began to reign after the overthrow of the latter. Now, we also learn from Ptolemy that Tiastenes reigned at Ozene about the time when he wrote, and was therefore a contemporary of Pulumâyi. Tiastenes has, I think, been reasonably identified with Chashtana. But according to the Junâgad inscription noticed above, Chashtana's grandson Rudradâman was the reigning prince in the year 72, which, taking the era to be the Saka, is 150 A. D. Chashtana and Pulumâyi therefore could not have been contemporaries in 150 A. D. Ptolemy's account must, in consequence, refer to a period much earlier, i.e. to about the year 132 A. D., since about eighteen or twenty years at least must be supposed to have elapsed between the date of his information when Chashtana was on the throne and the year 150 A. D. when his grandson was in possession of it, his son Jayadâman having occupied it for some time in the interval. Again, in the nineteenth year of Pulumâyi, Gotamiputra was in possession, according to the large inscription at Nâisk, of a\(^2\)id many of those provinces which, according to the Junâgad inscription, were conquered and ruled over by Rudradâman. The 72 in the inscription seems to refer to the sweeping away by a storm and excessive rain of the dyke on one side of the lake there mentioned and not to the cutting of the inscription on the rock. That it is doubtful whether Rudradâman had conquered those provinces before 72 or did so after 72 and before the inscription of his grandson; that he conquered them before 72, the nineteenth year of Pulumâyi must correspond at least to the second or third year before A. D. 150, that is, Pulumâyi must have begun to reign, at the latest, about the year A. D. 130. And his accession must not be placed much later, for the interval between Chashtana

\(^{1}\)The Guptas whose gold coinage is a close imitation of that of the Indo-Sceythian dynasty, came to power in A. D. 319: while the last of the three kings Kanishka, Vasudeva, and Vajiraksha, were, if the reign of the first began in A. D. 78, have ceased to reign about A. D. 178, i.e. about 100 years after the foundation of the dynasty. And the latest date of Vasudeva is 89. If so, an interval of 140 years must have elapsed between the last of the Indo-Sceythian kings and the first Gupta; but the close resemblance in the coinage necessitates the supposition that it was much shorter. Sir John Marshall's statement that the initial date of the Gupta era was 241 Saka, i.e. 319 A. D., has been pronounced unreliable by some antiquarians. As to this point and the era of the Satrap dates, see Appendix A.\

\(^{2}\)Professor Oldenberg considers Chashtana to be a Satrap appointed by Gotamiputra, supposition which is unwarrantable, since a prince like Gotamiputra whose aim was to expel and destroy foreigners cannot be expected to appoint a foreigner, as Chashtana's name indicates he was, to be a viceroy, and to use a foreign title, and we have no exact parallel to this. If the title was given to Rudradâman, the grandson of Chashtana, appointed, as we see from his Junâgad inscription, a Palhava of the name of Suvishaka, who was the son of Gularpa, to govern Sursâstra and Anarta. This circumstance confirms what we gather from other sources, namely, that this was a dynasty of princes of a foreign origin, who had adopted Hindu manners and even names and were domiciled in the country.
who was Pulumāyī's contemporary and his grandson Rudradāman who was reigning in 150 A.D. will be considerably shortened. Nahapāna or his successor must thus have been overthrown by Gotamiputra or Pulumāyī about five or six years at the most after his latest recorded date, viz. A.D. 124.

The history of the relations of these princes appears to be this. Nahapāna was a Satrap ruling over Mahārāṣṭra. His capital was probably Junnar since the inscriptions at the place show the town to have been in a flourishing condition about that time, and we have a record there of the gift of his minister. He must have died soon after 46 Saka or A.D. 124. Gotamiputra and Pulumāyī came from the south-east to regain the provinces lost to their family, overthrew Nahapāna’s successor, whoever he was, killed all his heirs, and re-established their power over this side of the country. This appears to be what is meant by Gotamiputra’s having been represented in the Nāsik inscription to have “left no remnant of the race of Khaḍarāt,” and to have “reigned the prestige of his family.” Chāshṭana founded or belonged to another dynasty of Satraps which reigned at Ujjainī. In the Junāgad inscription, men of all castes are represented to have gone to Rudradāman and chosen him their lord for their protection; ¹ and he is spoken of as having re-established the kingdom that had been lost, himself assumed the title of the Great Kshatrapa, conquered Akaṇavantī, Anūpa, Surāśṭra, Aparantī and other provinces which, as we have seen, were owned by Gotamiputra, and some more, and as having twice subdued Sātakarnī, the lord of Dakhināpatha, but still not destroyed him in consequence of the remoteness of the connection. The meaning of all this appears to me to be this. Gotamiputra Sātakarnī, after having destroyed Nahapāna or his successor, turned his arms against another dynasty of foreigners that was ruling at Ujjainī. Or the Kshatrapa sovereign of Ujjainī, Chāshṭana, or very probably his son Jayadāman, having observed the growing power of Gotamiputra

¹ The expression is सर्ववर्णराज्यम् रक्षणार्थ पतितेऽवृत्तते. Ind. Ant., Vol. VI p. 260, l. 9.

² In Paṇḍit Bhagvānḷāl’s transcript in Vol. VII, Ind. Ant., the reader will find the expression भए रज्ज्ये रज्ज्ये, which Dr. Buhler says is correct. But in a footnote Dr. Buhler says that the correct reading is रज्ज्ये रज्ज्ये. In Dr. Bhānu Dājī’s copy of the inscription the ज्य्य is disttive, but in a foot-note Dr. Buhler says that the correct reading is ज्य्य.

³ The reading is स्वच्छविद्या. It is allowable to insert त and take it as स्वच्छविद्या. But unless अद्वृत्त अद्वृत्त is altogether unintelligible, we are not authorized in taking it as अद्वृत्त and giving it quite the opposite signification, as the translators of the inscription have done, and in basing a historical inference on this precarious translation, as Professor Oldenberg has done. The composer of this inscription seems to have used the preposition अद्वृत्त as in अद्वृत्त विष्णु “having conquered,” which occurs in this line so that अद्वृत्त is the same as विष्णु and means “far away,” “distant,” and the sense also is good. For, Sātakarnī’s dominions being far away or distant from his capital, Rudradāman did not care whether he remained king or was uprooted.
Pulumāyi who had put an end to a kindred family of rulers, and desirous of preventing his further growth, must have attacked him. A fact such as this must be the basis of the popular stories about a king of Ujjayini having attacked Sālivāhana at Paithan and been defeated by him. Sālivāhana is but another mode of pronouncing Sātavāhana; and Pulumāyi or Gotamiputra was a Sātavāhana. The ruler of Ujjayini was defeated and pursued by the victorious Gotamiputra into his own dominions, when the latter subjugated Avanti, Anūpa, and Surāśṭra, and dethroned Jayadāman. For a time he held sway over the territories owned by Chushtan3, but subsequently Rudradāman collected a band of followers, the same as those that are represented in the inscription as having chosen him their lord, and drove away Gotamiputra Sātakarni. Having regained his kingdom and got himself crowned as Mahākshatrapa, he entered on a career of conquest and wrested from Gotamiputra some of the provinces owned by him. Thus the lord of Dakshināpatha that he conquered was Gotamiputra Sātakarni; but he was not able to pursue his enemy into the heart of his country because he was not powerful enough to do so. The rise of Rudradāman and his conquest took place after the nineteenth year of Pulumāyi’s seign, that is, after about A.D. 149. It is in this way alone that the Sūtras of information derived from the Greek writers and gathered at in inscriptions, coins, and popular legends, as well as the dates, made to harmonize with each other.

But the date thus assigned to Gotamiputra is not consistent with derived from the Mātṛya Purāṇa. Our next endeavour, therefore, must be to ascertain whether none of the Purāṇas agrees sufficiently with the conclusion arrived at, and, if any does, to account for the discrepancy between it and the Mātṛya and others. That there is very little agreement among them as regards the Andharbhṛtya dynasty, I have already indicated above. The thesis of our Purānic literature seems to be this. Certain versified accounts of certain things purporting to be narrated by a bard to a particular deity and to the inculcation of certain doctrines, derived from generation to generation and these were after some time assembled together at a sacrificial session were handed down orally from generation to generation and these were after some time committed to writing. The later Purāṇas, devoted to the exaltation of a particular deity and to the inculcation of certain doctrines, deleted their accounts of these things from the earliest written Purāṇas and not from the oral tradition. Of the works of this class which I am going to compare for our present purpose, the oldest by far to me to be the Vāyu, and next to it the Mātṛya. The Līlāvīla is later, and the Bhāgavata, the latest. The text of the old Purāṇas gradually became corrupt, and the authors of the later Purāṇas in some cases misled by their incorrect readings into writing forth statements at variance with the original account. The four Purāṇas just mentioned contain general statements about the several dynasties, giving the number of princes belonging each and its duration in years, and also mention the names of these princes more particularly, while the Vāyu and the Mātṛya two in addition the number of years for which each reigned.

Dates of the Andharbhṛtyas as determined from the Purānic accounts.

1 Hemachandra’s Prākṛit Grammar.
Often there is a discrepancy between the general and the particular statements. The duration assigned by them all to the Maurya dynasty, founded by Chandragupta whose date as determined by his relations with the successors of Alexander the Great is justly characterised by Professor Max Müller as the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology, is 137 years. The number of reigning princes given by the Vāyu is nine, and by the rest, ten; but the names actually enumerated in the Vishnū only are ten, while the Vāyu and the Bhāgavata give nine, and the Mātsya, only four. The total of the years assigned to each prince by the Vāyu is 133 years, so that it is not unlikely that a short reign of four years may have dropped out from the text of that Purāṇa. Thus the general statement about ten princes and 137 years seems to be corroborated, and it appears pretty clear that the text of the Mātsya has in this case undergone a good deal of corruption. Thus, if with Dr. Kern we take the date 322 B.C. as the date of the foundation of the Maurya dynasty, its overthrow and the foundation of the next or the Śungha family must have occurred in the year 185 B.C. The Śunghas are generally stated in all the Purāṇas to have been ten and to have reigned for 112 years, though the expression used in the Bhāgavata is not “112 years” but “more than a hundred years.” In the actual enumeration the Mātsya omits two, and the Bhāgavata, one; and the total of the years assigned to each prince in the Vāyu exceeds 112. Thence evidently some mistake here; but if we take the general statement to be the correct tradition handed down, the dynasty became extinct in the year 73 B.C. The dynasty next mentioned is that of the Kānva Kānvāyanas. There were four princes of this line and they reigned for forty-five years, though the Bhāgavata, through a mistake explained hereafter, makes the period to be 345 years. They followed by the Andhrabhṛityas. But here, there is a statement in the Vāyu and the Mātsya, the like of which does not occur in the account of the other dynasties. The founder of the Andhrabhṛityas, Sīnhuka, according to the first Purāṇa, and Śisūka, according to the other, is said to have uprooted not only the Kānvas, but “whatever was left of the power of the Śunghas.” And the Kānvas are pointedly spoken of as Śunghabhṛityas or “servants of the Śunghas.” It therefore appears likely that when the princes of the Śungha family became weak, the Kānvas usurped the whole power and ruled the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of the masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns and this supposition is strengthened by the fact that like the Peshwa they were Brāhmaṇas and not Kshatriyas. Thus then, these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śunghas include the 45 assigned to the Kānvas. The Śunghas and the Kānvas therefore were uprooted, and the fami

1 काप्यवायनसत [न त] तो प्रवणः प्रमणिं प्रवक्ष्यतम् || श्रव्यं चैव यत्तेष्य तत्त्वावत्ति वदै ते
सत्त्वनात समापत्तिः प्रश्नस्तिरी कवस्पपुराणम // Vāyu. “A servant of the race of Andhras having destroyed Susarman of the Kānva family with main force whatever will have been left of the power of the Śunghas, will obtain possession of earth.” The statement in the Mātsya is similar.

2 चतुर्व: श्रव्यारिति द्वयं काप्यवायनं हिन्दस् || Vāyu.
the Andhrabhrityas came to power in B.C. 73. In a general way, the number of princes belonging to this line is given as thirty in the Vāyu, the Vishnu, and the Bhāgavata, and twenty-nine in the Mātasya; and the total duration is stated to be 411 years in the first, 456 in the second and the third, and 460 in the fourth. The disagreement here is not great, wherefore the tradition as to thirty princes and about 456 years may be accepted as correct. But the discrepancy between this general statement and the more particular accounts that follow, as well as the disagreement between the several Purāṇas in this last, is very great. This will be apparent from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sīhuka</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sīpraka</td>
<td>Namensotgiv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but mention-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>edas VRISH-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ina OR Sūdra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Kasmin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mallakarna</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pūrnātisāṅga</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sātakarna</td>
<td>Sātakarna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skandasvātī</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pūrnātisāṅga</td>
<td>Pūrnātisāṅ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sātakarna</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lambodara</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apiṭaka</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meghavātī</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svātī</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skandasvātī</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kumbhakarna</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kutalasvātī</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sātakarna</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Patumat</td>
<td>Atamanā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaurikṛishna or</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arishtakarman</td>
<td>Anishtakarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narikṛishna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hālēya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hālē</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hālē</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandulaka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pattalaka</td>
<td>Talaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purindrasisana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sundara Svātikar- 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pravillasena</td>
<td>Purishabhru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sundara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chakora Svātikar- 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunandana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sātakarna</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sīvasvātī</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gautamputra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulomāt</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sīvaśīr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sivaskanda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yajnaśīr Sātakar-29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karni</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yajnaśīr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vījaya</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vījaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandāśīr Sātakar- 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulomāvit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulomārchiś</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulomadhī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the Vāyu has seventeen princes and 272 years and a half; the Mātasya, thirty and 448 and a half. The Vishnu gives forty-four names and the Bhāgavata, twenty-two. This last has in many cases corrupted the names and confounded Hālē with the Arishtakarman of the Vishnu, whom it names Anishtā-
Two transitions about the duration of the Andhrabhritiya dynasty—456 and 300 years.

The lower period the main family.

Date of the accession and death of Gotamiputra.

Two traditions about the duration of the Andhrabhritiya dynasty—456 and 300 years.

The original account, which the author of this Purâna must have seen, probably assigned forty-five years to the Kânvas and three hundred to the next or Andhrabhritiya dynasty. But since the dynasty was also assigned another duration, viz. 456 years, he connected the “the three hundred” with the preceding, and gave 345 years to the Kânvâyana family. Now, the manner in which the two traditions are to be reconciled is by supposing that the longer period is made up by putting together the reigns of all the princes belonging to the several branches of the Andhrabhritiya dynasty. That the younger princes often reigned at Paithan and the elder ones at Dhanakaṭaka appears clear when we compare the inscriptions with the statement in Ptolemy. When the throne at the principal seat became vacant, the Paithan princes succeeded. But some probably died before their elders and never became kings of Dhanakaṭaka. From an inscription found at Banavâsî by Dr. Burgess it would appear that another branch of that dynasty ruled over Kânarâ. The period of three hundred years and the seventeen names given in the Vâyu Purâna refer probably to the main branch. The Mâtsya seems to me to put together the princes of all the branches and thus makes them out to be thirty. The total of the years assigned to the several reigns in the Vâyu is 272½, and if we should suppose one or two reigns lasting for about twenty-eight years to have dropped out by the corruption of the text, it would become 300½. Thus then the Vâyu and the Mâtsya Purânas give a correct account, but of different things. The Vishnu, which gives twenty-four princes, is not entitled to so much credit as Vâyu. It is a later work and the author’s purpose being sectâ he probably did not care so much for the accuracy of his data and hence omitted even the duration of each reign. The Bhâg is still more careless, as has already been shown.

If then we take the account in the Vâyu Purâna to refer to the main branch of the dynasty and consequently generally correct period that intervened between the rise of the Sâtavâhanâ Andhrabhritiyas and the end of the reign of Sîvavâti is 206 ye. The dynasty must, as we have seen, have been founded in B. C. wherefore the end of Sîvavâti’s reign and the accession

1 अन्ध्रभ्रीति वनस्पतिः स्वरूपः शालेः च शालेः च वै स० वायुः
2 By adding up the numbers in the table.
Gotamiputra must be placed in A. D. 133. We have seen that Pulümâyī, whose capital was Paithan according to Ptolemy and who from the inscriptions appears to have been king of this part of the country and to have reigned contemporaneously with his father, must have begun to reign at Paithan about 130 A.D. The father and the son drove the foreigners from the Dekkan, and the son was established as the ruler of the regained provinces, Gotamiputra expecting to succeed to the throne at the original seat of the family. Gotamiputra reigned for twenty-one years according to the literature, therefore he must have died in 154 A.D. He was alive, as stated before, in the eighteenth year of Pulumayi, i.e., in 148, and also in the nineteenth when the cave temple was dedicated, and not alive in the twenty-fourth, i.e., in 154, according to the two inscriptions mentioned before. Ptolemy’s mention of Pulumayi I have already referred to about the year 132; so that, the date deduced from this source and those derived from Gotamiputra’s and Pulumayi’s inscriptions at Nasik and Rudradåman’s at Junagadh, on the supposition that the era used in this last is the Saka, as well as those derived from the Purânas may thus be shown to be consistent with each other. The dates of all the princes whose names we find in the inscriptions may therefore be thus arranged:

Simukha began to reign in B. c. 73 and ceased in B. c. 50.
Krishna began in B. c. 50 and ceased in B. c. 40.
Sätakarni (third in the Vāyu P.) began in B. c. 40 and ceased in A. D. 16.
Nahapāna Kshaharātā.
Gotamiputra began in A. D. 133 and ceased in A. D. 154.

If the twenty-eight years assigned to Pulümâyī in the Mātsya Purâna are to be reckoned from the year of Gotamiputra’s death, he must be considered to have begun to reign at Dhanakaštaka in A. D. 154, and to have ceased in A. D. 182. He reigned at Paithan from A. D. 130 to A. D. 154, that is, for about twenty-four years, and we have seen that the latest year of his reign recorded in the inscriptions at Nasik and Kārli is the twenty-fourth. Altogether then his reign lasted for fifty-two years. But if the twenty-eight include the twenty-four for which he ruled at Paithan, he must have died in 158. This supposition looks very probable. He was succeeded by Śiva Brī, whose coin found in the Tailângana districts has been described by Mr. Thomas in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX., p. 64.

Of Pulümâyī's successors.

Of the other princes mentioned in the inscriptions.
for twenty-nine years at Dhanakataka since, according to our supposition, the Vāyu Purāṇa gives an account of the Dhanakataka branch and his coins are found in Tailāṅgaṇa. And this is confirmed by what we have already said. Pulumāyi reigned at Dhanakataka for four years and his two successors for fourteen. All this while, i.e., for eighteen years, Yajña Śrī was ruler of Mahārāṣṭra. He must thus have ceased to reign in the last country in about A. D. 172 and died in about A. D. 202. The next three reigns lasted, according to the Vāyu, for sixteen years. No trace of any of these has yet been found on this side of the country; but coins of Chandra Śrī are found near the original seat of government, and two of these are described by Mr. Thomas in the paper mentioned above. Thus the latest Andhrabhūtya date is A. D. 218. Madhariputa Sakasena of the Kānheri inscription, the same as the Madhariputa of the Kolhāpur coins, has been identified with Śiva Śrī, the successor of Pulumāyi, by Pañādit Bhagvānlāl, and I also at one time concurred with him. But the identification is not, I think, tenable. For Sakasena, which was read as Śrisena by the Pañādit, will not, as I have already observed, admit of being so read. And Mr. Thomas has described a specimen of eleven coins found at Amrāvatī near Dharanikot, on which he reads as Sakasakasa, but it is not unlikely Sakasasasa, “of Sakasena.” Besides, we see that on the Kolhāpur coins of Vāṣīṇhiputa and Gotamiputa, the other name that occurs is the same, viz., Vīlivakurasa, while on the coins of Madhariputa we have Sevalakurasa. This could not be the case if Madhariputa were the immediate successor of Pulumāyi. The occurrence of the name of the same viceroy on the coins of the two kings shows that one of them was the immediate successor of the other, and that Madhariputa whose viceroy was a different individual could not have reigned between them. One of the coins figured by Pañādit Bhagvānlāl Indrājī bears the names of both Gotamiputa and Madhariputa, showing that the piece originally bearing the name of one of them was re-stamped with the name of the other. Mr. Thomas thinks that it was originally Madhariputa’s coin. I think it was Gotamiputa’s, for, if we see the other figured coins we shall find that they are so stamped as to leave some space between the rim and the legend. This in the present case is utilized and the name of Madhariputa stamped close to the rim, which shows that the thing was done later. Madhariputra Sakasena, therefore, must have been a successor of Gotamiputra Yajña Śrī Śātakarni. But, as we have seen, none of his three Purāṇic successors bore the same, and the name Sakasena is one which has nothing like it on the long list of the Andhrabhūtyyas. Still that king must have reigned at Dhanakataka also if my surmise that Mr. Thomas’ Sakasaka is the same as Sakasena is correct. In the Māṭṣyas Purāṇa another A dhra dynasty of “seven princes sprung from the servants of the original Andhrabhūtya family will,” it is said, “come into power after that family becomes extinct.”¹ The Vāyu has got a similar verse reading of which, however, is corrupt; but it appears that this dynasty is there meant to be spoken of as having sprung from Andhrabhūtya family itself and was perhaps an illegitimate br

¹ अन्ध्राणां स्वस्थिता (ते?) रज्जे तेषां मृत्यान्यं नृपम्। सेवान्धा भवि
of it. Our Madhāripuṭa Sakasena, therefore, probably belonged to that branch. Since on this side of the country there is no trace of the Purānic successor of Yajña Śrī, Madhāripuṭa was probably his immediate successor here. How long he reigned we do not know, but, as we have seen, an inscription at Kāṅheri is dated in the eighth year of his reign, which probably corresponds to A.D. 180. The dates of the later Śatavāhanas are therefore these:—

In Mahārāṣṭra.

Pūlumāyi ... ... A.D. 130—A.D. 154.
Yajña Śrī ... ... A.D. 154—A.D. 172.
Maḍhāripuṭa ... ... A.D. 172—was reigning in A.D. 180.

In Tailāṅgāṇa.

Pūlumāyi ... ... A.D. 154—A.D. 158.
Śiva Śrī ... ... A.D. 158—A.D. 165.
Śivakandana ... ... A.D. 165—A.D. 172.
Yajña Śrī ... ... A.D. 172—A.D. 202.
Vijaya ... ... A.D. 202—A.D. 208.
Chandra Śrī ... ... A.D. 208—A.D. 211.
Pulomavi ... ... A.D. 211—A.D. 218.

Thus then, the Andhrabhṛtyas or Śatavāhanas ruled over the Dekkan from B.C. 73 to about A.D. 218, i.e., for about three centuries. For some time, however, they were dispossessed of the country by foreigners who belonged to the Saka tribe. How long these were in power it is difficult to determine. If the Saka era was established by the foreign conqueror after his subjugation of the country, and if his Satrap Nahapāna or his successor was overthrown by Gotamiputra or Pūlumāyi, six or seven years after Nahapāna's latest date, viz., 413, the foreigners held possession of this country only for about fifty-three years.

SECTION VII.

POLITICAL AND LITERARY TRADITIONS ABOUT THE ŚATAVĀHANAS OR ŚALIVĀHANAS.

The period during which the Śatavāhanas or Andhrabhṛtyas ruled over Mahārāṣṭra must have been a prosperous one in the history of the country. Hence several traditions with regard to different kings of this dynasty have been preserved. But that Śalivāhana or Śatavāhana was a family name has been forgotten and different princes of the dynasty have been confounded and identified. Thus Hemachandra in his Deśikosa gives Śalivāhana, Śālana, Hāla, and Kuntala as the names of one individual; but we see from the list given above that the last two were borne by different princes and both of them were Śalivāhanas. In his grammar he gives Śalivāhana as a Prākrit corruption of Śatavāhana. In modern times the Saka era is called the Śalivāhana era or an era added by Śalivāhana. When it began to be attributed to him is difficult to determine precisely. All the copper-plate grants to the eleventh century speak of the era as Śakaṇripakāla, i.e., era of the Saka king, or Śakakāla, i.e., the era of the Saka, and in an inscription at Bādami it is stated to be the era beginning from "the coronation of the Saka king." Subsequently, the simple expression Śako, "in the year of the Saka,"
was used, and thereafter S'ake or "in the Saka." The word S'aka thus came to be understood as equivalent to "an era," generally, the original sense being forgotten. And since the era had to be connected with some great king it was associated with the name of Sālivāhana whom tradition had represented to be such a king, and thus we now use the expression Sālivāhana S'aka, which etymologically can have no sense and is made up of the names of two royal families. The current legend makes Sālivāhana the son of a Brahman girl who was a sojourner at Paithān and lived with her two brothers in the house of a potter. On one occasion she went to the Godāvari to bathe, when Sesha, the king of serpents, becoming enamoured of her, transformed himself into a man and embraced her. In due course she gave birth to S'alivāhana, who was brought up in the house of the potter. Some time after, king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, to whom a certain deity had revealed that he was destined to die at the hands of the son of a girl of two years, sent about his Vetāla or king of Ghosts to find out if there was such a child anywhere. The Vetālasaw Sālivāhana playing with his girlish mother and informed Vikramāditya. Thereupon he invaded Paithān with a large army, but Sālivāhana infused life into clay figures of horses, elephants, and men, by means of a charm communicated to him by his father, the king of serpents, encountered Vikramāditya, and defeated him. This descent of a king of Ujjayinī on Paithān I have already alluded to and endeavoured to explain. The Sālivāhana referred to in this tradition appears to be Pulumāy who in conjunction with his father freed the country from the S'akas and fought with Chashtana or Jayadāman and Rudradāman, whose capital appears to have been Ujjayinī. It was in consequence of some faint reminiscence of Pulumāy Sālivāhana’s relations with the S'akas and their Satrap kings that his name was attached to the era first used by his adversaries.

There are also several literary traditions connected with the name of Sātavāhana or Sālivāhana. A work of the name of Brihatkathā written in that form of the Prākrit which is called the Paśachī or the language of goblin is mentioned by Danḍin in his work the Kāvyādarśa. Somadeva, the author of the Kathāsarat-sagara, and Kshemendra, the author of another Brihatkathā, profess to have derived their stories from this Paśachī Brihatkathā. The stories comprised in this are said to have been communicated to Gunaḍhyā, who for some time had been minister to Sātavāhana, by a ghost of the name of Kāṇabhūti. They were written in blood and arranged in seven books. Gunaḍhyā offered them to king Sātavāhana, but he refused to receive such a ghastly work written in blood and in the language of goblins, whereupon Gunaḍhyā burnt six of them. Some time after, king Sātavāhana having been informed of the charming nature of those stories went to Gunaḍhyā and asked for them. But the last or seventh book alone remained, and this the king obtained from his pupils with his permission.

1 The story about the girl and her serpent-lover is in the Kathāsarit-sagara mentioned with reference to Gunaḍhyā who was the son of the girl. S'atavāhana’s origin is given differently.

2 भूतमाणमयी प्रहुःकुंतलयी तुल्कथाम्। ।

3 Kathāsarit-sagara II, 8.
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There is a work written in the old Mahārāṣṭrī dialect called Saptasati, which is of the nature of an anthology consisting of śāhās or stanzas in the Āryā metre, mostly on love matters. The author of this is in the third verse mentioned as Hāla, and ordinarily is spoken of as Śālivāhana. Bāṇa speaks of it in the introduction to his Harshacharita as “an imperishable and refined repository of good sayings composed by Śālivāhana.” Verses from it are quoted in Dhanika’s commentary on the Jayarupaka, in the Sarasvati Kāntabhārana, and in the Kavyaprāśa. There is, it will be observed, in the list of the Andhrabhūtyas, princes, one of the name of Hāla, who probably was either the author of the work or to whom it was dedicated by a court-poet. From these traditions we may, I think, safely conclude that literature flourished under the rule of the Andhrabhūtyas, and that the Prākrit or spoken languages, especially the Mahārāṣṭrī, were probably for the first time used for literary purposes. In Vatsyayana’s Kāmasūtra or Institutes of Love, Kuntala Śātakarni or Śātakarni is spoken of as having killed Malayavati, who is called Mahādevī, and consequently must have been his chief queen, by means of a pair of scissors in connection with certain amorous sports. The name Kuntala occurs in the list given in the Mātyya Purāṇa.

SECTION VIII.

RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC CONDITION OF MAHĀRĀṢṬRA UNDER THE ANDHRABHIṬYAS OR ŚĀṬAṆAHANAS.

During this period the religion of Buddha was in a flourishing condition. Princes and chiefs calling themselves Mahābhūjas and Mahārāṭhis, merchants (Naigamas), goldsmiths (Suvarṇakārās), carpenters (Vardhakas), corn-dealers (Dhanyakaras), and ordinary householders (Grihasthas) caused at their expense temples and monasteries to be excavated out of the solid rock for the use of the followers of that religion. It has been mentioned that in the first part of this period the country was exposed to the inroads of foreign tribes, such as Yavanas or Bactrian Greeks, Sakas, and Palbhavas. These afterwards settled in the country and adopted the Buddhist religion. For, among the donors and benefactors whose names are recorded in the cave inscriptions, there are a good many Sakas and Yavanas. The temples were provided with chaityas or tombs in imitation of those in which some relic of Buddha was buried, and these were objects of worship. The monasteries contained cells intended as residences for Bhikshus or wandering Buddhist mendicant priests. These travelled over the country during the year and spent the four rainy months at one of these monastic establishments. In the month of Srāvana the monks held the ceremony of robing, at which the old clothes were thrown away and new ones worn. To provide these for them, charitable persons sited, as we have seen, sums of money with certain guilds with directions that out of the interest new robes should be purchased and given to the priests. Villages were assigned by kings and their successors for the support of these religious establishments. The
Brähmanism also flourished side by side with Buddhism. In the inscription at Nasik in which Ushavadāta dedicates the cave monastery excavated at his expense for the use of the itinerant "priests of the four quarters," he speaks, as we have seen, of his many charities to Brähmanś. The same notions as regards these matters prevailed then as now. Ushavadatā fed a hundred thousand Brähmanś as the Mahārāj Sindia did about twenty years ago. It was considered highly meritorious to get Brähmanś married at one's expense then as now. Gotamiputra also, in the same inscription which records a benefaction in favour of the Buddhists, is spoken of as the only protector of Brähmanś and as having like Ushavadatā put them in the way of increasing their race. Kings and princes thus appear to have patronized the followers of both the religions, and in none of the inscriptions is there an indication of an open hostility between them.

Trade and commerce must also have been in a flourishing condition during this early period. Ships from the western countries came, according to the author of the Periplus, to Barugaza or Bharukachchha, the modern Bharoch, and the merchandise brought by them was thence carried to the inland countries. Onyx stone in large quantities from Paithan, and ordinary cottons, muslins, mallow-coloured cottons, and other articles of local production from Tagara, were carried in waggons to Barugaza and thence exported to the west. Paithan is placed by the author of the Periplus at the distance of twenty days' journey to the south of Barugaza, and is spoken of as the greatest city in Dakhinabades or Dakshināpatha and Tagara, ten days' east of Paithan. This town has not yet been identified. Its name does not occur in any of the cave inscriptions, but it is mentioned in a copper-plate grant of the first half of the seventh century; and princes of a dynasty known by the name of Silāhāra call themselves sovereigns of Tagara, the best of towns, in all their grants. Some have identified it with Devagiri and others with Junnar, but in both cases its bearing from Paithan as given by the Greek geographers has not been taken into account. I have elsewhere discussed the question and have proposed Dharur in Nizām’s territory as the site of the ancient city. The other sea-ports towns mentioned in the Periplus are Souppara, the modern Supān or Supārā near Bassein and the Šorparaka of the inscriptions and the Purāṇas, where interesting Buddhist relics have recently been found by Mr. Campbell and Paṇḍit Bhagvānlā; Kalliena, the modern Kalyān, which must have been a place of great commercial importance since a good many of the donors whose names are inscribed in the caves at Kānheri and some mentioned in the caves at Junnar were merchants residing in Kalyān; Semulla identified with Chele.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., pp. 143, 144.
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some and with Chaul by others; Mandagora, very likely the name as the modern Mândâd, originally Mandagaḍa, situated on the Râjâpurï creek near Kuḍeṇī where we have the caves; Palai-patmai, which probably was the same as Pâḷ which is near Mahâd; Melizeigara, the second part of the name of which can at once be recognised as Jayagâd and which must be identified with that place whatever the first part Meli may mean; Buzantion, and others. Buzantion is probably the Vaijayanti of the inscriptions, but with what modern town it is to be identified it is difficult to say. Vaijayanti is mentioned in the Kadamba copper-plates translated by Mr. Belang, and was most probably some place in North Kânârâ. In a grant of the Vijayanâgar dynasty, Mâdhava, the great counsellor of king Harihara, is represented to have been appointed Viceroy of Jayantipura. He then conquered Goa and seems to have made that his capital. Jayantipura is said to be another name for Banavâsî, the capital of the Hindu Brahmâṇas. It is not possible to ascertain the names of all the towns in the inland country that were in a flourishing condition during the time we have been speaking of. Besides Paithâ and Tagara there was Nâsik, which is mentioned in an inscription in one of the caves at the place and also at Bedâ. The district about the town was called Govardhana. Junnar was another flourishing town, as is attested by the number of cave-temples at the place. But what its name was we do not know. The name Junnar, Junanara, Jirianagara, or Jiranaagara, which means the old town, must have been given to it after it had lost its importance. I have already expressed my belief that it was the capital of Nâhapâna. Pulumâyi, who overthrew the dynasty of Nâhapâna, is in one of the Nâsik inscriptions styled “lord of Navanâra,” meant probably for Nava-nagarâ or the new town. That he reigned at Paithâ, we know from Ptolemy and also from the many traditions about Sâlivâhana which locate the person or persons bearing that name at that city. The Navanâra, then, of the inscription was probably another name given to the town when Pulumâyi re-established his dynasty, and, in contrast with it, Nâhapâna’s capital was called the “Old Town.” Or perhaps Pulumâyi widened the old town of Paithâ and called the new extension Navanâra. What town existed near...

1. Hi No. 1, Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
4. Cap. XXXI, vv. 69 and 70, Bom. Ed. The Vanavasînak at the end of v. 69 says the town or country of Banavâsi and ought properly to appear as Vanavâsikâṅ.
5. Purânas, too, Vanavâsikâṅ is given as the name of a people.
the group of caves at Kârli and the adjoining places, we do not know. But the place spoken of in connection with the monastic establish-
ment is in an inscription named Valuraka, and the district in which it was situated is called Mâmalâhâra or the district of Mâmala, the modern Mâvâl. Further south, there was the town of Karâhâtaka, the modern Karhâd, which is mentioned in an inscription at Kudêm and also in the Mahâbhârata. Kolhâpur also must have been a flourishing town in those days, since a Buddhistic stûpa containing the coin, we have already noticed and other remains of antiquity have been found there. The old name of the place is unknown. Either Karhâd or Kolhâpur must be the Hippocura of Ptolemy in which he located Baleoecuros whom we have identified with the Vilivâyakura of the Kolhâpur coins.

Persons engaged in trade and commerce seem to have acquired large fortunes. The great chaitya cave at Kârli was caused to be constructed by a Sêth (Sreshthin) of Vaijayantî, and in other place also, especially at Kânheri, their gifts were costly. There were in those days guilds of trades such as those of weavers, druggists, corn-dealers, oil-manufacturers, &c. Their organization seems to have been complete and effective, since, as already mentioned, the received permanent deposits of money and paid interest on them from generation to generation. Self-government by means of such guilds and village communities has always formed an important factor of the political administration of the country. A nigationasabha or town-corporation is also mentioned in one of Ushavadata Nâsik inscriptions, which shows that something like municipals institutions existed in those early days. It is also worthy of remark that the yearly interest on the 2000 kârshâpanas deposited by Ushavadata was 100 kârshâpanas, and in another case that on 100 was 75, showing that the rate of interest was not so high as it has been in recent times, but varied from five to seven and a half cent. per annum. If the rate of interest depends on the degree of security and bears an inverse ratio to the efficiency of government, it appears that the country was well governed notwithstanding political revolutions. To this result the efficient local organization spoken of above, which no changes of dynasties ever affected, upon no doubt have contributed in a large measure.

Communication between the several provinces does not appear to have been very difficult. Benefactions of persons residing at Vaijayantî or Banavâsî, and Sôparaka or Supârâ, are recorded: the cave at Kârli; of a Nâsik merchant at Bedâsâ; of some inhabitant of Bharukachchha and Kalyân at Junnar; of natives of Norâ India and Dâtâmitri, which I have elsewhere shown was situate in Lower Sindh, at Nâsik; and of an iron-monger of Karâhâkâ Karhâd at Kudêm. On the other hand, gifts of natives of Kolhâpur and Karhâd are recorded on the stûpa at Bharhut which lies midway between Jabalpur and Allahâbâd. Unless there were free communications between these places, it is not possible that natives of one should make religious endowments at another.

---

2 Ibid, No. 19.
3 No. 20, Kudâ Caves. Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
4 In the place above referred to.
5 Cunningham's Stupa of Bharhut, pp. 131,135,135,138,159.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

SECTION IX.

Probable History of the Period between the Extinction of the Andhrabhrityas and the Rise of the Chalukyas.

For about three centuries after the extinction of the Andhrabhrityas, we have no specific information about the dynasties that ruled over the country. The Mâtsya and the Vâyu, as observed before, place seven princes of a branch of the Andhrabhrityas after them, and I have given reasons to believe that the Madhariputra of the inscription and the coins referred to before was one of them. This branch seems to have been in possession of the whole extent of the country that was ruled over by their predecessors. If the fact, noticed before, of some coins of the later Kshatrapa kings being found in a village near Karhâd to be regarded as evidence of their sway over this country and not to be attributed merely to commercial intercourse, the Kshatrapa dynasty also must be considered to have obtained possession of a portion at least of the Dekkan after the Sàtavâhanas. The earliest of these princes is Vijaya Sâha¹ (or Sena) whose date is 1442 which, if the era is that of the Saka kings, corresponds to A. D. 222, while the latest date we have assigned to the Sàtavâhanas is about A. D. 218. The last of the princes whose coins are found near Karhâd is Viîva Sâha (Sena), one of whose coins has the date 214 and another 224, corresponding to A. D. 292 and A. D. 302.³ About this time princes of the race of Abhiras or cowherds must have come into power. Ten of them are mentioned in the Purâñas. In the Nâsik caves there is an inscription dated in the ninth year of Virasena Âbhira, the son of Jamari and of Sivadatta Âbhira.² The characters in the inscription, though they do not differ much from those in the inscriptions of the later Andhrabhritya kings, must be regarded as more modern. The language is Sanskrit, which I regard as an indication of later era. When the popular dialect became different from the Pâli, or the Pâli became less sacred, the people fell back upon the dâtrinal Sanskrit for such purposes as those of recording religious facts; and thus in all the later grants we find the Sanskrit used, while, after the times of Âsoka to the extinction of the Andhrabhrityas, the language used was mostly the Pâli, or, to speak more accurately, or more of the Prakrits of the period. The Abhiras were in power sixty-seven years according to the Vâyu Purâna. Many other families are mentioned in the Purânas as having ruled over the region. But the information given there is much more confused than in the case of the previous families. It appears that the thrones that ruled over different parts of India at the same time were together and confused with those that succeeded each other, so that it is not possible without extraneous assistance to determine their chronological relations.

¹ Published copy of the inscription was made in the time of Dr. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VII., p. 17. ² Ibid, p. 28 (No. 10). ³ Ibid, No. 15.


Bird and the plates themselves are not now available for re-examination. But we have seen from the cave inscriptions that from remote times tribes of Kshatriyas calling themselves Bhojis and Raṭṭhis on Rāṣṭrīkas were predominant in the country. In the northern part of the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra these called themselves “the Great Raṭṭhis or Mahārāṭhis, the ancient Maṭhās,” but in other places the name in use must have been Raṭṭhis or Raṭṭhas, since we know of more modern chiefs in the Southern Maṭhā Country who called themselves by that name. Some of the Raṭṭha tribes must have formed themselves into a family or group (kūta) and called themselves Raṭṭhakūda and later on Rāṭṭhoda, the Sanskrit origin of which is Rāṣṭrakūta. These native chiefs that ruled over the country must have been held in subjection by the Adbhritiyas during the continuance of their power, and also by the later Kshatrapas. But after the dynasties became extinct they must have resumed their independence. The Abhiras held sway for some time and over a part of the country only, for the tradition of Gauli or cowherd rulers which very probably refers to them is confined to the Nāsik and Khāndeś districts. The Rāṣṭrakūtas therefore probably rose to power about the same time as the Abhiras. The Strakūṭa of the Kānheri plate is not unlikely a mislection for Rāṣṭrakūta, and if so that family had been in power for 245 years at the time when the inscription was engraved. From the form of the characters it appears that the plates were engraved in the latter part of the fifth century or the early part of the sixth, wherefore it would appear that the dynasty was founded about the end of the third. And in the inscriptions on the Miraj plates and the Yevur tablet first brought to light by Mr. Wathen and Sir Walter Elliot, respectively, it is stated that Jayasimha, the founder of the Chālukya dynasty in the Dekkan, established himself in the country after having vanquished Indra, the son of Kṛṣṇa of the Rāṣṭrakūta family. The Chālukya dynasty was, as will hereafter be seen, founded in the beginning of the sixth century of the Christian era. From about the end of the third to the beginning of the sixth century, therefore, the Dekkan was ruled over by princes of the Rāṣṭrakūta family. This is all that we can gather. More particular information about the period is not available.

SECTION X.

THE EARLY CHĀLUKYAS.

We will next proceed to an account of the princes who belong to the dynasty called Chalikya, Chālukya, or Chālukya. A large number of inscriptions on copper-plates and stone tablets amply elucidated the history of this dynasty. The legendary origin of this family is thus given by Bīlahaṇa, the author of the Viṃkuṭakadevacharita, or life of Viṃkuṭakadevacharita, a prince of the late restored Chālukya line. On one occasion when Brahmadeva engaged in his morning devotions, Indra came up to him and complained of the sinfulness of the world in which no man performs the sacrificial rites or gave oblations to the gods. Brahmadeva listened and explained his ideas to Indra. The inscriptions on copper-plates and stone tablets give the names of many of their kings, the dates of their reigns, and the events of their reigns.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

At his chuluka or the hand hollowed for the reception of water in the course of his devotional exercise, and from it sprang a mighty warrior who became the progenitor of the Châlukya race. Some time after, two great heroes of the name of Harita and Mânavya were born in the family and they raised it to very great distinction. The original seat of the dynasty was Ayodhyâ, and in the course of time a branch of it established itself in the south.

As stated in the opening lines of all the copper-plate grants of this family, the Châlukyas belonged to the Gotra or race of Mânavya and were the descendants of Hâriti. They were under the guardianship of the Seven Mothers and were led to prosperity by the god Kartikeya. They obtained from Nârâyana a standard with a boar represented on it, and fighting under that standard they subjugated all kings. The Yevur tablet and the Miraj plates, referred to above, agree with Bilhana in representing Ayodhyâ as the original seat of the family. But since these were almost contemporaneous with the poet, all the three represent only the tradition that was current in the eleventh century. The first prince who raised the family to distinction in the south was Jayasimha. He fought several battles with the reigning princes, and, among them, those belonging to the Ashrâkûta family, if the Yevur tablet is to be trusted, and acquired the sovereignty of the country. After him reigned Rânarâga, who was a prince of great valour and had a stately and gigantic person. He was succeeded by his son Pulakesi, who performed a great Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice and attended equally to the concerns of this world and the next. He made Vâtâpipura, which has been identified with Bâdami in the Kalâdgi district, his capital. He appears to have been the first great prince of the family; for, in all the subsequent genealogy begins with him. His full title was Satyaśravya Sri Pulakesi Vallabha Mahârâja. Of these words, Vallabha appears to be the title of all princes of this dynasty. In some cases, Vallabha had Prithivê prefixed to it, so that the expression meant "the Lover or Husband of the Earth." Satyaśravya or "the Support of Truth" was inherited by some of the later princes. Pulakesi’s son Kirtivarman succeeded to the throne after him. He subjugated a family of princes of the name of Nalas; but over what province it ruled is not known. He also subdued the Mauryas, who, from a statement in an inscription at Aihole upon which this fragment is principally based, seem to have been chiefs of northern Konkan, and reduced also the Kadambas of Banavasi in North Kanara. Kirtivarman had three sons at least, who were all young when he died. His brother Maṅgaliśa therefore came to the throne after him. Maṅgaliśa vanquished the Kalachuris, a family of princes reigning over the country of Chedi, the capital of which was Tripura, near Jabalpur. He is said to have carried his arms to both eastern and the western seas. On the coast of the latter he explored what is called Revatidvipa, or the Island of Revati. A copper-plate grant by a governor of this island was found near from which it would appear that Revati was very probably

Death of Mañgaliśa.

In an inscription in a cave-temple at Badami, it is stated that the temple was caused to be excavated by Mañgaliśa. He there placed an idol of Viṣṇu, and on the occasion of its consecration granted a village, out of the revenues of which a ceremony called Nārāyanaṇabali was to be performed and sixteen Brāhmans to be fed every day, and the residue to be devoted to the maintenance of recluses. This inscription is dated in the twelfth year of some reign when 500 years of the Saka era had elapsed. The reign in the twelfth year of which the cave-temple was consecrated is taken to be the reign of Mañgaliśa. On this supposition Mañgaliśa began to reign in 489 Saka; but I have elsewhere brought forward what I consider to be very strong arguments to show that Mañgaliśa could not have come to the throne so early as that, and the only criticism that I have seen on my observations seems to me to be very unsatisfactory and serves only to confirm my statement. The reign referred to, therefore, is that of Kirtivarman, and if its twelfth year fell in 500 Saka, Kirtivarman must have come to the throne in 489 Saka, corresponding to A.D. 567. In that inscription Mañgaliśa assigns all the good fruits of his charities to his brother in the presence of the gods Aditya and Agni and of the assembled crowd of men, and claims to himself only the fruit arising from serving his brother faithfully. In the copper-plate grant of the governor of Revatī referred to above, Saka 532 is mentioned as the twentieth year of the reign of a prince who, from the titles given there and from the fact that Mañgaliśa had about that period conquered the island, must have belonged to the Chālukya family. He could not have been Kirtivarman, for the island was not conquered in his time; neither could he be the successor of Mañgaliśa who, as I shall presently state, got possession of the throne in 532 Saka. He must therefore have been Mañgaliśa himself, and if Saka 532 was the twentieth year of his reign, he must have begun to reign in 513 Saka. Kirtivarman thus reigned from 489 Saka or A.D. 567 to 513 Saka or A.D. 591, that is, for twenty-four years.

Pulakeśi. II.

In the latter years of his reign Mañgaliśa seems to have been engaged in intrigues to keep his brother's son Pulakeśi off from the succession and to place his own son on the throne. But Pulakeśi, who had grown to be a prince of remarkable abilities, baffled all his intrigues, and by the use of energy and counsel he neutralized all the advantage that Mañgaliśa had by the actual possession of power, and in the attempt to secure the throne for his son Mañgaliśa lost his own life and his kingdom.

Pulakeśi, the son of Kirtivarman, succeeded. His full title was Satyāśraya Śrī Prithvi-Vallabha Mahārāja. From a copper-plate grant executed in the third year of his reign and in 535 Saka, it appears to have come to the throne in 533 Saka or A.D. 611.

---

1 Revati should, according to the usual rules, be corrupted to Revadī or Re and then to Re.  
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. III., p. 305.  
5 See also the arguments used by me in the paper referred to above.  
6 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 73.
Maongalisa's death, the enemies whom his valour had kept in subjection rose on all sides. A prince of the name of Appayika and another named Govinda who very probably belonged to the Ashtrakuta race, since that name occurs frequently in the genealogy of that family, attacked the new Chalukya king. The former, who had horses from the northern seas in his army, fled away in fear when opposed by the powerful forces of Pulakesi, and the latter surrendered to him and becoming his ally was received into favour and rewarded. He then turned his arms against the Kadambas, attacked Banavasi, their capital, and reduced it. The prince of the Ganga family which ruled over the Chera country situated about the modern province of Maisur, and the head of the Alupa race which probably held the province of Malabar, became his allies. He then sent his forces against the Mauryas of the Konkan, who were vanquished without any difficulty. With a fleet of hundreds of ships he attacked Puri, which was the mistress of the western sea, and reduced it. The kings of Lata, Malava, and Gurjara were conquered and became his dependents. About this time, there was a powerful monarch in Northern India whose name was Harshavarmana. He was king of Kanj, but in the course of time made himself the paramount sovereign of the north. He then endeavoured to extend his power to the south of the Narmadâ, but was opposed by Pulakesi, who killed many of his elephants and defeated his army. Thenceforward, Pulakesi received or assumed the title of Paramesvara or lord paramount. This achievement was by the later kings of the dynasty considered the most important, and that alone is mentioned in their copper-plate grants in the description of Pulakesi II. Pulakesi appears to have kept a strong force on the banks of the Narmadâ to guard the frontiers. Thus, by his policy as well as valour, he became the supreme lord of the three countries called Maharashtrakas containing ninety-nine thousand villages. The kings of Kosala and Kalinga trembled at his approach and surrendered to him. After some time he marched with a large army against the king of Kannhipura or Conjeevaram and laid siege to the town. He then crossed the Kaveri and invaded the country of the Cholas, the Pandyas, and the Keralas. But these appear to have become his allies. After having in this manner established his supremacy throughout the south, he entered his capital and lived in peace. The date of the inscription from which the greater part of this narrative is taken is 556 Saka, corresponding to A.D. 634.

It was in the reign of this king that Hwan Thsang, the Chinese pilgrim, visited India. In the course of his travels he wrote an account of the countries he visited. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 242, line 8 of the inscription. From the words cha, and aparen it is clear that two persons are here meant. But Mr. Fleet in his translation makes both of them one, which is a mistake, and the translation, I must say, is unintelligible.

The name of the royal family seems to be preserved in the name of the modern town of Alupai on the Malabar Coast.

The town is called the Lakshmi of the Western Ocean. It was probably the seat of the Maurya king of the Konkan and afterwards of the Sâhâtras.

For the position of these countries, see p. 6.
through the country he visited Mahārāṣṭra, which he calls Mo-la-cha. He saw Pulakesī, whom he thus describes: “He is of the race of Tsa-ta-li (Kshatriyas); his name is Pu-lo-ki-she; his ideas are large and profound and he extends widely his sympathy and benevolence. His subjects serve him with perfect self-devotion.”

About Pulakesī’s having withstood the power of Harshavardhan which we have before mentioned on the authority of inscriptions, Hwan Thsang speaks in these words: “At present the great king Śīlāditya (Harshavardhana) carries his victorious arms from the east to the west; he subdues distant people and makes the neighbouring nations fear him; but the people of this kingdom alone have not submitted. Although he be often at the head of all the troops of the five Indies, though he has summoned the bravest generals of all the kingdoms, and though he has marched himself to punish them, he has not yet been able to vanquish their opposition. From this we may judge of their warlike habits and manners.”

The Chinese traveller visited Mahārāṣṭra about the year A.D. 639, that is, five years after the inscription referred to above was incised. The kingdom, according to him, was six thousand li (1200 miles) in circuit and the capital was thirty li, and towards the west was situated near a large river. The soil, climate, and the character and general condition of the people of Mahārāṣṭra are thus described by him: “The soil is rich and fertile and produces abundance of grain. The climate is warm. The manners are simple and honest. The natives are tall and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude, but he that offends them will not escape their vengeance. If any one insult them they will risk their lives to wipe out that affront. If one apply to them in difficulty they will forget to care for themselves in order to flee to his assistance. When they have an injury to avenge they never fail to give warning to their enemy; after which each puts on his cuirass and grasps his spear in his hand. In battle they pursue the fugitives but do not slay those who give themselves up. When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporeally, they make him wear women’s clothes, and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds. Each time they prepare for combat they drink wine to intoxicate them, and then one of these men, speaking with his hand, will defy ten thousand enemies. If they kill a man upon the road the law does not punish them. Whenever in army commences a campaign these braves march in the sound of the drum. Besides, they intoxicate many hundred of naturally fierce elephants. At the time of their cominble blows they drink also strong liquor. They run in a body tramping everything under their feet. No enemy can stand before them. The king, proud of possessing these men and elephants, displays and slight the neighbouring kingdoms.”

Pulakesī II. appears undoubtedly to have been the great prince of this dynasty; and his fame reached even foreign countries. He is represented in an Arabic work to have sent

Ambassy to Chosroes II., king of Persia, who reigned from A. D. 602 to A. D. 628, in the thirty-sixth year of that prince’s reign, and must have received one from him, either before or after. During his reign the power of the Chalukyas was established over a very large extent of country. His younger brother Vishnudhana, otherwise called Vishamasiddhi, seems to have been for a time appointed to rule over the Satara and Pandharur districts, since a copper-plate inscription of his found at Satara records the grant of a village situated on the southern bank of the Bhima. Vishnudhana afterwards obtained the province of Venigi between the lower Krishnâ and the Godâvari, where he founded another flourishing branch of the Chalukya dynasty.

Pulakesi’s second brother Jayasimha must have been his brother’s viceroy in the district about Nasik. For, in a copper-plate grant found in the Igatpur taluka of the district, Jayavardhana, the son of Jayasimha, assigns the village of Balewar to the god Kapâlikesvara. The district in which the village was situated is in the grant called Goparashtra. Similarly, Pulakesi’s eldest son Chandraditya ruled over the province which contained the Savantvadi district. In a copper-plate grant, Vijayabhaṭṭārī, the queen of Chandraditya, who is styled Prithvivallaha and Bhâraja or great king, assigns to certain Brâhmans a field along with the adjoining Khajjana (modern Khajana) or marshy land in the village of Kocharem situated on the east about seven miles to the north of Veṅgurle. In another grant found at Nerur, she assigns a field in the fifth year of svaṛājya or “one’s own reign”. The reign referred to by this expression must be her husband’s, so spoken of to distinguish it from that of his brother Vikramaditya, the second son of Pulakesi, who succeeded his father Chodès, the chief seat of government. Chandraditya was a king, as the titles above given show, and it is proper that his crowned queen should speak of his reign as svaṛājya or her reign. It is not necessary that charities such as those recorded in these grants could, like political offices or rights, be conferred by the reigning prince alone. The religious merit arising from them is sought after by men as much as by men; and hence a woman like Vijayabhaṭṭārī might, during the lifetime of her husband, give a field. Contect of her doing so does not necessitate the supposition that she was simply the crowned queen of a reigning prince at that time. Another son of Pulakesi named Adityavarman had to have ruled over the district near the confluence of the Chalukyā and the Tungabhadra.

Pulakesi was succeeded by his second son Vikramaditya. In grants he is called Pulakesi’s priyātayana or favourite son; what it appears that Pulakesi had arranged that Vikramaditya

Vishnudhana.

Jayasimha.

Chandraditya.

Vijayabhattacharya.

Adityavarman.

Vikramaditya.

Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. II., p. 4, first translated by Bâla Sâstri and then by Mr. Fleet (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX., p. 244), and last of all, by Mr. Fleet (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX., p. 244).
should succeed him at the principal seat of government, and he assigned an outlying province to his eldest son Chandrāditya. The beginning of this reign as of the previous ones there was a disturbance; but it did not come from the princes or chieftains of the north who seem to have now been permanently humbled, but from the far south. The Pallava king of Kānchana or Conjeveram and the rulers of the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, and the Keralas threw off the yoke which Pulakesī had but loosely placed over them, and rebelled. Vikramāditya, who was a man of ability and daring adventure, broke the power of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, and the Keralas. He defeated the Pallava king, captured his capital Kānchi, and compelled him, who had never before humbled himself before anybody, to do him homage. On the back of his horse Chittakānta and sword in hand he is said to have repelled all the enemies that attacked him. In this manner he acquired again the whole of the dominions ruled over by his father, and became the paramount sovereign of the country “between the three seas.”

During the reign of Vikramāditya I. a branch of the Chālukya dynasty was founded in southern Gujarāt or the country called Lāndhā in ancient times. Vikramāditya seems to have assigned that province to a younger brother named Jayasimhavarman, who thus was a son of Pulakesī II. Jayasimha’s son Vinayāditya Yuddhamallarajey assigned a grant of land in Saka 653, and Śrīyāsraya Śilāditya, another son of the same monarch, assigned a village, while residing at Navādhana, in the year 421. What era this date refers to is not stated in the grant; but it is only by taking it as referring to the Gupta era, was in use in Gujarāt at the time, that we can bring the two dates close together; for Gupta 421 corresponds to Saka 662. Śrīyāsraya is called yuvardāya or “prince-regent,” from which it appears that he was associated with his brother in the government of the country. A copper-plate grant of the Gujarāt Chālukyas found at Kherā and translated by Prof. Dowson contains the names of the other princes, viz., Jayasimharāja, Buddhavarmarāja, and Vijayarāja. Scholars and antiquarians have understood the first of these to be the same as Jayasimha the founder of the Chālukya dynasty in the Dekkan. But I think the prince meant is Jayasimharāja, the younger brother of Vikramāditya I. and founder of the Gujarāt branch of the Chālukya dynasty; for nothing has hitherto been discovered to show that he was associated with his brother in the government of the country. The grant, however, is to me to be a forgery. The Buddhavarman mentioned in the grant existed at all, must have been another son of Jayasimha the besides the two spoken of above, and he and his son Vijayarāja have ruled over another part of Gujarāt. If the grant is regarded as genuine, the date 394 will have to be referred to the Gupta era, as that of Śrīyāsraya’s grant has to be.

---

4. Ibid., p. 5.
5. Ibid., pp. 2 & 5
6. See Appendix A.
7. My reasons are these:—(1) Its style is unlike that of the Chālukya grants. (2) It does not contain the usual invocation to the Boar incarnation. (3) It simply gives three regulation names, i.e., so many as are prescribed in the legal treatises. (4) This is a uniform mode of naming the three princes, by adding the suffix...
After Vikramāditya I. his son Vinayāditya came to the throne. One of his grants is dated S'aka 611, which was the tenth year of his reign, another in 613 S'aka and in the eleventh year, and a third in 618 S'aka and the fourteenth year. There is also an inscription on a stone tablet, the date occurring in which is 608 S'aka and the seventh year of his reign. From these it appears that Vinayāditya came to the throne in 602 S'aka corresponding to A.D. 680, in which year his father Vikramāditya must have ceased to reign. His latest date is A.D. 694, but his reign terminated in A.D. 696 as is seen from his son’s grants referred to below. During his father’s lifetime, Vinayāditya assisted him in his wars with the southern kings and won his love by destroying the forces of the Pallava king and of the other three, and tranquillizing the country. Between the eleventh and fourteenth years of his reign (A.D. 692 – A.D. 695) he succeeded in making the Pallavas, Kalambiras, Keralas, Haidayas, Chitas, Malevas, Cholas, Pāndyas, and others as steadfast allies of the Chālukya crown as the Gaṅga family of Chera and the Alupas whose loyalty was for the first time secured by Pulakesi II. The kings of Kāvera, or Kerala as it is read in some of the grants, of the Pārasikas who were probably the Syrians settled on the coast of Malabar, and of Simhala were made tributaries. He also seems, like his grandfather, to have fought with and defeated some paramount sovereign of Northern India whose name is not given, and have acquired all the insignia of paramountcy, such as a certain standard called Pālidhavoja, the drum called Dhakkā, and others. These events must have taken place after 616 S’aka, since they are not mentioned in his grant of that year, but in those of his successors.

Vinayāditya was succeeded by his son Vijayāditya. He appears to have assisted his grandfather in his campaigns against the southern kings and his father in the expedition into the north. At the time he was captured by his enemies though they had been defeated and were retreating. Notwithstanding he was in their camp he succeeded in averting anarchy and disturbance in his own country, and when he got off, established his power everywhere and acquired all the insignia of supreme sovereignty. There is an inscription of Kadāmī in which it is stated that during his reign, idols of Brahmā, Śiva, and Mahēśvara were put up at Vatālpipura in S’aka 621 and third year of his reign. One of his grants was issued in S’aka 622 in the fourth year of his reign, and another in S’aka 627 and in seventh year, from which it follows that his reign began in 619 S’aka corresponding to A.D. 697. Both of these grants, and another which bears no date, were found at Nerur in the Sāvantvāḍī state.
After Vijayāditya, his son Vikramāditya II. ascended the throne. A grant of his, engraved on a stone tablet, is dated in 656 Śaka and in the second year of his reign, wherefore he must have come to the throne in 655 Śaka or A.D. 733. Soon after his coronation, he had to turn his arms against his hereditary enemy the Pallava king. The name of the prince who reigned at the Pallava capital this time was Nandipotavarman. Vikramāditya marched against him in haste and encountered him in the Tailap country. Nandipotavarman was defeated and had to fly away from the battle-field. The Chalukya king got a good deal of spoil in the shape of large quantities of rubies, elephants, and instruments of martial musi. He then entered the city of Kāñchi but did not destroy it. In the city he gave a good deal of money to Brāhmans and to the poor and helpless, and restored to the temples of Rājasimhēśvara and other gods the gold which, it appears, had been taken by some previous king. He then fought with the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Keralas, and the Kaḷabhras, and reduced them. A temple commemorating his victories over the king of Kāñchi was constructed by his queen at Patṭadakal in the Kalâdgi district. The king reigned for fourteen years.

His son Kirtivarman II. began to reign in 669 Śaka or A.D. 741 since a grant of his, made in the eleventh year of his reign, bear the date 679 Śaka. He assisted his father in his wars with the Pallavas. On one occasion he marched against the Pallava king with his father's permission. The ruler of Kāñchi, too weak to face him in the battle-field, took refuge in a fortress. His power was broken by the Chalukya king, who returned to his country with a large spoil. During the reign of this prince the Chalukyas were deprived of their power in Maḥārāṣṭra and the sovereignty of the country passed from their hands into those of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes. The main branch of the dynasty became extinct; but it had several minor offshoots, and one of these in the person of Tailap succeeded in the course of time in regaining supreme power. From this time forward, therefore, we do not meet with any copperplate grants issued by the Chalukyas; but Rāṣṭrakūṭa plates belonging to this intervening period are met with from Rādhanpur in Northern Gujārāt to Sāmangāḍ near Kolhāpur. The grant of Kirtivarman II., from which the above account of that prince is taken, does not allude to the fact of his disgrace, but he must have lost possession of Maḥārāṣṭra before Śaka 679, the date of the grant. The name of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch who first humbled the Chalukyas was Dantidurga, and the work begun by him was completed by his successor Krishna. In a copper-plate grant of the former found a Sāmangāḍ, he is spoken of as having become paramount sovereign after having vanquished Vaiḍūrya. The date occurring in the grant is 675 Śaka. Before that time, therefore, the Chalukyas must have lost their hold over Maḥārāṣṭra. In the Yevur tablet and the Miraj plates the Chalukyas are spoken of as having lost sovereign...
During the period occupied by the reigns of these early Chalukya princes, the Jaina religion comes into prominence along with a developed form of Puranic Brahmanism as well as the old Vedic religion. Ravikirti, the Jaina who composed the Aihole inscription and represents himself as a poet, was patronized by Pulakesi II., and Vikramaditya II. repaired a Jaina temple and gave a grant in connection with it to a learned Jaina of the name of Vijaya Pañdit, who is represented to have silenced his opponents in argument and styled the only disputant.

But Jainism in those days, as present, probably flourished in the Southern Marathá Country only. Temples in honour of the Puranic triad, Brahmá, Vishnu, and Mahesvara with a variety of images were constructed in many places. The worship of Siva in his gigantic form seems also to have prevailed, as the Nasik grant of Nagavardhana assigning a certain village to the worship of Kipalikesvara, or the god wearing a garland of skulls, would show. The grants to Brahmanas who knew the Vedas and Sastras are very common. Cave architecture came to be used for the purposes of the Puranic religion about the time of the early princes of the dynasty, as we see from the cave-temple at Baddani dedicated to the worship of Vishnu by Mañgaliśa. No inscription has yet come to light showing any close relations between the Buddhists and the Chalukya princes. But that the religion did prevail and that there were many Buddhist temples and monasteries is shown by the account given by Hwan Thsang. Still there is little question but it was in a condition of decline. The Chalukyas, like their predecessors in previous times, were tolerant towards all religions.

Genealogy of the early Chalukyas.

1. Jayasimha.
2. Ranaraga.

5. Mangalīśa, Śaka 513—532 or A.D. 591—610.

6. Pulakesi II.—Satyagraya Sri Prithvi-vallabha, began to reign in Śaka 532 or A.D. 610, was on the throne in Śaka 556 or A.D. 634, and seen by Hwan Thsang in A.D. 639.

Chandragītīya. 7. Vikramāditya I., ceased Aditya Jayasimha to reign in Śaka 602 or A.D. 680.

8. Vināyaditya, Śaka 602—619 or A.D. 680—697.
10. Vikramāditya II., Śaka 655—669 or A.D. 733—747.

11. Kirtivarman II., Śaka 669 or A.D. 747, deprived of supreme sovereignty by Dantidurga before Śaka 675 or A.D. 753.
The RKṣhtrakūtas.

The earliest prince of this dynasty mentioned in the grants hitherto discovered is Govinda I. But in an inscription in the rock-cut temple of the Daśāvatāras at Elurā the names of two earlier ones, Dantivarman and Indrarāja, occur. The latter was Govinda's father and the former his grandfather. Govinda I. was probably the prince of that name who in Raviṅktī's inscription at Aihole is spoken of as having attacked the Chālukya king Pulakesi II. and to have afterwards become his ally. Govinda was succeeded by his son Karka, during whose reign the Brāhmaṇs performed many sacrifices and who seems to have patronized the old Vedic religion. After him his son Indrarāja came to the throne. Indrarāja married a girl who belonged to the Chālukya family, though on her mother's side she was connected with the lunar race, probably that of the RKṣhtrakūtas themselves. From this union sprang Dantidurga, who became king after his father. With a handful of soldiers Dantidurga defeated the army of Karnāṭaka, which hitherto had achieved very great glory by vanquishing the forces of the kings of Kānchī, the Keralas, Cholas, and Pāndyas, and of Śṛīraha, the lord paramount of Northern India, and Vajraṭa; and thus conquered Vallaḥba or the last Chālukya king Kṛtiṉvarman II. with ease. He thus acquired paramount sovereignty in the south. He also subdued the kings of Kānchī, Kaliṅga, Kosala, Śṛī-Sāila, Mālava, Lāṭa, and Taṅka. At Ujjayanī he gave large quantities of gold and jewels in charity. A grant of Dantidurga found at Sāmangaḷ in the Kolhāpur districts bears the date 675 of the Śaka era, corresponding to A. D. 753.

Dantidurga died childless according to a grant found at Karāḍā and his paternal uncle Kṛṣṇarāja succeeded to the throne. Another grant found at Baroda omits the name of Dantidurga, since the object of the writer was simply to give the pedigree of the reigning monarch, with reference to whom Dantidurga was but a collateral, and not to give the names of all the previous kings. In that grant Kṛṣṇarāja is spoken of as having “rooted out” a prince belonging to the same family with him who had taken to evil ways and to have himself assumed the task of governing for the “benefit of his race.” The prince dethroned or destroyed by Kṛṣṇarāja could not have been Dantidurga, as has been supposed by some writers, since he was a powerful monarch who for the first time acquired supreme sovereignty for his family. In a grant found at Kāvī, Kṛṣṇa is represented to have succeeded to the throne after

 Govinda I.
 Karka I.
 Indra II.
 Dantidurga.

Krishnaraṇa.

1 Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10, pp. 92–96.
2 The army of Karnāṭaka was thus the army of the Chālukyas.
3 Sāmangaḷ grant, p. 375, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. II.
4 This must have been the country about Śṛī-Sāila which contains the celebrated shrine of Mallikārjunā and which is situated on the lower Kṛṣṇa in the Karnul district, Madras Presidency.
5 Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10, loc. cit.
6 Referred to above.
7 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. III.
Dantidurga's death. 1 The prince whom he set aside, therefore, must either have been a son of Dantidurga or some other person with a better claim to the throne than himself. The statement of the Kardā plate that Dantidurga died childless may be discredited as being made two hundred years after the occurrence.

Krishnarāja, otherwise called Subhatsuṅga, carried on the work of Dantidurga and reduced the Chālukyas to complete subjection. In two of the grants 2 he is spoken of as having with the aid of gods in the form of his counsellors or followers churned the ocean of the Chālukya race which had been resorted to by mountains in the shape of kings afraid of their wings or power being destroyed—an ocean that was inaccessible to others, and drew out from it the Lakshmi 3 of paramount sovereignty. He is said to have defeated Rāhappa who was proud of his own power and prowess, and afterwards assumed the ensigns of supreme sovereignty. 4 Who this person was we have not the means of determining. In the Baroda grant it is stated that Krishnarāja "caused to be constructed a temple of a wonderful form on the mountain at Elapura. When the gods moving in their aerial cars saw it they were struck with wonder, and constantly thought much over the matter saying to themselves: 'This temple of Śiva is self-existent; for such beauty is not to be found in a work of art.' Even the architect who constructed it was struck with wonder, saying when his heart misgave him as regards making another similar attempt, 'Wonderful! I do not know how it was that I could construct it.' King Krishna with his own hand again decorated Sambhu (Śiva) placed in that temple, by means of gold, rubies and other precious jewels, though he had already been decorated by the wonderful artificial ornaments of the stream of the Gangā, the moon, and the deadly poison." The ending purā in the names of towns, when it undergoes a change at all, is invariably changed to ur, as in Sihur for Śiṅhapura, Indur for Indrapura, Śirur for Śirahpura or Śriṇūra, &c. The Elapura of the inscription, therefore, is Elur, and the temple described in the grant in such terms must be one of those excavated on the hills at the place, perhaps the temple of Kailāsa itself. 5 Thus it appears that it was

1 See stanza 11 (p. 146, Ind. Ant., Vol. V.,) of the first half of which only तत्ततितेति गृह विवरण remains.
3 The legend is that in early times mountains had wings, and as they did considerable mischief by their use, Indra set about cutting them. The mountains thereupon took refuge in the sea. The story originated from the double sense which the word parvata bears in the Vedas. It denotes "a mountain" and "a cloud" also. Indra was the god who prevented the clouds from flying from place to place, and compelled them to discharge their freight on the earth for the benefit of his human worshippers.
4 Vishnu churned the ocean with the aid of the gods and drew out Laksmbi from it, whom he married.
6 Dr. Bühler in his paper in Vol. VI., Ind. Ant., simply states that the "grant (Baroda) connects him (Krishnarāja) with the hill at Elapūra, where he seems to have built a fort and a splendid temple of Śiva." He has not identified Elapūra and did not perceive the important significance of this and the next two stanzas. He, however, suspected that one of the verses was badly deciphered. That this and the following verses are somewhat badly deciphered there is no doubt; but the translation in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Journal is far worse and Dr. Bühler was misled by it. Mr. Fleet has recently published a revised translation (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 162), but as regards this passage it certainly is no improvement on the first. He also once spoke of
Krishnārāja that caused the Kailāsa to be constructed, and the date assigned to it by Drs. Fergusson and Burgess simply on architectural grounds is verified. Krishnārāja must have reigned in the last quarter of the seventh century of the S'aka era, i. e., between 753 and 775 A.D.

Krishnārāja was succeeded by his son Govinda II.1 Nothing particular is recorded of him in the grants, except, of course, the general praise which is accorded to every prince, however weak and inglorious. It however appears from the Vaṇi-Dinḍorī and Rādhanpur grants that he was superseded by his younger brother Dhrūva, and the grants endeavour to palliate his crime in having thus usurped the throne. Dhrūva, however, was an able and warlike prince. His other names were Nirupama or the “Matchless,” Kalivalabha, and Dhārāvarsha. He humbled the Pallava king of Kāṇchi and obtained from him a tribute of elephants. He detained in custody the prince of the Gaṅga family, which ruled over the Chera country. He also carried his arms into the north against the king of the Vatsas, whose capital must have been Kausāmbī, the modern Kosam near Allahabad, and who had grown haughty by his conquest of a king of the Gauḍa country. He drove the Vatsa prince into the impassable desert of Mārvāḍ and carried away the two state umbrellas which he had won from the Gauḍa king.2 A stone inscription at Pattadakal was incised in the reign of Nirupama. There he is styled Dhārāvarsha and Kalivalabha.3

Dhrūva Nirupama was succeeded by his son Govinda III. The Rādhanpur and Vaṇi-Dinḍorī grants were issued by him in the S'aka year 730 corresponding to A.D. 8084 while he was at Mayūrakhandi. This place has been identified with a hill-fort in the Nāsik territory of the name of Morkhand. Whether Mayūrakhandi was the capital of the dynasty in the time of this king cannot be satisfactorily determined. Govinda III. was certainly one of the greatest of the Rāshtrakūṭa princes, and the statement in his grant that during his time the Rāshtrakūṭa became invincible, as the Yadavas of Pūrāṇic history did when under the guidance of Krishnā, appears credible. Seeing he had grown up to be a brave prince his father proposed to abdicate the throne in his favour; but he declined, expressing himself perfectly satisfied with his position

1 The name of this prince is omitted in the Vaṇi-Dinḍorī and Rādhanpur grants, for the same reason apparently as that for which Dantidurgā's is omitted in the Baroda grant; but he is alluded to when they state that Dhrūva or Nirupama set aside his elder brother.

2 Vaṇi-Dinḍorī and Rādhanpur plates.


4 The Samvatsara or cyclic year given in the first is Sarvajīt, the current S'aka year corresponding to which was 730, while in the second it is Vyaya corresponding to 729 current. As regards the exact signification to be attached to these dates, see Appendix B.
as Yuvarāja or prince-regent. When after his father’s death he ascended the throne, twelve kings united their forces and rose against him, desirous of striking an effectual blow at the power of the Rāṣṭrakūtas. But alone and unassisted, he by his personal valour suddenly inflicted a crushing defeat on them and broke the confederacy. He released the Gāṅga prince of Chera, who had been kept in custody by his father; but no sooner did he go back to his native country than he put himself into an attitude of hostility. But Govinda III. immediately vanquished him, and threw him into captivity again. Subsequently he marched against the Gūrjara king, who fled away at his approach. Thence he proceeded to Mālvā, the king of which country knowing himself to be unable to resist his power surrendered to him. After receiving his obeisance he directed his march to the Vindhyas. When Māṅgāsarva, the ruler of the adjoining country, who had been watching his movements, heard from his spies that Govinda’s army had encamped on the slopes of that mountain, he went up to him, and throwing himself at his feet presented to him his most highly valued heirlooms which no other prince had ever got before. On this occasion Govinda spent the rainy season at a place called Śrībhavana, which has not been identified. When the rains were over, he marched with his army to the Tungabhadra, where he stayed for a short time, and brought the Pallava king of Kāñči under a more complete subjection than before. Thence he sent a message to the king of Vengi, or the country between the lower Krishnā and the Godavāri, who probably belonged to the eastern Chālukya dynasty, and he came and attended on him as if he were his servant. This grand victorious march to the north and the south must have taken place before Saka 726 or A.D. 804. For in a copper-plate grant bearing that date found in the Kānarese country, it is stated that when the king (Govinda III.) “having conquered Dantīga who ruled over Kāñči, had come to levy tribute, and when his encampments were on the banks of the Tungabhadra,” he allotted some lands to one Śivadārśi at a holy place named Rāmeśvara.

Govinda III. thus acquired a large extent of territory and established his supremacy over a number of kings. He appears to have become the paramount sovereign of the whole country from Mālvā in the north to Kāñčhipura in the south and to have under his immediate sway the country between the Narmada and the Tungabhadra. The Vānī-Dindori plates convey a village situated in the Nāsik district, while those found in the Kānarese country assign some land near the Tungabhadra. The province of Lāṭa, situated between the Mahī and the lower Tāpī, was assigned by him to his brother Indra, who

1 The Kāvi grant, however, states that the father did raise him to the supreme sovereignty which his enemies were endeavouring to deprive his family of, i.e., when he found the enemies of his family too powerful for him, he raised his son to the throne and assigned to him the task of suppressing them. Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 147, v. 27. The reading, however, is somewhat corrupt. The enemies spoken of here must be those twelve whom he is represented to have vanquished in the other grants.

2 Vānī-Dindori and Rādhānapur plates.


began the founder of another branch of the dynasty. Govinda III., as stated in the Baroda grant, made and unmade kings. His secondary names as found in his own grants were Prabhūtavarsha or "Raining profusely," Prithivivallabha or "the Lover of the Earth," and Sīrī-Vallabha. Others will be noticed below. The Baroda grant was issued by Karka, the son of Govinda's brother Lidra, the king of Lāṭa, in Saka 734 or A.D. 812, and the Kāvi grant by Govinda the younger brother of Karka, in Saka 749 or A.D. 827. We need not notice these princes further, since they belong more to the history of Gujarāt than of the Dekkan.

The authorities for the history of the later princes of this dynasty are three copper-plate grants found at Sāṅgali, Kārdā and Khārepātan.1 These do not give many details that may be relied on as historical; and at first sight there appear some inconsistencies in the genealogy found in them. Several scholars have endeavoured to reconcile them in their own ways, or to explain them by making certain suppositions, but it does not appear a difficult task to make out a consistent genealogy. We have a few stone inscriptions containing the names of one or two princes, and a copper-plate grant found at Surat which stops at the successor of Govinda III., while stray notices of some kings have been discovered in Jaina works.

In two of the grants just mentioned, the son and successor of Nirupama is stated to be Jagattunaga, while in that found at Kārdā he is called Jagadrudra. Now, since Govinda III. was one of the greatest princes of this dynasty, it is impossible that he should have been passed over by the writers of these grants. Jagattunaga or Jagadrudra, therefore, the son of Nirupama, must be Govinda himself and no other. After his death his son Amogha-varsha, whose proper name appears to have been Sarva,2 came to the throne. He seems to have marched against the Chālukyas of Vengi and put several of the princes to death.3 In the Kārdā grant the city of Mānyakhēta is spoken of as being in a very flourishing condition in his time. There is little question that it was his capital; but whether it was he who founded it and made it the capital of the dynasty cannot be clearly made out, as the reading given by Mr. Wathen is corrupt. But it is very probable that Mānyakhēta became the capital of the empire in his time. Mānyakhēta has been properly identified with Mākhe(ī in the Nizam's territory. In the Kānheri caves there are three inscriptions, in which the reigning paramount sovereign is represented to be Amogha-varsha. In one of them Pullaśaktī of the Śilāhāra family, and in the other two his son Kapardin, are mentioned as his dependents ruling over Konkan, which province had been assigned to them by Amogha-varsha. The dates occurring in the last two are Saka 775 and 799.4 In a historical appendix at the end of a Jaina work entitled Uttarapurāṇa,

---

2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 183, l. 25.
3 Sāṅgali plates. But the reading is somewhat corrupt.
4 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI., West's copies Nos. 15 and 42; Vol. XIII, p. 11; and Prof. Kielhorn's paper, Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII., p. 133. The cyclic year given with 775 is Praitipati, the current Saka year corresponding to which, however, was 774. See Appendix B.
or the latter half of the Mahāpurāṇa, by Guṇabhadra, Amogha-varsha is represented to have been a devoted worshipper of a holy Jaina saint named Jinasena, who was the preceptor of Guṇabhadra and wrote the Ādirūpaṇa or the first part of the same work. 1

Amoghavarsha’s son and successor was Akalavarsha. He married the daughter of Kokkala, king of Chedi, who belonged to the Haihaya race, and by her had a son named Jagattuṅga or Jagadarudra. Akalavarsha’s proper name seems from the Kāḍā plates to have been Krishṇa. He is the Krishṇarāja during whose reign a tributary chief of the name of Prithvirama made a grant of land to a Jaina temple which he had caused to be constructed in the Saka year 797 at Saundatti. 2 Another Jaina temple was built by a Vāsiṣṭa or Bania named Chikarya during his reign in Saka 824 at Mulgunda in the Dhārvād district, and in the inscription which records this fact he is styled Krishṇa Vallabha. 3

In the reign of this prince the Jaina Purāṇa noticed above was completed by Guṇabhadra and consecrated in Saka 820, the cyclic year being Piṅgala. 4 In the historical appendix, “the lofty elephants

1 One copy of the whole of this Purāṇa and another of the last three Pārvans or sections have been purchased by me for Government this year. The stanza in which Amoghavarsha is alluded to is this:

श्य प्राप्तेषु जुइतकाविषयंतागताविवेषेन-
वार्तारो जगत: विशेषसूर्यास्यस्यार्यत:।
संस्ततिः स्वमयोर्वणेनुः: पूजाः होमकिर्त्से
स श्रीमाङ्जनेनंतरमणवन्तादेहं जगन्मद्यम।

“ The king Amoghavarsha remembered himself to have been purified that day when the lustre of the genius was heightened in consequence of his diadem becoming reddish by the dust-pollen of [Jinasena’s] foot-lotuses appearing in the stream of waterlike lustre] flowing from the collection of the brilliant rays of his nails — enough — that prosperous Jinasena with the worshipful and revered feet is the blessing of the whole world.” 2


3 Ib., p. 192. The cyclic year is Dundubhi, which fell in 825 current.

4 अकालीवर्षभीमुः पाठमिस्तभासिमित्स्वाप्तमय:।
तास्माणवर्षवतान्त:संप्रभुव:षंवायशस्युष्झ:।
भद्र ९. ५.

* * *

शकुन्तपक्षायर्मन्तरविशालपिशाचायशतांतांचान्।
मुक्तमहायथार्थिणि भुस्तनामिनि समस्तजनसुवल्दे।

* * *

निषिद्धं भवनेव:।

प्राणिव शाखसारं जगतं विचजयं पुष्पमेत्तपुस्मम।

“Victorious in the world is this holy Purāṇa, the essence of the S’astras which was finished and worshipped by the best among respectable men” * * in the year Piṅgala that brings about great prosperity, and confers happiness on all mankind, at the end of the year measured by 820 of the era of the S’aka king * * *, while that king Akalavarsha, all of whose enemies were destroyed and whose fame was pure (or who acquired religious merit and fame), was protecting the whole earth.”

The cyclic year Piṅgala corresponded to 820 S’aka current and followed next after the year 819.
of Akalavarsha” are represented “to have drunk the waters of the Ganges rendered fragrant by being mixed with the humour flowing from their temples, and, as if not having their thirst quenched, to have resorted to the Kaumāra forest (in the extreme south), which was full of sandal trees set in gentle motion by the breezes blowing over the sea waves, and into the shade of which the rays of the sun did not penetrate.” The date 833 S’aka has also been assigned to Akalavarsha.2

Jagattuṅga became king after his father. He married Lakṣmī, the daughter of his maternal uncle, the son of Kokkala, who is called Raṇavigraha in the Sāṅgali grant and Saṃkaragana in the Kardā plates. From this union sprang Indra, who succeeded his father. Jagattuṅga is not here mentioned in the Khārepāṭan grant, but Indra is noticed as the grandson of Akalavarsha, as he really was. The prince, however, is mentioned in the plates in another connection below. As regards the next king there is some confusion in the Kardā plates, which is partly due to the bad deciphering and translation. The Sāṅgali grant however is clear. Indra married a lady from the Haihaya family of Chedi again. Her name was Vijāmbā and she was the daughter of Anganadeva, the son of Arjuna, who was the eldest son of Kokkala, mentioned above. By her Indra had a son named Govinda, who is the last king noticed in the Sāṅgali grant, since it was issued by him. But according to the Khārepāṭan grant Govinda was the younger brother of a prince named Amoghavarsha.3 The immediate successor of Indra, therefore, was Amoghavarsha, and after him his younger brother Govinda came to the throne. And this is confirmed by the Kardā plates also. Amoghavarsha and Govinda are there mentioned as the two sons of Ambā, who is the same as the Vijāmbā of the Sāṅgali plate. But the translator of the grant understood Govinda and Ambā as forming one compound, and called the lady Govindāmbā, which certainly is an unique name and strikes one as absurd. Thus he dropped king Govinda altogether, and he was followed by all subsequent writers.4

The Sāṅgali plate of Govinda the Fourth, as he must be called, does not mention his elder brother Amoghavarsha by name; and

\[\text{कालयुक्तमतिवज्ञा निजमद्वालस्वनीतंगमा—}\
\[\text{दुःखी वारी कलहुः कटु मुहः पीतवायमिलुष्णं:}\
\[\text{रीमारे पन्न्य-द्रव वनमयमयुस्तर्तंगलिङ्क-}\
\[\text{स्नेध्दी} मोक्लितभयक्तस्फलकच्छयां समाजःश्रीयन \]

3 Mr. Fleet in his genealogical table at p. 109, Vol. XI., Ind. Ant., speaks of Govinda’s brother as unnamed. But he is named Amoghavarsha in the Khārepāṭan grant, and also in that of Kardā if properly understood.
4 The 14th stanza, the latter part of which I have construed as in the text, is दैविक संयुतकरणाने नामानुयं जनवर्तरु | ज्ञानस्मानोत्तर गोविन्दामध्यानात। Now, the first line of this is, as it stands, out of place and must contain some mistakes. For, (1) it contains, in substance, a repetition of what we have in the first line of stanza 12, and (2) if it is read here as it is, we shall have to make Ambā a wife of Jagadrūḍa along with Lakṣmī, who has been represented as his wife in stanza 12, and understand her to be Lakṣmī’s sister, the father of both being Saṃkaragana. But Ambā or Vijāmbā is in the Sāṅgali grant clearly spoken of as the daughter of Anganadeva, the son of Arjuna, who was the brother of Raṇavigraha, the father of Lakṣmī; that is, Ambā was the daughter of Lakṣmī’s first cousin. She is also distinctly represented as the
the reason is obvious. Amoghavarsha was deposed by Govinda, who usurped the throne. This circumstance is alluded to in his grant, which states that “though Govinda had the power, he did not act with any reprehensible cruelty towards his elder brother, and did not render himself infamous by incest, or assume the nature of a devil by casting aside considerations of purity and impurity, but became Sāhasānika by his matchless enterprise and liberality.” Probably the sins which are pointedly denied in the case of Govinda were laid to his brother’s charge, and they are alluded to in order to excuse his conduct in having dethroned him, and even credit is given to the king for not having used such severity towards his brother as in the opinion of the writer he deserved. Govinda seems also from this passage to have been called Sāhasānika, while below is given another of his names, viz., Suvarnavarsha (Raining gold). Govinda is said to have been a bountiful prince and to have constructed a good many temples of Siva. His grant was issued in S’aka 855, or A.D. 933, in the Vijaya1 year of the cycle, while he was at his capital Mānyakhetā.

Baddiga or Amoghavarsha III.

From the Kharepātan plates it appears that Govinda IV. was succeeded by his paternal uncle Baddiga, the second son of Jagattunga. He is represented to have been a virtuous prince. He was succeeded by his son Krishnārāja, and after his death his younger brother Khotika became king. The Kardā grant is somewhat confusing here, but when properly understood it is perfectly consistent with that of Kharepātan. It states: “When the elder brother Krishnārājadeva went to heaven, Khoṭvigadeva, who was begotten by the king Amoghavarsha on Kandakadevi, the daughter of Yuvarāja, became king.” Here the expression “elder brother” must be taken as related to Khotīgadeva and not to the preceding king, whoever he may have been. Khotika therefore was, even according to the Kardā grant, the younger brother of Krishnārāja. But he is represented to have been the son of Amoghavarsha, while Krishnārāja is spoken of in the Kharepātan plates as the son of Baddiga. In an inscription at Salotgi, Krishnārāja, the son of Amoghavarsha, is represented to have been reigning at Mānyakhetā in 867 S’aka,4 that is, twelve years after the Sāngalī grant of Govinda.

Krishna III. and Khotika.

wife of Indra and the mother of Govinda IV. If, however, this first line were not read here, the second would be applicable to the king mentioned immediately before, i.e., Indra, and the whole would be consistent with the information derived from the Sāngalī grant. The emendation I make in the second line is to read दृ for दृ, and then Ambā would be released from her incongruous association with Govinda and the whole would be consistent and intelligible.

Mr. Fleet along with others, following Water, calls her Govindāmba and makes her the wife of Jagadudrāja. There is no doubt the text of the Kardā grant is corrupt. But whether this is due to the bad deciphering, or to the mistake of the engraver or the composer, cannot be decided until the original is re-examined.

1 The current S’aka year was 856.

2 एकदनेनोत्तरः व ज्ञेयः नातारी श्रीमत्वमश्रमदेषे || युस्मरणदासदोहमिरस्यस्माश्रमविश्वस्य। ||

3 ज्ञानां स्वागीयेव त्रिस्तरसिद्धिनिश्चयति : || १६ ||

3 For, the clause containing that expression is dependent on the principal sentence, which is in the next or 16th stanza and the subject of which is Khoṭvigadeva. See the passage in the last note.

4 Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 205, et seq. The cyclic year given is Plavaṅga, which followed next after S’aka 869 and the current year corresponding to which was 870.
Khotika was succeeded, according to the Khārepātaṇ grant, by Kakkala, the son of his brother. The name of this brother was Nirupama according to the Kardā grant. Kakkala is said to have been a brave soldier; but he was conquered in battle by Tailapa, who belonged to the Chāluūya race, and thus the sovereignty of the Dekkan passed from the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas once more into those of the Chāluūyas. The Kardā grant, which was made in the reign of Kakkala, is dated Saka 894 or A.D. 972, and in the following year or Saka 895 Tailapa attained sovereign power. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas were thus supreme masters of this country from about A.D. 748 to A.D. 973, that is, for nearly two hundred and twenty-five years.

2 Mr. Fleet, following Mr. Wathen's translation, makes Krishna, whom he calls Krishna III., the elder brother of Amoghavarsha and thus a son of Jagattunga II. But in the Khārepātaṇ grant he is distinctly represented as the son of Baddiga, who was the son of Jagattunga, and thus a grandson of Jagattunga II. He is also represented as Khotika's elder brother. I have shown in the text that the expression "elder brother," occurring in the Kardā grant, should by the rules of construction be taken as referring to Khotika and in this way that grant becomes perfectly consistent with that of Khārepātaṇ. The Amoghavarsha who was the son of Jagattunga is that spoken of in the sixteenth stanza of the Kardā grant, and was different from the one mentioned in the fourteenth, who was the son of Indra and nephew of that Amoghavarsha, as I have shown above. Mr. Fleet brings in another Krishna and makes him the younger brother of Khotika, and identifies him with Nirupama (see the text below). What his authority is I do not know. But the Khārepātaṇ grant mentions only Krishna, the elder brother of Khotika and son of Baddiga. The Kardā also mentions one only, and as to his relation with the other princes I have shown that that grant agrees with the Khārepātaṇ plates. The Krishna of the Salotgi inscription is to be identified with the elder brother of Khotika and is not to be considered a different prince unalluded to in the grants. Nirupama, the younger brother of Khotika, is not and cannot have been called Krishna, because his elder brother and the elder brother of Khotika was called Krishna. Nirupama does not appear to have been a reigning prince, for in the Kardā plates he is only parenthetically introduced as the father of Kakka, who was a reigning prince; and in the Khārepātaṇ grant he is not mentioned at all by name, but Kakkala is said to be the son of the brother of Khotika. Krishna, on the other hand, was on the throne in 867 Saka according to the Salotgi inscription and was a reigning prince according to the grants. Thus then Krishna was the eldest brother, Khotika the next, and Nirupama the youngest. They were the sons of Amoghavarsha, the same as the Baddiga of the Khārepātaṇ grant. In this whole investigation I have found that the apparent inconsistencies and confusion are due only to the Kardā plates, which must be revised if they are available and re-translated.

3 The cyclic years mentioned along with these two dates are Aṅgiras and Srimukha respectively, the current S'aka years corresponding to which were 895 and 896.
That the princes of this race were very powerful there can be little doubt. The rock-cut temples at Elurâ still attest their power and magnificence. Under them the worship of the Purânic god rose into much greater importance than before. The days when kings and princes got temples and monasteries cut out of the solid rock for the use of the followers of Gotama Buddha had gone by never to return. Instead of them we have during this period temples excavated or constructed on a more magnificent scale and dedicated to the worship of Śiva and Vishnu. Several of the grants of these Râshtrakûta princes praise their bounty and mention their having constructed temples. Still, as the Kânheri inscriptions of the reign of Amoghavarsha I. show, Buddhism had its votaries and benefactors, though the religion had evidently sunk into unimportance. Jainism, on the other hand, retained the prominence it had acquired during the Châlukya period, or even made greater progress. Amoghavarsha was, as we have seen, favourably disposed towards it, and some of the minor chiefs and the lower castes, especially the traders, were its devoted adherents. The form of Jainism that prevailed in the country was mostly that professed by the Digambara sect.

It is remarkable that, unlike the grants of the early Châlukya princes, those of the Râshtrakûtas contain accounts in verse of the ancestors of the grantor, and most of the verses are of the nature of those we find in the ordinary artificial poems in Sanskrit literature possessing the same merits and faults. The Râshtrakûtas, therefore must have been patrons of learning, and probably had poets in their service. One of the three Krishnas belonging to the dynasty is the hero of an artificial poem by Halâyudha entitled the Kâvirâhasya, the purpose of which is to explain the distinction as regards sense and conjugational peculiarities between roots having the same external form. He is spoken of as the paramount sovereign of Dakshinâpatha. Prof. Westergaard, however, thought him to be the Krishnarâya of the Vijayanagar dynasty who reigned in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. But in the Kâvirâhasya he is spoken of in one place as “having sprung from the Râshtrakûta race,” and is in another called “the ornament of the lunar race,” which description is of course not applicable to the Vijayanagar prince.

Arabic travellers of the tenth century mention a powerful dynasty of the name of Balharâs who ruled at a place called Mânkir. The name of the city would show that the Râshtrakûtas, whose capital was
Idvyakheta or Mânkhed, were meant. But Balhâra, the name of the dynasty, has not been identified with any that might be considered to be applicable to the Râshtrakûtas. But to me the identification does not appear difficult. The Râshtrakûtas appear clearly to have assumed the title of Vallabha which was used by their predecessors the Châluukyas. In an inscription on a stone tablet at Lakshmesvar, Govinda III. is called Śrī-Vallabha, while in the Râdhânapur plates he is spoken of as Vallabha-narendra. In the Sângali and Kârdâ grants also the reigning king is styled Vallabha-narendra, while in other inscriptions we find the title Prithivivallabha alone used. Now Vallabha-narendra means "the king Vallabha," and is the same as Vallabharâja, the words râja(n) and narendra both denoting "a king." Vallabha-râja should, by the rules of Prâkrit or vernacular pronunciation, become Vallabha-rây, Ballaha-rây, or Ballha-rây. This last is the same as the Balhâra of the Arabs.

The genealogy of the Râshtrakûtas is shown in the following table:

| 1. | Dantivarman |
| 2. | Indra 1. |
| 3. | Govinda I. |
| 4. | Karka I. |
| 5. | Indra II. |
| 6. | Dantigurora. (675 S.) |
| 7. | Krîshna I. or Subhataunga. |
| 8. | Govinda II. |
| 9. | Dhruva, Nirupama, or Bhadrawarsha. |
| 10. | Govinda III. Jagattunga I., Jagadendra, or Prabhottavarsha. |
| 11. | Sarva or Amoghavarsha I. (775 & 770 S.) |
| 12. | Krîshna II. or Akâlavarsa. (630, 634 & 633 S.) |
| 13. | Jagattunga II. |
| 14. | Indra III. |
| 15. | Amoghavarsha II. |
| 16. | Govinda IV. (865 S.) |
| 17. | Radhya or Amoghavarsha III |
| 18. | Krîshna III. or Akâlavarsa. |
| 20. | Kakkala, Karka II. or Amoghavarsha IV. (894 S.) |

(a.) The names of those who were supreme sovereigns in the Dekkan are printed in capitals.
(b.) The names of those who were kings before the attainment of supreme power are printed in small letters.
(c.) The order of succession is represented by the numbers.
(d.) The name of the father of Kakkala, who does not appear to have ascended the throne at all, has been printed in italics.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, p. 156.
The later Chalukya dynasty, not a continuation of the earlier.

A Chalukya prince mentioned in a Vedantic work.

SECTION XII.

THE LATER CHALUKYAS.

We left the history of the kings of the Chalukya race at Kirtivarman II. Between him and Tailapa, who wrested the supreme sovereignty of the Dekkan from Kakkala, the last of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings, the Miraj copper-plate grant and the Yevur tablet place six kings. Kirtivarman ascended the throne in Saka 669 and was reigning in 679, before which time he had been reduced to the condition of a minor chief; and Tailapa regained sovereign power in 895 Saka.1 We have thus seven princes only between 669 and 895, i.e., for 226 years. This gives an average reign of 32 years to each, which is far too much. This was the darkest period in the history of the Chalukya dynasty, and probably no correct account of the succession was kept. Where the dynasty reigned and what the extent of its power was cannot be satisfactorily determined in the absence of the usual contemporary evidence, viz., inscriptions. There must have been several branches of the Chalukya family, and it is even a question whether Tailapa sprang from the main branch. I am inclined to believe that he belonged to quite a collateral and unimportant branch, and that the main branch became extinct. For the princes of the earlier dynasty always traced their descent to Hāriti and spoke of themselves as belonging to the Mānava race; while these later Chalukyas traced their pedigree to Satyāśraya only, and those two names do not occur in their inscriptions except in the Miraj grant and its copies, where an effort is made to begin at the beginning. But evidently the writer of that grant had not sufficient materials at his disposal, since, as above stated, he places six princes only between Kirtivarman II. and Tailapa. There is little question that there was no continuity of tradition. The titles Jagadekamalla, Tribhuvanamalla, &c., which the later Chalukyas assumed, mark them off distinctively from princes of the earlier dynasty, who had none like them. In a copper-plate grant dated Saka 735 found in Maisur a Chalukya prince of the name of Vimalāditya, the son of Yaśovarman and grandson of Balavarman, is mentioned. To ward off the evil influence of Saturn from Vimalāditya, a village was granted to a Jaina sage on behalf of a Jaina temple by Govinda III., the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, at the request of Chākīrāja of the Gaṅga family, the maternal uncle of Vimalāditya.2 These three Chalukya names do not occur in the usual genealogy of the family. This therefore appears to have been an independent branch.

At the end of a work entitled Saṁkṣhepaśāriraka, the author Sarvajnātman, the pupil of Suresvara, who himself was a pupil of the great Saṁkarachārya, states that he composed it while "the prosperous king of the Kshatriya race, the Aditya (sun) of the race of Mañu whose orders were never disobeyed, was ruling over the earth."3

1 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 4. 2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 11. 3 श्रीदेवेशरपादपुज्जर: संपर्कपत्ताचाथं: के सर्वलाभगिरिति मुनिि: संक्षेपशारिरकम्। चक्षु सज्जनसुद्दिर्धवर्तनेंद्रि राज्यवद्धं नूः श्रीमयक्षत्रसि मनुकुलाहिं मृच्छ भारत।।

The Devesvara spoken of in the first line is Suresvara, the pupil of Sāmkarāchārya.
This description would apply with propriety to such a king as Vikramâditya I., Vinâyâditya, Vijayâditya, or Vikramâditya II. of the early Châlukya dynasty, since they were very powerful princes and were "Adityas of the race of Manu." For the Mânava race to which they belonged may be understood as "the race of Manu." But Sàmkarâchârya is said to have lived between Saka 710 and 742, wherefore his grand-pupil must have flourished about the year 800 of that era, while Vikramâditya II., the latest of the four, ceased to reign in 669 Saka. Supposing then that the date assigned to Sàmkarâchârya is correct, the king meant by Sàrvarajatman must be one of those placed by the Miraj grant between Kirtivarman II. and Tailapa. He may be Vikramâditya, the third prince after Kirtivarman II., but if the description is considered hardly applicable to a minor chief, Sàmkarâchârya's date must be pushed backwards so as to place the pupil of his pupil in the reign of one of the four princes of the early Châlukya dynasty mentioned above.

Tailapa seems to have carried his arms into the country of the Cholas and humbled the king of Chedi. He despatched an expedition into Gujarât, under a general of the name of Bârâpa, against Mûlarâja, the founder of the Chaulukya dynasty of Anahilapattana, who for some time was hard pressed, but according to the Gujarât chroniclers the general was eventually defeated with slaughter. Someâvara, the author of the Kirtikaumudi, speaks of Bârâpa as the general of the lord of Lâta, from which it would appear that Tailapa was in possession of that country. Tailapa invaded Mâlvâ also, which at this time was governed by Muûja, the uncle of the celebrated Bhoja. Muûja, instead of strictly confining himself to the defensive, took the offensive, and, against the counsels of his aged minister Rudrâditya, crossed the Godâvari with a large army. He was encountered by Tailapa, who inflicted a crushing defeat on him and took him prisoner. At first Muûja was treated with consideration by his captor, but an attempt to effect his escape having been detected, he was subjected to indignities, made to beg from door to door, and finally beheaded. This event is alluded to in one of Tailapa's inscriptions. Tailapa reigned for twenty-four years. One of his feudatory chiefs granted a piece of land to a Jaina temple that he had constructed at Saundatti in the Belgaum district, in the year 902 Saka or A.D. 980.

Tailapa married Jâkabbâ, the daughter of the last Râshtrakûta king, and had by her two sons, whose names were Satyâšraya and Dašavarman. The former succeeded him in 919 Saka or A.D. 997. Nothing particular is mentioned of him in any of the inscriptions. The Khârepâtañ grant, which we have so often referred to, was issued in his reign in Saka 930 by a dependent chief of the Sîlâhâra family which ruled over southern Konkan.

Satyārāya died without issue and was succeeded by Vikramādiṭya I, the son of his younger brother Dāsavarman by his wife Bhagavatī. The earliest of his inscriptions is dated Śaka 930, which is also the latest date of his predecessor. He therefore succeeded to the throne in that year, i.e., in 1008 A.D., and appears to have reigned for only a short time. He was succeeded by his brother Jayasimha or Jagadekamalla, who in an inscription dated 941 Śaka, i.e., 1019 A.D., is represented to have put to flight or broken the confederacy of Mālava and is styled "the moon of the lotus which was king Bhoja," that is, one who humbled him. He is also spoken of as having beaten the Cholas and the Cheras. The Mira Grant was executed by him five years later, i.e., in Śaka 946, when "after having subdued the powerful Chola, the lord of the Dramila country, and taken away everything belonging to the ruler of the seven Konkans, he had encamped with his victorious army at Kolhāpur in the course of a march to the northern countries to vanquish them."  

Jayasimha ceased to reign in 962 Śaka, or 1040 A.D., and was succeeded by his son Someśvara I., who assumed the titles of Ahavamalla and Rālakoyamalla. As usual with the Chalukya princes, the first enemy he had to turn his arms against was the king of the Cholas. He is then represented by Bihāra to have marched against Dhārā, the capital of Bhoja, and captured it. Bhoja was compelled to abandon the city. These hostilities with the king of Mālava seem to have been inherited by this king and his predecessor from Tailapa, who had caused Muñja to be put to death. Bhoja was but a boy when this event took place. It is narrated in the Bhojacharitra that after he had come of age and begun to administer the affairs of his kingdom, on one occasion a dramatic play representing the fate of Muñja was acted before him, and thereupon he resolved to avenge his uncle's death. He invaded the Dekkan with a large army, captured Tailapa, subjected him to the same indignities to which Muñja had been subjected by him, and finally executed him. Bhoja, who ruled over Mālava for about fifty-three years, was but a minor when Muñja died. Muñja was on the throne in 994 A.D., while Tailapa died or ceased to reign in 997 A.D. He must therefore have been slain by the latter between 994 and 997 A.D., and Tailapa did not survive Muñja for a sufficiently long time to allow of Bhoja's attaining majority and fighting with him. Hence Bhoja could not have wreaked vengeance on Tailapa. But the wars of Jayasimha and Someśvara I. with him show that the tradition recorded in the Bhojacharitra must have been correct to this extent, that to avenge his uncle's death the king

---

1 I call him Vikramādiṭya I. and not Vikramādiṭya V. as others do, because I would keep the two dynasties distinct for the reasons given in the text above. I shall call Vikramādiṭya Tribhuvanamalla, Vikramādiṭya II., and so on.  
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 17.  
4 Loc. cit. Dramila is another form of Dravīḍa. There is some mistake here in the original. The letters are चंग्रिमलाधिपति. Mr. Fleet takes च as one word and चंग्रिदिपति as another, but च cannot be construed and Chandramila is unknown. The first word must be स्य, a mistake for some such word as स्यु, "down," "below," and the second Dramilādhapati.  
6 Bhojacharitra, I., 50-56.  
of Mālvā formed a confederacy with some neighbouring princes and attacked the dominions of the Chālukyas. Perhaps he captured Vikramaditya I., of whom we know so little, and put him to death. It was probably on that account that Jayasiṃha took arms against him and broke the confederacy, as represented in the inscription dated 941 Śaka.

After some time Someśvara attacked Chedi or Dāhala, the capital of which was Tevur or Tripura, and deposed or slew Karna. King Bhoja must have died before this event; for, just about the time of his death, Karna had formed a confederacy with Bhīmadeva I. of Gujarāt with a view to attack Mālvā from two sides, and sacked Mālā after his death. Bilhana next represents the Chālukya prince to have marched against the countries on the sea-coast, probably the western. These he conquered, and having erected a triumphal column there, proceeded by the sea-shore to the extremity of the peninsula. In his progress through that part of the country the king of the Dravīḍas or Cholas attacked him, but was defeated. Someśvara thereupon proceeded to his capital Kāṇīchi, which he captured, and the Chola king had to flee away to save his life. Ahavamalla's operations against Bhoja and the Cholas are alluded to in an inscription, and he is also represented to have fought with the king of Kanyakubja or Kanoj and compelled him to betake himself to the caverns of mountains for safety.

Ahavamalla or Someśvara founded the city of Kalyāṇa and made it his capital. Bilhana mentions the fact, and the name of the city does not occur in any inscriptions of a date earlier than 975 Śaka, when Someśvara was reigning. In the course of time three sons were born to Ahavamalla, the eldest of whom was named Someśvara, the second Vikramaditya, and the third Jayasimha. The ablest of these was Vikramaditya, and Ahavamalla intended to raise him to the dignity of prince-regent in supersession of his elder brother, but Bilhana tells us he declined the honour. Someśvara therefore was installed as prince-regent, but the real work was done by Vikramaditya, who was invariably employed by his father to fight his battles. The first thing he did was to march as usual against the Cholas, whose king was defeated and deprived of his kingdom. The king of Mālvā, who had been driven from his country by somebody whose name is not given, sought Vikramaditya's assistance. That prince put down his enemies and placed him on the throne. Vikramaditya is said to have invaded the Gauda country

1 Bilhana’s Vikr., I., 102-103.
2 Merutunga’s Bhojaprabandha; Rāṣa Mālā VI., p. 69, new Ed.
5 Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., II., 1. The natural construction appears to be to take प्रचंड in “most excellent” as an attributive adjective, not predicative, and take अनुच्छारितत्व as the predicate. The sense then will be: “He made (founded) the most excellent city named Kalyāṇa.”
6 See Mr. Fleet’s remarks on the point, Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 105. The word Kalyāṇa occurring in the Salotgi inscription (Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 210,) is also, like that in Kirtivarman’s grant, to be taken in the sense of “good,” “benefit,” “beneficial,” and not as the name of a town as Mr. Pandit and Dr. Bühler have done.
7 Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., II., 57-58 and 83; III., 1. 25; 16, III., 26-32, 35-41, and 48-54.
8 Ib., III., 55-67.
Ahavamalla’s death.

While Vikramāditya was so employed, Ahavamalla was seized with a strong fever. When he observed his end approaching, he caused himself to be taken to the banks of the Tungabhadra. He bathed in the waters of the river and gave away a great deal of gold in charity. Then entering the river again, he proceeded, until the water reached his neck, and, in the din caused by the waves and a number of musical instruments, drowned himself. This event must have taken place in Śaka 991, corresponding to 1069 A.D. Ahavamalla, according to Bilhana, performed a great many sacrifices and was very liberal to men of learning. On account of his virtues, poets made him the hero of the tales, poems, and dramas composed by them.

Someśvara, the eldest son of Ahavamalla, having been prince-regent, ascended the throne as a matter of course, and assumed the title of Bhuvanaikamalla. Vikramāditya received intelligence of his father’s death while returning from Vengi. He hastened to the capital and was received with affection by his brother. Vikramāditya made over to him all the spoils he had won in the course of his conquests, and for some time there was a good understanding between the brothers. But Someśvara was a weak and tyrannical prince. He oppressed his subjects and lost their affection. He would not be guided by the counsels of wiser and better men; and the kingdom of Kuntala lost a good deal of its importance and influence. Vikramāditya, unable to control his brother and suspecting his intentions towards himself, left the capital with his younger brother Jayasimha and a large army. Someśvara II. sent his forces after him, but they were defeated by Vikramāditya with great slaughter. The prince then proceeded to the banks of the Tungabhadra, and, after some time, directed his march towards the country of the Cholas. On the way he stopped at Banavasi, where he enjoyed himself for some time, and then started for the country of Malaya. Jayakeśi is represented to have submitted to Vikramāditya and “given him more wealth than he desired, and thus to have rendered lasting the smile on the face of the Konkan ladies.” Jayakeśi appears thus to have been king of the Konkan, and was the same as the first king of that name, who in the copper-plate grants of the Goa Kadambas, published by Mr. Fleet, is spoken of as having entered into an alliance with the Chālukya and Chola.

1 Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., III., 74. 2 Ib., IV., 2, 18. 3 Ib., IV., 20. 4 Ib., IV., 21-30. For the situation of Vengi, see supra, p. 41. 5 Ib., IV., 46-68. 6 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 4. 7 Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., I., 97-99; IV., 52. 8 Ib., I., 88. 9 Ib., IV., 88-119; V., I. 10 Ib., V., 5-8. 11 Ib., V., 10, 18-25.
kings and made Gopakapattana or Goa his capital. Vikramāditya or Tribhuvanamalla in after-life gave his daughter Mallalasahādevi in marriage to his grandson, who also was called Jayakesi, and this circumstance is mentioned in all the three grants, since the connection with the paramount sovereign of the Dekkan raised the dignity of the family. 1 The king of the Alupas 2 also rendered his allegiance to the Chālukya prince, who showed him marks of favour. He then subjugated the Keralas or people of Malabār, and turned towards the country of the Dravidas or Cholas. Being informed of this, the Chola prince sent a herald with proposals of peace, offering his daughter in marriage to Vikramāditya. These were accepted by the latter, and at the solicitations of the Chola he fell back on the Tungabhadra, where the prince arrived with his daughter and concluded an alliance. 3

Some time after, the king of the Cholas died and there was a revolution in the kingdom. When the Chālukya prince heard of this he immediately proceeded to Kānchī, and placing the son of his father-in-law on the throne, remained there for a month to suppress his enemies and render his position secure. A short time after his return to the Tungabhadra, however, Rājīga, the king of Veṅgi, observing that the nobility of the Chola prince were disaffected, seized the opportunity, and, having deposed him, usurped the sovereignty of the country. 4 To embarrass Vikramāditya and prevent his descent on Kānchī, Rājīga incited his brother Someśvara II to attack him from behind. Vikramāditya, however, marched on, and, by the time he came in sight of the Dravida forces, Someśvara overtook him in his rear. He had a very large army, which was well equipped. 5 Bilhana, who is, of course, anxious to show his patron to be guiltless in this fratricidal war, represents him to be deeply afflicted when he saw that his brother had made common cause with his enemy, and to have endeavoured to dissuade him from the course on which he had embarked. Someśvara made a show of yielding to his brother’s expostulations, seeking however in the meanwhile for a favourable opportunity to strike a decisive blow. 6 But Vikramāditya finally resolved to give a fight to the armies of both. Then a bloody battle ensued, Vikramāditya proved victorious, the new king of the Dravidas fled, and Someśvara was taken prisoner. The Chālukya prince then returned to the Tungabhadra, and after some hesitation dethroned Someśvara and had himself crowned king. To his younger brother Jayasimha he assigned the province of Banavasi. 7 These events took place in the cyclic year Nāla, Saka 998, or A.D. 1076. 8

---

1 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. IX., pp. 242, 265, 279. 2 See supra, p. 39, note 3. 3 Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., V. 26-29, 46, 56, 60, 73, 79-89. 4 ib., VI., 7-54. 5 ib., VI., 56-61. 6 ib., VI., 90-93, 98-99. 7 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 4; Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 189. The current Saka year was 999. Mr. Fleet thinks that the festival of his Pushābandha or coronation, grants on account of which are recorded as made on the 5th day of the bright half of Phālīguna in the Nāla year, in an inscription at Vadageri, was the annual festival. But this is a mere assumption. One would expect in such a case the word vādākotasa. The uṇa or festival spoken of must be that which followed the ceremony. The date in this inscription refers to the grant, and does not, in my opinion, show at all the day on which the coronation ceremony took place. All we can gather from this inscription and that at Araleśvara is that the Nāla Sārīvatsaśa was the first year of his reign.
Reign of Vikramāditya II. then entered Kalyāṇa and had a long and peaceful reign of fifty years. He assumed the title of Tribhuvanamalla, and is known by the names of Kalivikrama and Parmādirāya also. He abolished the Saka era and established his own; but it fell into disuse not long after his death. Some time after his accession, he went to Karahataka or Karhād and married the daughter of the Śilhāra king who reigned at the place. Her name was Chandralekha and she was a woman of rare beauty. Bilhana represents her to have held a swayamvara where a great many kings assembled, out of whom she chose the Chālukya prince and placed the nuptial wreath round his neck. Whether the swayamvara was real, or imagined by the poet to give himself an opportunity for the display of his poetic and descriptive powers, it is not possible to decide. Chandralekha is spoken of in the inscriptions as Chandaladevi, and many other wives of Tribhuvaramalla are mentioned besides her. The revenues of certain villages were assigned to them for their private expenses.

Some years after, Vikrama’s brother Jayasimha, who had been appointed his viceroy at Banavāsī, began to meditate treason against him. He extorted a great deal of money from his subjects, entered into an alliance with the Dravidā king and other chiefs, and even endeavoured to foment sedition and treachery among Vikramāditya’s troops. When the king heard of this, he made several attempts to dissuade his brother from his evil course, but they were of no avail; and in a short time Jayasimha came with his numerous allies and his large army and encamped on the banks of the Kṛishṇa. He plundered and burned the surrounding villages and took many prisoners and considered success so certain that he sent insulting messages to Vikrama. The king then marched against him at the head of his forces. As he approached the river he was harassed by the enemy’s skirmishers, but driving them away he encamped on the banks. He surveyed his brother’s army and found it to be very large and strong. Then a battle ensued. At first the elephants of the enemy advanced and spread confusion in the ranks of Vikrama. All his elephants, horses, and men turned backwards; but with remarkable bravery the king rushed forward on the back of his maddened elephant, dealing heavy blows right and left. The elephants of the enemy were driven back and the king killed a great many of his soldiers. The army was defeated and Jayasimha and his followers fled away. Vikrama did not pursue the enemy, but took the elephants, horses, women, and baggage left on the battle-field and returned to his capital. After a time Jayasimha was caught skulking in a forest and brought to Vikramāditya, who, however, is represented to have pardoned him.

In the latter part of Vikrama’s reign his dominions were invaded by a prince of the Hoysala branch of the Yādava family reigning at Dvārasamudra, the modern Ḥalebid in Māsīr; and with him were associated the kings of the Pāṇḍya country, Goa, and Konkan. This
Hoysala prince must have been Vishnuvardhana, the younger brother of Ballala and the grandson of Vinayaditya, who first brought the dynasty into prominence. For in the inscription of Vira Ballala, the grandson of Vishnuvardhana, at Gaddaka, Vishnuvardhana is represented to have overrun the whole country between his capital and Belvola and washed his horses with the waters of the Krishna-Venâ. It is also stated that he was again and again reminded of the honour done to him by the king Paramardideva (Vikramâditya), who said, 'Know the Hoysala alone among all princes to be unconquerable.'

Vikramâditya despatched against these enemies a dependent chief of the name of Acha or Achagi, whose territory lay to the south. Acha, who was "a very lion in war and shining like the hot-rayed sun, sounding his war-cry, pursued and prevailed against Poysala, took Gove, put to flight Lakshma in war, valorously followed after Pândya, dispersed at all times the Malapas, and seized upon the Konkan." Acha must have fought several other battles for his master; for he is represented to have made "the kings of Kalinga, Vaṅga, Maru, Gûjrara, Mâlava, Chera, and Chola (subject) to his sovereign." Vikramâditya himself had to take the field against the Chola prince, who had grown insubordinate. He was defeated and fled, and the king returned to his capital. Vikramâditya II. constructed a large temple of Vishnu and had a tank dug in front of it. In the vicinity he founded a town which was called Vikramapura. He governed his subjects well and they were happy under his rule. The security they enjoyed was so great that, according to Bilhana, "they did not care to close the doors of their houses at night, and instead of thieves the rays of the moon entered through the window openings." He was very liberal and bountiful to the poor and "gave the sixteen great gifts at each holy conjuncture." That he was a patron of learning is shown by the fact of a Kâsmirian Pândit like Bilhana, who travelled over the whole of India in quest of support, having been raised by him to the dignity of Vidyâpati or chief Pândit. Vijâñâñâvara, the author of the Mitâkshara, which is at present acknowledged over a large part of India, and especially in the Marâtha country, as the chief authority on matters of law and religion, flourished in the reign of Vikramâditya and lived at Kalyâna. At the end of most manuscripts of that work there occur three stanzas, which may be translated as follows:—

"On the surface of the earth, there was not, there is not, and there will be not, a town like Kalyâna; never was a monarch like the prosperous Vikramârka seen or heard of; and,—what more?—"
Vijñānesvara, the Pandit, does not bear comparison with any other\(^1\) (person). May this triad which is like a celestial creeper\(^2\) exist to the end of the Kalpa!

"May the Lord of wisdom\(^3\) live as long as the sun and moon endure,—he who produces words which distil honey and that nothing is more wonderful to the learned, gives wealth exceeding their wishes to a multitude of supplicants,\(^4\) contemplates the form of the subjugator of Mura, and has conquered the enemies that are born with the body.

"May the lord Vikramāditya protect this whole earth as long as the moon and the stars endure,—he whose feet are resplendent with the lustre of the crest jewels of prostrate kings from the bridge, which is the heap of the glory of the best scion of the Raghu race, to the lord of mountains, and from the Western Ocean, the waves\(^5\) of which surge heavily with the nimble shoals of fishes, to the Eastern Ocean."

Though Sanskrit authors often indulge in hyperbolic expressions without sufficient basis and as mere conventionalities, still the language and manner of these stanzas do show a really enthusiastic admiration in the mind of the writer for the city, its ruler, and the

\(^1\) Dr. Bühler’s reading of the last two lines is विज्ञानेश्वरिहिन्दी न भजते कितानायद्रीपोषमि कल्पस्य बिद्यमस्य कुप्पतिक्रवर्त्यं तदेव नयम्। The Doctor connects कल्पस्य with बिद्यमस्य and translates “nothing else that exists in this Kalpa bears comparison with the learned Vijñānesvara.” To mean “nothing else,” कितानायद्री must be विक्रद्री and in this construction पिन्दित्व, the nominative, has no verb, अनुव्यायत, being taken as the nominative to the verb भजते. Again, it will not do to say “nothing that exists in this Kalpa bears comparison,” &c., for one-half of this Kalpa only has passed away the other half still remains, and what it will produce but has not yet produced cannot be spoken of as existing in the Kalpa. The only proper reading with कल्पस्य a slight alteration is that of the Bombay lithographed edition, which he has given in a footnote and which is कितानायद्रीप्रोपामायक्रवर्त्यं। Instead of गृह there must be च here. And this is the reading of a manuscript of the Mitākshāra, dated Samvatsara 1535 and Saka 1401, purchased by me this year for the Bombay Government. Th reading is to be translated as in the text.

\(^2\) Like the celestial creeper, in so far as the triad satisfies all desires.

\(^3\) Dr. Bühler reads तत्र विज्ञानायथ and construes it as a vocative. The vocative does not look natural here. The Bombay lithographed edition and my manuscript have विज्ञानायथ: the nominative. Instead of तत्र the former has तत्त्व तत्र and the latter तत्र I have adopted this last. The author has here taken the name Vijñānesvara in its etymological sense and given to विज्ञान the object यथा or “knowledge” the object यथा or “truth, the whole meaning “the lord of the knowledge of truth.”

\(^4\) Dr. Bühler’s reading here is दत्तायमतिस्यज्ञातिसाधारणीयतय:। Here अथाय: cannot make any sense; it ought to be अर्थाय: which the lithographed edition and my manuscript have. The latter reads the whole line thus:—

\(^5\) The reading of the epithet of the “Western Ocean” is corrupt in all the three to चक्रातोभिसिदानोविश्वासिनीर्दर्शनं. The root चक्रात is used in connection with waves (see B. & R.’s Lexicon sub vocer).
great Pandit, who from the fact of the liberality attributed to him appears to have enjoyed the favour of the king and perhaps held a high office. From this and from the description given by Bilhana, as well as from Vikramâditya's inscriptions, of which we have about two hundred, it appears to be an undoubted fact that he was the greatest prince of this later Chalukya dynasty, and that during his reign the country enjoyed happiness and prosperity.

Vikramâditya II. was succeeded in Saka 1048 and in the cyclic year Parâbhava (A.D. 1127) by his son Someśvara III., who assumed the title of Bhûlokamalla.1 He had a short reign of about 11 years. He is represented to have "placed his feet on the heads of the kings of Andhra, Dravida, Magadha, Nepal; and to have been admired by all learned men."2 This last praise does not seem to be undeserved; for we have a work in Sanskrit written by Someśvara entitled Mânasollása or Abhilashitârtha Chintâmani, in which a great deal of information on a variety of subjects is given. The book is divided into five parts. In the first are given the causes which lead to the acquisition of a kingdom; in the second, those that enable one to retain it after he has acquired it; in the third, the kinds of enjoyment which are open to a king after he has rendered his power firm; in the fourth, the modes of diversion which give mental pleasure; and in the fifth, sports or amusements. Each of these consists of twenty kinds. In the first are included such virtues as shunning lies, refraining from injury to others, continence, meekness, affability, faith in the gods, feeding and supporting the poor and helpless, friends and adherents, &c. Under the second head are described what are called the seven aıyas, i.e., the ideal king, his ministers including the priest and the astrologer, the treasury and the way of replenishing it, the army, &c. The enjoyments are—a beautiful palace, bathing, anointing, rich clothing, ornaments, &c. The diversions are—military practice, horsemanship, training elephants, wrestling, cockfights, bringing up of dogs, poetry, music, dancing, and others. The last class comprises sports in gardens and fields, or on mountains and sandbanks, games, enjoyment of the company of women, &c. In connection with these subjects there are few branches of learning or art in Sanskrit the main principles of which are not stated. We have polity, astronomy, astrology, dialectics, rhetoric, poetry, music, painting, architecture, medicine, training of horses, elephants, and dogs, &c. The king does appear to have been a man of learning, and it was on that account that he received the title of Sarvejñabhūpta3 or the "all-knowing king." In the Mânasollása, in connection with the preparation of an almanac, the day used as an epoch from which to calculate the positions of certain heavenly bodies is stated as "Friday, the beginning of the month of Chaitra, one thousand and fifty-one years of Saka having elapsed, the year of the cycle being Saunyya, while the king Soma, the ornament of the Chalukya [race], who was the very sage Agastya to the ocean of the essences of all the Sāstras,4 and whose enemies were destroyed, was

1 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 15. The current Saka year corresponding to Parâbhava was 1049.
3 Ib., pp. 259 and 268.
4 That is, he drank the essences of all the Sāstras or sciences as the sage Agastya drank the whole ocean.
ruling over the sea-begirt earth.”¹ This work, therefore, was written in the fourth year after his accession.

Someśvara III. or Bhúlokamalla was succeeded in the cyclic year Kālayukti,² Śaka 1060 or A.D. 1138, by his son Jagadekamalla. Nothing particular is recorded of him. He reigned for 12 years and was succeeded by his brother Tailapa II., Nurmadi Taila or Trailokyamalla, in Śaka 1072, Pramoda Saṁvatsara.³ During these two reigns the power of the Chālukyas rapidly declined, and some of the feudatory chiefs became powerful and arrogant. The opportunity was seized by a dependent chief named Vijjala or Vījīana of the Kalachuri race, who held the office of Daṇḍānāyaka or minister of war under Tailapa. He conceived the design of usurping the throne of his master, and endeavoured to secure the sympathies and co-operation of some of the powerful and semi-independent chiefs. Vijayārka, the Mahámanḍalesvara of Kolhāpur, was one of those who assisted him,⁴ and Prolarāja of the Kşitēya dynasty of Tailaṅgana, who is represented to have fought with Tailapa, did so probably to advance the same cause.⁵ He kept his master Tailapa under complete subjection till Śaka 1079 or A.D. 1157, when Tailapa left Kālyāna and fled to Annigeri in the Dhārvā district, which now became the capital of his kingdom greatly reduced in extent. There is an inscription dated Śaka 1079, in Vījjala’s name, the cyclic year being Isvara, and the next Saṁvatsara, Bahladhanya, is spoken of as the second year of his reign.⁶ He does not however seem to have assumed the titles of supreme sovereignty till Śaka 1084, when he marched against Tailapa II., who was at Annigeri, and proclaimed

---

¹ The Siddhārthīn Saṁvatsara is mentioned as the second of his reign, wherefore the preceding Kālayukti (Śaka 1060) must have been the first. The current Śaka year was 1061. Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 141. There are several inscriptions in which the name of Jagadekamalla occurs, but it is difficult to make out whether they belong to the reign of this king or Jayasimha-Jagadekamalla, since the cyclic year only is given in them. Sometimes the year of the king’s reign is also given, but that even does not help in settling the point. For Jayasimha began to reign in Śaka 940, just 120 years or two complete cycles of 60 years each before Jagadekamalla II., and consequently the cyclic years and the years of their reigns are the same.

² For the Yuva Saṁvatsara was the sixth of his reign and it fell next after Śaka 1077. In Pramoda, 1073 was the current Śaka year and 1072 years had expired; Pāli, Sans. and old Can. Ins. No. 181.

³ Grant of Bhoja II. of Kolhāpur, Trans. Bomb. Lit. Soc., Vol. III. See Section XV.

⁴ He is said to have captured Tailapa and let him off through his devotion for him. He probably owed some allegiance to the Chālukya sovereign. Ins. of Rudradeva, Ind. Ant., Vol. XI., pp. 12-13, lines 27-30.

⁵ P. S. & O. C. Ins. Nos. 219 and 182.
himself an independent monarch. Tailapa seems then to have gone farther south and established himself at Banavasi.¹ The latest year of his reign mentioned in the inscriptions is the fifteenth, the Samvat or cyclic year being Párthīva, which was current next after Saka 1087.²

For some time there was an interruption in the Chālukya power, and the Kalachuris seem to have held possession of the whole territory of that dynasty. But internal dissensions consequent on the rise of the Lingāyata creed and the assassination of Vījīla considerably weakened the power of the Kalachuris, and about the Saka year 1104 Someśvara, the son of Nurmaći Taila, succeeded in wresting a considerable portion of the hereditary dominions of his family, and established himself at Annigeri. He owed his restoration to power to the valour and devoted attachment of a feudatory of his family named Brahma or Bomma, who fought several battles with the enemies of his master and is said to have conquered sixty elephants by means of a single one.³ Bomma is represented in an inscription at Annigeri dated Saka 1106 to have destroyed the Kalachuris and restored the Chālukyas to the throne.⁴ But a short time after the Yādavas of the south rose under Vīra Ballāla and of the north under Bhīllama. They both fought with Bomma; but success at first attended the arms of Vīra Ballāla, who subdued the Chālukya general and put an end to the power of the dynasty.⁵ We lose trace of Vīra Soma or Someśvara IV. after Saka 1111.

The Chālukya family must have thrown out several branches of petty chiefs. One such has been brought to light by a copper-plate grant dated Saka 1182, Rauḍra Saṁvatārā, which was in the possession of the Khot of Teravān, a village in the Rājāpur taluka of the Ratnāgiri district.⁶ The donor Keśava Mahājani was the minister of a Mahāmaṇḍālaśvara or chief of the name of Kāṁvadeva, one of whose titles was “the sun that blows open the lotus bud in the shape of the Chālukya race.” He is also called Kālīyānā-puravardhitāśvara or “lord of Kalyāṇa the best of cities,” which like several such titles of other chiefs⁷ simply shows that he belonged to the family that once reigned with glory at Kalyāṇa. The village conveyed by the grant was Teravāntaka, identified with Teravān itself, from which it would appear that Kāṁvadeva was chief of that part of Konkan. There is an inscription in the temple of Ambābālī at Kollāpur in which is recorded the grant of a village by Somadēva who belonged to the Chālukya family and reigned at Saṅganeśvara, which is twelve kos to the north-east of Ratnāgiri. Somadēva was the son of Vetugideva and the father of this last was Karnadeva.⁸ Probably the Kāṁvadeva of the Teravān grant belonged to this branch of the family. There are still Marāṭhā families of the name of Chālīke reduced to poverty in the Saṅga-neśvara Tāluka or in the vicinity.

² P. S. & O. C. Ins. No. 140.
⁷ See infra, Section XVI.
The earliest mention of a family of this name that we have is in connection with Maṅgalāśa of the early Chālukya dynasty. Vinayāditya is represented in one of his inscriptions to have subdued the Haihayas. A family of this name with which, as we have seen, the later Kāśṭrakūṭa princes were connected by marriage, ruled over Chedi or the country about Jabalpur. The Haihayas were also called Kalachuris or Kulachuris. The Kalachuris of Kālañja must have been an offshoot of this family. One of the titles used by Vijjala was Kālañjara-puravarādhīśvara "or Lord of the best city of Kālañjara." Kālañjara was a stronghold belonging to the rulers of Chedi and was probably their capital, though Tripura, the modern Tevur, is also known to have been the principal seat of the family. Vijjala before his usurpation called himself only a Mahāmāndalesvara or minor chief, and is first mentioned as a feudatory of Jagadekamalla, the successor of Somesvara III. The manner in which he drove away Taila III. from Kalyāna, and having raised himself to the supreme power in the state gradually assumed the titles of a paramount sovereign, has already been described. But soon after, a religious revolution took place at Kalyāna, and Vijjala and his family succumbed to it.

The principal leader of that revolution was a person of the name of Basava. A work in Kanarese entitled Basava Purana gives an account of Basava; but it is full of marvellous stories and relates the wonderful miracles wrought by him. The principal incidents, however, may be relied on as historical. On the other hand there is another work entitled Vijjalarāya Charita, written by a Jain, which gives an account of the events from the opposite side, since the attacks of the Lingāyas were chiefly directed against the Jainas, and these were their enemies.

Basava was the son of a Brāhman named Mādirāja, who lived at Bāgevaḍā in the Kalâdwgī district. Baladeva, the prime minister of Vijjala, was his maternal uncle and gave him his daughter in marriage. After Baladeva's death the king appointed Basava his prime minister as being closely related to Baladeva. The Jainas, however, state that Basava had a beautiful sister named Padmavatī, of whom the king became enamoured and whom he either married or made his mistress; and it was on that account that he was raised to that office and became a man of influence. There must be some truth in this story; for the Basava Purana narrates that the king gave his younger sister Nilaločanā in marriage to Basava, which looks as if it were a counter-story devised to throw discredit on the
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other, which was so derogatory to Basava. Basava had another sister named Nágulambikâ, who had a son named Chenna-Basava or Basava the younger. In concert with him Basava began to proclaim a new doctrine and a new mode of worshipping Siva, in which the Linga and the Nandin or bull were prominent. He speedily got a large number of followers, and ordained a great many priests, who were called Jângamas. Basava had charge of the king’s treasury, and out of it he spent large amounts in supporting and entertaining these Jângamas, who led a profligate life. Vijjala had another minister named Mânchannâ, who was the enemy of Basava, and informed the king of his rival’s embezzlements. In the course of time Vijjala was completely alienated from Basava and endeavoured to apprehend him. But he made his escape with a number of followers, whereupon the king sent some men in pursuit. These were easily dispersed by Basava, and then Vijjala advanced in person. But a large number of followers now joined Basava, and the king was defeated and had to submit to his minister. Basava was allowed to return to Kalyâna and reinstated in his office.

At Kalyâna there were two pious Lingâyatas named Halleyaga and Madhuveyya, who were the devout adherents of their master Basava. Vijjala, listening to the calumnious accusations of their enemies, caused their eyes to be put out. All the disciples of Basava were highly indignant at this cruel treatment of these holy men, and assembled in their master’s house. Basava ordered Jagaddeva to murder the king, pronounced a curse on Kalyâna, and left the town. Jagaddeva hesitated for a moment, but his mother spurred him on, and with two companions, Mullaya and Bommaya, went straight to the palace of the king; and rushing through the throng of courtiers, counsellors, and princes, they drew their poignards and stabbed Vijjala. Thence they went into the streets, and brandishing their weapons proclaimed the reason of their perpetrating the deed.

Then arose dissensions in the city, men fought with men, horses with horses, and elephants with elephants; the race of Vijjala was extinct, Kalyâna was a heap of ruins, and the curse pronounced by Basava was verified. Basava went in haste to his favourite shrine of Sâlgamesvara, situated on the confluence of the Malaprabhâ with the Krîshnâ, and there in compliance with his prayers the god absorbed him in his body.

The account given by the Jainas is different. Vijjala had gone on an expedition to Kolhâpur to reduce the Sîlâhâra chief Bhoja II. to subjection. In the course of his march back to the capital he encamped at a certain place on the banks of the Bhîmâ, and, while reposing in his tent, Basava sent to him a Jângama disguised as a Jaina with a poisoned fruit. Vijjala, who is said to have been a

2 ib., pp. 78 & 89.
Jaina himself, unsuspectingly took the fruit from the hands of the seeming Jaina priest; and as soon as he smelled it, he became senseless. His son Immadi Vijjala and others hastened to the spot, but to no purpose. Vijjala, however, somewhat recovered his senses for a short while, and, knowing who it was that had sent the poisoned fruit, enjoined his son to put Basava to death. Immadi Vijjala gave orders that Basava should be arrested and all Jangamas, wherever found, executed. On hearing of this, Basava fled, and being pursued went to the Malabar coast and took refuge at a place called Ulavi. The town was closely invested and Basava in despair threw himself into a well and died, while his wife Nilamba put an end to her existence by drinking poison. When Vijjala's son was pacified, Chenna-Basava surrendered all his uncle's property to him and was admitted into favour. He now became the sole leader of the Lingayatas, but, even before, his position was in some respects superior to that of Basava. The religious portion of the movement was under his sole direction, and it was he who shaped the creed of the sect. In him the Pranava or sacred syllable Om is said to have become incarnate to teach the doctrines of the Vira Saiva faith to Basava, and, according to the Chenna-Basava Purana, "Chenna-Basava was Siva; Basava, Vrishabha (or Siva's bull, the Nandim); Bijjala, the door-keeper; Kalyana, Kailasa; (and) Siva worshippers (or Lingayatas), the Siva host (or the troops of Siva's attendants)."

Vijjala's death took place in Saka 1089 (1090 current), or A.D. 1167. He was succeeded by his son, who in the inscriptions is called Sovideva or Somesvara. He reigned till Saka 1100 and was followed by his brother Saṃkama, whose inscriptions come down to the cyclic year Sūbhakrit. In an inscription at Balagāṅve the cyclic year Vikārin (S. 1101) is called the third of his reign, while in another at the same place the same year is spoken of as the fifth. In other inscriptions we have two names Saṃkama and Āhavamalla and the cyclic years Sādvārin (S. 1102) and Plava (S. 1103) are represented as the third year of his or their reign, which is possible, and Sūbhakrit (S. 1104) as the eighth. About Saka 1104 the Chālukya prince Somesvara IV. wrested some of the provinces of his ancestral dominions from the Kalachuris, and the rest must have been conquered by the Northern Yādavas; so that about this time the Kalachuri dynasty became extinct.

During the period occupied by the later Chālukya dynasty and the Kalachuris (Saka 895-1110 or A.D. 973-1188), the old state of things as regards the religious and social condition of the country may be said to have finally disappeared and the new ushered in. First, we have in this period what might be considered the last traces of Buddhism. In the reign of Tribhuvanamalla or Vikramāditya II., in the cyclic year Yuvan, and the nineteenth of his era (Saka 1017), sixteen merchants of the Vaiśya caste constructed a Buddhistic vihāra or monastery and temple at Dharmavolal, the

---

1 Wilson's Mackenzie MSS., p. 320.  
4 Ibid., p. 311.  
7 Ibid., No. 189.
modern Dambal in the Dhāravāḍ district and assigned for its support
and for the maintenance of another vihāra at Lokkūṇḍi, the modern
Lakkūṇḍi, a field and a certain amount of money to be raised by
voluntary taxation.¹ In Śaka 1032 the Silāhāra chief of Kolhāpur
constructed a large tank and placed on its margin an idol of Buddha
along with those of Śiva and Arhat, and assigned lands for their
support.² Jainism ceased in this period to be the conquering reli-
gion that it was, and about the end received an effectual check by
the rise of the Liṅgāyata sect. This new creed spread widely among
the trading classes, which before were the chief supporters of
Jainism. There is a tradition in some parts of the country that
some of the existing temples contained Jaina idols at one time
and that afterwards they were thrown out and Brāhmanic ones
placed instead. This points to a change of feeling with reference
to Jainism, the origin of which must be referred to this period.

The worship of the Purānic gods flourished; and during this
period the endeavours of the Brāhmans and their adherents were
for the first time directed towards reducing the civil and religious
law to a system, or towards its codification, as it might be called.
The texts or precepts on the subject were scattered in a great
many Smṛitis and Purāṇas; and often there were apparent in-
consistencies and the law was doubtful. Nibandhas or digests, of
which we have now so many, began to be written in this period, but
the form which they first took, and which even now is one of the
recognized forms, was that of commentaries on Smṛitis. Bhoja
of Dhārā, who belongs to the first part of this period, must have
written a treatise on the subject, since under the name of Dhārēśvara he
is referred to by Vijnāneśvara in his work. He was followed by
Vijñāneśvara, who, as we have seen, lived at Kalyāṇa in the reign
of Vikramaḍītya II. Aparārka, another commentator on Yaññaval-
kyya, who calls his work a nibandha on the Dharmasastra or institutes
of Yaññavalkyya, was a prince of the Silāhāra family of northern
Konkan and was on the throne in Śaka 1109 (A. D. 1187) and in
the cyclic year Pardhava.³ Or, if he was the earlier prince of that
name, he must have flourished about fifty years before. This
movement was continued in the next or thirteenth century by
Hemādri, and by Sāyaṇa in the fourteenth.

¹ Ind. Ant., Vol. X., p. 185.
² Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XIII., p. 4, and infra, Section XVI.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

Genealogy of the Chalukya family between Vijayaditya and Tailapa as given in the Miraj grant of Jayasimha dated Saka 946.

Vijayaditya:

- Vikramaditya II.
- Krtivarman II.
- Another son.

Krtivarman:

- Krtivarman.
- Tailapa.

Tailapa:

- Vikramaditya.
- Ayyana, married the daughter of Krishna.
- Vikramaditya, married Bontha-devi the daughter of Lakshmana, king of Chedi.
- Tailapa.

Genealogy of the later Chalukyas:

1. TAILAPA I. (Saka 896-919. (A.D. 973-997.)

2. SATYAS' RATA, Irivibhujanga. (Saka 909-920. (A.D. 986-997.)

3. VIKRAMADITYA I. (Saka 920-940. (A.D. 997-1017.)

4. JAYASIMHA, Jagadeekamalla I. (Saka 940-952. (A.D. 1018-1030.)

5. SOMESVARA I., Ahavamalla, Trailokyaamalla I. (Saka 962-963. (A.D. 1040-1041.)

6. SOMESVARA II., Bhuvanakamalla. (Saka 991-998. (A.D. 1069-1076.)

7. VIKRAMADITYA II., Tribhuvanakamalla. (Saka 996-1018. (A.D. 1069-1091.)

8. SOMESVARA III., Bhuvanakamalla. (Saka 1018-1040. (A.D. 1126-1148.)

9. JAGADEEKAMALLA II. (Saka 1069-1072. (A.D. 1138-1150.)

10. TAILAPA II., Nurmadi Taila, Trailokyaamalla II. (Saka 1072-1087. (A.D. 1150-1165.)

11. SOMESVARA IV. (Saka 1104-1111. (A.D. 1182-1189.)
The genealogy of the Yádavas is given in the introduction to the Vratakhandá attributed to or composed by Hemádri who was a minister of Mahádeva, one of the later princes of the dynasty. Some of the manuscripts of the work, however, do not contain it, and in others it begins with Bhillama, as it was he who acquired supreme power and raised the dynasty to importance. Others again contain an account of the family from the very beginning, the first person mentioned being the Moon who was churned out of the milky ocean. From the Moon the genealogy is carried down through all the Puránic or legendary ancestors to Mahádeva. But it is not difficult from the account itself to determine where the legend ends and history begins. Besides, the names of most of the historical predecessors of Bhillama agree with those occurring in the copper-plate grant translated by Pádít Bhágvánlal Indrájí. He considered the Yádava dynasty mentioned in his grant to be different from that of Devagiri and called it "A New Yádava Dynasty," as, of course, in the absence of the information I now publish, he was justified in doing. But it is now perfectly clear that the princes mentioned in the grant were the ancestors of the Devagiri Yádavas. The following early history of the family is based on the account given in the Vratakhandá and on the grant published by the Pádít. The latter, however, brings down the genealogy only to Scuñchachandra II. who was on the throne in 991 Saka or 1069 A.D., and omits the names of some of the intermediate princes.

Subáhu who belonged to the Yádava race was a universal sovereign. He had four sons among whom he divided the whole earth ruled over by him. The second son Drídhapraháéra became the founder of the family.  

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 119 et seq.
2 The edition of the Vratakhandá in the Bibliotheca Indica contains neither of these two very valuable and important Práṣastis. I have therefore had recourse to manuscripts. There is one manuscript only in the Government collections deposited in the Library of the Dekkan College and that is No. 234 of Collection A. of 1881-82 which was made by me. It contains the shorter Práṣasti beginning with the reign of Bhillama. There is another copy in the collection belonging to the old Sanskrit College of Poona, which contains the longer Práṣasti. Unfortunately, however, the third and fourth leaves of the manuscript are missing; and the second ends with Parammádeva the successor of Scuñchachandra II., while the fifth begins with some of the last stanzas of the introduction referring to Hemádri and his works. The valuable portion therefore is in leaves 3 and 4; but that is irretrievably lost. I therefore endeavoured to procure copies from the private collections in the city of Poona and obtained one from Khásigvála’s library. It contains the shorter Práṣasti only. My learned friend Gangádáhar S‘ástri Dútá procurèd another. In it the two, the shorter one and the longer, are jumbled together. There are in the commencement the first seventeen stanzas of the shorter and then the longer one begins; and after that is over, we have the remaining stanzas of the shorter. This is the only manuscript of the four now before me which contains the whole of the longer Práṣasti, and the information it gives about the later princes of the dynasty known to us from the inscriptions is also valuable and now, but the manuscript is extremely incorrect. I therefore caused a search for other copies to be made at Nasik, Kolhápur, and Ahmedabad; but none was available at those places. I give the two Práṣastis in Appendix C.
3 He is called Drídhapraháéra (nom. sing.) in the MSS; stanza 20, Appendix C. I.
king in the south or Dekkan. The Yādavas, it is stated, were at first lords of Mathurā, then from the time of Krishna they became sovereigns of Dvāravatī or Dvārakā, and came to be rulers of the south from the time of the son of Subāhu, viz., Drīdhaprāhāra. His capital was Sṛinagura according to the Vratakhaṇḍa, while from the grant it appears to have been a town of the name of Chandrādityapura, which may have been the modern Chāndīνor in the Nasik district. He had a son of the name of Seunachandra who succeeded to the throne. The country over which he ruled was called Seunadesa1 after him, and he appears to have founded a town also of the name of Seunapura. Seunadesa was the name of the region extending from Nāsik to Devagiri, the modern Daulatbād, since later on we are told that Devagiri was situated in Seunadesa and that this latter was situated on the confines of Dandakāranya.2 Seunachandra’s son Dhādiyappa3 became king after him and he was succeeded by his son Bhillama. After Bhillama, his son Śrīrāja according to the grant, or Rājagi according to the other authority, came to the throne, and he was succeeded4 by Vaddiga or Vādugi who was probably the brother of his predecessor. Then came Dhādiyasa5 who was the son of Vādugi according to the Vratakhaṇḍa. The grant omits his name. Dhādiyasa was succeeded by his son Bhillama.6 Bhillama married according to the grant

1 Stanza 22, Appendix C. I. 2 Stanza 19, Appendix C. II.
3 Called Dhādiyasa in the MSS.; Appendix C. I., stanza 23.
4 Ibid. Pandit Bhagvanłāl translates the words arvāk tasya (see note 6 below) occurring in the Yādava grant as “before him,” and placing Vaddiga before Śrīrāja, conjectures that he was Bhillama’s son and that Śrīrāja his uncle deposed him and usurped the throne; (Ind. Ant. Vol. XII, pp. 125a. and 128b.). But arvāk tasya can never mean “before him,” and must mean “after him,” and hence the conjectures are groundless. I have never seen a preceding prince mentioned in the grants after his successor, with such an introductory expression as “before him so and so became king.” By the occurrence of the word अजनि in stanza 23, line 2, Appendix C. I., it appears Rājagi was the son of Bhillama I.
5 Appendix C. I. Stanza 24. If he had been mentioned in the grant, he would probably have been called Dhādiyappa.
6 Ibid. Pandit Bhagvanłāl omits this prince though he is mentioned in his grant. The last two lines of the fourth stanza in this are:

ःखरस्य वभुव भृत्यहि: श्रीवद्गि गाण्यो नूपः
तस्मात्तौ वर्मिद्वियमेवतिपते: प्रश्चक्ष्यस्मभवत्॥

The Pandit translates this:—“Before him was the illustrious king Vaddiga, a Hari on earth; and therefore he was exactly like the illustrious good Bhillama in his actions.” I have already remarked that instead of “before him,” we should have “after him,” here. The word तस्मात्तौ is translated by “therefore.” “Wherefore?” I would ask. No reason is given in the first of these lines for his being exactly like Bhillama; and therefore, it will not do to translate तस्मात्तौ by “therefore.” Again, the Pandit’s interpretation of प्रश्चक्ष्यस्मभवत् as “exactly like in actions” is farfetched and unnatural. The thing is, the genitive or ablative तस्मात्तौ cannot be connected with any word in the line, and is therefore one of the innumerable mistakes which we have in this grant and most of which have been pointed out by the Pandit himself. What is wanted here is the nominative प्रश्चक्ष्यस्मभवत् for तस्मात्तौ and then the whole is appropriate, and the phrase will have its proper sense of “after him,” or “from him.”

The correct translation then is “After him was a king of the name of Vaddiga the prosperous, who was a Hari on earth, and after him or of him (i.e., Vaddiga), came the prosperous, great Bhillama in whom Virtue became incarnate.” In this way, we have here another king Bhillama, as mentioned in the Prafasti in the Vratakhaṇḍa in the passage cited above.
Lasthíyavvá, the daughter of Jhañjha who was probably the Śiśáhára prince of Tháná of that name. Lasthíyavvá sprang on her mother’s side from the Ráshtrákúta family, and through her son became “the upholder of the race of Yadu”; so that she was connected with three ruling dynasties and flourishing kingdoms. The next king was Vesugi called in the grant Tésuka which probably is a mistake or misreading for Vesuka or Vesuqa. He married Návaladevi, the daughter of Gogi, who is styled a feudatory of the Chálukya family, and was perhaps the same as the successor of the Tháná prince Jhañjha. The Ráshtrákúta must have been

1 This lady, according to my translation becomes the wife of Bhillama who is the king mentioned immediately before and not of his grand-father Vaddiga as the Pandit makes out.

2 Here there is another difficulty arising from a mistake in the grant which Pandit Bhágavánl has in my opinion not succeeded in solving; and he bases upon that mistake conjectures which are rather too far-reaching (p. 125a, Ind. Ant., Vol. XII). The stanza is:

मायाय यशस्व संस्कराजतया श्रीलिथिष्यवाहिया
धर्मायंगाधिकविकुड़ूसुयणा राधरावकुण्या
या जाता नववाचनातसबि यदववधारिता
संस्करायाृतायमभार्यवर्णाद्यग्रामः ततः ||

The Pandit’s translation is:—“Whose wife was the daughter of king Jhañjha, Lasthíyavvá by name, possessed of the (three) good qualities of virtue, liberality, and hospitality, who was of the Ráshtrákúta race, as being adopted (by them) at the time of the rule of the young prince (during his minority), and who therefore by reason of bearing the burden of the kingdoms, with its seven ángas, was an object of reverence to the three kingdoms.”

I agree with the Pandit in reading the before राधरावकुण्या and taking रास्मयम as रुपयम and, generally, in his translation of the first two and the fourth lines. But the translation of the third line, that is, the portion italicised in the above, is very objectionable. The Pandit reads रुप from नात and says that the य in रुपयम ought to be long for the metre but would make no sense. Now, in seeking the true solution of the difficulty here, we must bear in mind that in the fourth line the lady is spoken of as “an object of reverence to the three kingdoms.” Which are the three kingdoms? First evidently, that of Jhañjha, her father, who is spoken of in the first line; and secondly, that of the Ráshtrákúta from whose race she is spoken of as having sprung in the second line. Now, we must expect some allusion to the third kingdom in the third line. The third kingdom was clearly that of the Yadavas into whose family she had been married. Therefore, read रुपयम for रास्मयम and thus the difficulty about the metre is removed, the य becoming prosodically long in consequence of the following त. In the same manner I think बालनाथ is a mistake for बालनाम: The word मात the writer must have taken from his vernacular and considered it a Sanskrit word; or probably not knowing Sanskrit well, he must have formed it from the root जन on the analogy of मात from पुरुष, नात from नास, पृत from पृत &c. Or बालनाम may be considered as a mistake for बालनाम, the sense being the same, viz. “birth of a child.” The compound बालनामारिता is to be dissolved as आरिता.

3 Stanza 24, Appendix C, I.

4 The expression चालुक्यायमपुष्करः in the grant admits of being taken in the manner I have done. The Pandit understands Gogiraja as belonging to the Chálukya race. I consider my interpretation to be more probable.
Bhillama III., son-in-law of Jayasiriha.

Seuna, the ally of Vikramaditya II.

Successors of Seuna, the ally of Vikramaditya II.

overthrown by the Chalukyas about the end of Jhañjha’s reign and thus his successor became a feudatory of the Chalukyas.

The Vratakhandha places Arjuna after Vesugi, but the grant omits his name. The next king was Bhillama who married Hāmmā, the daughter of Jayasiriha and sister of Āhavamalla, the Chalukya emperor, under whose standard he fought several battles. The grant then proceeds at once to the donor, the reigning prince Seuna, who is spoken of in general terms as “having sprung from the race” of the last-mentioned king, and is represented to have defeated several kings and freed his kingdom from enemies after “the death of Bhillama.” This Bhillama was his immediate predecessor, but he was a different person from the brother-in-law of Āhavamalla since Seuna is spoken of not as the son of the latter or any such near relation but simply as “having sprung from his race.” The Vratakhandha supplies the names of the intermediate princes. The elder Bhillama was succeeded by Vādugi, his son, “whose praise was sung by poets in melodious words.” After him Vesugi became king, but how he was related to Vādugi we are not told. He humbled a number of subordinate chiefs who had grown troublesome. Then came Bhillama and after him Seuna who issued the charter translated by Paṇḍit Bhagvānālā. What relationship the last three princes bore to each other is not stated. Seuna is represented to have saved Paramardideva, that is, Vikramaditya II., who is styled the “luminary of the Chalukya family” from a coalition of his enemies, and to have placed him on the throne of Kalyāṇa. This appears to be a reference to the coalition between the Veilgi prince and Vikramaditya’s brother Someśvara. The Yādava prince Seuna was thus a close ally of the Chalukya monarch and their dates also are consistent with the fact. Seunachandra’s grant is dated Saka 991 Saunya Saumatsari, while Vikramaditya II. got possession of the Chalukya throne in Saka 998 Nāla. The grant mentions the relations of previous Yādava princes to the Chalukyas of Kalyāṇa, while the important service rendered by Seunachandra to Vikramaditya is not recorded, and he is spoken of only in general terms as having vanquished “all kings.” This itself shows that in all likelihood the fact mentioned in the Vratakhandha of Seunachandra’s having delivered that prince from his enemies and placed him on the throne took place after Saka 991, and we know it as a matter of fact that Vikramaditya became king in Saka 998.

Seunachandra was succeeded by Parammadeva who was probably his son, and after him came Sīnharaja. Sīnharaja is probably a mislection for Sīnharāja or “King Sīnha”, and the full name of the

1 Stanza 24, Appendix C. I.
2 Stanza 26, Ibid.
3 This appears to me to be the general sense of stanza 8 and not that he fought with Āhavamalla as Paṇḍit Bhagvānālā understands. I need not discuss the matter in detail.
4 Stanza 26, Appendix C. I.
5 Stanza 27, Ibid.
6 Stanza 28, Ibid.
7 Stanza 29, Ibid.
8 Stanzas 30 and 31, Ibid.
priu. may have been Sinhāna or Singha. How Sinhā was related to Paramma we do not know; probably he was his brother. He is said to have brought an elephant of the name of Karpuratalaka from L(Tr)anjipura. He was succeeded by his son Mallugi who took a town of the name of Parnakheta from his enemies, and while residing there carried away by force the troop of elephants belonging to the king of Utkala or Orissa. Then followed his son Amaragāneya whose name is mentioned in a copperplate grant issued in the reign of a subsequent king. After him came Govindaṛāja who was probably his son. Govindaṛāja was succeeded by Amaramallagi, a son of Mallugi, and he, by Kāliya Ballāla. This prince was in all likelihood the son of Amaramallagi, though it is not expressly stated. Ballāla’s sons were set aside and the sovereignty of the Yādava family fell into the hands of his uncle Bhillama who was possessed of superior abilities. Bhillama being represented as the uncle of Ballāla must have been another son of Mallugi, and he is so spoken of in the grant referred to above. He got possession of the throne after two of his brothers and their sons, wherefore he must have been a very old man at the time. Hence it is that he reigned only for a short time, having come to the throne in Śaka 1109 and died in 1113. It was this Bhillama who acquired for his family the empire that was ruled over by the Chālukyas.

Pandit Bhagyānlal has published a stone-inscription existing in a ruined temple at Anjaneri near Nasik, in which a chief of the Yādava family named SeuJadeva is represented to have made some grant in the Śaka year 1063 to a Jaina temple. From the account given above, it will be seen that there were two princes only of the name of Seuṇa in the Yādava family, and that the later of the two was an ally of Vikramāditya II., and consequently reigned about the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century of the Śaka era. The Seuṇadeva of the Anjaneri inscription therefore cannot be this individual, and no other prince of that name is mentioned in the Vratākhanda. Besides Seuṇadeva calls himself pointedly a Mahāsamantrī or chief only; while about 1063 Śaka when the Chālukya power had begun to decline, it does not appear likely that the Yādavas of Seuṇadeva should give themselves such an inferior title. It therefore appears to me that the Seuṇadeva of Anjaneri belonged to a minor branch of the Yādava family dependent on the main branch and that the branch ruled over a small district of which Anjaneri was the chief city.

The number of princes who reigned from Drīḍhaprahāra to Bhillama V. inclusive is 23. There are in the list a good many who belonged to the same generation as their predecessors and consequently these twenty-three do not represent so many different generations. Allowing, therefore, the usual average, in such cases of 19 years to each reign, the period that must have elapsed between the accession of Drīḍhaprahāra and the death of Bhillama V. is 437

1 Stanza 32, Appendix C. I. May Traṇjipura be the modern Tanjor?
2 Stanzas 33 and 34, Ibid.
3 Stanza 35. Ibid.
5 Stanzas 35-37, Appendix C. I.
years. The dynasty, therefore, was founded about 676 S'aka or 755 A.D., that is, about the time of the overthrow of the early Chälukyas by the Rāshtrakūtas.

*The relations of those whose names are marked with an asterisk to their predecessors are not clearly stated.*

Genealogy of the early Yādavas or the Yādavas of Seunadeśa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driṅhaprahabāra.</th>
<th>Seunachandra I.</th>
<th>Dhādiyappa I.</th>
<th>Bhillama I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajagi or Śirāja.</td>
<td>Vādugi or Vaddiga I.</td>
<td>Dhādiyappa II.</td>
<td>Bhillama II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seunachandra II.* Saka 991 or A.D. 1069.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paramma.</th>
<th>Siñha.*</th>
<th>Mallugi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amaragāngeya.</th>
<th>Amaramallagi.</th>
<th>Bhillama V. or I. died Saka 1113 or A.D 1191.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govindarāja.</td>
<td>Ballāla.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
Later History.

We have seen that the Hoysala Yādavas of Halebid in Māsūr were becoming powerful in the time of Tribhuvanamalla or Vikramāditya II. and aspired to the supreme sovereignty of the Dekkan, and Vishnuvardhana the reigning prince of the family at that period actually invaded the Chālukya territory and encamped on the banks of the Krishnā-Venā. But those times were not favourable for the realization of their ambitious projects. The Chālukya prince was a man of great ability, the power of the family was firmly established over the country, its resources were large, and the dependent chiefs and noblemen were obedient. But the state of things had now changed. Weaker princes had succeeded, the Chālukya power had been broken by their dependents the Kalachuris, and these in their turn had succumbed to the internal troubles and dissensions consequent on the rise of the Liṅgāyata sect. At this time the occupant of the Hoysala throne was Vīra Ballāla, the grandson of Vishnuvardhana. He fought with Brahma or Bomma, the general of the last Chālukya prince Somesvara IV., and putting down his elephants by means of his horses defeated him and acquired the provinces which the general had won back from Viṭāla.

The Yādavas of the north were not slow to take advantage of the unsettled condition of the country to extend their power and territory. The reigning prince at that time must have been Ballāla the son of Amaramallagi. But the most enterprising member of the family was Bhillama his uncle. He captured a town of the name of Śrīvardhana from a king who is called Aṁśala, vanquished in battle the king of Pratyāndaka, put to death the ruler of Maṅgalaveshta, (Maṅgalvedheīm), of the name of Vajrin, and having obtained the sovereignty of Kalyāna, set at defiance the Hoysala Yādava. When in this manner he made himself master of the whole country to the north of the Krishnā, he founded the city of Devagiri and having got himself crowned, made that city his capital. This took place about the S'aka year 1109.

Bhillama then endeavoured to extend his territory farther southwards, but he was opposed by Vīra Ballāla, who, as we have seen, had been pushing his conquests northwards. It was a contest for the possession of an empire and was consequently arduous and determined. Several battles took place between the two rivals, and eventually a decisive engagement was fought at Lokkigūnda, now Lakkūnda, in the Dhārvād District, in which Jaitrasinha, who is compared to "the right arm of Bhillama" and must have been his son, was defeated and Vīra Ballāla became sovereign of Kuntala. The inscription in which this is recorded bears the date S'aka 1114 or A.D. 1192;
and Vira Ballåla who made the grant recorded in it was at that
time encamped with his victorious army at Lokkigundî, from which
it would appear that the battle had taken place but a short time
before. The northern Yâdavas had to put off the conquest of
Kuntala or the Southern Marâthå Country for a generation.

Bhillama was succeeded in 1113 Saka by his son Jaitrapåla or
Jaitugi. He took an active part in his father’s battles. “He assumed
the sacrificial vow on the holy ground of the battle-field and throwing
a great many kings into the fire of his prowess by means of the ladles
of his weapons, performed a human sacrifice by immolating a victim
in the shape of the fierce Rudra, the lord of the Tailångas, and
vanquished the three worlds.”¹ The Rudra whom he is thus repre­
sented to have killed on the field of battle was probably the
Rudradeva of the Kakateya dynasty whose inscription we have at
Anamkond near Woraûngal. In other places also his war with the
king of the Andhras or Tailångas is alluded to, and he is repre­
sented to have deprived the Andhra ladies of happiness.² Laksh­
midhara, the son of the celebrated mathematician and astronomer
Bhåskaråcharya, was in the service of Jaitrapåla and was placed by him at the head of all learned Pandîts. He knew the Vedas
and was versed in the Tarkåsåstra and Mîmaså.

Jaitrapåla’s son and successor was Siûghana, under whom the
power and territory of the family greatly increased. He ascended
the throne in 1132 Saka.³ He defeated a king of the name of Jajjala
and brought away his elephants. He deprived a monarch named
Kakkûla of his sovereignty, destroyed Arjuna who was probably
the sovereign of Målå, and made Bhoja a prisoner. “King
Lakshmîdihara, the lion of Bhangârica, was reduced, the ruler of
Dhârâ was besieged by means of troops of horses, and the
whole of the country in the possession of Ballåla was taken. All
this was but a child’s play to King Siûghana.”⁴ The kings of
Mathnra and Kâsi were killed by him in battle and Hammîra was
vanquished by but a boy-general of Siûghana.⁵ In an inscription
also at Tîljvalî in the Dhitvrå District, he is represented to have
defeated Jajjalladeva, conquered Ballåla the Hoysåla king, subdued
Bhoja of Panbålå, and humbled the sovereign of Målåva.⁶ He is
also spoken of as “the goad of the elephant in the shape of the
Gårjara king.”⁷ We have an inscription of his at Gaddaka dated
1135 S’aka, which shows that Vira Ballåla must have been deprived
of the southern part of the country before that time.⁸ Siûghana is
represented to be reigning at his capital Devagiri.

¹ Appendix C. I. st. 41. Just as the fruit of a horse sacrifice is the conquest of the
whole world, the fruit of a man-sacrifice is supposed here to be the conquest of the
three worlds. Jaitrapåla performed metaphorically such a sacrifice; and that is
considered to be the reason, as it were, of his having obtained victories everywhere,
i.e. in the usual hyperbolic language, of his having succeeded in vanquishing the three
worlds.
¹¹ Major Graham’s Report, Ins. No. 10.
The Bhoja of Panthāla spoken of above was a prince of the Sīlāhāra dynasty, and after his defeat the Kolhāpur kingdom appears to have been annexed by the Yādavas to their dominions. They put an end to this branch of the family as later on they did to another which ruled over Northern Konkan. From this time forward the Kolhāpur inscriptions contain the names of the Yādava princes with those of the governors appointed by them to rule over the district. An inscription of Siṅghaṇa at Khedrāpur in that district records the grant of a village to the temple of Koppeśvara in the year 1136 S'aka.

Siṅghaṇa seems to have invaded Gujārāt several times. In an inscription at Āmben a Brāhman chief of the name of Kholesvāra of the Mudgala Gotra is spoken of as a very brave general in the service of the Yādava sovereign. He humbled the pride of the Gūrjara prince, crushed the Mālava, destroyed the race of the king of the Abhīres, and being like “wild fire to the enemies” of his master left nothing for Siṅghaṇa to be anxious about. His son Rāma succeeded him, and a large expedition under his command was again sent to Gujārāt. Rāma advanced up to the Narmada, where a battle was fought, in which he slew numbers of Gūrjara soldiers, but he himself lost his life. 1 From this it would appear that Gujārāt was invaded by Siṅghaṇa on two occasions at least, if not more; and this is borne out by what we find stated in the authorities for the history of Gujārāt. Somadeva, the author of the Kirtīkaumudi, which gives an account of the minister Vastupāla and his masters the princes of the Vāghelā branch of the Chaulukya family, describes an invasion of Gujārāt by Siṅghaṇa in the time of Lavaṇa-prasāda and his son Viradhavala. “The capital of Gujārāt trembled with fear when the advance of Siṅghaṇa’s army was reported. Being afraid of this foreign invasion no one among the subjects of the Gūrjara king began the construction of a new house or stored grain, and the minds of all were restless. Neglecting to secure the grain in their fields they showed a particular solicitude to procure carts, and as the army of the enemy approached nearer and nearer, the people with their fears greatly excited removed farther and farther. When Lavaṇa-prasāda heard of the rapid advance of the innumerable host of the Yādava prince, he knit his brow in anger, and though he had but a small army, proceeded with it to meet that of the enemy, which was vastly superior. When the forces of Siṅghaṇa arrived on the banks of the Tāpī he rapidly advanced to the Māhī. Seeing, on the one hand, the vast army of the enemy and, on the other, the indomitable prowess of the Chaulukya force, the people were full of doubt and could not foresee the result. The enemy burnt villages on their way, and the volume of smoke that rose up in the air showed the position of their camp to the terrified people and enabled them to direct their movements accordingly. The Yādavas overran the country about Bharoch while the plentiful crops were still standing in the fields; but the king of Gujārāt did not consider them unconquerable.” 2 In the meanwhile, however, four kings of Mārvād rose against Lavaṇa-prasāda and his son Viradhavala, and the chiefs

---

1 Arch. Surv. of W. I., Vol. III., p. 85.  
2 Kirtīkaumudi IV., Stanza 43-63.
of Godhrá and Láta, who had united their forces with theirs, abandoned them and joined the Máravád princes. In these circumstances Lavana-prasáda suddenly stopped his march and turned backwards.¹ The Yádava army, however, did not, according to Someśvara, advance farther; but he gives no reason whatever, observing only that "deer do not follow a lion’s path even when he has left it."² But if the invasion spread such terror over the country as Someśvara himself represents and the army of Sínghana was so large, it is impossible to conceive how it could have ceased to advance when the Gírjara prince retreated, unless he had agreed to pay tribute or satisfied the Yádava commander in some other way. In a manuscript recently discovered of a work containing forms of letters, deeds, patents &c., there is a specimen of a treaty with the names of Sínhana and Lavana-prasáda as parties to it, from which it appears that a treaty of that nature must actually have been concluded between them.³ The result of the expedition, therefore, was that Lavana-prasáda had to submit and conclude a treaty of alliance with Sínghana.

¹ Ib., St. 55-60. ² Ib., St. 63.
³ This work is entitled Lékhapaścháśikā, and the manuscript was purchased by me for Government last year. The first leaf is wanting and the colophon does not contain the name of the author. The manuscript, however, is more than four hundred years old, being transcribed in 1536 of the VikramaSaúvat. For the variable terms in the forms given by the author, he often uses the usual expression amuka, meaning "some one" or "such a one." This general expression, however, is not used to indicate the date and we have in all the forms one date, viz., 15 Sudi of Vaisiśkha, in the year of Vikrama 1288, except in one case where it is the 3rd Sudi. This probably was the date when the author wrote. Similarly, when giving the form of a grant inscribed on copper-plates, the author in order probably to make the form clear, uses real and specific names. He gives the genealogy of the Chau-lukya kings of Anabhipatta from Maláraja to Bhíma II. and then introduces Lavana-prasáda, whom he calls Lávanyaprasáda and styles a Mahamandaleśvara, as the prince making the grant. Similarly, in giving the form of a treaty of alliance called yamalapattī, the persons who are introduced as parties to it are Sínhana and Lávanyaprasáda, and the form runs thus:—

"śrīvatsa 1288 वर्ष वैशाख शुद्ध १६ सोमीदेवह श्रीमहादेवजयकटके महाराजा-विराजमणिसिंहनदेवभय महामण्डलेश्वरको महाभाष्य प्रसादस्य C I संताज-(तायाभ्या or सनाट्त)कुल श्रीमण्डलेश्वरको महामण्डलेश्वरको महाभाष्य प्रसादस्य पूर्वबाह्याता र इत्यादि अवस्था यो देशमें श्रीगंगे इ। केनापि कस्यापि भूमि नामकरणियाः"

"On this day the 15th Sudi of Vaisiśkha, in the year Saúvat in the Camp of Victory, [a treaty] between the paramount king of kings, the prosperous Sínhana and the Mahamandaleśvara Ramaka, the prosperous Lávanyaprasáda. Sínhana whose patrimony is paramount sovereignty, and the Mahamandaleśvara Ramaka the prosperous Lávanyaprasáda should according to former usage confine themselves, each to his own country; neither should invade the country of the other." The treaty then provides that when either of them is taken up by an enemy, the armies of both should march to his release; that if a prince from either country ran away into the other with some valuable thing, he should not be allowed quarter, &c. Now, it is extremely unlikely that the author of the work should introduce these persons in his form unless he had seen or heard of such a treaty between them. Sínhana is but another form of Sínghana, and he is spoken of as a paramount sovereign. The treaty, it will be seen, was concluded in the "victorious camp" which is a clear reference to the invasion described by Someśvara.

In रहस्यम् we have, I think, the vernacular root रह "to remain," "to live." For further details see my Report on the search for manuscripts during 1882-83, pp. 39 and 225.
This invasion of Gujarāt must have been one of the earlier ones alluded to in the Ambeṅ inscription, and Kholeśvara himself must have been the commander of the Yādava army on the occasion. For Lavanaprasāda is said to have declared himself independent of his original master Bhima II. of Anahilapattana about the year 1276 Vikrama,\(^1\) corresponding to 1141 S'aka, which was about the ninth or tenth year of Siṅghana's reign, and the work in which the treaty mentioned above occurs was composed in 1283 Vikrama, i.e. 1153 S'aka. But the expedition under the command of Rāma, the son of Kholeśvara, must have been sent a short time before S'aka 1160, the date of the Ambeṅ inscription. For Rāma's son is represented to have been a minor under the guardianship of that chief's sister Lakshmi, who governed the principality in the name of the boy. Rāma, therefore, had not died so many years before S'aka 1160 as to allow of his boy having attained his majority by that time. On the occasion of this expedition Visaladeva, the son of Viradhavala, was the sovereign of Gujarāt. For in an inscription of his he boasts of having been "the submarine fire that dried up the ocean of Siṅghana's army,"\(^2\) and he must have succeeded his father about the year 1292 Vikrama corresponding to S'aka 1157.\(^3\) The foundation of his boast was probably the fact of Rāma's having been killed in the battle. What the ultimate result was, however, the inscription does not inform us.

Siṅghana appointed one Bichana or Bicha, the son of Chikka and younger brother of Mallā, to be governor of the southern provinces and his viceroy there. He fought with his master's enemies in the south as Kholeśvara did in the north and kept them in check. Bichana is represented to have humbled the Raṭṭas who were petty feudatories in the Southern Marāṭha Country, the Kadambas of Konkan, i.e. of Goa, the Guttas sprung from the ancient Guptas, who held a principality in the south, the Pāṇḍyas, the Hoysalas, and the chiefs of other southern princes, and to have erected a triumphal column on the banks of the Kāverī.\(^4\) The date of the grant in which all this is recorded is S'aka 1160 or A.D. 1238.

It thus appears that the Yādava empire became in the time of Siṅghana as extensive as that ruled over by the ablest monarchs of the preceding dynasties. The full titles of a paramount sovereign are given to Siṅghana in his inscriptions, such as "the support of the whole world," "the lover of the earth (Prithvīwallabha)," and "king of kings." Since Krishna, the eighth incarnation of Viṣṇu, is represented in the Purāṇas to have belonged to the Yādava family, the princes of Devagiri called themselves Viṣṇuvamśādhiśvaru; and as Krishna and his immediate descendants reigned at Dvārakā, they assumed the title of Dvāravatipuravaravādhiśvaru, "the supreme

---

\(^1\) Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, p. 190.  
\(^2\) Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, pp. 191 and 212.  
\(^3\) Viradhavala, it is said, died not long before Vastupāla. The death of the latter took place in Vikrama 1297. Vastupāla was minister to Visaladeva also.  
\(^5\) i.e. "of the race of Viṣṇu."
Jaitrapāla, Śiṅghaṇa’s son, died before him.

Śiṅghaṇa’s son was Jaitugi or Jaitrapāla, who “was the abode of all arts, and was thus the very moon in opposition, full of all the digits, that had come down to the earth, to protect it. He was death to hostile kings and firm in unequal fights.”

But if he protected the earth at all he must have done so during the lifetime of his father as Yuvārāja, for the latest date of Śiṅghaṇa is Saka 1169, and in a copper-plate inscription of his grandson and Jaitugi’s son Krishna, Saka 1175, Prāṇḍūla-Sānivasavara, is stated to be the seventh of his reign, so that Krishna began to reign in Saka 1169 corresponding to 1247 A.D. And in the longer of the two historical introductions to the Vratañcāla, Jaitugi is not mentioned at all. After Śiṅghaṇa, we are told that his grandsons Krishna and Mahādeva came to the throne.

Krishna’s Prākrit name was Kanhāra, Kanhara, or Kandhāra. He is represented to have been the terror of the kings of Mālava, Gujarāt, and Konkan, to have “established the king of Telunga,” and to have been the sovereign of the country of the Chola king.

But nothing particular is mentioned about him in the Vratañcāla, and he is, in general terms, said to have “conquered a great many enemies in bloody battles in which numbers of horses and elephants were engaged, to have reduced some to captivity and compelled others to seek refuge in forests, and, having thus finished the work of vanquishing the series of earthly kings, to have marched to the heavenly world to conquer Indra.” Krishna performed a great many sacrifices and thus “brought fresh strength to the Vedic ceremonial religion which in the course of time had lost its hold over the people.” In a copper-plate grant dated Saka 1171, found in the Belgaum Tāluka, Malla or Malliseṭṭi is spoken of as the elder brother of Bīcha or Bīchaṇa, the viceroy of Śiṅghaṇa in the south, and was himself governor of the province of Kuhuṇḍi. He lived at Mudugala, probably the modern Mudgaḷa, and gave, by the consent of Krishna his sovereign, lands in the village of Bāgevāḍi to thirty-two Brāhmaṇs of different Gotras.

Among the family names of these it is interesting to observe some borne by modern Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇs, such as Patavardhana and Ghāisāva, prevalent among Chitpāvaras, and Ghālisāva, Ghālisa, and Paṭhaka, among Desasthas. The name Trivāḍi also occurs; but there is no trace of it among Marāṭha Brāhmaṇs, while it is borne by Brāhmaṇs in Gujarāt and Upper Hindustan. In another grant, Chauṇḍa, the son of Bīchaṇa, who succeeded to the office and title of his father, is represented to have personally solicited king Krishna at Devagiri to permit him to grant the village mentioned therein.

7 That is, “left this world,” “died” Appendix C. I. st. 11.
Krishna was succeeded by his brother Mahadeva in 1182 Saka or 1260 A.D. "He was a tempestuous wind that blew away the heap of cotton in the shape of the king of the Tailanga country, the prowess of his arm was like a thunderbolt that shattered the mountain in the shape of the pride of the swaggering Gurjara, he destroyed the king of Konkan with ease, and reduced the arrogant sovereigns of Karnata and Lata to mockery." The king of Karnata here mentioned was probably a Hoysala Yadava of Halebid. "King Mahadeva never killed a woman, a child, or one who submitted to him; knowing this and being greatly afraid of him, the Andhras placed a woman on the throne; and the king of Malava also for the same reason installed a child in his position, and forthwith renouncing all his possessions, practised false penance for a long time." "Soma, the lord of Konkan, though skilled in swimming in the sea, was together with his forces drowned in the rivers formed by the humour trickling from the temples of Mahadeva's maddened elephants." "Mahadeva deprived Somesvara of his kingdom and his life." We have seen that Krishna fought with the king of Konkan, but it appears he did not subjugate the country thoroughly. His successor Mahadeva, however, again invaded it with an army consisting of a large number of elephants. Soma or Someśvara was completely defeated on land and his power broken, whereupon he appears to have betaken himself to his ships. There somehow he met with his death, probably by being drowned, for it is said that "even the sea did not protect him" and that "he betook himself to the submarine fire," thinking the fire of Mahadeva's prowess to be more unbearable. Konkan was thereupon annexed to the territories of the Yadavas. Hence it is that the country was governed by a viceroy appointed by the Devagiri king during the time of Mahadeva's successor, as we find from the Thanā plates published by Mr. Wathen. The Someśvara whom Mahadeva subdued probably belonged to the Silāhāra dynasty of Thanā that had been ruling over that part of Konkan for a considerable period, though our present information with regard to it does not extend beyond Aparāditya, who reigned in 1109 Saka. Mahadeva like his predecessors reigned at Devagiri, which is represented as the capital of the dynasty to which he belonged and as situated in the country called Seuṇa on the borders of Dandakaranya. "It was the abode of the essence of the beauty of the three worlds and its houses rivalled the peaks of the Mountain tenanted by gods, and the Seuṇa country deserved all the sweet and ornamental epithets that might be applied to it." At Pāndharpur there is an

---

1 Appendix C. I. st. 48 and II. st. 13.  
2 Ib. II. st. 14 and 15.  
3 Ib. I. st. 50, and II. st. 17.  
4 Ib. I. st. 49.  
5 Ib. I. st. 51 and II. st. 18.  
7 Jour. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. XIII., p. 13. Since the above was written, the Thanā volumes of the Bombay Gazetteer have been published. In vol. XIII., part II., p. 422, occurs a revised genealogical table of the Thanā Silāhāras based on inscriptions which have recently been discovered but not yet published. The last king there mentioned is Someśvara and his dates are Saka 1171 and 1182.  
8 Appendix C. II. st. 19 and 20. "The mountain tenanted by gods" may be the Himālaya or Meru. In this epithet there is a reference to the etymology of Devagiri which means "a mountain of or having gods."
Ramachandra or Râmadeva.

Hemadri, the minister of Mahâdeva and Râmadeva.

Hemâdri's Works.

inscription dated 1192 Śaka, Pramoda Sūnvatsara, in which Mahâdeva is represented to have been reigning at the time. He is there called Pramugdhrapratipa Chakravartin, or “Paramount sovereign possessing great valour.” The inscription records the performance of an Aptyyâna sacrifice by a Brâhmaṇ chief of the name of Kesâv belonging to the Kaśyapa Gotra.

Mahâdeva was succeeded in the year 1193 Śaka or 1271 A.D. by his nephew Ramachandra, the son of Krishâna. He is called Râmadeva or Râmarâjâ also. In the Thânâ copper-plate grants he is spoken of as “a lion to the proud elephant in the shape of the lord of Mâlava,” from which it would appear that he was at war with that country. Several other epithets, such as “the elephant that tore up by the root the tree in the shape of the Tailânga king,” occur in the grants; but they are given as mere birudas or titles which were inherited by Râmachandra from his predecessors, and do not point to any specific events in his reign. His inscriptions are found as far to the south as the confines of Mâurs, so that the empire he ruled over was as large as it ever was. There is in the Dekkat College Library a manuscript of the Amarâkosa written in Konkân or Tâla leaves during his reign in the year 4398 of the Kaliyuga, corresponding to Śaka 1210 and A.D. 1287. His viceroy in Konkân in Śaka 1212 was a Brâhmaṇ named Krishâna belonging to the Bhâradvâja Gotra, whose grandfather Padmanâbha first acquired royal favour and rose into importance in the reign of Siîghâna. One of the Thânâ grants was issued by him, and the other dated 1194 Śaka by Achyutâ Nâyaka, who was also a Brâhmaṇ and who appears to have been a petty chief and held some office which is not stated. Where he resided is also not clear.

Hemâdri, the celebrated author, principally of works on Dharmâsâstra, flourished during the reigns of Mahâdeva and Râmachandra and was minister to both. In the introduction to his works on Dharmâsâstra he is called Mahâdeva’s Śrîkaraṇâdhipa or Śrîkaraṇaprabhâ. In the Thânâ copper-plate of 1194 Śaka also, he is said to have taken upon himself the âdhipatya or controllership of all karana. This office seems to have been that of chief secretary or one who wrote and issued all orders on behalf of his master and kept the state record. Hemâdri is also called Mantri, or counsellor generally. In his other works and in the Thânâ plate Râmarâjâ instead of Mahâdeva is represented as his master Mahâdeva’s genealogy and his own are given at the beginning of his works on Dharma. Sometimes the former begins with Siîghâna, sometimes with Bhillama, while in the Dânakharga the exploits of Mahâdeva alone are enumerated. The description of the several princes is often couched in general terms and consists of nothing but eulogy. But the Vratakâhâra, which was the first work composed by Hemâdri, contains, as we have seen, a very valuable account of the dynasty from the very beginning and by far the greater portion of it is undoubtedly historical.

Hemâdri was a Brâhmaṇ of the Vatsa Gotra. His father’s name was Kâmadeva, grandfather’s, Vâsudeva, and great-grandfather’s,

1 Referred to above.
Vāmana. He is described in terms of extravagant praise; and the historical truth that may be gleaned from it appears to be this. Hemādri was very liberal to Brāhmans and fed numbers of them every day. He was a man of learning himself, and learned men found a generous patron in him. He is represented to be religious and pious, and at the same time very brave. He evidently possessed a great deal of influence. Whether the voluminous works attributed to him were really written by him may well be questioned; but the idea at least of reducing the religious practices and observances that had descended from times immemorial to a system must certainly have been his, and must have been carried out under his supervision.

His great work is called the Chaturvarga Chintāmanī, which is divided into four parts, viz., (1) Vratakhaṇḍa, containing an exposition of the religious fasts and observances; (2) Dānakhanda, in which the several gifts to which great religious importance is attached are explained; (3) Tirthakhanda, which treats of pilgrimages to holy places; and (4) Mokśhakhaṇḍa, in which the way to final deliverance is set forth. There is a fifth Khaṇḍa or part which is called Pariśeshakhaṇḍa or appendix, which contains voluminous treatises on (1) the deities that should be worshipped, (2) on Śrāddhas or offerings to the manes, (3) on the determination of the proper times and seasons for the performance of religious rites, and (4) on Prāyahṣchitta or atonement. All these works are replete with a great deal of information and innumerable quotations. They are held in great estimation and future writers on the same subjects draw largely from them. A commentary called Āyurvedarasa-yana on Vāgbhata’s medical treatise and another on Bopadeva’s Muktāphalā, a work expounding Vaishnava doctrines, are also attributed to him.

This Bopadeva was one of Hemādri’s proteges and the author of the work mentioned above and of another entitled Harilotā, which contains an abstract of the Bhāgavata. Both of these were written at the request of Hemādri as the author himself tells us. Bopadeva was the son of a physician named Keśava and the pupil of Dhanesā. His father as well as his teacher lived at a place called Sārtha situated on the banks of the Varadā. Bopadeva, therefore, was a native of Berar. Bopadeva, the author of a treatise on grammar called Mūgdhabodha, appears to be the same person as this, since the names of the father and the teacher there mentioned are the same as those we find in these works. A few medical treatises also, written by Bopadeva, have come down to us.

Hemādri has not yet been forgotten in the Marathā country. He is popularly known by the name of Hemādpant and old temples throughout the country of a certain structure are attributed to him.

1 Pariśeshakhaṇḍa, Ed. Bib. Ind., pp. 4-5.
2 विद्वद्विशेषिष्येण भिषजेश्वरस्य निर्देशनम्। हेमाद्रिर्गप्रेरितम् मुक्ताफलम् चीकरात्।
   श्रीमद्धारामवस्त्रवस्त्रधारायायायाधिक निरूपयं। विदुषस वृपदेवम् मघवेश्वरस्य निरूपयं।

Dr. Rājendralal’s notices of Skr. MSS., Vol. II., pp. 48 and 200.
He is said to have introduced the Moḍī or the current form of writing and is believed to have brought it from Laṅkā or Ceylon. As chief secretary he had to superintend the writing of official papers and records, and it is possible he may have introduced some improvements in the mode of writing.

The great Marāṭha sādhu or saint Jñāneśvara or Dnyāneśvara as his name is ordinarily pronounced, flourished during the reign of Rāmacandra. At the end of his Marāṭhi commentary on the Bhāgavadgītā he tells us: "In the Kali age, in the country of Mahārāṣṭra and on the southern bank of the Godāvari there is a sacred place five kos in circuit, the holiest in the three worlds, where exists Mahālayā, who is the thread that sustains the life of the world. There, king Rāmacandra, a scion of the Yadav race and the abode of all arts, dispenses justice, and there, a vernacular garb was prepared for the Gita by Jñānadeva, the son of Nivṛttinātha, sprung from the family of Maheśa."

The date of the completion of the work is given as Saka 1212 or A. D. 1290, when we know Rāmacandra was on the throne.

Rāmacandra was the last of the independent Hindu sovereigns of the Dekkan. The Mussalmans had been firmly established at Delhi for about a century, and though they had not yet turned their attention to the Dekkan it was not possible they should refrain from doing so for a long time. Alla-ud-din Khilji, the nephew of the reigning king who had been appointed governor of Karra, was a person of a bold and adventurous spirit. In the year 1294 A. D. or Saka 1216 he collected a small army of 8000 men and marched straight to the south till he reached Ellichpur, and then suddenly turning to the west appeared in a short time before Devagiri. The king never expected such an attack and was consequently unprepared to resist it. According to one account he was even absent from his capital. He hastily collected about 4000 troops and threw himself between the city and the invading army. But being aware he could not hold out for a long time, he took measures for provisioning the fort and retired into it. The city was then taken by the Mahomedans and plundered, and the fort was closely invested. Alla-ud-din had taken care to spread a report that his troops were but the advanced guard of the army of the king which was on its way to the Dekkan. Rāmacandra, therefore,
despairing of a successful resistance, began to treat for peace. Alla-ud-din, who was conscious of his own weakness, received his proposals with gladness and agreed to raise the siege and retire on condition of receiving from the king a large quantity of gold. In the meantime, Rāmachandra's son Šāmkara collected a large army and was marching to the relief of the fort, when Alla-ud-din left about a thousand men to continue the siege and proceeded with the rest to a short distance from the town and gave battle to Šāmkara's forces. The Hindus were numerically superior and forced the Mahomedans to fall back; but the detachment left to observe the movements of the garrison joined them at this time, and Šāmkara's followers thinking it to be the main army that was on its way from Delhi were seized with a panic, and a confusion ensued which resulted in the complete defeat of the Hindus.

Rāmachandra or Rāmadeva then continued the negotiations, but Alla-ud-din raised his demands. The Hindu king's allies were preparing to march to his assistance, but in the meanwhile Rāmachandra discovered that the sacks of grain that had been hastily thrown into the fort really contained salt; and since the provisions had been well nigh exhausted he was anxious to hasten the conclusion of peace. It was therefore agreed that he should pay to Alla-ud-din “600 maunds of pearls, two of jewels, 1000 of silver, 4000 pieces of silk, and other precious things,” cede Ellichpur and its dependencies, and send an annual tribute to Delhi. On the receipt of the valuable treasure given to him by the Devagiri prince, Alla-ud-din retired.

Some time after, Alla-ud-din assassinated his aged uncle and usurped the throne. King Rāmachandra did not send the tribute for several years, and to punish him the Delhi monarch despatched an expedition of 30,000 horse under the command of Malik Kafur, a slave who had risen high in his favour. Malik Kafur accomplished the long and difficult march “over stones and hills without drawing rein,” and arrived at Devagiri in March 1307 A.D., or about the end of Saka 1228. A fight ensued in which the Hindus were defeated and Rāmadeva was taken prisoner.1 According to another account, Malik Kafur came laying waste the country about Devagiri, and the Hindu king observing the futility of resistance surrendered himself. Rāmachandra was sent to Delhi, where he was detained for six months and afterwards released with all honour. Thenceforward he sent the tribute regularly and remained faithful to the Mahomedans. In Saka 1231 or A.D. 1309, Malik Kafur was again sent to the Dekkan to subdue Tailāṅgana. On the way he stopped at Devagiri, where he was hospitably entertained by the king.

Rāmadeva died this year and was succeeded by his son Šāmkara. He discontinued sending the annual tribute to Delhi and Malik Kafur was again sent to the Dekkan in Saka 1234 or A.D. 1312 to reduce him to submission. He put Šāmkara to death, laid waste his kingdom, and fixed his residence at Devagiri.

---

1 Elliot's History of India, Vol. III., p. 77.
In the latter years of Alla-ud-din his nobles, disgusted with the overwhelming influence which Malik Kafur had acquired over him, revolted. In the meantime Alla-ud-din died and was succeeded by his third son Mubarak. The opportunity was seized by Harapāla, the son-in-law of Rāmachandra, who raised an in surrender and drove away some of the Mahomedan governors. In 1240 S'aka or A.D. 1318 Mubarak marched to the Dekkan to person to suppress the revolt. He took Harapāla prisoner and in humanly flayed him alive.

Thus ended the last Hindu or Marāṭhā monarchy of the Dekkan and the country became a province of the Mahomedan empire.

---

**SECTION XVI.**

**THE SĪLĀHĀRAS OF KOLHĀPUR.**

Three distinct families of chiefs or minor princes with the name of Sīlāra or Sīlāhāra ruled over different parts of the country. They all traced their origin to Jīmūtavāhana the son of Jīmūtaketu, who was the king of a certain class of demigods called Vidyādharas, all of who saved the life of a serpent named Sārākhāchua by offering himself as a victim to Garuḍa in his place. One of the titles borne by the princes of all the three families was Tagarapuravarādhīśvara or "lords of Tagara, the best of cities," which fact has a historical significance. We have seen that Kāmādeva, the donor of the Rājā pura grant, who was a Chālukya, called himself Kalyāṇapuravarādhīśvara and one of the titles of the later Kadambas after they had been reduced to vassalage and of the rulers of Goa was Banavāstipura varādhīśvara. As these titles signify that the bearers of them belonged to the families that once held supreme power at Kalyāṇa.

---

1. This story has been dramatized in the Sanskrit play Nāgānanda attributed to Śrī-Harsha.
and Banavasi, so does Tugurapuranavaradhi'svara show that the Silaharas who bore the title belonged to a family that once possessed supreme sovereignty and reigned at Tagara. In one Silahara grant it is expressly stated that "the race known by the name of Silahara was that of the kings who were masters of Tagara." As mentioned in a former section, Tagara was a famous town in the early centuries of the Christian era and retained its importance till a very late period, but unfortunately the town has not yet been identified, nor have we found any trace of the Silahara kingdom with Tagara as its capital. Perhaps it existed between the close of the Andhra period, but unfortunately the town has not yet been identified, nor have we found any trace of the Silahara kingdom with Tagara as its capital. Perhaps it existed between the close of the Andhra-bhrya period and the foundation of the Chalukya power.

The three Silahara dynasties of Mahamanḍaleśvaras or dependent princes which we have been considering were founded in the times of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. One of them ruled over Northern Konkan, which was composed of fourteen hundred villages, the chief of them being Puri, which probably was at one time the capital of the province. As represented in an inscription at Kānharvi noticed before, Konkan was assigned to Pulasaṅkī by Amoghavarsha a few years before S'aka 775. Another Silahara family established itself in Southern Konkan. The founder or first chief named Śanaphulla enjoying the favour of Krishnarāja acquired the territory between the sea-coast and the Sahya range. There were three Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes of the name of Krishnarāja, but the one meant here must be the first prince of that name who reigned in the last quarter of the seventh century of the S'aka era or between 753 and 775 A.D. The genealogy of this dynasty is given in the Kharepātan grant, the last prince mentioned in which was on the throne in S'aka 930 while the Chalukya king Satyāśraya was reigning. The capital must have been situated somewhere near Kharepātan.

1 Grant translated by Dr. Taylor and published in the Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay, Vol. III.
2 Kharepātan plates, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. I., p. 217. The name of the first chief is read "Jhallaṇhulla" by Bāl Gangādhara S'astrī; but the first letter looks like Ś though there is some difference. That difference, however, brings it nearer to Ś. The letter which was read by him as Ś is clearly Ś. For देहरमगमे हो देशसमस्थ भे on the plates.
3 From Śanaphulla the first chief to Ratta the last there are ten generations. Somehow each succeeding chief in this line happens to be the son of the preceding. Though in a line of princes some of whom bear to others the relation of brother or uncle the average duration of each reign is from 19 to 21 years, the average duration of a generation is always much longer, and varies from 26 to 28 years. One can verify this by taking any line of princes or chiefs in the world. Ratta was on the throne in S'aka 930, and supposing him to have begun to reign about that time, nine generations or about 27 x 9 years must have passed away from the date of the foundation of the family to S'aka 930. Subtracting 27 x 9 = 243 from 930, we have S'aka 687 as the approximate date of Śanaphulla. If we take the average to be 26, we shall have 696 as the date. In either case we are brought to the reign of Krishna I. The dates of Krishna II. range from S'aka 739 to 753 and of Krishna III. from S'aka 767 to 775, and therefore neither of these will do. Even if we take the other average of a reign in the present case and subtract 19 x 9 = 171 from 930, we get S'aka 739, which will not take us to the reign of Krishna II., whose earliest date is S'aka 799 while the latest of his predecessor is S'aka 795. The Kharepātan family therefore was the oldest of the three, and was founded in the reign of Krishna I. Bāl S'astrī read the name of the last chief in the grant as Rahu; but the second syllable of the name is certainly not Ś the form of which in the grant itself is different. It looks exactly like the Ś in the word परमभूधर and आधे, which occur elsewhere in the grant.
The third Silahara family, the history of which falls within the scope of this paper, ruled over the districts of Kolhapur, Miraj, and Karhada, and in later times Southern Konkan was added to its territory. This dynasty was the latest of the three and was founded about the time of the downfall of the Rashtra Kuta empire, as will be hereafter shown. The first prince of the family was Jatiga, who was succeeded by his son Nayanma or Nayarvanma. Nayanma was followed by his son Chandraraja, and Chandraraja by his son Jatiga, who is called "the lion of the hill-fortress of Panhalâ." Jatiga's son and successor was Goanka, otherwise called Gomkala or Gokalla. He is represented to have been the ruler of the districts of Karhâta-Kunđi and Mairiñja and to have harassed Konkan. He had three brothers named Gûvala, Kirtiraja, and Chandrâditya, of whom the first at least appears to have succeeded him. Then followed Mârasinimha the son of Goanka, whose grant first published by Wathen is dated Saka 980. He is represented to have constructed temples; and to have been reigning at his capital, the fort of Khilgiji, which probably was another name of Panhalâ in the Kolhapur districts. Mârasinimha was succeeded by his son Gûvala and he by his brother Bhoja I. Bhoja's two brothers Ballâla and Gandarâditya governed the principality after him in succession.

An inscription at Kolhapur mentions another brother named Gaṅgadeva and the order in which the brothers are spoken of is Gûvala, Gaṅga, Ballâla, Bhoja, and Gandarâditya. But the grants of Gandarâditya and Bhoja II. agree in representing Bhoja as the elder and Ballâla as the younger brother, and in omitting Gaṅga.

Of all these brothers the youngest Gandarâditya seems to have been the most famous. He is the donor, as indicated above, in the grant published by Pandit Bhagvânâlî Indrâji, and in others recorded on stone at Kolhapur and in the districts. His dates are Saka 1032, 1040, and 1058. He ruled over the country of Mirinja along with the seven Khollas and over Konkan, which thus seems to have been subdued by the Kolhapur Silâhâras before 1032. Probably it was added to their dominions in the time of Goanka or soon after. From the grant of Bhoja II. it appears that the part of Konkan ruled over by the Dekkan Silâhâras was the same as that which was in the possession of the family mentioned in the Khârepâtan grant, wherefore it follows that the Silâhâras of southern Konkan were uprooted by their kinsmen of the Kolhapur districts. Gandarâditya fed a hundred thousand Brâhmans at Prayâga, the modern Allahâbâd. He built a Jaina temple at Ajarem, a village in
the Kolhapur districts, and constructed a large tank, called after him Gañḍasamudra or “the sea of Gañḍa,” at Irukuṇḍi in the Miraj district, and on its margin placed idols of Īśvara or Śiva, Buddha, and Arhat (Jina), for the maintenance of each of which he assigned a piece of land. Several other charities of his, in which the Jainas also had their share, are mentioned, and his bountiful nature as well as good and just government are extolled. He first resided at a place called Tiravāḍa and afterwards at Valavāṭa, which has been identified with the present Valavāṃ. Gañḍarāḍiyā was succeeded by his son Vijayārka, who was on the throne in Śaka 1065 and 1073. He restored the chiefs of the territory about Thāṇā to their principality which they had lost, and replaced the princes of Goa on the throne and fortified their position which had become shaky. He assisted Vijjana or Vijjala in his revolt against his masters, the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa, and enabled him to acquire supreme sovereignty. This event, as we have seen, took place about 1079 Śaka.

After Vijayārka, his son Bhoja II became Mahāmanḍalesvara and reigned in the fort of Panhālā. His dates are Śaka 1101, 1109, 1112, 1113, 1114, and 1127. He granted the village of Kasiḷi in Konkan near Khārēpilītan on the application of his son Gañḍarāḍiyā for feeding Brāhmans regularly; and gave lands for Hindu and Jaina temples in other places also. Two of the grantees in one case at Kolhāpur are called Karahatakas, which shows that the caste of Karhaṭe Brāhmans had come to be recognized in those days; and two others bore the family name of Ghaisāsa, which is now found among Chitpavan Brāhmans. In the reign of Bhoja II, a Jaina Paṇḍit of the name of Somadeva composed in Śaka 1127 a commentary entitled Sādānṣaṭvarṇavacanavibhāgā on Pūjyapāda’s Sanskrit Grammar. The Kolhāpur chiefs enjoyed a sort of semi-independence. Vijjala, the new sovereign at Kalyāṇa, however, endeavoured probably to establish his authority over Bhoja. But that chief was not content to be his feudatory, and to reduce him to subjection Vijjala marched against Kolhāpur a little before his assassination in Śaka 1089. On the establishment of the power of the Devagiri Yādavas, Bhoja seems similarly to have assumed independence; but Śinghana subdued him completely, and annexed the principality to the Yādava empire.
The number of generations from Jatiga, the founder of the dynasty, to Gaṇḍarāditya is seven. The latest date of the latter is S'aka 1058 and the earliest of his successor Vijayārka is 1065; so that if we suppose Gaṇḍarāditya to have died in 1060 and allow about 27 years to each generation, we shall arrive at S'aka 871 as the approximate date of the foundation of the family. At that time the reigning Rāṣṭrakaṭuṭa sovereign was Krishna III., the uncle of Kakkala the last prince.

One of the many titles used by the Śilāhāras was Sṛman-Mahālakshmīnt-labdha-vara-prasāda, i. e., “one who has obtained the favour of a boon from the glorious Mahālakshmī.” Mahālakshmī was thus their tutelary deity, and they were clearly the followers of the Purānic and Vedic religion; but they patronized both Brāhmaṇas and Jainas alike; and their impartiality is strikingly displayed by the fact noticed above of Gaṇḍarāditya’s having placed an idol of Buddha, whose religion had well nigh become extinct, along with those of the gods worshipped by the other two sects, on the margin of the tank dug by him.

There are at the present day many Marāṭhā families of the name of Selāra reduced to poverty, and the name Selāravāḍī of a station on the railway from Khāṇḍālā to Poona is also, I believe, to be traced to the family name of the sovereigns of Tagara.

Genealogy of the Śilāhāras of Kolhāpur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jatiga I.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nāyimma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrarāja.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatiga II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gomka.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gūvala I. Kirtirāja. Chandrāditya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārasimha, S’aka 980 or A.D. 1058.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gūvala II. Bhoja I. Ballāla.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaṇḍarāditya, S’aka 1032, 1040, 1058, or A.D. 1110, 1118, 1136.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayārka, S’aka 1065, 1073, or A.D. 1143, 1151.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhoja II, S’aka 1101, 1109, 1112, 1113, 1114, 1127, or A.D. 1179, 1187, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1205.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A.

Note on the Gupta Era.

In order to render the chronologies of the different dynasties that ruled over western and northern India in the early centuries of the Christian era mutually consistent, it is necessary to discuss the initial date of the Gupta era. Albiruni, who accompanied Mahmud of Ghizni in his invasion of Gujarāt in the early part of the eleventh century, states that that era was posterior to the S'aka by 241 years, and that it was the epoch of the extermination of the Guptas. He mentions another era named after Balaha, the initial date of which was the same as that of the Guptas.

Now in some of the inscriptions of the Gupta kings and their dependent chiefs the dates are referred to Guptakāla or the Gupta era, wherefore Albiruni's statement that it was the epoch of their extermination cannot be true. This error is regarded as throwing discredit on his other statement, viz., that the era was posterior to the S'aka by 241 years. But it has nothing whatever to do with it. Albiruni must have derived his knowledge of the initial date from contemporary evidence, since the era of the Guptas was, as stated by him, one of those ordinarily used in the country in his time, and as his statements regarding the initial dates of the Vikrama and the S'aka eras are true, so must that with reference to the Gupta era be true. On the other hand his information as regards the event which the Gupta era memorialized must have been based upon the tradition current among the Hindu astronomers of the day, who were his informants. Such traditions are often erroneous, as has been proved in many a case. Albiruni was also informed that the S'aka era was the epoch of the defeat of the S'aka king by Vikramāditya. This was the tradition as to its origin among Indian astronomers, though it has now given place to another. For Sodhala, in his commentary on Bhāskarāchārya's Karanakutūhala, a manuscript of which more than four hundred years old exists in the collection made by me for Government last year, tells us that 'the epoch when Vikramāditya killed Mlechchhas of the name of S'akas is ordinarily known as the S'aka era.' But we know that in Maṅgaliśa's inscription at Badāmi it is spoken of as the era of the 'coronation of the S'aka king,' that Raviṅkīrti in the inscription at Aihole describes it as the era of the S'aka kings and that it is similarly represented in many other places. Albiruni's error therefore as regards the origin of the Gupta era no more invalidates his statement as to its initial date than his error about the origin of the S'aka era does his statement about the initial date of that era. The only reasonable course for us under the circumstances is to reject the statement as to the era being an epoch of the extermination of the Guptas and accept that about the initial date of the era. But some antiquarians reject both these statements and accept what simply hangs on them and what must fall with them, viz., that the Guptas were exterminated in S'aka 242, and make elaborate endeavours to find an earlier initial date for the era. If the inscriptions show that the era was not posthumous but contemporaneous, we should rather believe that the Guptas rose to power in S'aka 242, assigning its due value to the statement of Albiruni, which must have been based on contemporary evidence, that the era began in that year. But if instead of that we declare that they ceased to reign in S'aka 242, we in effect reject contemporary evidence and accept a mere tradition which in so far as it represents the era to be posthumous has been proved to be erroneous.
Again, Albiruni’s statement that the initial date of the Gupta era and of the Valabhi era was the same seems to some not “at all probable.” To my mind the improbability is not so great as to render valueless what clearly is contemporary evidence. We all know that the date occurring in a grant of one of the sons of the founder of the dynasty is 207, and we have a large number of grants of subsequent kings with dates posterior to this and in harmony with it. So that it is clear that these dates cannot refer to an era dating from the foundation of the dynasty. Such a long time as 207 years cannot be considered to have elapsed between the father who founded the dynasty and his son, even supposing him to have been a posthumous son. The dates, therefore, are understood to refer to the Gupta era. What, then, could have been the Valabhi era, if it was never used by the Valabhi princes during the 275 years or thereabouts of the existence of their dynasty? An era cannot receive the name of a certain line of princes unless used by those princes, at least on a few occasions, and enforced. The era used by the Valabhi princes must be the Valabhi era. One certainly would expect that it should be so. The only supposition, therefore, on which the whole becomes intelligible is that the era introduced by the Valabhis in Suraśṭhra and used by them was called the Valabhi era by their subjects, and not one dating from the foundation of the dynasty; for such a one, we see, was not used by the Valabhi princes themselves. The era introduced and used by the Valabhis was that of the Guptas, whose dependents they were in the beginning, and hence Albiruni’s statement that the initial date of the Gupta and Valabhi eras was the same is true. From an inscription at Somanāth discovered by Colonel Tod, we gather that Śaka 242 was the first year of the Valabhi era. Hence, therefore, the initial date of the Gupta era was 242 Śaka, as stated by Albiruni.

The question in this way is, I think, plain enough. Still since astronomical calculations have been resorted to to prove the incorrectness of the date given by Albiruni and to arrive at an earlier one so as to place the extinction of the Gupta dynasty in Śaka 212, it is necessary to go into the question further. The following tests may be used and have been used to determine the correctness of a proposed initial date:—

1. The date of Budha Gupta’s pillar inscription at Eran, which is Thursday, the 12th of Ashādhā, in the Gupta year 165.
2. Rāja Hastin’s inscription dated 156 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle of Jupiter being Mahāvaśākha.
3. Rāja Hastin’s inscription dated 173 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahāsvayuṇa.
4. Rāja Hastin’s inscription dated 191 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahāchaitra.
5. Rāja Samkshobha’s inscription dated 209 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahāsvayuṇa.
6. An eclipse of the sun mentioned in the Morvi copperplate grant dated 5th Phālguna Sudi 555 of the Gupta era.

Before applying these tests to the initial date given by Albiruni, it must be premised that according to the Arabic author the Gupta era was 241 years posterior to the Śaka. To convert a Śaka date into a Valabhi date, or which is the same thing, into a Gupta date, he tells us to deduct from it the cube of 6 and the square of 5, that is, 241. And proceeding to give actual instances, he says 953 Śaka corresponds to 712 Valabhi or Gupta. We have thus to add 241 to a Gupta date to arrive at the corresponding Śaka date. Again, as I shall show in Appendix B, in inscriptions the numerical date indicates, in a large number of instances, the number of years of an era that have elapsed, that is, the past year and in about a third of the instances, the current year. The year of the cycle, however, whenever it occurs, is as a rule the current year, though in rare cases that also is
the past year. If, therefore, a past Gupta year is to be converted into the current Saka year, we shall have to add 242 to the former; while if both are current or both past, the difference between them is only 241.

Now, as to the first of the above tests, Gupta 165 + 241 = 406 Saka. If Albiruni is correct, the 12th Ashadha Sudi of this year should be a Thursday. I asked my friend Professor Keru Lakshman Chhatre to make the calculation for me, and he tells me that it was a Thursday. Since our astronomical methods are based on the past Saka year, and even our present Saka year 1895 really represents, as I shall show in the next Appendix, the years that have elapsed, the current year being really 1806, Gupta 165 was a past year, as well as Saka 406. Hence only 241 has to be added. Saka 406 corresponds to 484 A.D. General Cunningham takes the Gupta 165 to correspond to 483 A.D., adding 240 + 78 = 318 to it, and of course arrives at the result that "the 12th day of Ashadha Sudi was a Friday instead of a Thursday." If, however, he had added 241 + 78 = 319 and taken 484 A.D. to correspond to Gupta 165, he would have arrived at the correct result.

Then as to the dates in years of the 12-year cycle, General Cunningham himself has placed before us the means of verifying them. In the tables published by him in Volume X. of the Archaeological Reports, the cyclic year corresponding to the current Christian year is given, and if we subtract 78 from the number representing the year, we shall arrive at the current Saka year. Now, if we take the Gupta figured dates to represent the years that had elapsed before the cyclic year commenced, (and this way of marking the dates is, as remarked above, the one we usually find), then 173 Gupta, the third date in the above, corresponds to 414 Saka past and 415 current, 241 being added in the first case, and 242 in the second. If we add 78 to 415 we shall get the current Christian year, which is 493. Now in General Cunningham's tables we do find the year Mahâvaiśākha given as corresponding to 493 A.D. In the same way, 191 Gupta past + 242 = 433 Saka current, + 78 = 511 A.D. current. In the tables we find 511 put down under Mahâchaitra. Similarly 209 Gupta past + 242 = 451 Saka current, + 78 = 529 A.D. current which was Mahâsvayujya.

Now, as to the first of the dates in the 12-year cycle, 156 Gupta + 242 + 78 is equal to 476 A.D., which however is Mahâchaitra instead of Mahâvaiśākha. Here there is a discrepancy of one year; but such discrepancies do sometimes occur even in Saka dates and the years of the 50-years cycle given along with them, and some of them will be noticed in the note forming the next Appendix. They are probably due to the fact that the frequent use of the past or expired year and also of the current year led sometimes the past year to be mistaken for the current year, just as we now mistake the year 1805 Saka for the current year, though it really is the completed or past year. Thus the completed year 157 must, in the case before us, have come to be mistaken by the writer of the inscription for the current year, and he thought 156 to be the past year and thus gave that instead of 157. Now 157 Gupta + 242 + 78 = 477 A.D., which is Mahâvaiśākha, according to the tables.

The eclipse mentioned in the Morvi plate occurred, according to my friend Professor Keru Lakshman, on the 30th of Vaiśākha, Saka 827. The Gupta year given in the plate is 585. If 827 is in the astronomical calculation the current year, it must correspond to 585 Gupta past; for 585 + 242 = 827. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the eclipse occurred on the new-moon day immediately previous to the 5th of Phâlguna Sudi mentioned in the grant. For it is perfectly possible that the actual religious ceremony with reference to the grant was made in Vaiśākha and the deed executed in Phâlguna.
I have thus shown that Albiuni’s initial date for the Gupta era stands all these tests. It may even be said that it stands them better than 167 A.D. and 190 A.D. proposed by General Cunningham and Sir E. Clive Bayley respectively. But I am loath to decide such questions simply on astronomical grounds; for there are several very confusing elements involved, and a modern astronomer cannot know them all and make allowance for them.

It now remains to notice the last point relied on by the opponents of Albiuni. The date on a copper-plate grant by the last S'iladitya of Valabbi hitherto known is 447. This S'iladitya is also styled Dhrubhata in the grant and has been identified with the Tu-lu-po-tou or Dhrubavbhata of Hwan Thsang who visited Valabbi in 640 A.D. The date 447 is understood as referring to the Gupta era, and, 319 being added it, corresponds to 766 A.D. It has therefore been argued that an earlier initial date must be assigned to the Gupta era so as to bring this S'iladitya or Dhrubhata nearer to the date of Hwan Thsang’s visit. But the identification of the last S'iladitya with Hwan Thsang’s Dhrubabhata cannot stand. In the Si-yu-ki the Chinese writer does not speak of a king but of kings, and says they were nephews of S'iladitya of Málva and the younger of them named Dhrubavbhata was son-in-law to the son of Harshavardhana. If they were nephews of the king of Málva they were brothers and both of them kings. Now, the predecessor of the last S'iladitya of Valabbi was his father, and among the kings of Valabbi we do not find brothers reigning in succession at this period. There were two brothers who occupied the throne before this period, one of them being named Dharasena and the other Dhruvasena. They were the sons of Kharagraha, and the younger of them was the father and predecessor of Dharasena IV. This younger brother or Dhruvasena must have been Hwan Thsang’s Dhrubavbhata. Nothing important is involved in the suffix Bhata. It was a mere title or honorific termination as Pant and Rāv are among us the Marāthās. Sena, Sinhā, and Bhata were the Valabhi honorific endings and they could be used promiscuously. The king spoken of in the plates as Dhrubasminha may have been called Dhrubavbhata by ordinary people, from whom Hwan Thsang must have got the name. Now, a copper-plate grant of Dhruvasena bears the date 310 and the earliest date of his successor Dharasena IV. is 326. The first corresponds to 629 A.D. (310 + 241 + 78 = 629), and the second to 645 (326 + 241 + 78 = 645). It is quite possible, therefore, that Dhruvasena was on the throne in 640 A.D. at the time when Hwan Thsang visited Valabhi.

The initial date mentioned by Albiuni is thus consistent with everything with which it has been thought to be not consistent. I have shown that the statement of the Arabic writer is in itself entitled to our confidence, being based as it must have been on contemporary evidence as his statements about the Śaka and Vikrama eras were. I will now show that the date mentioned by him is alone consistent with the information we possess as regards the relations of the several dynasties that ruled over Gujarāt and Kāthiawād in the early centuries of the Christian era, and the dates proposed by General Cunningham and Sir E. Clive Bayley are not. We know that the Guptas succeeded the Satraps, and the Valabhīs were at first dependents of the Guptas and afterwards attained independence. Chandragupta II. must have been the Gupta prince who overthrew the Satraps, since he is the first prince of that dynasty whose silver coins are a close imitation of those of the Satraps. The latest date of that monarch is 93. This corresponds to 260 A.D. and 283 A.D. on the supposition that the Gupta era took its start in 167 A.D., and 190 A.D. respectively. Now, the latest date of the Satrap dynasty is 304. If the era to which it refers is the Śaka, it corresponds to 382 A.D., that is, we shall have to suppose one of the princes of the dynasty to have
reigned about a hundred years after the dynasty had been put an end to by Chandragupta II. The S'aka era will therefore not do. Supposing the Satrap dates refer to the Vikrama era, 304 corresponds to 248 A.D., which of course is consistent with Chandragupta's date 260 A.D. or 283 A.D. If then the Satrap dates refer to the era of Vikrama, Rudradâman's 72 must correspond to 16 A.D. Rudradâman's grandfather Chashtana will have to be placed about B.C. 4. But Ptolemy, writing after 150 A.D., tells us that Ujjayini was ruled over about the time when he wrote by Tiastenes, who has been very reasonably identified with Chashtana. Ptolemy's information cannot certainly be 150 years old. It has, however, been argued that Ptolemy does not state that Tiastenes reigned about the time when he lived, and that he and Siro Polemios were contemporaries. For, he gives the information in the form of two short notes, "Ozone, the royal residence of Tiastenes," and "Baithana, the royal residence of Siro Polemios." Such notes it is possible that one should write even if the princes reigned several hundred years before him, as a modern geographer may mention Berlin as "the capital of Frederick the Great," or Ghizni as "the capital of Mahmud." As to this I have to observe that the analogy does not hold good. A modern geographer and his readers are very well acquainted with past history, while neither Ptolemy nor those for whom he wrote could have known the past history of India. A modern geographer knows which of the princes that ruled over a certain country in past times was the ablest or most powerful and selects him out of a number and mentions his name in connection with a certain place. It is extremely improbable or almost impossible that Ptolemy should have known many Indian princes who reigned before he lived, along with their achievements, and should have chosen the ablest of them for being mentioned. And, as a matter of fact, we know that one at least of the rulers mentioned by him could be a person of no importance. For Baleocuros who according to him held power in Hippocura was, as we have seen, but a Viceroy or dependent of Pulumâyi and Gotamiputra Yajña S'rî, since as Vîjvâyakura his name occurs along with those of the two princes on the Kolhâpur coins. Again, Ptolemy must have derived his information from merchants carrying on trade with India and these from the natives of the country. And we know that natives of India care very little for past history and soon forget their kings. Hence the information derived by the merchants cannot have reference to princes who reigned long before the time of Ptolemy. It is possible that Indians may remember a celebrated prince for a century or two. But, as stated above, one of the rulers mentioned by Ptolemy was but a dependent sovereign and could not have been a man of note. The only other supposition that our opponents may resort to, is that Ptolemy's statements were based on those of previous geographers whose contemporaries the princes mentioned by him were. No ground whatever has however been adduced in support of such a supposition. In the Periplu which was written before Ptolemy, Paithana and Ozone are mentioned but Polemios and Tiastenes are not. On the contrary, the author of that work says that Ozone was "formerly the capital wherein the king resided." If Tiastenes lived before him and Ptolemy's mention of the former was due to his having been a prince of note like Frederick the Great and Mahmud; of Ghizni in modern times, we should expect the author of the Periplu to have noticed him, especially when he does allude to the kings of Uzene: Tiastenes, Polemios, and Baleocuros must thus have reigned about the time of Ptolemy. The last two were, we know, contemporaries, and so also must the third have been.

In this manner the Vikrama era will not do for the Satrap dates. Besides, no trace whatever has hitherto been discovered of the use of that era in the early centuries of Christ. Since, then, the use of no other era
at the time has been well authenticated, the Satraps must be supposed to have employed the Saka era. The circumstances of the country at that period render, as I have shown, the establishment of this era by the SAKAS who ruled over the country in every way probable. The latest Satrap date will thus correspond to 382 A.D., and Chandragupta, the conqueror of the Satraps, can be rendered posterior to this only by taking 242 S'aka or 320 A.D. as the initial date of the Gupta era; for his 93 past will then correspond to 412 A.D. And in this way Rudradamán's 72 will correspond to 150 A.D.; and Chashțana's date will be about 130 A.D., i.e., anterior to the date of Ptolemy's geography by about 25 years.

Pandit Bhagvánalál has recently published a facsimile, transcript, and translation of a grant by Śryāśraya Silāditya, son of Jayasimhabavarman the founder of the Gujarāt branch of the early Chālukya dynasty. The date occurring in it is 421. The Pandit also mentions a grant by Vinayāditya Yuddhamalla, the brother of Śryāśraya the date of which is Śaka 653. What era the first date refers to is not stated, but it certainly cannot be the Śaka or the Vikrama. It must therefore be the Gupta which was one of those in ordinary use in Gujarāt and which the Valabhi princes themselves are said to have used. If so, neither 167 A.D. nor 190 A.D. will do as the initial date of that era; for then 421 would correspond to 588 A.D. and §11 A.D. respectively, while Yuddhamalla's date is 731 A.D. The distance of time between the brothers would thus be 143 and 120 years which is impossible. The only initial date of the Gupta era, therefore, that will bring the brothers close together is that given by Albiruni viz., 212 Saka; for Śryāśraya's date thus becomes 662 Saka, while his brother's is 653 Saka.

Those who believe that the Valabhi princes themselves did not use the Valabhi era can have little ground to suppose that any other rival dynasty did it, and that Śryāśraya's date refers to that era; but if it does, the Valabhi era is, as I have already observed, the same as the Gupta era. Pandit Bhagvánalál, however, in a paper recently published refers Śryāśraya's date to an unknown era with 250 A.D. as its initial date. But even thus the interval between the two brothers becomes sixty years, which unquestionably is too long. For Śryāśraya's 421 corresponds under the supposition, to 671 A.D. and Vinayāditya's 653 Saka to 731 A.D. The grounds adduced for the supposition of a new era appear to me to be very questionable. Dadda II. of the Gūrajra dynasty, whose date is 380, is spoken of in a grant to have protected a prince of Valabhi who had been hard pressed by Harshadeva. This Harshadeva is supposed by the Pandit to be Harshavardhana of Kanol, the contemporary of Hwan Thsang and Pulakesi II. of the Dekkan. But the Chinese traveller represents the king of Valabhi as the son-in-law of Harshavardhana's son and consequently a friend of the monarch rather than an enemy. Even granting for a time that the Umetā and the Iào grants of Dadda II., the dates of which are 400 and 417 Saka respectively, are forgeries, it is not, I think, too much to expect the forgers to be pretty accurate as regards the time when the prince in whose name they executed the forgeries lived. The dates 380 and 385 therefore of the Kherā grants of Dadda refer not unlikely, to the Śaka era. And Dadda may have lived to Śaka 417 corresponding to 495 A.D. This brings us down to about the time of Harsha of Ujjayini who may have been the monarch from whom Dadda protected the Valabhi prince. The second ground on which the supposition of the existence of a new era is based is that in the opening passage of another grant of Śryāśraya, Vinayāditya Satyāśraya Vallabha is praised. This Vinayāditya the Pandit identifies with the sovereign of the Dekkan of that name. But I should think it to be more natural to understand him as the brother of Śryāśraya, the donor of the grant dated 653 Śaka. For this last is not called Visavānī, while Śryāśraya is, and from this it appears that the latter was his brother's
associate in the administration and governed a province as his Viceroy. It is on this account that the brother's name is mentioned at the beginning of the grant. The title Satyāśraya Vallabha was promiscuously applied to all Chālukya rulers. The date Śaka 653 of Vinayāditya Yuddhamalla of Gujarāt also does not harmonize with the supposition that his brother was the contemporary of Vinayāditya of the Dekkan. The two astronomical coincidences mentioned by Mr. Fleet in his note on the Pandit's paper in themselves prove nothing, unless it is shown that the coincidences do not occur when the dates 456 and 486 of the Nāvsāri and Kāvi grants are understood as referring to any one of the well known eras. Besides, if this new era was in such extensive use in Gujarāt, surely we must meet with some allusion to it in some Gujarāt inscription or literary work from the earliest times to those of Albiruni. As the question however has no direct bearing on the point under discussion in this note, I need not go into it further.

Thus, then, the evidence in favour of Albiruni's initial date for the Gupta era appears to me to be simply overwhelming.
APPENDIX B.

Note on the S’aka dates and the years of the Bārhaspatya cycle, occurring in the Inscriptions.

There are certain difficulties with reference to the Saka dates and the cyclic years or Sāṃsvatsaras occurring in the inscriptions which require to be cleared up. The current Saka year (A.D. 1883-84) in the Bombay Presidency is 1805, and the year of the sixty years’ cycle, Subhānu. In the southern provinces and the Madras Presidency the current Saka year is 1806, the cyclic year being the same. The first question then is, “Do the dates in the inscriptions conform to the Bombay reckoning or the Madras reckoning?” and the next, “What is the cause of this difference of a year?” We have also to consider whether the Saka dates in the inscriptions represent the number of years that have expired before the event recorded in them or the current year in which the event took place.

Mr. Robert Sewell of the Madras Civil Service gives in the first column of the Chronological Tables compiled by him the number of the Saka years that have expired before the beginning of the cyclic year set against it in the same line in the third column. The current Saka year corresponding to that cyclic year is the one given in the next line in the first column. Thus against Saka 855, the date of the Sāngali grant of Govind IV. of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, we have in the third column the cyclic year Vijaya which shows that 855 years of the Saka era had expired before the Vijaya year began, while the current Saka year corresponding to Vijaya was that given in the next line, viz. 856. Mr. Sewell follows the Madras reckoning. If we interpret the tables according to the Bombay mode, the Saka year appearing in the first column will be the current year corresponding to the cyclic year in the same line in the third column, while the number in the line immediately above will represent the years that have expired before the beginning of that cyclic year. Thus against 1805, the current Saka year on this side of the country, we have in the third column the current cyclic year Subhānu, while 1804 in the line above shows the number of years that have expired. By comparing the Saka dates and cyclic years occurring in the inscriptions with those in the tables we shall be able to determine the points raised above.

In the analysis of Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions published by Mr. Fleet and Dr. Burgess there are 97 cases in which the Saka date as well as the cyclic year are distinctly given. On comparing these with the Tables I observe that in 58 out of these the given Saka date occurs in the same line with the cyclic year mentioned in the inscription. These are:


Thus in inscription No. 20, the date given is 1200, and the cyclic year the Bahudhānya, both of which occur in the same line set against each other in the tables.

In 28 cases the Saka date given in the inscription occurs in the tables in the line below that in which the given cyclic year occurs. These are:
Nos. 19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 47, 72, 89, 91, 95, 96 (first part), 96 (second part), 100, 110, 111, 112, 118 (first part), 118 (second part), 146, 151, 194, 227, 230 (second part), 231, 234, 236, 237, 281.

In No. 19, for instance, the Śaka date is 1184 and the cyclic year Gurmāti. In the tables, Gurmāti occurs in the upper line set against 1183, and 1184 is in the line below, and Dundubhi is the year marked against it.

Now on the supposition that the inscriptions conform to the Madras reckoning, in the first 58 cases the Śaka date represents the number of Śaka years that had expired before the current cyclic year of the inscription, and in 28 it shows the current year of that era. If we suppose the Bombay reckoning to have been in use, the dates in the first 58 cases will represent the current year and those in the next 28, the future year and not the past. But since it is almost absurd to suppose that the immediately next year should be stated in the inscriptions, it follows that the Madras mode of reckoning was the one in use. The objection, however, may be obviated by supposing that these 28 cases conform to the Madras reckoning and give the current year, while the first 58 follow the Bombay mode. But this supposition is not reasonable or probable, since these groups are not confined to particular provinces, and often one of the former exists in the same district or even place with one of the latter. We thus see that though in the majority of cases the inscriptions give the past Śaka year, there is a large number in which the current year is given and not the past.

I have also compared other dates with the tables, and the result I give below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śaka date.</th>
<th>Cyclic year.</th>
<th>What the Śaka date represents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Subbhānu</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Sarvajit</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Piṅgala</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>Dundubhi</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Anāgiras</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>Śrīmukha</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Kīlaka</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>Raktākshi</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>Vilambin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Vikṛiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Virodhiṇa</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Vilambin</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>Dundubhi</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Sanmya</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Sādhārāṇa</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>Virodhiṇa</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Virodhiṇa</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>Paridhāvin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>Śrīmukha</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Raudrā</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>Pramoda</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Anāgiras</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>Virodhiṇa</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of these 24 dates, eight give the current year and the rest the years that had expired, the proportion being the same as in the other case, viz., 1 to 2. In all cases in which the cyclic year is given it is possible to determine whether the date represents the current or past year, but not in others. The inscriptions of the early Chālukyas do not give it, and hence the exact date remains doubtful.

Now the Bombay mode of reckoning, which is one year behind that prevalent in Madras, is, I believe, due to a mistake. We have seen it was more usual in recording a date to mark the years that had expired than the current year. A word expressive of that sense such as gateshu, "having elapsed," was used after the number, and another such as pravartamāne, "being current," was used in connection with the name of the cyclic year. These words were, for brevity's sake, afterwards dropped, and in the course of time, the sense, to express which they were used, was also forgotten and the number came to be regarded as denoting the current year. There are a few dates in the inscriptions which indicate such a mistake as this. Thus in No. 86 of the Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions, Śaka 911 is given along with the cyclic year Vikriti. Now, according to the tables, the number of years that had expired before Vikriti was 912 and the current year was 913. This discrepancy is to be explained by the supposition that Śaka 912 which represented the years that had expired came to be thought of as the current year, just as we, on this side of the country, consider 1805 as the current year now, though it indicates the past year, and the writer of the inscription wishing to give the years that had expired before his current year, put them as 911. The same is the case with Nos. 27, 67, 115, 130, 224, and 284, the Śaka dates in which are 1444, 1084, 1430, 1453, 1114, and 1128, respectively, and are two years behind the current year as determined by the cyclic years given along with them. In some cases the Śaka dates are in advance of the Saṅvatsara or cyclic year by one year. Thus in the Vānī-Dindori grant of Govinda III. the Śaka date is 730 and the Saṅvatsara Vyaya, and in the Kānheri inscription of Amoghavarsha we have Śaka 775 and the Prajāpati Saṅvatsara. Now the Śaka years immediately preceding Vyaya and Prajāpati were 728 and 773, while the current years were 729 and 774 respectively. The dates in these inscriptions may be explained on the supposition that 730 and 775 were the current Śaka years, while instead of the current cyclic years Sarvajit and Áṇgiras, the past Saṅvatsaras Vyaya and Prajāpati were given as the past Śaka years were given in so many cases; in other words the usual process was inverted in these two cases.

The date in No. 79 of the Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions is three years behind the current Saṅvatsara, and that in No. 228, four years; No. 221 has 1113 for 1121; and No. 246, 1492 for 1485. These must be considered to be positive mistakes.

The Śaka dates given in the preceding pages represent in most cases the years that had expired before the particular occurrences mentioned. Thus "in 855" means after 855 years of the Śaka era had expired.
APPENDIX C.

Introduction to Hemādri's Vratakhandāda.

In the critical notes D. represents the Ms. in the Dekkan College Library, No. 234 of A. 1881-82; S. the Ms. belonging to the old Sanskrit College, No. 657; Kh. the Ms. belonging to Khāsīgīrā, and G. the Ms. procured by Gaṅgādāsa Sāstrī Dātār. See Section XIV., p. 75, note 2.

* Shri Gopāl Pārāśāyanaśrī Vīrāja Kālmukha the Ms. in the Dekkan College Library, No. 234 of A. 1881-82; S. the Ms. belonging to the old Sanskrit College, No. 657; Kh. the Ms. belonging to Khāsīgīrā, and G. the Ms. procured by Gaṅgādāsa Sāstrī Dātār. See Section XIV., p. 75, note 2.

These two stanzas exist only in a mutilated form in S., but they occur fully in D. and Kh., which contain the shorter Praśasti. In G., which contains both the Praśastis mixed together, they occur at the head of the shorter one, so that they appear to belong to the latter rather than to the other.

1. for B: D. Kh. 2. for व: D. Kh.

Rājapraśasti I

राजाप्रासाठि

श्रीयानुतनभूतसङ्गसमयाविवर्तयाभावता:

राजाप्रासाठि

संयुत्त्वातुप्युद्धृतिशिरोपश्रेयसितीर्दितः ॥

कल्पानुपपेशु नाभिमकः प्रोदायसंस्करः

श्रीरसारयाविराधग्रापतिबिवर्णितपूज्यातिश्रेष्ठं हरि ॥ १ ॥

अर्थ प्राचासं पुश्पयोतमस्त्र श्रावघृंह क्षोभमः पपोषि ॥

पद्मप्राप्तप्रसयायनः स्वयंकम्बनोपारंतमः ॥ २ ॥

संतानविकल्पग्राहणेन श्रावसतत्त्वारसस्माः ॥

सिन्धोप्रसारतिबिन्दुदसरस्यंद्रमानावृत्तिभिन्नतिरं ॥ ३ ॥

संधनुष्ठानं विवृद्धिवृत्तां कुव सुप्राणादितिरिस्वूत ॥

बमुद्र तस्मान्यदेह चक्रवर्ती पुरुस्तवः पुण्यपाणांकवताः ॥ ४ ॥

अभ्यस्तः ओकिर्मानादायायु: प्रजानां

गुणपदनिद्राया ज्योतिरासीतीपि ॥

1. जायानू S. जीवनू G. 2. नलप S. तुलय. G. 3. ओमानो G. मानी S.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEK

Chapter 1

1. शून्यतिरथ यात: स्वातिमनप्युप्स: -
2. यमापि चतुर्मूर्ति कृतिविनिश्चकार: ॥ ५ ॥

Chapter 2

1. यदीर्दायो विशारदेशेशोभिमोहिनिः -
2. अन्वयव: स एतामधुर: यदुवंश: ॥ ६ ॥

Chapter 3

1. तत: कौटिया तस्माद: जनवरी वृजिनिवासपि त:प: -
2. स्त: जने राजपि शिरिगतिस्य स्वाहित इति: ॥

Chapter 4

1. नवानुसन: - समभवदश: चित्तश: इः -
2. यत: जना: स्वात: स किषु शाशविनः: इति: ॥ ७ ॥

Chapter 5

1. तत: प्रयुक्तवा वीरिसदन्तन्तरं: -
2. तत: सुधा उजाना: सितेपुरितिः च कथां: ॥ ८ ॥

Chapter 6

1. सुनुस्तः तु महान इत्युपम: प्रियामदाविककम -
2. ऋवस्मादुद्योगाय सुमकवचस्त्वाधिराज्यनुप: -

Chapter 7

1. ततो विद्भः: कथुपतिः जनिनासहितं: परतो: दशः: -
2. व्योमेः च तीमृत इति कथेय जाता नरेन्द्रा बिकातिः बीरा: ॥ १० ॥

Chapter 8

1. तददु सोमरथ: प्रयुक्तिपति: विश्वथं ततो राजिः वर: -
2. दशरथ: शाकुनिः शरमश्रिहः पदिशास्वपि रुपायामाण: ॥ ११ ॥

Chapter 9

1. देवराजस्वत: सोमान्तित: जतस्व: -
2. तत: कुष्ठवे राजा पुषोहः: कपादस्व: ॥ १२ ॥

Chapter 10

1. अधायुरातुपन्त सान्त: भुद्रायन्तवाचीन्द्र: जनानां: -
2. विप्रवस्तः तपोसिपुरस्वरूप: प्रसिद्धं इति सिर्वाह: ॥ १३ ॥

Chapter 11

1. बुधवार श्रवंशम: जस्तोपि ब्रह्मोडः: -
2. असूत सोिपि धर्मामा राजने देवोद्व: -

Chapter 12

1. निर्धिश्चाकृतिकैर्पुरस्त: शिति: पाल्यतं स्म: सूर: -
2. ततोपि राजा बुधदेवामा यो विशुद्धीतार्पि हेतुरासीत: ॥ १५ ॥

Chapter 13

1. नृपार्जुरुन्दारकुन्दूमीलिन्दारमालासुरभीकतां: -
2. आसिद्वरभास्वपार्थाराय: रुशा: सुरारिः: ॥ १६ ॥

1. शून्यति: S. भूति G. ॥ २. श्याहित S. स्तवहित G. ॥ ३. नवानुस्तः S. नवानुस्तः G. ॥ ४. नाम for राजा G. ॥ ५. वर्तकसा G. S. ॥ ६. So both Mss. But there must be a mistake. The name of Sūra's son शोभिः is disguised as राशि. Perhaps the reading is दूरशोभिः. ॥ ७. पुरा सुरारिः S.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

1. The Purānic genealogy ends here. Subāhu, however, is there called Suchāru. 2. This is the reading both of S. and G. probably for धारियस. But the name according to Pañḍit Bhāgvānālī's granth was धारियप. 3. This appears to be a mistake for मीम्बुजीताजस्वसदान. G. has मनसुहडाकस्मात् 6. Pāt S., पवि G. for पत्र। 7. The visarga is dropped in both Mss.

1. परिस्रूपादित्या: S.; G. is totally incorrect and there is a lacuna.

2. The Purānic genealogy ends here. Subāhu, however, is there called Suchāru. 3. ता राजा विसराज राजस्थियों विलक्षिताजतराजा: S. and G. for pak. The visarga is dropped in both Mss.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

Both Mss. have लंचितः त्रिष्णम्.

Here S. ends and the following is based on G. only, which, as I have already observed, is an extremely incorrect manuscript.

Three syllables have dropped out here. चलव्यः is evidently वल्यः. I read the line thus:—तथायानुजस्तदनु मुक्तवल्यं बलीयान्. तस्य refers to the previous King Paramma whose brother Sinha appears to be. The copyist, after having written तस्यानुमुक्तवल्यं बलि ज्ञानि त्रिजगतिविज्ञाय स राजा, thought this to be the end of तदनु and so omitted जनसाद. What I read as अत्रायत looks in the Ms. like अत्रायत, but there is little doubt अत्रायत is the word intended.

This may be त्रेन्द्रिगुरुनाथः.

The Ms. has नवं for नवं. The Ms. omits होः.

This line is bad. I read it thus:—उद्दनमथं भम्भरिष्मृद्भिष्मद्विगुमिद्विगुमामि. निवास is निवाह in the Ms. In the Ms. अहारि is अहैरि and उतकाल is उतकाल which violates the metre.

This line is bad. I read it thus:—उदन्मथं भम्भरिष्मृद्भिष्मद्विगुमिद्विगुमामि.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

1. The Ms. has this line thus:— ततो मल्लिगुरुत्मपण्डितोमरलयानी: २. मेदिनी इस देश में in the Ms. ३. मोशम Ms. ४. अन्यत्र is unintelligible. ५. For आ we have नी in the Ms. and the द is curiously written. ६. What the exact name of the king was it is difficult to say; अनलाल is ungrammatical, and may have been intended for अनलाला. ७. What this word is cannot be said with any certainty. A form of the root वत will not do; perhaps जिगाय was meant. ८. As is very usual in Ms., the ज़ of this is written as if it were ज़. ९. होलेसें is very likely होलेसेल, i.e., the Hoysala Yadava of Halebid. What I have put as वेशी is in the Ms. वेषी १०. दण्डका is written as दण्डिका in the Ms. ११. What this word is, it is difficult to say. What is wanted is a word like अजन्त, अतयय &c. Possibly, it is अचय. संपत्त is written as संप and विलास: as विलास १२. In the Ms. we have पसाद्यमालासर्दितो १३. Perhaps संद is meant for संघ. १४. The Ms. has विकाश: for अवकाशः १५. देवयाय in the Ms. The द must be due to the copyist having mistaken न which was the old form of writing ने for that letter. १६. ज्ञान is केवः in the Ms.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

1. तैलिन्द्र is तस्यमित्र in the Ms.

2. श्रीरस्य ought to be श्रीरस्य, unless the son of Rudradeva is meant. 3. There is a lacuna here; but this stanza must be the same as the sixth in the smaller Prasasti, and therefore the second line should be कारिगरः पदं जगति सिद्धांदेवभूमि: ४ वर्गः is वेद in the Ms. 5. This line is thus written in the Ms.:—सीमांतःविनो- दनकैरवचंद्रभासानः । ६ In the Ms. we have युज्यत, but it violates the metre. 7. यद्राहावलिम् in the Ms. 8. We should read तद्धि for यद् here. 9. There is a lacuna here. 10. In these two lines, अकारि ought to be अकारि, हल्लो, हल्लो, and उवागिते, उवागिते, and the general sense is clear; but it is difficult to restore the original thoroughly.
This stanza is the same as stanza 13 of the second Praastati; and, therefore, I have corrected the mistakes of the Ms. by comparing the two, keeping only such words as deserved to be considered as different readings.

Two letters are wanting here. Perhaps the word meant is समुद्रगायत्रक.: as an epithet of Mahadeva involves censure instead of praise. The correct form of the word is, probably, मदमन्दसर्वादत्, in which case it would be an epithet of Bhojadeva.

There are so many bad mistakes in this that an endeavour at restoration must be fruitless.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN.

At ev hi maolubhur: shishumay swadaye nyabhyat.

Swamasya bhay samad: kapastin chayer tapasyati II 19 II

Vipasaamarthu: shrjhi gasya pana3

Pruthyadhunayamamatahitdhammu.

Prathyabharvahayalamoli kanyto

Bhav sharamitima mantramuvarthit II 16 II

Yadityagandhiragantapalini shrayantadanaaswaryadipii.

Soma: samudraupadesaloyi mam man saini: sah krodaya.

II 17 II

Aatvamapi bhiradhursharabhimantarpayati kuty: prayami.

Chire bhutasiti yadityarani somaishvari bhadramayu yat: II 18 II

Aala: shrihitadhandaka parisar: shrihodiagrey: par

Desa: pashalabahusuranavachamadhuruparikriti:

Tasmindebra: puri bhujati trikalyasahristyaan

Bhramanti: shubhakalyadhitparisadhyanati: II 19 II

Jagaharvargin: prasharista: shastta samsatvanimadhur.

Shrimanamvaranadhanii soma mahadistirupi varami II 20 II

Kuruvinmayagamavistartarihvarasasamadhyam.

Aphitayati hemadhirima viprapravasam: II 21 II

Sama sampetah yasho balmbide soma pratapama.

Naike prathyayatma muhi mahadiswara kaikisvar.

Yasas shriyakaranath: swamyahemadhirir: pura:

Pratpashiramvarvamajvaladhehri bhsha gopate II 22 II

Vitarajamayati: II

1 Himachalbhand G. 2 N pashati for tapasyati G. 3 Pana.


Kbh. 6 Shrechayh: D. Sevchara: Kh. The middle letter of the name in G.

looks somewhat like ट but there is little question that the copyist had ट before him and made it appear like ट by producing the nether curve and making its end touch the knot of ट. 7 Svarbhun D.
SUPPLEMENT.

SECTION XI.

THE RASHTRAKUTAS.

GOVINDA II.

At the end of a Purana entitled Harivamsha of the Digambara Jainas, it is stated that the work was composed by Jinasena in the Saka year 705 while Vallabha the son of Krishna was ruling over the south. Govinda II. is in the Kavi grant called Vallabha, while one of the names of Dhruruva the second son of Krishna I. was Kalivalabha. Govinda II., therefore, must be the prince alluded to, and he appears thus to have been on the throne in the Saka year 705, or A.D. 783.

The north was ruled over at the same time by a prince of the name of Indrāyudha, the east by the king of Avanti, and the west by the sovereign of the Vatsas. The last prince must have been the same as that whom Dhrura Nirupama is represented to have defeated. The ruler of the country of the Sauryas (Sauras) was Varaha who is spoken of as a victorious warrior.1

JAGATTUNGA.

The Kardā grant has been re-examined by Mr. Fleet and a new transcript and translation along with a facsimile have been published by him.2 From the latter I see that Jagadrudra, as a name of Govinda III. and of his great grandson, is a misreading; and that the correct name was Jagattunga as given in the other plates.

AMOGHAVARSHA I.

An inscription at Sirur in the Dhārvād district published by Mr. Fleet is dated Saka 787, Vyaya, which is represented as the fifty-second year of the reign of Amoghavarsha I.3 According to a

1 शालेewareशेषयु सम्भु दिश कृष्णसिंहजन्मत्रमानि कृष्णमूर्तजेश्वरमेव दक्षिणाभु।
पुर्व ओमदचर्चमुनिय स्वं वस्तिदि (धि) राजेःपरां
संगयो(रा)णयाधिगम्यर्ते (स्व)नययूर्ते वैरी वराहेघवति ॥
Rajendralal’s Skr. Mss., Vol. VI., p. 80. There is a copy of this Purana in the Government collections deposited in the library of the Dekkan College; but it has been sent to Germany.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 263 et seq.
3 Ibid., p. 216.
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Kānheri inscription that prince was, as we have seen, on the throne in 799 Śaka. This year must then have been the sixty-fourth of his reign. It is very improbable that a prince should reign for such a long period, and I think there must be some mistake somewhere. The cyclic year Vyaya corresponds to the Śaka year 788 past and 789 current.

PRABHŪTAVARSHA AND NITYAVARSHA.

Mr. Fleet has published an inscription dated Śaka 840, Pramā-thin, in which year Prabhūtavarsha was the reigning prince.1 This prince he identifies with Jagattunga II. The very next inscription given by him is dated Śaka 838, Dhātu, when Nityavarsha was on the throne.2 Now Nityavarsha was a name of Indra III. who was the son of Jagattunga II., since in the Sāngali grant Indra's son Govinda IV. is represented as meditating on the feet of Nityavarsha; and Mr. Fleet himself takes that to be another name of Indra III., though he calls him Indra IV. The father's date is thus Śaka 840 and the son's 838, which is impossible. I therefore think that the Prabhūtavarsha meant was Govinda IV. That was his name, though he was called Suvannavarsha by people. For, it is stated in the Sāngali grant, that “though he was Prabhūtavarsha, he was called Suvannavarsha ('one who rains down gold') by people, because raining down gold in streams (by his gifts), he made the whole earth solely golden”3. Mr. Fleet's statement that Jagattunga II. was called Prabhūtavarsha is based upon a mere inference, while in this passage we are distinctly told that that was one of the names of Govinda IV. The latest date of Akalavarsha or Krishna II. is 833 Śaka. Supposing him to have died in that year and Govinda IV. to have begun to reign in Śaka 840 which, by the way, is a mistake for 841, the reigns of Jagattunga II., his son Indra III., and Amoghavarsha II. the eldest son of Indra occupied only about seven years. But since Jagattunga is not mentioned after Akalavarsha in the Kharepatal) grant, but Indra, the grandson of Akalavarsha, I gather that Jagattunga did not ascend the throne at all; and Amoghavarsha II. could have reigned but for a very short time, perhaps, a few months, as he was deposed by his brother Govinda IV.

Mr. Fleet mentions another inscription of Govinda IV. dated 851 Śaka.4

GOVINDĀMBĀ.

In the facsimile of the Kardā grant published by Mr. Fleet, I find the stanza containing the name of Govindāmbā exactly as it is

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 222.
2 Ibid, p. 224.
3 वर्षसुद्रव्याच्यः प्रभूतवर्षोपवि कनकधारामः।

जेन्द्रलक्ष्मेनकल्चरनस्थमकरोदिति जनार्दनः।

Mr. Fleet's translation of this is:—"Raining down gifts, discharging showers of gold, and raining abundantly,—he is said by people to have caused the whole world to be made solely of gold by (his) showers of gold."5 (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., pp. 250—253. The whole point of the stanza is lost in this translation which, of course, is wrong. The word अभिन्न has been altogether neglected.
given by Mr. Wathen, except that we have Jagattunga instead of Jagadrudra, and therefore the mistakes I speak of in note 4, page 53, are not due to Mr. Wathen, but to the engraver or the composer of the grant. That the Kardā grant contains mistakes here of addition and omission is unquestionable. Those who take the text as it is, make out that Jagattunga II. married two sisters Lakshmi and Govinda Amba, the daughters of Samkaragaṇa of Chedi. If we so understand it, the result will be that the Kardā grant makes no mention of Indra’s wife Vijāmbā1 and of his sons Amoghavarsha and Govinda IV., the latter of whom reigned, as we have seen, for at least fifteen years. Such an omission is not likely. Then, again, the Sāṅgali grant makes no allusion whatever to Jagattunga’s marriage with a lady of the name of Govinda Amba. This name itself is, as I have observed, queer. And the line in the Kardā grant Srimān Amoghavarsha Govinda Ambadbhilānāyām, looks as if the intention of the writer of it was to set forth the names of the two sons of Indra, Amoghavarsha and Govinda, and of their mother Amba or Vijāmbā. And it appears to me that the following stanza in which the liberality of a monarch has been praised refers to Govinda IV. who, as noticed above, was called Suvarnavarsha by people, because he “ruined down gold”. The name of that prince, therefore, must occur in the verse immediately previous. The line which precedes that beginning with Srimān must thus have crept in through mistake; and probably a verse or two are omitted here as also after the next stanza when Krishna Jája is abruptly introduced and spoken of parenthetically.

THE LATER PRINCES.

Krishna III. was on the throne in Saka 873 according to an inscription2 in the Dharvāḍ District published by Mr. Fleet, and his younger brother Khotika was the reigning sovereign in Saka 893, prajāpati, according to another.3 Krishna’s dates are thus 867, 873 and 878 Saka.

Mr. Fleet adheres to Mr. Wathen’s translation of the passage in note 2, p. 54, which makes out the Krishna there mentioned to be a son of Jagattunga II. I need not discuss the grammar further than I have done. He brings in, as before stated, another Krishna, whom he calls Krishna IV. and identifies him with Nirupama the younger brother of Khotika and the father of Kakkala the last Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince, and with the Krishna whose dates range from 867 to 878 Saka. But if Khotika was his elder brother it is impossible that he should be reigning in 893 Saka, while Krishna should be on the throne from 867 to 878 Saka, that is, before his elder brother. Krishna, therefore, was the elder of the two as stated in the Khārepāṭar grant and Khotika the younger. Mr. Fleet, however, being under the belief that this last was the elder brother, gives the following explanation of the discrepancy in the dates:—

---

1 Mr. Fleet in his revised transcript and translation of the Sāṅgali grant calls her Dvijambā, but in the facsimile given by him the name is distinctly Vijāmbā in both the places where it occurs. The Sanskrit of Vijāmbā is Vidyambā. Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 250.


3 Ibid, p. 255.
"Kottiga or Khoṭṭiga left no issue, and this explains why the date of his inscription now published is considerably later than the dates obtained for Krishna IV.; viz., there being no probability of Kottiga leaving any issue, first his younger brother Krishna IV. was joined with him in the government and then the latter's son Kakka III." This supposition is not supported by any circumstance; on the contrary it is utterly discountenanced by the inscriptions of Krishna which represent him to be the "Supreme king of great kings," and to have been reigning at the time at Manyakheṭa and governing the kingdom. Otherwise, they would have spoken of him as Yuvārāja.

Khoṭika is called Khoṭṭiga in the Karḍa grant and not Khoṭviga.

In addition to these several new inscriptions we owe another to Mr. Fleet. It is dated Saka 896 current, Šrīmulāśa, when the reigning prince was Kakkala. This was the year in which the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were overthrown by Tailapa.

Section XIV., p. 76.

Seunadesā.

This name seems to be preserved in the modern Khândes. In a foot-note on the opening page of the Khândes Volume, the Editor of the "Bombay Gazetteer" observes that the name of the country was older than Musalman times, and it was afterwards changed by them to suit the title of Khān given to the Fāruki kings by Ahmed I. of Gujārāt. Seunadesā, therefore, was very likely the original name and it was changed to Khândes, which name soon came into general use on account of its close resemblance in sound to Seunadesā. The country however extended farther southwards than the present district of Khândes, since it included Devagiri or Daulatābād, and probably it did not include the portion north of the Tāpī.

Section XV., p. 82.

Jajjalla and Kakkuḷa.

Jajjalla whose elephants Singhana is spoken of as having carried away must have been a prince belonging to the eastern branch of the Chedi dynasty that ruled over the province of Chhattisgarh, for that name occurs in the genealogy of that dynasty. The name Kakkula I would identify with Kokkala which was borne by some princes of the western branch of the family, the capital of which was Tripura or Tevur.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 255.  
2 Ibid., p. 258.  
5 General Cunningham's Arch. Reports, Vol. XVII., pp. 75, 76, & 79.