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FOREWORD

Dr. K. Gopalachari's book comprises the results of the research he carried on in this department in the years 1934-36. The subject of his study, The Early History of the Andhra Country, is well known in its outline but is full of many little problems in epigraphy and archaeology that need elucidation. Dr. Gopalachari's thesis does not claim in any way to revolutionise our interpretation of the history of the period; its value consists in a large number of detailed suggestions confirming results now generally accepted by stronger arguments or bringing forward fresh points of view. Parts of the thesis may be found therefore highly technical and possibly of little interest to the general reader; but there is much in the thesis not merely in the selection of facts but also in their elucidation and presentation that I hope will be recognised to be of permanent value to all historians of India.

I have great pleasure in tendering on behalf of Dr. Gopalachari and myself our sincere thanks to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for their sanctioning the inclusion of the work in the Departmental series.

University Buildings,
Triplicane, Madras, K. A. N.
15th Sept. 1941.
PREFACE

This book represents my work as a research scholar in the Department of Indian History in the University of Madras from 1934 to 1936. It is an attempt to present a connected history of the Andhras and the Andhra country from the earliest times to the advent of the Eastern Cálukyas. The Viṣṇukunḍins had to be brought into the picture as they close the epoch. A full account of the dynasty would have involved a study of the many contemporary dynasties and increased the bulk of the volume. So the last chapter is a compromise, a treatment of the skirts and fringes of the subject.

The first five chapters traverse a field covered long ago by great scholars like Prof. Rapson, R. G. Bhandarkar and Bhagawanlal Indraji and unruffled by startling discoveries. This has saved me from pioneering work; but I have had the difficult task of challenging great names and accepted conclusions. An independent study of inscriptions and monuments in situ has necessitated my doing so in some cases. Palaeography and the discovery of a few coins like the Āpilaka coin and the silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa Satakaṇi have enabled me to reconstruct Andhra and Kṣatrapa chronology on less insecure foundations and question Rapson’s identification of Puḷumāvi with the son-in-law of Rudradāman. The much neglected social, economic and cultural conditions of the period, upon which a flood of light is thrown by inscriptions and Buddhist remains, have been dealt with at length. One of the conclusions which should not be lost sight of is that the Sātavāhanas were Andhras but began their political career in Western Deccan.

The second period in Andhra history beginning with the Ikṣvākus, one of many short-lived dynasties, is a comparatively unexplored field. The evidence is also scanty. I have built up the chronological scheme with the help of palaeography. A fuller chapter on the Ikṣvākus than anything written before, the date of the Brhatphalāyanas, Kandara and Vaingeyaka genealogy and chronology are some of the contributions to the subject. D. C. Sircar’s monograph on The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Eastern Deccan was published while I was writing my thesis. I am
indebted to him only for the Viśṇukunḍin genealogy, but even here I have modified his conclusions with the help of palaeography.

The Akola hoard of Sātavāhana coins discovered in 1939 does not necessitate a modification or abandonment of the conclusions reached in the thesis.

Some of the epigraphical notes in the thesis have been published in Vol. XXIV No. 6 of *Epigraphia Indica*.

My task of reading the Allūru inscription has been greatly facilitated by the article of Rao Bahadur C. R. Krishnamacharlu waiting for publication in the *Epigraphia Indica*. The manuscript was with me when I was reading the inscription. Readings like 'ailasa' and 'vadālābhikaro', to mention only a few and the translations of a few words I owe to the article. I am indebted to Prof. V. V. Mirashi of Nagpur for promptly supplying me a copy of the photograph of the coins of the Akola hoard mentioned above as also his readings.

Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has more than guided me in my work. Discussions with him have led me to new lines of approach and new conclusions. Apart from specific suggestions, I owe to him in no small measure the habit of minute attention to details and of exactitude.

K. G.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Epigraphia Carnatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indian Antiquary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASWI</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Western India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSI</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Southern India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>Cave Temples of Western India—Burgess and Indraji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBBRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBORS</td>
<td>Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASB</td>
<td>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YB of the AS of B</td>
<td>Year-Book of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAI</td>
<td>Coins of Ancient India, Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Coins of Southern India, Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Catalogue of the Indian Coins in the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE</td>
<td>Annual Report on Epigraphy (Madras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Bombay Gazetteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRI</td>
<td>Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>Sacred Books of the East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABIA</td>
<td>Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. BH</td>
<td>Mahabharata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHQ</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSW</td>
<td>Tree and Serpent Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGI</td>
<td>Ancient Geography of India, Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS</td>
<td>Gaekwad's Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matsya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vā</td>
<td>Vayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛd</td>
<td>Brahmāṇḍa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣ</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERE</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>Journal of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Gupta Inscriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The following pages represent an attempt to trace the fortunes, political, social and religious, of the Andhras, a people whose hoary antiquity is attested by pieces of evidence, literary, epigraphic and numismatic. The period covered is that from the earliest times to the advent of the Eastern Cālukyas. Politically, socially and culturally the Dravidian Andhras (condemned sons of Viśvāmitra) proved a tremendous success. Once their empire extended from sea to sea. The Amarāvatī art is the most eloquent testimony to the cultural achievements of the race. The activities, maritime and colonial, of the people read like romance. No ancient tribe has on record such a unique achievement in all branches.

Andhras as a people are mentioned as early as the fifth century B.C. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa speaks of them as the exiled sons of Viśvāmitra, as non-Aryans evidently.1 The Jātakas speak of an Andhakapura and Āndhra country.2 The inscriptions of Asoka mention Āndhras along with Pulindas as border peoples.3 The Saptasātakam speaks of Pulindas.4 The Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa speak of Āndhras along with Cōlās, Ceras and Pāṇḍyas.5 The Purāṇas speak of the Āndhrajātiyas.6 They enjoyed the same political status as Kāmbojas, Yavanas, and Gāndhāras in the north. It will thus be seen that the earliest references to the Āndhra are to people or tribe and not to their country. The reference to their country occurs first in the Mayidavolū inscription of Śiva-Skandavarman (4th century) in which Dhamānakataka is spoken of as the headquarters of the Pallava province Āndhāpatha (Andhrāpatha). It is therefore clear that the country derived its name from the people, an instance with many parallels in Indian History. The

1. VII, 8.
   Āndhra city, ibid., I, 12.
   Andhakas, ibid., V, pp. 10 and 138.
3. RE, XIII.
5. M. Bh., Sabhāparvan, XXXI; Rāmāyaṇa, iv, 41.
name Andhradesa found in literature is also evidence in the same direction. In the 5th and 6th centuries, the Pallava province conquered from the Vaiṅgeyakas, came to be called Veṅgorāstra. It is very probable that during the Vaiṅgeyaka period Andhradesa got the name Veṅgidesa, or Veṅgināḍu, or Veṅgimāṇḍalam by which it was commonly known during the period of the Eastern Cālukyas. The Andhras are spoken of as Vaṅgugār (Tamil), and their country Vaṅgugavaḷi (northerners and the country of the northerners). But the name Andhra lived through all these changes. Andhra people are spoken of in the Chezarla inscription of Kandara’s grandson. The inscriptions of the Maukhari kings Isvaravarman and Isānavarman speak of Andhrādhipati. An inscription of the Vākāṭaka king Harisena speaks of his conquest of the Kalīṅga and Andhra countries. An inscription of the 14th century speaks of the Andhradesa.

To-day, Andhradesa is a linguistic and cultural unity. It may be noted, that from the earliest times the Andhras were an entity, ethnical and cultural. Megasthenes says that the Andhras were a separate race. The Bhaṭṭiprōḷu alphabet, the Veṅgi alphabet as Burnell would call it, and the Telugu-Canarese script were evolved in the Andhradesa. And the Kṛṣṇā Prākṛt of our period, of which we know something, has peculiarities which we do not find elsewhere. To-day the Andhras speak Telugu and during the Middle Ages their country was known as Teliṅgāṇa.

The extent of the Andhradesa of our period is not however easy of determination. As Asoka’s inscriptions speak of the Andhras and the Kalīṅga country, and as under Kharavela Kalīṅga was a first-rate power, the Andhradesa of our study was in the north limited by Kalīṅga. Since Ptolemy’s Maisōlia and Periplus’ Masalia refer to the Andhra country, the remark that Masalia extended far into the interior, shows that not only the seaboard between the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā, but also a considerable area in the interior was included in the Andhradesa. In the south, Andhradesa did not extend far beyond the northern part of the modern Nellore District. For the Mayidavōlu Amādhāpatha

7. Māṅgajūr grant, IA, Vol. V.
Haraha Inscription, EI, XIV, 120.
9. JRAS, 1914, p. 137.
11. See Chap. II.
which refers to the region around Dhamañakaṭaka was limited by Karmarāṣṭra.¹² No doubt under the Sātavāhanas the Andhra Empire extended from sea to sea, and from the Central Provinces in the north to Cuddalore in the south and Mysore in the southwest.¹³ An inscription of Caṇḍa Sāti is found in Koḍavali near Piṭhāpuram; and some of the dynasties that succeeded the Sātavāhanas would seem to have annexed parts of Kaliṅga if only for a time. In the Srīraṅgam plates dated A.D. 1358¹⁴ it is said that the Tiliṅga country is bounded in the north by Kanyākubja, on the west by Mahārāṣṭra, on the east by Kaliṅga, on the south by Pāṇḍyaka. The description of the Andhradeśa is certainly reminiscent of the old empire of the Sātavāhanas. But the Andhradeśa of our period is clearly only the territory bounded on the north by Kaliṅga, on the south by the southern part of the Nellore D.t., and extending from the coast far into the mainland in the west.

¹² Chapter on Kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra.
¹³ Coins of Pulumāvi II bearing the device of ship with masts are found on the Coromandel Coast as far south as Cuddalore.
¹⁴ Paścāt purastādapi yasya deśau Khyaṭau Mahārāṣṭra-Kaliṅga-Samjñau
   Avāgudak Pāṇḍyaka-Kanyakubjau deśas sa tatrāsti Tiliṅganāmed
CHAPTER II

ORIGINS OF SĀTAVĀHANA POWER

Materials for a study of Sātavāhana history

It is some decades since some Prākṛt inscriptions in Brāhmi characters of a line of kings called Sātavāhanas in lithic records and in literature, and Āndhras (Andhrajātiyaḥ) in the Purānic genealogies, were discovered. The first publication of their western inscriptions goes back to volume VII of the J.B.B.R.A.S. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar was the first to translate them in his 'Notices' published in the Transactions of the London Congress of Orientalists (1874) pp. 306 ff. Bühler¹ and Bhagvanlal Indraji² improved upon Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's readings and interpretations; in 1906 the French savant, Emile Senart, gave not merely a modest gloss in the wake of his predecessors' learned interpretations but a scholarly edition of the inscriptions.³ The five short but important Sātavāhana records from the eastern Deccan have been edited by Bühler,⁴ Burgess,⁵ Sten Konow⁶ and Sukthankar⁷. Thanks to exceptionally skilled numismatists like General Cunningham, F. W. Thomas, Prof. Rapson, Bhagvanlal Indraji and the Rev. H. R. Scott, we have as much information as could be extracted from the Sātavāhana and Kṣatrapa coins. The Purānic material has been carefully studied and diligently collected by F. E. Pargiter in his "Dynasties of the Kali Age", though his conclusions on the history of Purāṇa literature have been questioned often.

Still it is true to say that the historian's task is made difficult by the paucity of material. A great part of the Sātavāhana dominions remains unexplored. Recently the archaeological department of Hyderabad have begun excavations at Paithān. Only a hoard of Sātavāhana coins has come to light so far. Twenty-four

---

¹. ASWI, Vols. IV and V.
². BG, Vol. XVI.
³. EI, Vols. VII and VIII.
⁵. ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 61, 100.
inscriptions (some of which are very short) for a line of 30 kings, who held sway over the greater part of the peninsula for more than three hundred years, are a disappointing number. A long historical night envelops kings Nos. 4 to 22 in the Purānic list. Prior to the discovery of the Jogalthembi hoard, we had no coins which could with certainty be attributed to Gotamiputra Siri-Satavahana. The Purāṇas do not tell us much. Neither does the Brhatkathā which, according to tradition, was written in the court of a Satavahana king, nor the Saptaśatakam, an anthology of erotic verses attributed to Hāla (Satavahana), nor even Liṅgavatī, a Prākṛt work, the theme of which is the military transactions of Hāla’s reign, offer many peep-holes into the dark period. In short, the historian has still to call to aid his imagination to forge some of the missing links. His enterprise even now is not unlike that of adding piece by piece to the ends of the two arms of a cantilever bridge intended to meet at the centre; the ends of the two structures are still, for all we know, facing each other in the air. Until they have met and been firmly and finally riveted they cannot offer a safe passage.

**The old theory**

Scholars who were assiduously collecting every scrap of information on the Satavahana period found that the names gleaned from inscriptions and coins as well as their order agreed with those in the Purānic genealogies; and they straightaway identified the Satavahanas of the epigraphic and numismatic records with the Andhras of the Purāṇas. The home of the Andhras was the next question to be tackled. The early references to the Andhras and their country enabled them to fix the habitat of this people in the country, the heart of which roughly comprised the present Godāvarī, Kṛṣṇā and Guṇṭūr districts. Scholars like Prof. Rapson, V. A. Smith and Dr. Bhandarkar found no difficulty in building on these postulates the theory of an eastern origin of Satavahana power, i.e., in the Āndhradeśa; while V. A. Smith located the Satavahana capital at Śrī-Kākuḷam, Dr. Bhandarkar saw it in Dhamśa-kaṭaka.12

---

8. Recently, however, a copper coin of Śrī-Apīlaka No. 8 in the Matsya list has been discovered in the Central Provinces.


10. Vide supra.

11. ZDMG, 1902 p. 637; CIC, Andhras, and Western Kṣtrapas, etc., xvi and xvii.

12. Vide infra.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE ANDHRA COUNTRY

Epigraphic, numismatic and literary evidence against it

A careful revaluation of the materials, epigraphic, numismatic and literary, would throw in high relief the objections to the orthodox theory of the expansion of Sātavāhana power from the Kṛṣṇa-Godāvari valleys to western Deccan. It is of course hard to break the cake of old theories. Except for a dissentient note here and there\(^{13}\) nothing was done to disprove the old theory till the year 1922 when Sukthankar took up the question.\(^{14}\) His spirited attack on the old theory, only marred by an erroneous theory of the original habitat of the Sātavāhanas and the absence of a sound constructive side, does not seem to have gained the approval of later writers.

An inscription over a relievo figure, mentioning the founder of the dynasty (Rāya Simuka), an inscription of the reign of Kaṇha (Kṛṣṇa), his brother, and an inscription of queen Nāyanikā, the widow of Siri-Sātakani, son of Simuka, come from Nāneghāṭ and Nāsik in the western Deccan. The Amaravati Stūpa has yielded many inscriptions some of which, on palaeographical grounds, can be ascribed to the 3rd century B.C.,\(^{15}\) some others to the 2nd or 1st century B.C.,\(^{16}\) and still others to the 1st century A.D.\(^{17}\) The silence of these inscriptions about not only Simuka, Kaṇha and Siri-Sātakani I, but also other early Sātavāhanas, put by the side of the mention of two Sātavāhana kings of the 2nd century A.D. in two inscriptions,\(^{18}\) tells its own simple story. One would expect the long record of queen Nāyanikā recording the numerous sacrifices performed during the minority of her son to be very near the capital and not in a place on the farthest limits of the empire, which would be the case if the theory of an eastern capital is correct. It may be noted that Nāneghāṭ is only 120 miles, as the crow flies, from Pratiṣṭhāna, the capital according to tradition, of the early Sātavāhanas.\(^{19}\)

13. IA, 1913, pp. 281 ff.
14. ABORI, ii, pp. 21ff.
16. EI, Vol. XV, ibid., 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18.
17. Ibid., Nos. 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 42, 43 and 44.
19. Nāneghāṭ (Ghāṭghar) is a pass in the Western Ghats which was in the direct line of communication from inland market-towns like Pratiṣṭhāna and Tagara to the western ports like Kalyāṇ, Barygaza, etc.
prōlu inscriptions, ‘probably only a few decades later than Asoka’s edicts’, mention a king Khubirako and his father Śa. Andhradesa would, therefore, seem to have been ruled by a different line in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. A coin from the Andhradesa bearing the legends (— — —) B (i) ra or (— — —) Vira is corroborative evidence pointing in the same direction. True, inscriptions of kings Nos. 4 to 22 are not found either in the western Deccan or in the Andhradesa. Gotamiputa Sīrī-Sātakāni’s three inscriptions come from Nāsik and Kārlā. The Nāsik record of Gotamī Balasiri recounting her son’s political achievements, and describing his empire, makes no reference to the Andhradesa. Only records engraved during the reigns of Vāsiṣṭhipuṭa sāmi Sīrī-Puḷumāvī, son of Gotamiputa Sīrī-Sātakāni, and some of his successors, i.e., during the latter half of the second century and the first quarter of the third century A.D., come from the Andhradesa and Kaliṅga. Of the 24 records of these kings, 8 come from Nāsik, 5 from Kañhēri, three from Kārlā, one from Bhilsā, two from Nāneghāṭ (besides there are 5 short ones over reliefo figures), one from Myākadoni, one from Cinna Ganjam, two from Amarāvatī and one from Koḍavali.

The Hāθigumph inscription of Khaṛavela, king of Kaliṅga and a contemporary of the third or fifth king in the Sātavāhana line, throws some welcome light on the question. In the inscription Khaṛavela is said to have destroyed the city of Pithuriṇḍa in the eleventh year. In the next line an expedition against the kings of Uttarāpatha in the twelfth year is spoken of. We must, therefore, look for the city elsewhere than in the North. The East is likewise excluded for the sea lies on that side. Since the destruction of Pithuriṇḍa and the breaking up of ‘the confederacy of the T(r)amira (Damira or Tamil) countries of 113 years’ are spoken of in the same breath and achieved in the same year, the South has greater claims than the West. Sylvain Lévi has shown that the

22. Scholars like Dr. Bhandarkar have made attempts to identify some mountains and countries mentioned in that record with those in the eastern Deccan. Prof. Rapson is of opinion that the record only mentions Gotamiputra’s conquests. For a discussion of these views, vide infra.
25. Pithuriṇḍam gadabha navagalena kāsyati, ibid., p. 79, t. 1. 11.
Pitundra of Ptolemy is a Greek transliteration of the Indian Pithunḍa. He says:—"Ptolemy places Pitundra in the hinterland, between the mouths of the Maisolos and the Manadas, or in other words, between the deltas of the Godāvari and Mahānadi, at an equal distance from both. We must, therefore, look for the site of the city between Chicacole and Kalingapatam, if Ptolemy's information approximates to the truth."  

We cannot very much rely on Ptolemy's information here, as he has erred in placing to the southeast of the mouth of the Maisolos a great peninsula which, however, existed only in his imagination. 

We have, moreover, to say with Yule that Maisolos is the Kṛṣṇā and not the Godāvari as Lassen and Sylvain Lévi would have it. Ptolemy places a Kantakossula near (latitude 134°30' longitude 11°40') and a Koddura not far away from (latitude 135° longitude 11°30') the mouth of the Maisolos (latitude 134° longitude 11°40'). Koddura has been identified with the modern Gūḍūr in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district. Kantakossula is the Kaṇṭakasila of a Nāgārjunikonḍa inscription of the time of the Ikṣvākū Virapurisadata, and Koddura is the Kūḍūra of an Amarāvati inscription of the second century A.D.

They were, therefore, nearer to the Kṛṣṇā than to the Godāvari. It is possible to get a better clue. Ptolemy places Koroungkala (identified with the modern Warangal) in longitude 15° and more in the interior than Pitundra. Warangal is placed 3°20' degrees and Pitundra 6° of a degree north of the mouth of the Maisolos (11°40'). Warangal is in the Godāvari-Kṛṣṇā region (south of the Godāvari). Pitundra has, therefore, to be sought for in the Andhradesa and not in Kharavela's Kaliṅga. The reference to the destruction of Pithunḍa along with the reference to the breaking up of the confederacy of Tamil powers is corroborative evidence in the same direction.

In such a case the destruction of Pithunḍa (probably then, as in Ptolemy's days, the metro- 

26. IA, LV, pp. 146-47. 
33. The fact that the destruction of the city is spoken of along with his wars with the northern and southern powers makes it least probable that the city was within the kingdom of Kaliṅga.
polis of the Andhra country) by Kharavela would have evoked immediate and tremendous hostilities (or would have been a result of such hostilities) between him and his Sātavāhana contemporary, if really the early Sātavāhanas had been ruling over the Andhra-deśa. If such a conflict with ‘the Lord of the Deccan’ had taken place, Kharavela would not have failed to make mention of it in an inscription which speaks of his wars with the northern kings, southern confederacies and western powers. The silence of the Hāthigumpha inscription on this matter is, therefore, conclusive proof that the early Sātavāhanas were not ruling over the land of their birth in the third and second centuries B.C.

The association of the early Sātavāhanas with the Mahāraṭhīs, a class of officers who are mentioned in the western cave inscriptions only, is another piece of evidence that supports our conclusion. Queen Nāyanikā, wife of Siri-Sātakaṇī the third king of the dynasty, is the daughter of the Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro of the Aṅgiya family.

Numismatics tells the same story. The earliest known coins of the dynasty are two pieces, one of copper and the other of lead, bearing the legend ‘Siri-Sātasa.’ Considering the angular ta, the absence of the mātrā over ra and the early form of sa, Rapson attributes these coins to Siri-Sātakaṇī of the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions. But the nailed heads of the sa of the copper coin make its attribution to a later king, perhaps No. 5 in the Matsya list, reasonable. These coins were picked up in western India with which they are connected by their Malwa fabric, i.e., the Ujjain symbol, the standing man, the representation of a river with fishes swimming in it, which reminds us of the representation of a man standing.

34. In line 11 (EI, Vol. XX, p. 79) K. P. Jayaswal reads ‘ava rājā nive-sitam Pithuṁḍaḥ’ for ‘puva rājā etc.,’ his earlier reading. (Pithuṁḍa built by a former king). While the upper and lower limbs of the usual a of the inscription are not connected with each other, in the letter read as a, they are connected with each other even if the crease on the stone can be taken to represent the lower curve. The curve taken as the upper limb is usually big. The letter may, therefore, be more correctly read as pu.

35. It is also highly improbable that the Andhradeśa escaped the widely thrown net of Kharavela’s expeditions.

36. CIC, Andhras and Western Ksatrapas, &c., p. 1.

37. The copper coin differs from the lead coin also in the representation of a man standing.
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river Bīna on the coins of Erān. From western India came 8 coins bearing the legends (partly or fully) \( \text{Raño Satakaṁṭha} \). The alphabetical characters of the legends seem to be later than those of the Sātā coins, but the elongated instead of the squat and rounded form of \( tə \) on all the three coins, makes a very long interval impossible.

Prof. Rapson brings into the list of early Sātavāhana coins, three coins coming from the \( \text{Andhradesa} \); according to him two of them bear the legends \( (\text{R}a) \, ū (— —) \text{Vira} \) and one, the legend \( (\text{gha}) \) Sadasā. The former are exceptionally large \( \text{siṁha} \) coins “found in a deserted site at the village of Chittala, in the Yernagudem Talook of the Godāvari District.” V. A. Smith attributed them provisionally to Siri-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi (second century A.D.). True, the incomplete and indistinct nature of the legends makes it impossible for us to rely on their palaeography for their date, but according to Rapson, their early date seems to be indicated by the fact that they are struck on one side only. We do not possess \( \text{siṁha} \) coins of Siri-Yaṅa. It is doubtful whether these coins were issued by any member of the Sātavāhana dynasty. We have come across neither Sātavāhana names ending in ‘vira’ or ‘bira,’ nor such unusually big Sātavāhana coins. The letter read as \( \text{v}i \) may well be read as \( \text{b} \,(i) \) or \( \text{b}(e) \). ‘Vira’ or ‘bira’ strongly reminds us of king Khubiraka of the Bhaṭṭiprōlū inscriptions. Significantly enough ‘he is there called the head of the Simha group (\( \text{Siḥagoṭhiyā pāmulkho} \)). On the coins the term ‘raño’ comes after the personal name. It does not do so on other coins while in the Bhaṭṭiprōlū inscriptions ‘rājā’ comes after Khubirako. The striker of these coins might presumably have belonged to this line of kings of the \( \text{Andhradesa} \). But the distance between Bhaṭṭi-
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prolu and the findspot of the coin casts some doubt on this identi-

On the strength of the early form of da and the incomplete legend read as [ (gha) ] Sadasa, Rapson attributes the third coin to Meghasvāti (Megha Sātakarṇi), ninth in the Matsya list (2nd or 1st century B.C.). As the coin contains neither the full legends nor the upper part of the first letter, we cannot be quite sure of Prof. Rapson's reading. The letter read as gha by Rapson might very well be read as na; what appears as a vertical to the proper right is a scratch (compared to the central vertical), and does not start from the end of the horizontal. We might reconstruct the legend thus: (Ra)n(o) Sadasa. In Inscriptions Sada alternates with Sāta; and Sāta, Sāti and Saḍa (?) are abbreviations of Sātakarṇi (the Sanskrit form corresponding to it is Sātakarṇi). The striker of this coin might therefore have been any one of the numerous Sātakarṇis in the Purāṇic list. So far as epigraphical evidence alone is concerned, the coin may be ascribed to a period as late as the first century A.D., for da open to the left occurs in some of the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and some epigraphs from Amarāvati which, on palaeographical considerations, have been assigned to the first century B.C. or A.D.

It will do well to bear in mind the remark of Bühler that "the contemporaneous employment of more advanced types and of more archaic ones .......... will have to be explained .......... by a desire to select archaic and monumental forms for epigraphic purposes and a failure to completely carry out this intention." The type is not that of a horse as Rapson would describe it in the Catalogue, but that of a bull whose hump and horns are visible. Coins of the bull type tentatively attributed by Rapson to the Sātavāhana dynasty, come from western India, especially from

45. According to V. A. Smith, Saṅgha is No. 9 and Meghasvāti No. 16 in the Matsya list (ZDMG, 1902, p. 659). The coin would seem to belong to an early period in the history of the dynasty since the form of the ākṣara da is that found in the Nāneghat inscription and in the Nasīk inscription of Kṛṣṇa Rāja: "So far as the evidence from epigraphy is concerned, this coin might well be assigned to the first or second century B.C." Rapson, op. cit., lxxvii.
46. In the Nāneghat inscription of Catarapana Sātakarṇi we have ṛaṇo for raṇo. Lüders op. cit., No. 1120.
47. Nos. 36, 37, 38 and 49 in El, Vol. XV, plate facing p. 272.
48. IA. xxxiii, Appendix, Ind. Palae. p. 43.
Ujjain and Erān.\textsuperscript{50} The Sada coin is a square piece bearing the impress of a round die. Cunningham notes that some square coins with impressions made from round dies come from Ujjain and Erān.\textsuperscript{51} It is hazardous to conclude on the provenance of a single coin that the early Sātavāhanas ruled over the Andhradeśa. It is very probable that a coin of a Sātavāhana king of the first century B.C. or A.D. found its way from his dominions in the western Deccan into the Andhradeśa in the wake of commerce.

The next group of coins found in the Andhradeśa belong to Saka Sada (Sāḍa?);\textsuperscript{52} the name is an abbreviated and corrupted form of Sakasena Sātakaṇi. Sometimes in the inscriptions, for want of space or other reasons, titles and names are shortened.\textsuperscript{53} Metronymics appear on some coins whilst in others of the same kings they do not.\textsuperscript{54} So Sakasena Sātakaṇi can be identified with Māḍhariputa Sakasena Sātakaṇi of the Kanheri inscriptions.\textsuperscript{55} As the Andhradeśa is not mentioned in the long record of Gotamī Balasiṃ\textsuperscript{56} and as no coin or inscription of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi has been found in the Andhradeśa, it is highly improbable that Māḍhariputa Sakasena preceded the former as Rapson would have it.\textsuperscript{57} Dr. Bhandarkar would place Māḍhariputa Sakasena late in the Sātavāhana series.\textsuperscript{58} Rapson remarks:—"In the inscription (of Māḍhariputa Sakasena) \ldots \ldots the later form seems to

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., pp. 54-56.
\textsuperscript{52} At Guḍivaḍa and Amārāvati; Rapson, op. cit., pp. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{53} Some coins of Nahapāna (JBBRAS, XXIII, pp. 13 ff.), coins of Caḍa Sātakaṇi and the lead coins attributed to Siri-Sātakaṇi of the Nāneghāṭ inscriptions are instances.
\textsuperscript{54} Rapson, op. cit., pp. 20-21, 30-33, 38-42.
\textsuperscript{55} Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji identified him with sīva Siri-Sātakaṇi, successor of Pulumāvi. He was probably led to it by his reading Sīrīsena for Sakasena. This reading is incorrect. (JBBRAS, VII, p. 407). Rapson remarks that (op. cit., Intro. lxxv) for Śka-Sāta "no identification with a similar name occurring on other coins or in inscriptions (of the Sātavāhanas) can be suggested." If Prof. Rapson and Dr. Bhandarkar (EHD, 3rd ed. p. 61) have embarked on an ocean of conjectures and doubtfully identified Saka Sada of the coins with Māḍhariputa Sakasena of the Kanheri inscriptions or tried to read the third letter as na (Rapson, op. cit., p. 11, No. 38), it is because they did not look upon Saka Sada as an abbreviated form.
\textsuperscript{56} Vide infra.
\textsuperscript{57} Op. cit., Intro. xxviii.
\textsuperscript{58} After 202 A.D., EHD, 3rd ed. p. 61.
occur in the name while the earlier form is seen in other words.” It will be shown below that the alphabet of these inscriptions resembles that of a Kañhēri inscription of Siri-Yañā.\(^{59}\) Moreover, the rather peculiar name Sakasena reminds us of the matrimonial alliance contracted with the Śakas by a successor of Vasiśthi-puta sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi. Names ending in sena are borne by the Western Kṣatrapas of the line of Caśāna.\(^ {60}\) We might not, therefore, be grudged the conjecture that the peculiar name is a result of that matrimonial alliance.\(^ {61}\) Finally even according to Rapson’s assumption, the earliest king who ruled over the Āndhradēśa on numismatic evidence would be No. 21 in the Sātavāhana series!

While discussing the inscriptions on the reverse of three coins of Siri-Yañā from Aparānta, Kathiawar and Baroda, Rapson remarks that the reverse inscription is substantially the same as the obverse inscription, but in a different dialect and written in a variety of the Brāhmī alphabet which has not been found elsewhere and which approaches most nearly to that of the Bhaṭṭiprōlū inscriptions. “It seems reasonable to suppose, then,” he concludes, “that the two varieties of alphabet used in the Kistna District were associated with the use of two different dialects (1) . . . . . . . . the ‘Leṇaprākṛt’ of Prof. Pischel, . . . . . . . . and (2) a local Prākṛt, perhaps containing Dravidian elements, peculiar to the Kistna District. Traces of this latter dialect are probably to be seen in certain Andhra names, such as Ḥakū=Sakti; Ḥāla=Sāta, &c.; and its occurrence like that of the alphabet associated with it, on coins of Śrī-Yajña struck in Western India must, no doubt, be regarded as a reminiscence of the old home of the race in the Telugu country, . . . . . . . .”\(^ {62}\) So far as the alphabetical peculiarities are concerned, it seems that we now have a nearer analogy than the Bhaṭṭiprōlū inscriptions, to the characters on the Siri-Yañā coins. And this analogy is furnished by the inscription on the coin of (Hi)ru Hātakaṇi found in Sopāra and now to be seen in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. And this coin is clearly modelled on Kṣatrapa coinage. The peculiarities exhibited in individual letters like ha and sa by these coins would thus appear to be a develop-

\(^{59}\) ASWI, V, No. 15.

\(^{60}\) The Bhaṭṭiprōlū sa has its tail turned to the left and not to the right as on the coins of Siri-Yañā and Vasiśthi-puta Sātakaṇi; the ha of the coins bears very little resemblance to the Bhaṭṭiprōlū ha.

\(^{61}\) A predecessor of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi bears in the Purānic lists a name with -sena ending: Purindrasena.

ment that took place in western India, a development which does not seem to stand in any necessary or direct relation to the Bhaṭṭi-prōḷu alphabet. The dialectical peculiarities exhibited by the legends of Siri-Yaṅa's coins are the use of ha for sa, and ṣa for final sa. The Bhaṭṭi-prōḷu inscriptions do not offer us a single instance of the use of ha for sa. We cannot, therefore, be sure that we have in names like Haku, Hāla (the names of early Sātavāhanas) and Hiru-Hātaṇaṇī, traces of a dialect peculiar to the Kṛṣṇā district. True in the use of ṣa for final sa, we seem to have a trace of the Kṛṣṇā dialect, but this occurs only on the coins of Hiru-Hātaṇaṇī and Siri-Yaṅa (second century A.D.) and not earlier. Considering the distance in time and space between Bhaṭṭi-prōḷu and the Yaṅa coins, and the parallels we find for all other features shown by these coins in those of the Kṣatrapas, we may hesitate to accept the view that the use of ṣa for final sa is derived from the influence, direct or remote, of an eastern dialect. I am not at present able to offer an explanation of this feature.

Andhradeśa is rich in stūpas some of which date back to the third and second century B.C., i.e., the Bhaṭṭi-prōḷu and Amarāvatī Stūpas, it is really strange that these stūpas should not have contained coins of the early Sātavāhana kings whilst some of the later stūpas, or old stūpas which were decorated and enlarged in the second century A.D., should have yielded us numerous coins of Vāsithiputa sāmi Siri-Puḷumāvi and his successors, i.e., siva Siri-Sātakaṇi, Caḍa Sātakaṇi, Rudra Sātakarni, Siri-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi and Kanha Sātakaṇi.

The most characteristic titles of the Andhra kings are the metronymics. Metronymics seem to have been purely local. Gotiputa, Gagiputa and Vāsithiputa (borne by a royal artisan) occur in the Sāṇcī, Barhut and Bhilsā (Malwa) stūpa inscriptions of the second century B.C. In the Pītalkhōrā cave inscriptions of the second century B.C. the royal physician Magila bears the title Vachiputa (Vatsāputra). Metronymics like those borne by the Sātavāhanas are borne by their feudatories and officers in their inscriptions in the western Deccan. In the

63. EL, II, p. 325.
64. Rapson, op. cit., lxxi.
67. Ibid., Nos. 1189, 1191-93.
68. Ibid., Nos. 1088, 1100 and 1146.
numerous inscriptions in the Andhradeśa metronymics occur only in three inscriptions of the second century A.D. In the Nāgārjunikondā inscriptions the Ikṣvākus and the high dignitaries of state under them, like the Mahātalavaras and Mahāsenāpatis, bear metronymics derived from Vedic gotras. It seems, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the Satavāhanas had nothing to do with the Andhradeśa at first and that the practice of coupling metronymics with personal names became common there after the Sātavāhanas had overrun it; that the practice was not native to the soil is shown by the fact that the successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Andhradeśa, i.e., the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra, the Vaingeyakas, the Kandaras and the Viṣṇukundins, do not assume metronymics.

Many personal names, like alphabets and dialects, are local. The queen of the third king of the dynasty bears a name ending in 'anika' (anika), and names ending in 'anaka' and 'anika' (fem) occur frequently in the western cave inscriptions. The earliest known inscription in the eastern Deccan to mention a name with such an ending is the Amarāvatī inscription dated in the regnal years of Vāsīṭhupāta sami Siri-Pujumāvi, the first inscription on this side of South India to mention a Sātavāhana king. Such names occur frequently in the Nāgārjunikondā inscriptions. Names resembling 'Vedisiri' and 'Bhāya' of the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions occur in the Kuḍā and Mahāḍ cave inscriptions; a name beginning in Bhaya (Bhayabhūti) occurs in an unpublished Kārlā inscription. ‘Skanda’ which enters into the composition of the names of some of the early Sātavāhanas occurs in the Kuḍā, Kārlā and Nāsik inscriptions of the first and second centuries A.D. and in the eastern inscriptions only after the reign of Vāsīṭhupāta sami Siri-Pujumāvi. The Saḍakara of a Kuḍā inscription bears a striking resemblance to the surname Sātakaṇi or Sādakaṇi.

Thus, all available epigraphic and numismatic evidence proves not only that undeniably the centre of gravity of the early Sāta-
vāhana power lay in the western Deccan, but also that the early Sātavāhanas did not rule over the Āndhradesa.

Jain literature furnishes corroborative evidence in the same direction. In many versions of the Kālakācāryakathā including the Long Anonymous Version, the Kālaka who changed the Paryusāna date is said to have gone to Pratiśṭhāna, the city of Sālivāhana and ‘the ornament of the land of Mahārāṣṭra.’ The evidence of this work is of course of doubtful value; but it is adduced because it corroborates evidence from other sources. In Jain chronology the changing of the date is put at 993 Vira era (446 A.D.). The Sātavāhanas as a political power pass out of history in the first quarter of the 3rd century A.D. It seems preferable to accept the account of Yugapradhāna-svarūpa according to which it was Kālaka I (died Vira era 376 or 171 B.C.) who changed the date, Kālaka III coming in to confirm the change 600 years later. Then, the Sātavāhana king mentioned must have been ruling at Paithān during the first half of the second century B.C.

An old gāthā taken from the Niyukti (50 B.C.—150 A.D.) and cited in the commentary on the Āvaśyaka Sūtra says that Bharukaccha is known for Paithāna Sālāvāhana and Nahavāṇa. Bharukaccha, the Barygaza of the Periplus, is modern Broach. Obviously the Nahavāṇa and Sālāvāhana were contemporaries. The Sanskrit commentary on it extracted in the Abhidhāna Rājendra makes them contemporaries. The name Nahavāṇa, corrupted into Naravāha in Jinasena’s Harivamsa Purāṇa, is a variation of Nahapaṇa. The only Nahapāna so far known to history, is Rājjan Kṣatrapa Nahapāna of the Kṣaharāta vaṁśa, who dispossessed his Sātavāhana contemporary of a part of Mahārāṣṭra and Aparānta. The ‘Naravāhas’ of the Harivamsa Purāṇa may imply not the existence of two or more Nahapānas, but Nahapāna and his

74. Hemacandra in his grammar gives Sālivāhana as a Prākrit conception of Sātavāhana, 1, 8, 211; Kālakācāryakathā, Norman Brown: p. 1.
75. Ibid., p. 7.
77. JBORS, 1930, p. 290.
78. Ibid., pp. 291-293.
79. For instances of the use of va for pa see Pischel’s Gram. der Prā. Spra., Sec. 144.
80. The Mambanes of the Periplus.
The old theory that dates in Uśavadāta's (governor under Nahapāna) inscription\textsuperscript{81} and the Jumnār inscription of Ayama, a minister of Nahapāna,\textsuperscript{82} must be referred to the Śaka era is to be abandoned in favour of the theory that they are dated either in the regnal years of Nahapāna or in an era starting from the end of the first century B.C. The capital of the Sātavāhanas in the first century A.D. would, therefore, seem to have been Paithān.

The theory of a second eastern capital of the Sātavāhanas also rests upon unsafe foundations. The only source of the assertion made by many writers that the capital of the early Sātavāhanas was Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka, is the conjecture of Dr. Bhandarkar that the compound Dhanakaṭasamanehi in Nasik No. 3\textsuperscript{83} may be taken as Dhanakaṭasāminehi.\textsuperscript{84} Obsessed by the unproven and improbable theory of the conjoint rule of Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi\textsuperscript{85} and Vāsiṭṭhiputa Siri-Puḷumāvi, and taking for granted that the donation recorded in the beginning of Nāsik No. 3 is identical with that recorded in Balasiri's inscription, Dr. Bhandarkar says\textsuperscript{86} that Dhanakaṭasāmi [lord of Dhanakaṭa (ka)] is a title of Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi and reads Benākaṭakasāmi of Nāsik No. 4 as Dhanakaṭakasāmi.\textsuperscript{87}

In his valuable paper on the Nāsik inscriptions Emile Senart has pointed out the orthographical objection to the identification of Dhanakaṭa with Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka (equivalent to or near modern Dharaṇikot) of the Amarāvati inscriptions. Considering the general similarity of b and dh, he would read Benākaṭa for Dhanakaṭa.\textsuperscript{88} D. R. Bhandarkar, however, does not agree with Senart. He says: \textsuperscript{89}—"What is read as Dhanakaṭa can

\textsuperscript{81.} EI, Vol. VIII, Nāsik, No. 12.
\textsuperscript{82.} ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 103, No. 11.
\textsuperscript{83.} Vide infra., EI, Vol. VIII, p. 65, t. 1. 2; dated in the regnal years of Puḷumāvi.
\textsuperscript{84.} EHD, p. 30, n. 13; Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka is mentioned in two Amarāvati inscr. (EI, Vol. XV, Nos. 4 and 5, pp. 262-63) as a market-town (nigama) only. Ptolemy mentions Pitundra (Bk. VII, Chap. I, sec. 93) and not Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka as the capital of the Maisōlia region. The earliest mention of Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka as the headquarters of a district is in the Mayidavōḷu plates; also ASSI, Vol. I, No. 53, Dhaṇāṇakāṭaka.
\textsuperscript{85.} JRAS, 1926, pp. 644-650.
\textsuperscript{87.} Transact. Second. Lond. Congr. Ori., p. 349.
\textsuperscript{88.} Op. cit., p. 68.
\textsuperscript{89.} IA, 1913, p. 280, n. 18.
also be read as Dhamnakata (Dhannakata); and as, in Nāṣik inscriptions n is used instead of ṅ (compare e.g., ānapayati of the same Nāṣik inscription), Dhamnakata can very well be taken to be equivalent to Dhamṇakaṭaka. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's view, therefore, still stands incontrovertible.” To draw a parallel between the change of na in a Prākṛt word into ṅa in its Sanskrit equivalent (ājñāpayati) and the change of ṅa into na in different forms of a Prākṛt word is misleading. Moreover, the literary Pāli form, which occurs in the Nāṣik inscription also, is ‘ānāpayati’ and not ‘ānapayati’. The instance cited by D. R. Bhandarkar is one of the use of ṅa for na.90 There is not one clear instance of na used for ṅa in Prākṛt. The only instance cited by Pischel is one of the change of ṅa into cina, (raṅā becomes rācina, rācino and rācini) and this is not relevant to the point at issue.91 In the Mayidavolu plates92 edited after Pischel’s Prākṛt Grammar was published93 we have the word ‘ana’ (anna) the literary Pāli form of which is ‘aṅña’ and no support can be derived from this inscription for Bhandarkar’s position regarding Dhamṇakaṭaka because the Mayidavolu grant comes much later and from an altogether different area.94

Dhanakaṭasāmi could not have been the title of Gotamiputa Śri-Sātakaṇi, for neither was he reigning when Nāṣik Nos. 2 and 3 were incised, nor are the donations recorded in the two inscriptions identical; No. 2 records a non-official grant and No. 3 an official grant.95 Finally the reading Dhanakaṭasamiyehi must be abandoned for Bühler’s and Senart’s reading Dhanakaṭasamanehi. Thus the title “Lord of Dhanakaṭaka” is hypothetical.

V. A. Smith’s and J. Burgess’96 theory that Śrī-Kākuḷam was the capital of the early Sātavāhanas is based on a passage in the Triṅgānuśāsanam, translated and quoted by Campbell in his

90. We have a parallel in the Nāṇeghāṭ ins. of Catarapana Sātakaṇi (raṇo for raṅo).
93. The plates were, however, discovered a year before the book was published.
94. In Junnar No. 10, (ASWI, Vol. IV, Pl. XLIX) we have Dhaṁnīkaśenīya not Dhanikaseniya.
95. For a detailed discussion of these points, vide infra.
96. EHI, 2nd edn. p. 194; ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 3-4. The way in which Śrī-Kākuḷam is marked on the map appended to the Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum shows that Rapson favours their view.
Telugu Grammar. The thick fog of legendary matter in the passage will be apparent to any reader. Andhra Viṣṇu, son of the first Andhra monarch Sucandra (Simuka of the second century B.C.), is said in the same work to have been a patron of the first Telugu Grammarian Kaṇva. We know that Telugu was in the course of formation in the fifth century A.D., from the distinctly Telugu suffix in a Viṣṇukundin record. Atharvanācārya quotes from the Vālmīki Sūtras on Prākṛt, and it has been shown that the Sūtras were composed by Trivikrama who according to Dr. Hultzsch must have lived between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries A.D. The testimony of a writer removed from the early Sātavāhanas by more centuries than we are from him should not have been made the basis of such a categorical statement.

The old theory has another weak link. The attempts of Rapson and V. A. Smith to bring the epigraphic and numismatic evidence in line with the Purānic testimony, have led them to postulate a rapid expansion of the Sātavāhana empire from the lower Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā valleys, as far as Nāsik before the end of Kaṇha’s reign, that is to say, within 20 years. Yet Simuka and Kaṇha in whom the Washington and the Napoleon are combined, are mentioned in very short inscriptions only and no deed whatever of theirs is recorded. If they did in fact engage in wars of extensive conquest, the vast military operations would have necessitated large issues of coins. Not a single coin of Simuka or Kaṇha has been picked up in the western Deccan or in the Āndhradeśa. Not even a Candragupta Maurya could have accomplished the feat of liberating a people and building up, in such a short period, a huge and well organised empire, that withstood the shocks from the Sakas for a long period. Such a rapid expansion is not known to any period of South Indian History. Expansion from the plains over the tableland and the mountainous regions presents far greater diffi-

98. Footnote (Introduction viii) “He who speaks irreverently of my Grammar composed by the command of Andhra Viṣṇu shall be considered as guilty of irreverence to his priest.”
100. JA, XL, 219 ff.
101. Ibid., p. 221: “The time of Trivikrama can be settled only within rather wide limits. He quotes Hemachandra, who lived in the 12th century, and he is quoted in the Ratnāpana of Kumārasvāmin, who belonged to the fifteenth or sixteenth century.”
102. ZDMG, 1902, p. 657.
culties than expansion from the mountainous regions over the plains.\textsuperscript{103} With a powerful and jealous neighbour in Kaliṅga, which would seem to have thrown off the Mauryan yoke along with the Sātavāhanas, a westward expansion would well nigh have been impossible. The inventive genius of the historian has not only painted the glories of Simuka and Kanha whom inscriptions and literature agree to treat in a singularly unimpressive manner, but also brought about a travesty of justice in so far as the achievements of great conquerors like Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi and some of his predecessors like Sātakaṇi I have been fathered upon dim figures in history.

True, Sātakaṇi I, the third king of the line, is called 'Dakhina-pathapati.'\textsuperscript{104} But Dakhinapatha is an ambiguous term. In its widest sense it includes the whole of the Peninsula south of the Vindhyas; since a passage in the Vāyu Purāṇa excludes the Nar- madā and the Tapti valleys,\textsuperscript{105} the term seems to have been used in a narrow sense, then, as now. To go to an earlier work than the Purāṇas, the author of the Periplus (first century A.D.) mentions the market-towns of the Dachinabades separately from the market-towns of Damirica, mistakenly called by him Limyrike, i.e., the extreme south of the Peninsula including particularly the Cera, Cōla and Pāṇḍya countries.\textsuperscript{106} The extreme south is likewise excluded. Since the Maisōlos of Ptolemy is most probably the Kṛṣṇā,\textsuperscript{107} and since the Maisōlia of Ptolemy is the Masalia of the Periplus, Masalia would seem to be the name of the lower Kṛṣṇā-Godāvari region, i.e., the Āndhradesa. The author of the Periplus says that this region was studded with centres of trade and industry.\textsuperscript{108} Yet all the market-towns (of which Paithān and Tagara identified with modern Junnār are the most important) of the Dachinabades mentioned in the Periplus are in the western Deccan.\textsuperscript{109} Thus it is clear that the Dachinabades of the Periplus excludes the extreme east and south of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{103} Lüders, op. cit., Nos. 1112 and 1114.
\textsuperscript{104} ASWI, Vol. V, p. 60, Pl. LI.
\textsuperscript{105} Chap. 45, Verse 104. Bibliotheca Indica ed.
\textsuperscript{106} Schoff, The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. Sec. 51.
\textsuperscript{107} Vide supra.
\textsuperscript{108} Schoff, op. cit., Sec. 62.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., Sec. 51, 52, and 53.
\textsuperscript{110} Suzerainty over the whole of the Peninsula is therefore to be ruled out.
Even those who have propounded the theory of western origin of Sātavāhana power have failed to correlate properly the Purānic with epigraphic and numismatic evidence. Relying upon a passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which speaks of the Āndras as living on the fringes of Aryan civilisation, Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar places the Āndras in the Vindhyan regions. But we do not know the exact limits of Aryan civilisation in those days. It has been proved beyond doubt that the ancient home of the Āndras then as now was the lower valleys of the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā. His theory of western origins of Sātavāhana power, not accompanied by arguments, looks like a shot in the air.

Sukthankar cuts the Gordian knot by challenging the Āndra affinities of the Sātavāhanas. According to him in the whole range of epigraphic records, the Sātavāhanas are nowhere called Āndras. The passages from Greek authors which mention the Āndhra country and people contain no reference to the Sātavāhanas while those in which certain Sātavāhana kings are mentioned have nothing to say about the Āndras. The hopeless confusion of the Purāṇas makes their evidence worthless.

All these objections would vanish if the available pieces of evidence are properly weighed. Sukthankar treats ‘Āndhramhṛtya’ as a Tatpurūṣa compound (Servants of the Āndras) ‘having regard to the parallel phrase Śunīgabhṛtya applied to the Kanvas.’ The Purānic words ‘Āndhrajātiyāḥ’ and ‘Kānvāyanāms tato bhṛtyāḥ Susarmāṇāḥ prasahya tavi’ (Matsya) exclude the grammatical construction adopted by Sukthankar. The compound should, therefore, be treated as a Karmadhāraya one, in which case it would mean ‘Āndhra Servants.’ Then the Sātavāhanas could have been Āndras and Āndhrabhṛtyas. Sātavāhana is a family or a dynastic name while Āndhra is a tribal name (Āndhrajāti). In an inscription we have the expression Sātavāhana kulam; in Prākrit

111. Vide supra.
112. IA, 1913, pp. 28 ff.
114. Some of the Purāṇas call these kings Āndras; others call them Āndhrabhṛtyas, and there are others that call them by both names. The majority of the Purāṇas distinguish between Āndras and Āndhrabhṛtyas, and state that the Ārdhrabhṛtyas succeeded the Āndras. Ibid., p. 29.
'kula' essentially means 'family.'

The term 'jati' on the other hand means 'caste or tribe.' That the terms Sātavāhana and Andhra are not identical is shown by the fact that in the grants of Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman Sātāhāni-rāṭha (Sātavāhani-rāṭṭha) and Andhāpatha (Andhrāpatha) are the names given to two provinces. No wonder then that the inscriptions which give the dynastic name considered the mention of the tribal name superfluous. In the Pallava Kadamba and Cālukya records the dynastic appellation only is given and if literary evidence should throw some light upon their tribal connections no one would challenge them by saying that such connections are unknown to epigraphic records. As for the Greek writers, Megasthenes does not mention the dynastic name of the Magadhan, Kaliṅga, and Andhra kings. Ptolemy mentions Polemaios (Vāsiṭāhiputa sami Siri-Puḷumāvi of the records) of Paithān, but does not give us his dynastic name. Are we to hold that he did not belong to the Sātavāhana kula?

It will not do to ignore the Purānic testimony to the extent to which Sukthankar has done. No doubt the Purāṇas have to answer charges of defective chronology, incomplete lists of kings, corruption in names and different readings of the same passage in different manuscripts. Most of these defects are a result not of ignorance of facts on the part of Purānic writers but of misreading of manuscripts and bad copying; Pargiter thinks that the corruption in names must have occurred in the Sanskritization of Prākṛt names. The earliest Purāṇa, the Bhavisya, from which the Mātasya, Vāyu, Bṛhadāvata and Viṣṇu derive their account, Sanskritized earlier metrical accounts in literary Prākṛt; the dynastic portion terminates with the downfall of the Andhras and the rise

116. In the Mahāvaṁśa, Dharmanmapadam, the Five Jātakas and Kuddhaka-pāṭha, it is used in this sense only. In the Tālaṅga ins. of Kākusthavarman, Kadambakula signifies the Kadamba family.

117. The Hira-Hadagarli and the Mayidavolu plates.

118. In Usavadāta's Nāsik and Kārā inscrr. Nahapāna is called a Kṣaharāta, and we know from Nāsik No. 2 that Kṣaharāta is a family name, (Kha-kharatavasa). In a Kanhēri ins. (Lüders, op. cit., No. 1021) Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman's daughter is said to have belonged to the Kārddamaka race or family. From literary and other sources we know that Nahapāna and Rudradāman belonged to the Pahlava and Śaka tribes.

119. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 97 ff. It must be noted, however, that Pargiter's conclusions have often been challenged by Keith, Kirfel, and other writers.
of their servants. The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata carry the narrative to the rise of the Guptas, but are silent about the whirlwind campaigns of Samudragupta. Pargiter notes\(^\text{120}\) that between 325-340 A.D. the accounts were revised twice. The Purāṇas were, therefore, redacted at a time when the Sātavāhana dominion in South India was a thing of the immediate past. Pargiter has shown that there is an indication that a compilation was begun in the latter part of the second century A.D. in São-Yañá's reign, for five manuscripts of the Matsya, of which three appear to be independent,\(^\text{121}\) speak of him as reigning in his ninth or tenth year. The nearness of the Purāṇas to the Sātavāhanas makes their testimony about their tribal affinities unquestionable.\(^\text{122}\)

Having cut himself from the old moorings of Purānic testimony, Mr. Sukthankar seeks to locate the habitat of the Sātavāhanas in the modern Bellary District. The only source of his assertion is the terms 'Sātavāhani-hāra' and 'Sātahani-rajā' (Sātavāhani-rajā) occurring in inscriptions coming from the small compass of the Bellary District.\(^\text{123}\) On the analogy of inhabitants lending their names to countries, he looks upon Sātavāhani-hāra corresponding to the modern Bellary District and perhaps its neighbourhood as the original habitat of the Sātavāhanas.

---

\(^{120}\) Ibid., pp. xiii, g 23.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., p. 42, n. 8.

\(^{122}\) While Sukthankar accuses the Purāṇas of calling Andhrabhṛtyas (servants of the Andhras) Andhras, Ray Chaudhuri suggests that the name Andhra "probably came to be applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became purely an Andhra power governing the territory at the mouth of the river Kṛishṇā" (Pol. His. of India, p. 280). Sātavāhana rule over the Andhradeśa lasted for three quarters of a century. São Yañá, No. 27 in the Matsya list, ruled over the western Deccan. The Sātavāhanas would seem to have become a purely eastern power only a few decades before their fall. It has been shown that a compilation of the Purāṇas was begun in São-Yañá's reign, at a time when the Sātavāhanas were a western as well as an eastern power.

\(^{123}\) The Myākadoni inscription and the Hīra-Haḍagālī plates. Myākadoni is a village in the Adoni taluk of the Bellary Dt. Hemacandra gives Sālāhana and Sālavāhana as variations of Sātavāhana (Pischel, op. cit.). True, visaya (Hīra-Haḍagālī plates) and rāstra (Cōlarat-ṭha) denote sometimes a kingdom. But in the Uruvupāḷa grant Mūndarāṣṭra is referred to at the end as a visaya (IA, Vol. V, p. 51 t. ll. 17, 28). The Kūḍūrahāra of the Kōṇḍamudi grant is called Kūḍūrahāra-visaya in the Vaiṅgeyaka grants and Kūḍāra-visaya in some Eastern Cāḻukya grants. Therefore Sātavāhana 'ṭhāra,' Pallava 'rāstra' and Vaiṅgeyaka 'visaya' would denote the same territorial division—not bigger than a modern district.
If Sātavāhāni-hāra was the starting point of Sātavāhana power, why are not inscriptions of the early Sātavāhanas found in this territory? Worse still, only an inscription of the last king of the line is found here; and Sukthankar bases his conclusions on the provenance of inscriptions! He gives instances of provinces getting their names from their early inhabitants. But the term in question is an instance of a dynasty lending its name to a part of the kingdom and not of a people lending their name to the whole kingdom.

We are prepared to say with Mr. Sukthankar that the province must have been so called on account of “some intimate connection” between the land and the dynasty. A tentative solution may be proposed that under the later Sātavāhanas, a town in Sātavāhani-hāra became the seat of their capital which would have been shifted to the east after the conquest of their western territories by the Western Kṣatrapas. True, during the reign of the last king, the province is under a Mahāsenāpati. Instances of the headquarters of a district lending its name to the district are numerous, e.g., Govadhana, Govadhanahāra (Lüders, List No. 1124); Kūḍūra, Kūḍūrahāra (No. 1328); Patiṭhāṇa and Patiṭhāṇapatha (No. 988) and Dhaṇṭākaṭaka and the kingdom of To-na-kie-tse-kia which may be considered as the Chinese representative of Dhaṇṭākaṭaka. In the Tālagunḍa inscription of Kakusthavarman, the capital of the Pallavas is called Pallavapuri. Kandarapura at which Mahārāja Damodaravarman of the Ānanda gotra is said to have ruled must have received its name from that prince Kandara, who is mentioned as an ancestor of Attivarman. The Ānandas and the Pallavas are not far removed from the Sātavāhanas. The capital of the Sātavāhanas might have been called Sātavāhanapura or Sātavāhanipura and the district in which it was situated, Sātavāhani-hāra; the Pallavas might have continued the name.

124. The Myakadoni inscription of Puḷumāvi.
125. “The learned Parimellalagar is inclined to make Cōla the name, like the Pāṇḍya and Cēra, of a ruling family or clan of immemorial antiquity and renown.” The Cōlas, Vol. I, p. 24. Cōlamandalam would then be an instance of a territorial designation formed on a dynastic name. It is not, however, an instance of a part of a kingdom getting its name from the dynasty to the exclusion of the other parts.
126. The Myakadoni Inscription of Puḷumāvi.
129. Excavations of the type conducted at Nāgārjunikonda may bring to
Now the Purānic, epigraphic and numismatic evidence can be correlated in a way different from those so far considered. The term Āndhrabhṛtya, ‘Andhra Servant’ gives the clue. Will the facts of Sātavāhana history make it improbable that the Sātavāhanas, undoubtedly Āndhras by tribal connections, were high officers of state under the Mauryas like the Kaṇvas, called the servants of the Śuṅgas? True, the Āndhra territory while acknowledging Mauryan suzerainty enjoyed some independence unlike the ‘King’s Dominions.’ This semi-independence need not have been a bar to the Āndhras (of the ruling family) accepting offices under the suzerain. In Asoka’s edicts, Yavanas are politically classed with the Āndhras;¹³⁰ and we find a Yavana serving as governor under Asoka.¹³¹

It may still seem impossible to ascertain how these ‘Servant Āndhrs’ of the eastern Deccan drifted into the western Deccan. Asoka’s edicts and the Girnār inscription of Rudradāman form links in the chain of evidence, and suggest that the Mauryan dominion in South India was the medium through which this drift took place. In Asoka’s edicts the Yavanas are placed with the Gāndhāras and Kāmbojas in the north-west, and still Surāṣṭra was governed by a Yavana king for Asoka. Indian History offers us many clear instances of dynastic drifts like the Mauryas of Konkan, the Guttas or Guttas of Guttal and the Côlas of Renāṇḍu. In the reign of Pulakeśin II “in the Konkanas, the watery stores of the pools which were the Mauryas were quickly ejected by the great wave which was Caṇḍadanda, who acted at his command.”¹³² A prince, Dhavala, of the Maurya lineage is mentioned in the Kanaswa inscription of A.D. 738-739, in the Kotah State, Rajaputana.¹³³ In an inscription of Vāghli in the Khandesh District dated S. 991, princes of the Maurya clan, the original home of which is said to have been the city of Valabhi in Surāṣṭra, are mentioned.¹³⁴ The Guttas of the twelfth century A.D. with their capital at Guttavolal, which may be safely identified with the modern Guttal in the Karaji taluq of the Dharwar District (where all their records are found),

light the remains of the capital in the Bellary Dt. or its neighbourhood. In the Adoni taluq there is a village called Sātanūru.

130. RE. XIII.
132. The Aihôle inscription of Pulakeśin II, IA, VIII, p 244.
133. Ibid., XIX, p. 56.

H.A.—4
trace their descent to Candragupta through a Vikramāditya who is specified as a king of Ujjain. The earliest Telugu records (eighth century A.D.) from the Cuddapah District including the Mālepāḍu plates of Punyakumāra, have brought to light a line of kings claiming Cōla descent, who had however their dominion in Pallava territory. The Vēlūrpalayam plates give us the clue; there the Pallava Simhaviṣṇu is said to have "seized the country of the Cōlas embellished by the daughter of Kavera whose ornaments are the forests of the paddy (fields) and where (are found) brilliant groves of areca." When the power of the Cōlas fell to a low ebb and Simhaviṣṇu's sway extended over the Cōla country, the scions of the eclipsed Cōla dynasty must have sought service under their conqueror and so moved up north. Epigraphical records from the Maddaguri taluq of the Tumkur District refer to a certain Dhanāmjayā Eriga, a Cōla. The Cōlas of the Tumkur District may have been of a common stock with the Cōlas of Renāṇḍu among whom we have a Dhanāmjayavarman. The drift of the Mauryas from Magadha to Konkan, Khandesh and Rajputana, and of the Guptas (Guttas) from the north to Guttal may be explained in the same manner. Even as late as the sixteenth century, Cōla chiefs with traditionary descent from Karikāla are found as viceroys under Vijayanagara rulers. The instances so far cited support the theory that in the days of tribulation and rather obscure existence under their Mauryan suzerains, scions of the royal family in the Āndhradeśa might have passed into the service of the Mauryan kings and so have gone to the western Deccan as viceroys, thereby getting the Purāṇic appellation Āndhrabhṛtya. A fragment of Rock Edict VIII discovered at Supāra makes it certain that a part of the western Deccan was included in the 'King's Dominions.' When the strong arm of Asoka disappeared, their shrewd and more fortunate descendants would have found themselves in a position to strike a blow in their own interest, not in the land of their birth which was far away, but in the land of

137. The names of the first two princes mentioned in the Mālepāḍu plates, Nandivarman and his son Simhaviṣṇu, bear striking resemblance to some names in Pallava genealogy.
138. 380 of 1904.
139. ARE, 1909, p. 112.
140. CII, Vol. I.
their adoption. It is possible that in some such manner Simuka, an Andhra, might have started the political power of the dynasty. But at present we have no evidence in favour of this conjecture.

For all that we know, the ancestors of the Sātavāhanas of the western Deccan might not have belonged to any royal family in the Andhradeśa. They might have been nobles or fortune hunters who readily passed into the service of the Mauryan suzerains and so moved up to western Deccan.

If the Jain legends which mention Paithān as the capital of the first Sātavāhana king may be believed, it would seem to be the starting-point of the Sātavāhana power. The close association of the Sātavāhanas with Mahāraṭhis (matrimonial alliance) and the office of Mahāraṭhi show the extent to which Simuka enlisted the support of the powerful Raṭhikas of the west. This reminds one of the Cūṭa-Pallava matrimonial alliance which would seem to have, in the same measure, contributed to Pallava ascendancy in the south (later Pallava inscriptions mention a Cūta-Pallava as the founder of the dynasty). If the Purānic ‘bhṛtyāḥ’ and ‘sa-jātīyah’ are correct, it would seem that Simuka was also helped by a number of faithful Andhras who like his ancestors had moved up to the western Deccan. The early Sātavāhanas seem to have been engaged in the first instance in the conquest of Mahārāṣṭra north and south, Malwa and the modern Central Provinces.


CHAPTER III

THE EARLY SĀTAVĀHANAS

The Starting point

Relying upon the supposed date in the Maurya era in the Hāthigumpha inscription of Kharavela,1 and looking upon Kharavela as the third member of the Cedi dynasty of Kaliṅga2 like Sīri-Sātakaṇi of the Sātavāhana dynasty, Rapson would place the beginnings of the dynasty (170 B.C. + 41, i.e., Simuka 23, Kanha 18) somewhere between 220 and 211 B.C.3 The chronological arrangements adopted here would place Simuka 384 years4 before 150 A.D., i.e. 234 B.C. Though an edict later than Rock Edict VIII dated in the tenth year of Asoka5 has not been found in western Deccan,6 it is improbable that Asoka's reign witnessed a break-up of the empire; and Asoka's death would seem to have taken place somewhere between 236 and 232 B.C.7 The same conclusion can be arrived at in another way. As Pargiter has pointed out,8 the

1. Messrs. R. D. Banerji and K. P. Jayaswal remark: (El, Vol. XX, p. 74) "It has been proved by repeated examinations of the rock that there is no date in the Maurya era......as supposed by Bhagwanlal Indraji and ourselves formerly." The inscription reads "Muriya Kāla vochinam ca caoyathi Aṅga-satika(m) turiyam upādayati" 'causes to be completed the 11 Angas of the 64 letters which had become lost (or fragmentary) with the time of the Mauryas.'

2. Vṛddharāja and Kṣemarāja like Bhiśkurājā are epithets applied to King Kharavela, and not the names of his father and grandfather respectively as suggested by Rapson. (CIC, Andhras and Western Kaṭrāpas etc., xviii). The text has 'Khemarājā sa Vādharājā sa Bhiṣkurājā sa Dharma-rājā pasam(ō) Sunat(ō) anubhavato kalānāni......rājasī Vasūkula vinisrito mahā-vijayo Rājā Khāravela siri' El, Vol. XX, p. 80.


4. It would be shown below that Śivaskanda of the Purāṇas (No. 26 in the list) was the king defeated by Rudradāman twice before 150 A.D.

5. 10th year after his coronation.

6. A fragment found at Sopāra.

7. The Purānic statements would place an interval of 49 years between the accessions of Candragupta and Asoka. According to V. A. Smith's scheme of chronology, Candragupta began to reign in 322-21 B.C. So Asoka would have ascended the throne in 272 B.C., he is said to have ruled for 36 years and been anointed 4 years after his accession.

8. The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 37.
THE EARLY SATAVAHANAS

The total of the individual reigns (of the Satavahana kings) excluding 24-a, is only 442½ years even if we take the longest periods, where there is a difference. But the whole duration is said to have been 460 in the Matsya, though it is given as 411 in Vāyu. The addition of Satakarni mentioned in e Vāyu only would increase its total to 440. It would therefore appear, that the total 442½ years has much to be said in its favour. The end of the Satavahana dynasty cannot be placed earlier than 207 A.D., and 442½ years before 207 A.D. would give us the same 234 B.C.

Founder of the dynasty: Simuka

As the Purāṇas speak of 'Simuka Satavāhana Sirimato' as simply 'Siśuko ṇdhrah sa jātiyah' before the coup d'etat, and as

9. The Satavahanas ruled for 55 years after 150 A.D.
10. The Purāṇas place the Satavahanas after the Kāṇvas, i.e., (Mauryas 139, Śuṅgas 112 and Kāṇvas 45) 25 B.C. The Purāṇas treat contemporary dynasties as successive. They say that 18 Śakas (Western Ksatrapas) came after the Satavahanas. Some of the Western Ksatrapas of the Caṣṭana line were certainly contemporaries of the later Satavahanas as inscriptions, coins and Ptolemy's statement would show. It is not possible under the Purāṇic scheme to place Gautamiputra Satakarni and Pulumāvi who certainly preceded Rudradāman of the Girnār inscription of 150 A.D., after that date; for does not Ptolemy call Caṣṭana the grandfather of Rudradāman, a contemporary of Pulumāvi?

In the memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 1, Dates of Votive Inscriptions from Śāñcī, R. P. Chanda argues on palaeographical grounds that the earliest votive inscriptions are later than Asoka's and Heliodorus' inscriptions by a century, and that the Śiri-Satarkani inscription belongs to the later group, which he assigns to the period between 75 and 20 B.C. He identifies the Śiri-Satarkani of the Śāñcī inscription with No. 6 in the line. No. 6 in the line, according to the chronological scheme adopted here, belongs to the years between 180 and 130 B.C. There is no reason why he should not be one of the numerous Satakarnis found in the Purānic lists after No. 6.

A comparative study of the palaeography of the Nānegrāṭ and Bhilsā inscriptions enables us to reject the view of Bühler that the Satakān̄a of the two inscriptions are identical. Bhilsā va with the shorter neck and rounded body, the more ornate Bhilsā i sign, the less angular ta with the vertical at the centre and the da with the more rounded back than the Nānegrāṭ inscription, stamp the Bhilsā inscription as one later than the Nānegrāṭ inscription.

The Bhilsā Tope inscription under reference is carved on the bas-relief of a torāna in the middle of the upper architrave of the South Gateway. It records the donation of a Vāśithiputra Ananda, the foreman of the artisans of Śiri-Satarkani. The plates published in the JBO, 1917, make it clear that Vāśithiputra is the metronymic not of the king but of the artiṣan. For Rapson's view, op. cit., xlvii.
'Rāja Simuka' after it, it is certain that he was the founder of the dynasty. But as his brother Kanha is also said to have belonged to the Sātavāhana kula, Simuka could not have given the name of the dynasty. Then who gave the name to the dynasty? The question cannot at present be satisfactorily answered.

The meaning of 'Sātavāhana' is as obscure as those of 'Cālu-kya,' 'Pallava' and 'Vākāṭaka.' For one thing the name is not Sātavāhana as Rapson would have it. Jinaprabhasūri, a Jain monk of the fourteenth century A.D., derives the word thus: 'Sanoterdanarthatvāt lokaih Sātavāhana iti vypadesam lambhitāḥ,' i.e. people call him Sātavāhana, because (the verb) 'sanoti' signifies 'to give' and hence one by whom were given (sātānī) conveyances (vāhanānī) was called Sātavāhana. Another derivation of the name is given in the Kathāsaritsāgara which explains it as meaning 'he who rode a yakṣa named Sāta (in the form of a lion).' These fanciful explanations show that the origin of the term was forgotten long before the fourteenth century. Recently M. Przyluski has given us an equally fanciful explanation.  

12. The Purāṇas give various readings: Matsya generally 'Śiśuka'; d Mt. Śāudhraḥ; e Mt. Śiśuka; e Vāyu Cismako; Viṣṇu Śipraka; j Viṣ. Śudhra. According to Pargiter (op. cit., p. 38, n. 17), Simuka was misread 'Śisuka' and Sanskritized 'Śisuka'; and Śisuka cannot be Sanskrit Śrīmukha (one with a glorious face as Bhagwanlal and Buhler proposed (ASWI, Vol. V, p. 69). Sans. 'Śī' is invariably represented in Prākrit by 'siri.' In the relief inscription at Nānėgḥāṭ itself, Simuka bears the honorific prefix 'Sīrīmato'. 'Śīva' enters into the composition of some Sātavāhana names and is used as an honorific prefix even by early Sātavāhanas. However, palaeography prevents us from subscribing to Burgess' view that 'Sivamaka (of an Amāravati inscription) might possibly be the same as Simuka of the Nānėgḥāṭ inscription No. 3.' (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 62, n. 2).
13. Sātavāhana with the dental s occurs in Bāna's verse, Hemacandra's works and Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara. However, Vātsyāyana in his Kāma-sūtra spells the word with palatal sibilant ś. The words as given by Bhandarkar are (EHD, p. 69, n. 7) 'Kartaryā Kuntalaḥ Śātakarniḥ Sātavāhano Mahādevin Malayavatim (jagāna). Dr. Fleet remarks (JRAS, 1916, p. 818 n. 3): 'It is, however not possible that Vātsyāyana himself can have used the palatal sibilant in these two names.' As will be shown below, Śātakarni with the palatal sibilant ś is a mistake for Sātakarni with the dental s. It then becomes easier to suppose that Sātavāhana with the palatal sibilant ś is a similar error in spelling.
According to him Sādam, sadām and sādām in Munda languages mean 'horse,' vāhana is a Sanskritization of han or hapan meaning 'son.' Sātavāhana is rendered 'son of horse.' The explanation given is, that princes born of the magical union between the chief queen and the sacrificial horse (during the performance of the Aśvamedha) would have come to be called 'sons of the horse.' It is not possible here to traverse the grounds, highly speculative, on which Przyluski seeks to trace pre-Dravidian influences in post-Aryan society and institutions in India. We must be content with the observation that, according to the learned philologist's explanation every kṣatriya prince, whose father had performed the Aśvamedha would be a Sātavāhana or Sātahapan. Yet history knows of only one dynasty that went by that name. It is possible to consider 'Sātā' as the past participle of San, to obtain, to gain; Sātavāhana would then mean one who obtained a vāhana, perhaps one who by his deeds secured a high position in Mauryan military service; and the Sātavāhanas were according to the Purāṇas 'Servant Āndhras.' The Silappadikāram refers to Purambanaiyăn vālkottam and Pāsanđa Sāttan (ix, ll. 12 and 15). The commentaries explain Purambanaiyăn by Māsättan and Sātavāhanan; I do not think that these references to the village deity, the guardian of the boundary of the village, and to his proficiency in the heretical lore, have any place in the elucidation of the dynastic name of the Sātavāhanas. For one thing Adiyārkkunallār, the commentator, is only as old as Jinaprabhasūri. The spelling in 'Sāstā' is another argument.17

The wife of Sātakāṇī I was versed in and performed numerous sacrifices and worshipped Vāsudeva, Kṛṣṇa and Saṁkarsana. Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakāṇī's mother led the life of a royal ěśī. The former prides himself over 'having stopped the contamination of the four castes.' A later Sātavāhana king bears the name Yaña Sātakāṇi.

All Purāṇas are agreed that he ruled for 23 years. According to Jain legend the first king, Sātavāhana by name (evidently Simuka), built Jaina temples and cetiyas. But in the closing years of his reign he became a wicked king and was dethroned and killed.18

17. The reference to Sättan in Silappadikāram was pointed out to me by Mr. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar; but I am unable to follow his interpretation for which see Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu Commemoration Volume, pp. 156-8.
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Kanha I

Simuka was succeeded by his brother Kanha.19 In his time the Sātavāhana kingdom extended as far west as Nāsik if not further. Evidence of the modelling of Sātavāhana administration on Mauryan lines is furnished by the Nāsik inscription of his time, which mentions the construction of a cave by a Mahāmātra in charge of the śramaṇas or monks (at Nāsik)—Mahāmātras are a class of officials mentioned in the Asokan inscriptions. The cave is the earliest excavation in the series, and stands far below the other caves. The cells on three sides are decorated with cetiya arches at the top of the openings. Of the four pillars that support the roof of the verandah, two are half-pillars and the others are square at the top and bottom, and octagonal in the middle. They have no capital.20

According to Rapson, Kanha would have reigned for 18 years.21 Matsya has generally aśṭādaśa. But some Mss. of Vāyu read asmāddāsa.22 Pargiter has pointed out in the introduction that where there are two readings, one asmāddāsa and another aṣṭādaśa, abdāndaśa would reconcile these different readings.

Siri-Sātakaṇi I

On epigraphic as well as literary (Purānic) evidence, the third king of the line is Siri-Sātakaṇi—according to Rapson the Siri-Sāta of the coins, the husband of Nāyanikā, the daughter of Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro.23 According to Rapson it is not possible to reconcile the Purānic statement that Sātakarni I was the son of Krṣṇa, the brother of Simuka, with the evidence supplied by the

19. The Mt., Vā., Bd., Bhāg. and Vs. are agreed in calling him the brother of Simuka. According to Rapson this fact fully explains the absence of his name in the Nāneghāṭ reliefo inscriptions (op. cit., p. xix).
20. Pl. IV, No. 4.
23. In a Nāsik inscription (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 88), Viṣṇudatā, daughter of Śaka Agnivarman calls herself a Śakanikā. In the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta (EI, Vol. XV, p. 41, t. 11. 7 and 8), Kuberanāgā, wife of Candragupta, is said to have belonged to the Nāga tribe. On these analogies the name Nāganikā may indicate the tribe to which she belonged. The Nāga alliance is partially preserved in the Jain legends which make Sātavāhana the son of a Brahman girl and Śeṣa, the king of serpents. (JBBRAS, Vol. X, p. 132).
relieve figures of Simuka, Siri-Satatakeni, and the latter's family. 24 The relieve inscriptions mention Rāya Simuka, then Siri-Satatakeni and his wife, then a Kumāra Bhāya..., then Mahārāṭhi Tranakayiro, evidently the father of the queen, then Kumāras Hakusiri and Sātavāhana. Most of the relieve figures are almost lost, only the legs being partially visible; the rest are completely lost leaving only the space. As will be seen presently, the space for two figures between those of Nāyanikā and Kumāra Bhāya..., was filled by the figures of Vedisiri and Kumāra Satisiri. Then Kaṇha has no place in the relieveos.

Other results which Bühl er and Rapson have arrived at by a comparative study of the relieve figures and the sacrificial inscription of Nāyanikā at Nānegahta are that queen Nāyanikā was the mother of Vedisiri and Satisiri, and that she governed the kingdom during the minority of Vedisiri. According to them the Kumāra Hakusiri of the relieveos is the Satisirimat of the inscription. 25 True, in the Dravidian Prākṛt of the Sātavāhana epigraphs ha sometimes takes the place of sa, e.g. Haṁga = Saṁgha; 26 Hiru-Hātakanī = Siri-Satatakeni, Hāla = Sāta. But nowhere is ku or ka used for ti. Moreover one would expect Hakuhiru rather than Hakusiri. 27 This seems also to dispose of Bühl er's identification of Satisiri with Hakusiri. 28 Further, Kumāra Sati has 'sirimato' and not 'siri' suffixed to his name. As Kumāras Bhāya..., and Sātavāhana are not mentioned in the sacrificial inscription; 29 and as between the representations of Kumāra Bhāya..., and Mahārāṭhi Tranakayiro 30 two statues and their inscriptions have disappeared, 31 Nāyanikā would seem to have had more than two sons; it would seem that Vedisiri and Satisiri were represented in the relieve figures now lost and that the sacrificial inscription, which mentions only two princes (neither of whom is the eldest son, i.e. Kumāra Bhāya), is posterior to the relieve figures and the inscriptions over them.

25. Rapson: op. cit., xx, n. 3.
26. Lüders, List Nos. 1210, 1271, 1272, 1281, etc.
27. Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee assures me that the change of 'Sati' into 'Haku' is not possible.
29. Bühl er would identify the latter with Vedisiri ASWI, Vol. V, p. 68; but Rapson is more cautious, op. cit., xlvi.
30. PI. I, No. 1.
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Sātakarnī : Meaning

Many a prince in the Satavāhana line bore the name Sātakarnī, sometimes along with a metronymic and another name, and sometimes without one or both of them:—Sīri-Sātakarnī I, Cakora Sātakarnī, Mrṛgendra Sātakarnī, Gautamīputra Śrī-Yajña Sātakarnī.

Whilst Rapson’s view that sometimes Sātakarnī was used generally is correct, the example given by him, i.e., the Girnār inscription where Sātakarnī must mean Puḷumāvi is, as we shall see, rather unfortunate. Better examples are Sivamaka Sātakani called simply Satakarnī in the Girnār inscription, and perhaps the Sīri-Sātakani of some coins closely allied to Sīri-Yaṇa’s coins by type and fabric, as all the successors and immediate predecessors of the latter bear personal names. The Sātakani of the Nāṅgēḥat relievos would seem to have borne a personal name ending in ‘siri.’ Sātakani was sometimes abbreviated into Sāta, Sāti,32 Saḍa (Sada?)33 and Sātaka.34 Sadakana of the Chitaldoorg coins is a Prākṛt form of Satakarna.35

The meaning of the term is, however, not settled. Rapson did not attempt to elucidate it. The Purānic forms Sātakarnī, Śātakarnī, Svātikarnī, Svāti,36 Svātivarna and Śāntikarnī show how little the Purānic writers understood the meaning of the word Sātakarnī in Prākṛt. Prof. Jean Przyluski’s suggestion that kaṇi

33. Rapson, op. cit.
34. ASWI, Vol. V, No. 24, Kanhēri Inscriptions. According to Rapson, Sadakana and Sātaka may be forms of Sātakānāṇi (op. cit., lxxxii). As Sāta is an abbreviation of Sātakarnī or Sātakani, as the Banavāśi inscription of Hārītīputra Viśnukaḍa-Cuṭukulānanda Sātakarnī (IA, 1885, p. 331) and the Mālavallī inscription of a Kadamba king (EC, Vol. VII, p. 252 and Pl.) make it clear that more than one prince in the Cuṭū line bore the name Sātakarnī, Sātaka as a form of Sātakani is more probable.
35. ‘Sadakana’ occurs in a clay tablet from Candravallī which was exhibited at the Eighth Oriental Conference at Mysore (1935). The reading is mine. The tablet bears the Triśūla emblem in the centre.
36. The Purānic Svāti is possibly a mis-Sanskritization of Śāti, which, like Sāta, is an abbreviation of Sātakarnī. Krishna Sastry remarks: “…the name-ending svātikarna is more likely to have been the origin of the later Śātakarnī than the fanciful kāṭa-karṇa (the hundred-peed).” (EI, Vol. XVIII, pp. 317-18).
is derived from the Munda kon meaning 'son', and that Sāta is the Munda 'Sādāṁ' meaning horse, is ingenious, but not convincing. Long ago Mr. Coomaraswamy proposed to identify the Nūruvar Kannar of the Tamil Epic, Śilappadikārāṇi, with a Sātavāhana Satakarnī. Since then the Pandits have sought to derive Sātakarnī from Satakarna (Satakarnasya putrah Sātakarnīḥ). So far as we know Simuka, the father of Sātakarnī I, did not bear either the name Sātakarnī. In all the Sanskrit inscriptions in which the term occurs we have Sātakarnī and not Sātakarnī. True the Purāṇas spell the word sometimes with S and sometimes with Ś. Vātsyāyana in his Kāmasūtra gives the from Sātakarnī. But the evidence of the inscriptions which belong to the third and fourth centuries A.D. is conclusive. The meaning given by the Tamil annotator cannot therefore be readily accepted. Sāta cannot be connected with Śattan for the reasons stated above. Sātakarnī would be the name of a descendant of Satakarna. Satakarna is as curious a name as Kumbhakarna, Lambodara and Jātikarna. If we read the name as Sātakarna it may mean one with 'a sharp ear'.

It is not true to say that Sātakarnī is only the dynastic name of both Sātavāhana and Cūtu families. It was also borne by ministers and ordinary persons. In a Kuḍā inscription a minister bears the name Ḥāla Sāta, a contraction for Sātakarnī. In Nāsik No. 3, the preparation of the plates or the cloth or the palm leaves is attributed to a 'takani,' and the lacuna could have contained one letter only. So (Sā)takani is most probable.

37. Pp. 540-41. He figures as a close ally of Sēnguṭṭuvan; he is here represented as being prepared to secure for Sēnguṭṭuvan, a stone from the Himalayas, out of which was to be carved a figure of Pattini.

38. (a) Daksināpathapatēs Sātakarner dvir api . . . . . "—the Girnār inscription of Rudradāman, EI, Vol. VIII, p. 44. l. 12.

(b) " . . . prēsūbhīs-Sātakarny-ādībhīs . . . ."—the Tālagūnda inscription of Kākusthavarman, EI, Vol. VIII, p. 33. l. 14.

(c) "Vāsiṭthiputraṇya Sātakarnisyā"—Kanheri inscription of the daughter of Mahākāṣṭrapa Rudra, ASWI, Vol. V, p. 78, Pl. Li.

39. Vide supra.

40. Vedic Index, q.v.

41. Rapson: op. cit., Index, V, p. 264.

42. CII, No. 18, p. 15.

43. Pace Senart who says (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 70): "It is most improbable that we should have to read Sātakarnīṇā, and it would indeed be extremely puzzling if this royal name were borne by a simple engraver."
The long record at Nāṇeghat incised during the minority of Vedisiri by the regent Nāyanikā mentions a number of sacrifices performed. Among those mentioned are the Āsvamedha, Rājasūya, Agnyādheya. Anvārāmbhaṇīya, Gavāmayana, Bhagaladaśarātra, Aptoryāma, Āngirasāmayana, Gārgatirātra, Āngirasatri-rātra, Chandogapavamānatirātra, Trayodāśarātra, Daśarātra, and some others as the lacunae would show.

Bühler supposes that these sacrifices were all performed by Nāyanikā though he admits that "according to the Śāstras, women are not allowed to offer Śrauta sacrifices and that those who perform such sacrifices for them (strīyājaśa) are severely blamed; yet that seems hardly probable for in the sentence which ends with yañehi yiṭham, 'the sacrifices were offered,' we have the impersonal passive construction and the genitive rāyasa, 'of the king'..."

Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar objects:44 "It is inconceivable that Nāganikā, even as queen-regent, celebrated it (the Āsvamedha) of her own accord and to indicate her paramount sovereignty... as Nāganikā's husband Šatākarni has been styled apratiḥatacakra, it is proper and natural to suppose that it was he who celebrated the sacrifice twice. What appears to be the case is that Šatākarni it must be, who carried out the sacrifices referred to in the epigraph, and as all sacrifices are performed by Yajamanas along with their consorts, Nāganikā has been associated with him." The fact that Nāganikā's husband is called vīra, sūra, Dakhinā (patha)pa (ti), and apratiḥatacakra, and the words 'rāyasa... (ya)ñehi yiṭham' support Bhandarkar's conclusions. After 'caritabrahmacāriyāya dīkavratasūndaya yaṇa huta...,' 'vano' appears, and after 'vano' there is a stop. It is therefore probable that Nāyanikā's part is only the description of the sacrifices performed by her husband, and we know that the record was incised after the death of Siri-Śatākani I. The epithets dhamadasa, kāmadasa, varadasa, putradasa, if they apply to Siri-Śatākani, would be another piece of argument in favour of our conclusion.45.

44. IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 72, n. 11.
45. Bühler's reading 'a(n)āgavaradayiniya' is uncertain. Neither the a nor the na is certain.

The epithets 'putradasa varadasa' etc., cannot apply to Vedisiri as his name is in a compound with mātuya. Nor can they apply to Satisiri-matasa, as they are too far removed from it.
It would then be that Siri-Sātakaṇī I was a powerful monarch and that most of the sacrifices were performed by him to commemorate the expansion of his empire of which we have evidence from the coins. The Nāṇeghāṭ record is then the funeral oration of a disconsolate wife.

Sātakaṇī I—Khāravela Synchronism?

According to the Ḥathīgumpha inscription, Khāravela, in his second year, sent an army to the west disregarding Sātakaṇī. The army reached the Kanhabenā river and struck terror into the Mūsika capital or city.⁴⁶ K. P. Jayaswal and R. D. Banerji have shown that the Ḥathīgumpha inscription mentions a Yavana king Dimita who was forced by Khāravela’s victorious invasion of Northern India to retreat to Mathurā. As he could only be Demetrius I, who on his coins wears the head-dress made of elephant’s skin, and who would have come to the throne about 190 B.C., king Khāravela’s reign would on this synchronism fall in the second and third decades of the second century B.C. Sātakaṇī I would, according to the chronological scheme adopted here, have reigned between 200 and 190 B.C. As Sātakaṇī II would have come to throne in 172 B.C. the synchronism of Khāravela and Sātakaṇī II is as probable as that of Khāravela and Sātakaṇī I.

Hakusiri

An inscription on one of the pillars of the Cetiya cave at Nāsik mentions Mahā-Hakusiri and his grand-daughter Bhaṭapālikā, daughter of the royal officer (amaca) Arahalaya and wife of the royal officer Agiyatanaka. The early type (i.e. in low relief) of the decoration of the façade, the simple lotus-shaped capitals of the pillars, and the proximity of the cave to that excavated in the reign of king Kaṇha, stamp it as a very early excavation in the series. Senart has pointed out that “if this Mahāhakusiri is the same as Kumāra Hakasiri at Nānāghāṭ, two generations would not be too much to explain the difference in the forms of letters which exists between our epigraph and the Nānāghāṭ inscription.”⁴⁷ Bühler⁴⁸ assigns the inscription to a very early period and supposes that the

change in the characters of its alphabet is due not only to time, but
to the development of the ‘Malwa and Upper India style.’ The
fact that the grand-daughter of Mahā-Hakusiri is the daughter of
one royal officer and wife of another makes it highly probable that
the Hakusiri of this inscription belonged to the royal family and
was therefore the Kumāra Hakusiri of the Nāneghāṭ relievos. But
since he does not bear the title of Rājan which Satavāhana kings
invariably do, we cannot subscribe to the view of Rapson and
Bühler that the Hakusiri of our inscription ascended the throne.

Satisiri

Satisiri mentioned as a son of Nāyanikā in the sacrificial inscrip
tion was probably represented in the relievos between Kumāra
Bhāya..........., and Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro and therefore before
Hakusiri. Rapson and Bühler think that he may be the Śakti
Kumāra of the Jain legends.49 It has been shown above that he
cannot be identified with Kumāra Hakusiri. In the e Vāyu and
Matsya lists the successor of Sātakaṇī I is Pūrṇotsantu (Pūrṇo-
saṅga or Pūrṇotsarga also in Mt.). As Śāti and Sāta (abbrevia
tions of Sātakaṇī) were incorrectly Sanskritized into Śāntikarna or
Sātakarna, ‘Santu’ may likewise be an incorrect Sanskritization of
Śāti, (San. Śakti) ; in that case Satisirimato of the Nāneghāṭ
inscription would be the Pūrṇotsantu of e Vāyu.

Skandastambhi

This king, the sixth in the list, is mentioned only in some ver-
sions of the Matysa Purāṇa.50 As will be shown below two or
three kings have to be added to the Purānic list; and the number of
kings is nowhere mentioned to have been more than thirty.51 Pro-
bably some of the names in the first half of the list have to be
deleted as imaginary names mentioned to bring up the total to
thirty. Skandastambhi’s existence may therefore be reasonably
doubted.

Sātakaṇī II

If the Purānic chronology may be trusted Sātakaṇī II ruled
for 56 years,—the longest reign in the annals of the dynasty. From
Western India come certain square coins (potin and copper) bear-

51. Ibid., p. 36.
ing partially the legends Raño Satakamnisa; some bear the device of the springing lion, others that of an elephant with upraised trunk. According to Rapson they bear a close resemblance in size, shape and types to the coins of Erān (East Malwa). He cites the authority of Cunningham according to whom while the coins of Ujjain are invariably round pieces, those of Bēsnagar (according to him the capital of East Malwa) and Erān are nearly all square. The double line border with the fish and swastika symbols are strikingly similar to the device supposed to represent the river Bīna on the coins of Erān. The Sātakaṇi of these coins would therefore seem to have ruled over East Malwa. West Malwa, as the Śīrī-Śāṭā coins show, had already passed into Sātavāhana hands in the reign of Sātakaṇi I.

The Sātakaṇi of the coins would seem to have been earlier than Āpilaka, eighth in the Purāṇic lists. And so he must be No. 6 of the Purāṇic lists. The angular ṛ of the Sātakaṇi coins brings them near the Nāṇeghāṭ inscriptions. But too much reliance cannot be placed on the results arrived at by a comparison of coin legends and stone inscriptions. In the Sātakaṇi coin the ka has no nail-head, and has a longer horizontal member than the ka of the Āpilaka coin. East Malwa which, according to Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra, was ruled by Āgnimitra from Vidiśā would therefore seem to have come under Sātavāhana rule during the reign of Sātakaṇi II, some time between 180 and 130 B.C.

According to Rapson the coins may be those of Gautamiputra or some earlier Sātakaṇi, and the Bhilsa inscription that of the time of Vāsiṭhīpūta Viḷivāyakura, predecessor of Gautamiputra Sātakaṇi. But the early forms of ka, ṛa in the Bhilsa Tope inscription place it long before Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi's time. The Viḷivāyakuras do not belong to the Sātavāhana line (at least the main line). Moreover, Rapson's conjecture that Vāsiṭhīpūta applies to the king is not supported by the plate.

Āpilaka

The authenticity of the Purāṇic lists which mention Āpilaka as the 8th king has been proved by a large copper coin of this

52. Rapson: op. cit., Pl. I, Nos. 5 to 12.
53. CAI, p. 95.
54. Rapson: op. cit., xcii.
55. Op cit., xcvi.
56. Ibid., xxvii, n. 2.
57. Buhler's Tables m.
58. Vide supra.
king from the Central Provinces. 59 Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit reads the legend as 'rāṇo sīva-sīri-Āpilakasa.' The legend, I think, should be read as 'rāṇo sīva sīrīsa-Āpilakasa,' 60 the sign is represented by two short strokes one vertical and the other horizontal attached to the right arm of pa. The coin bears the device of an elephant goad. What is above the elephant may be nandipada. Dikshit remarks 'on numismatic grounds the place of this

59. The coin which belongs to the Mahā-Kośal Society was exhibited at the Annual Exhibition of the Asiatic Society of Bengal by Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director-General of Archaeology, who has been kind enough to furnish me with an excellent photograph of the coin (Pl. I, No. 2). About coin No. 3 in his catalogue of coins in the British Museum Pl.—I xciv Rapson says: 'It is inscribed with Brahmī characters which are apparently of the same period, (i.e., Sātakaṇi I's) but which are too fragmentary to allow of any satisfactory reading. All that can be said is that the name of the king seems to have begun with Aja—or Aji—No form occurring in the Purānic lists suggests any very probable identification, though it is possible that the curious name Apitaka or Āpilavā which appears early in these lists . . . may be a corruption of the name of this king.' It is no longer possible to hold with Rapson that Āpilaka is a Purānic corruption of a name beginning with Aja or Aji. We have a silver coin from Mathurā with the legends Ajadeva, and bearing the same symbols as our coin, i.e., the swastika with ma attached to each of the four arms, man standing, and representation of a river with fish swimming in it. On palaeographical evidence this coin belongs to the same period as No. 3 in Rapson's Catalogue.—(Mathurā is the findspot of many Śunga coins), and resembles in type and symbols the silver coin of Sumitra, identified with Sumitra of the Harṣacarita, a Śunga prince in whose kingdom Malwa might have been included. (JBORS, 1934, Pl. facing p. 5, No. 2 and the following).

It might be remarked that both the Sātavāhana and the Śunga coins from Mathurā bear the same symbols. Rapson thinks that the Aja-coin (lead) is clearly connected by type with the potin coins of Sīri-Sāta. Only future research can show whether the Sātavāhanas were indebted to the Śungas or vice versa, or whether both were indebted to a particular locality for these symbols.

60. From the numerous forms of the name in the Purāṇas, Pargiter long ago chose Āpilaka of e Vāyu—op. cit., p. 39, n. 45. See Plate IX, No. 3.

This is an instance of an honorific prefix having a case ending in Sātavāhana inscriptions and coins; the only other instance is afforded by the legends on a coin attributed conjecturally by Rapson to Pulumāvi II (G. P. 3, Pl. op. cit.), which should be read in the following order: 'samīsa s(i) r(i) (—). The combination of sa and a in sa is also curious, the only parallels for this being Śivadatt-ābhīraputraśya and Ābhīrasya-śivarasenasya. But these occur in a Sanskrit inscription while the legends on our coin are in Prākrit.
ruler is more with the later kings of this dynasty than with the earlier ones as indicated in the Purāṇas. But the blank reverse of the coin certainly attests its early age. The early forms of sa and ra which are only slightly developed forms of those of the Sirī-Sāta coins, and the primitive i sign (a short curve) stamp the coin as an early one in the series. No doubt the elephant is better executed but this is not without a parallel; the lion on Sātakaṇi II’s coins is better executed than that on Sakasena’s coins.

**His reign: Extent of his kingdom**

The coin, like the inscriptions, bears witness to a growing empire. In his time the Sātavāhana power would seem to have extended as far north-east as the modern Central Provinces. It is hazardous to build too much on the provenance of a single coin. It is even significant that Sātakaṇi I and II struck potin coins, and potin coins are found “exclusively in the Chanda District of the Central Provinces.” The Purāṇas are agreed that Apilaka ruled for 12 years (daśa dve or dvādaśa) and that he was the son of Lambodara.

**Hāla**

From Apilaka to Hāla (8th and 17th in the Purānic lists respectively), we have a period of absolute darkness, and the Purānic Sātavāhana kings between them are to us mere names. But it is probable that fresh evidence like the Apilaka coin may not only confirm the order in the Purānic list but also open a vista into the period.

**Hāla: Meaning of the name**

The king is mentioned by his name in the Purāṇas, the Saptasātakam, Lilāvatī, Abhidhānacintāmaṇī, and Deśināmamālā. In the last two works mentioned, Hemacandra considers Hāla as a variation of Sālāhana and Sātavāhana. In the Gaṭhāsaptaśaṭi the

---

63. The Sanskrit form as given in the Purāṇas is the same as the Prākrit form on the coins.
   Like sāmi Sirī-Puḷumāvi, Apilaka does not bear the name Sātakaṇi. Unlike other Sātavāhana kings he has the prefix ‘siva’ in addition to ‘siri’ (śiva=auspicious).
64. Abhidhānacintāmaṇī, V. 712.
king under mention is called Hala, and Sātavāhana. Rājaśekhara also calls him Hala and Sātavāhana.65 Hemacandra gives Kuntala and Cauricinda as synonyms of Hala.66 But we know from the Purāṇas that Kuntala and Hala are the names of two different kings. On coins and inscriptions Sātakaṇi is abbreviated into Sāta, Sāti, Sada and Sataka. No instance of the abbreviation of Sātavāhana is to be found. Hala cannot then be a variation of Sātavāhana. It can therefore be considered as a variation of Sātakaṇi only. Sāta and Sāti are contractions of Sātakaṇi. The form Hatakanī occurs on coins; and la is sometimes used for ta. Sātakaṇi as a personal name is borne by many a king in the line.

The reign of Hala introduces us to an epoch of literary activity. From inscriptions we know that the official language under the Sātavāhanas was Prākrit. The works attributed to or to the time of Hala show that the Sātavāhanas encouraged the use of Prākrit in literature. In this respect they played a part opposite to the part played by the Kṣatrapas. Only in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta at Nāsik and Kārlā do we have a mixture of Sanskrit. The Sātavāhana son-in-law got some Sanskrit from his father-in-law, and his wife uses Sanskrit in her inscription at Kanheri. But the official records of Gotamiputa and his son Puḷumāvi II at Nāsik and Kārlā are in pure Prākrit.67

Gāthāsaptasatī (700 verses in seven chapters), an anthology of erotic verses in Aryā metre and in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākrit is said to have been compiled by Hala. Hala evidently worked on the basis of an earlier anthology by a certain Kavivatsala and unified and embellished it considerably, retaining the names of the original composers in some cases, and adding other verses of his own. The work must have undergone several changes at other hands in subsequent times as its numerous recensions testify. But there is no doubt that its kernel dates from the first or second century A.D. and that it shows the previous existence of a considerable body of lyrical literature in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākrit.68 In the maṇgala or introductory verse adoration is paid to Paśupati or Śiva. Although the verses are said to have been composed by Hala alone, the commentator's notes men-

65. Deśināmamāḷa, 8, 66.
66. Ibid., ii, 36, iii, 7.
67. It is however to be noted that the Nānēghat record is not in pure Prākrit as is often imagined. It is in mixed dialect, e.g., prajugatino (1.1), aprathitacakrasa (1.2), bhāriyā, (1.4), and caritabrahmacāriyāya.
tion the following poets as contributors to the work: Bodissa, Culluha, Amaraja, Kumārila, Makarandasena and Śrīrāja.69 Verses from this work are quoted in Dhanika’s commentary on the Daśarūpaka, in the Sarasvatī Kaṭṭhābharana and in the Kavya-prakāśa. Bāṇa evidently refers to this work when he says “Sātavāhana made an immortal refined treasure (kośa) of song adorned with fine expressions of character like jewels.”70 Merutuṅga in his Prabandhacintāmaṇi tells us of Sātavāhana of Pratiśṭhāna who devoted himself to collecting the compositions of all great poets and wise men; he bought four gāthās for forty million gold pieces and had a book made which was a kośa of the gāthās that he had collected.71

Events of his reign

Līlāvatī throws some light on the events of Ḥāla’s reign. A theme in the work is the military exploits of Ḥāla’s Commander-in-chief Vijayanāṁda in Ceylon on behalf of his master. The king of the Sṛṅgaḷa dvīpa by name Silamegha had a daughter by name Līlāvatī by his gāndharva wife Sarasrī. She lived near Saptā Godāvari Bhīmaṁ which is identified with modern Drāksārāma. After his military exploits Vijayanāṁda camped with his troops at Saptā Godāvari Bhīmaṁ, and came to learn all about Līlāvatī. After his return to the capital, he narrates the whole story to his king. Ḥāla then proceeds to the place, kills the demon Bhiṣāṇana and marries Līlāvatī. After visiting the residence of her father the count returned to Pratiśṭhāna in Svabhukti viṣaya.

70. Harsacarita, Trans. by Cowell and Thomas, p. 2.
CHAPTER IV

THE LATER SĀTAVĀHANAS

(a) Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi

(i) Metronymics:—Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi is the first known Sātavāhana king to bear a metronymic. If Sātakaṇi of the Sāṇci inscription is a king later than the sixth in the Purāṇic lists the early Sātavāhanas would not seem to have borne metronymics. Nearly all the successors of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi, known to us through lithic records, bear metronymics. It may be noted at the outset that the Sātavāhana metronymics, like those in many primitive communities, were apparently an institution for regulation of marriages and not for descent of property, for the kingdom was, as is shown elsewhere, transmitted in the male line.

The Sātavāhana metronymics are derived from Vedic gotras. Gotamiputa means the son of Gotami or of a lady belonging to the Gotama gotra. Vāsiṭhīputa means the son of a Vāsiṭhi. Māḍharīputa means the son of a Māḍhari. It has not been pointedly emphasized by scholars, that the Sātavāhanas and their successors in eastern Deccan, the Iksvākus, bear metronymics derived from only the three Vedic gotras mentioned above. The Iksvāku records offer an explanation for this curious feature. The institution of cross-cousin marriages especially with the father’s sister's daughter was the cause. Occasionally a wife might be taken from a new

1. After the materials for a discussion of the views of Bühler and Cunningham had been collected and presented by me, D. R. Bhandarkar’s criticism of the old theory appeared in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXII, pp. 30 ff. I have made use of a few of his ideas.

2. The exceptions are Rājan Sivamaka Sada of an Amarāvati inscription and Pulumāvi of the Myākadoni inscription.


5. The Sātavāhanas bear a personal name, or a surname, or both, along with the metronymics: Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi, Vāsiṭhīputa Caḍa Sātakaṇi, Gotamiputa Siri-Yaṇa, etc. We cannot accept Prof. Bhandarkar’s remark that he knows of no instance where the metronymic alone without the personal name is mentioned. In some Andher Stūpa inscriptions (Lüders, List, Nos. 680, 681, 682 and 683) Vāchīpua and Gotīpua occur unaccompanied by a personal name.
family, e.g., Vāsiśṭhīputra Śrī-Sātakarni married the daughter of a Mahārāja of Ujjain, evidently a Western Kṣatrapa.

It is interesting to note that the feudatories and the successors of the Sātavāhanas in eastern Deccan also bear metronymics. An inscription at Kārlā belonging to the first century B.C., mentions a Mahāraṭhi Gotiputa. A Mahābhoja of the first century A.D. bears the metronymic Kociputa. A Mahāraṭhi of the second century A.D. bears the metronymic Vāsiśṭhīputa while his father bears the metronymic Kosikīputa. Abhira Īśvarasena of a Nāsik inscription bears the metronymic Māḍharīpūta. The Ikṣvākus bear the Sātavāhana metronymics.

Even as early as Vedic times people bear metronymics like Kauśikīputra, Kautsīputra, Ālambīputra, and Vaiyagrahapadīputra. Pāli canonical literature calls Ajātasattu a Vedehiputta. But it is from Malwa that we get a good crop of metronymics. Two inscriptions from Sāncī Stūpa III and an inscription from Satdhāra Stūpa II mention a saint Sārīpūta. In another Sāncī inscription an artisan under a Sātakāṇi is called Vāsiśṭhīpūta. In two inscriptions from the same place a Mogalīpūta (Maudgalyāpūtra) and a Kosikīpūta, both of whom are Buddhist saints, are mentioned. In a Barhut inscription of the second century B.C. a Vāsiśṭhīputa Velāmitā is mentioned. In another inscription, which begins with 'Sugānam rāje . . . . . ' a king is called Gotīpūta. But his father and son bear the Vedic gotra metronymics Gāgīpūta and Vātsīpūta. A Bēsnagar inscription reveals a Kāsīpūta (Kāsikīpūtra or Kāśīpūtra) Bhāgabhadra, perhaps a ruler of Ujjain in the time of Antalkidas. It is also worthy of note that some Pītakhōrā cave inscriptions of the third century B.C. mention a royal physician by
name Vachīputa (Vātsīputra) Magila.\textsuperscript{15} In the case of Malwa metronymics we are thus able to trace three classes of metronymics derived from (a) locality (b) race or clan (c) Vedic gotras; and these seem to be used as indifferently as Sātavāhana and non-Sātavāhana metronymics are used among Mahāraṭhis of western Deccan.

How did the institution of metronymics enter into the Sātavāhana family? As metronymics are borne by the later Sātavāhanas and not by the early Sātavāhanas, surely it is not the result of the change of father-kin into mother-kin.\textsuperscript{16} To go further we have only circumstantial evidence to depend upon. Like the early Sātavāhanas the early Mahāraṭhis bear no metronymics.\textsuperscript{17} Later Mahāraṭhis and later Sātavāhanas bear them, and the Mahāraṭhis and the Sātavāhanas were matrimonially connected. The Mahātalavaras who are feudatory nobles under the Ikṣvākus and are matrimonially connected with the latter, bear Ikṣvāku metronymics. The Ikṣvākus, originally servants of the Sātavāhanas, certainly got their metronymics from the Sātavāhanas, for do they not bear the Sātavāhana metronymics and are not metronymics quite foreign to the Āndhradesa?\textsuperscript{18} The Abhira servants of the Sātavāhanas also bear metronymics. From these facts two conclusions emerge. The feudatory nobles under the Sātavāhanas bear Sātavāhana metronymics and the Sātavāhanas and the Ikṣvākus are matrimonially connected with their feudatories and with one another. In the case of the Mahāraṭhis it is not clear whether they gave it to the royal family, or got it from them; for, the first Mahāraṭhi to bear a metronymic would on palaeographical evidence have to be assigned to the first century B.C.\textsuperscript{19} But, in other cases it is clear that the Sātavāhanas transmitted their metronymics through the channel of marriage as the Ikṣvāku records unequivocally show.\textsuperscript{20} The question then arises,

\textsuperscript{15} CTI, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7; Pl. xlv.

\textsuperscript{16} “Whereas a system of father-kin once established is perfectly stable never exchanged for mother-kin, the system of mother-kin is on the other hand unstable being constantly liable to be exchanged for father-kin.” Frazer, Totemism and Exogamy, Vol. IV, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{17} Nāneghāṭ Inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{18} The dynasties that succeeded the Ikṣvākus in the Āndhradesa do not know metronymics.

\textsuperscript{19} Karlā, simhastambha inscription.

\textsuperscript{20} It has not been noted that while in many cases metronymics and the father’s name are mentioned (personal name or gotra name), e.g., in the Barhut inscription referred to above, in all the later Sātavāhana records,
could they not have got metronymics through the same channel? It has been shown, that the inscriptions of an early period in the Paithān region and in East and West Malwa, mention metronymics. West Malwa came under Sātavāhana sway in the first decades of the second century B.C., and East Malwa some time between 175 and 125 B.C. It may be that marriages between the Sātavāhanas and Kṣatriya noble families, more probably in Malwa, gave these metronymics to the Sātavāhanas.

Bühler held that “the usage of calling sons after their mothers was caused not by polyandria as some Sanskritists have suggested but by the prevalence of polygamy, and it survives among the Rajputs to the present day” and that the surnames of the Sātavāhana queens which are derived from Vedic gotras and which form the metronymics borne by their children were originally the gotras of the Purohitas of the royal or noble families, from which the queens were descended and kings were affiliated to them for religious reasons as the Śrautasūtras indicate.

The title ‘ekabamhanasa’ applied to Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi and the adoption of metronymics derived from Vedic gotras need not mean that the Sātavāhanas were Brahmans. D. R. Bhandarkar objects to Senart’s translation of ‘ekabamhanasa’ as ‘the unique Brāhmaṇa,’ and adopts that of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, i.e., ‘ekabrāhmanysasya,’ ‘the only protector of Brahmans’ and the epithet ‘ekabrāhmanysasya’ applied to Viravarman on the Pikūra grant and to Mādhavavarman in his Polamūru grant makes Bhandarkar’s interpretation more acceptable. There is, however, no difficulty in looking upon even ‘ekabrāhmanysasya’ as an eulogistic expression. That the Sātavāhanas were Kṣatriyas is shown by the fact that Gotamī Balasiri styles herself as one who fully worked out the ideal of Rājaṛṣi’s wife. According to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, there are three kinds of ṛṣis, Devarṣis, ‘sages who are demigods also’, Brahm-
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marṣis, ‘sages who are sons of Brahmans’ and Ṛājaṛṣis, ‘Kṣatriya princes who have adopted a life of devotion.’ If the Sātavāhanas were Brahmans it would be difficult to explain the absence of gotra name in their early records especially in the Nāñeghāt record which gives an account of the sacrifices performed by a Sātavāhana king and queen.24

It may be pointed out that this theory is contradicted by the expression ‘khatiya dapa madanasa’ applied to Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakāṇi in Nāsik No. 2 itself. According to Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar25 ‘Khatiya’ (Kṣatriya) refers not to the Kṣatriya caste but to a tribe, the Xathroi of Arrian, placed on the confluence of the Chenab and the Indus, and the Kṣatriyas of Kauṭilya, Manu Smṛti and Ptolemy. In his Girnār inscription Rudradāman refers to the reinstatement of deposed kings and the defeats he inflicted on the contemporary Sātakarnī. If these were the descendants of feudatories of Nahapāna dethroned by Gautamiputra, might not ‘khatiya’ of the Nāsik record refer to the Kṣatriya princes deposed by Gautamiputra?26

The results of the foregoing discussion may be summarised as follows:—The Sātavāhanas were Kṣatriyas and bore the gotras of their mothers. They got this institution of tracing descent by mothers through intermarriages with Kṣatriya families in certain localities. The system was one for the regulation of marriages and not for descent of property. The system of cross-cousin marriages explains the occurrence of only a few gotra names along with the Sātavāhana names.

26. In some recensions of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Śudra heads the list of Andhra kings, instead of Simuka; this is obviously a mistake, for the numerous sacrifices performed by Sātakāṇi preclude us from looking upon Sātavāhanas as Śudras, for according to Manu, the Veda is never to be read in the presence of a Śudra (iv, 99) and for him no sacrifice is to be performed (iii, 78).

Brahmans also bear metronymics. The Buddhist teacher Vasubandhu, the son of a Brahman of the Kauṣikī family, was named Bi-lu-ci Vatsa. Bi-lu-ci was his mother’s name and ‘vatsa’ signifies ‘son’ (IA, Vol. IV, p. 143). Two inscriptions from Malavalli (Lüders, List Nos. 1195 and 1196) mention Kośikīputa Siri-Nāgadatta of the Koṇḍamāṇa family and of the Koṇḍinīya gotra and Hāritiputa Koṇḍamāṇa of the Koṇḍinīya gotra. In a Nāsik record (Lüders, List, No. 1131), a Brahman is called a Vārāhi-putra.
(ii) Gotamiputra Siri-Satakani and the Kṣaharātas

In Nāsik No. 2 Gotamiputra is spoken of as the destroyer of the Śakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas and as the exterminator of the ‘Khakharāta-vasa’. The Jogalthembi hoard has brought to light numerous coins of Kṣaharāta Nahapāna, ½ of which have been restruck by Gotamiputra Siri-Satakani. Nāsik No. 4 and Kārlā No. 19 show him as engaged in conquests. The Sātavāhana records at Nāsik and Kārlā show that the Nāsik and Poona Districts, Ākara, Avanti, Kukura, Suraṭha and Anūpa countries which, on epigraphical and numismatic evidence, would seem to have been included in Nahapāna’s kingdom, were conquered by Gotamiputra Siri-Satakani.

Kṣaharāta inroads into Sātavāhana dominions

According to tradition preserved in the Kālakācārya Kathānaka, the Śaka invasion of Western India and Ujjain took place some years before the Vikrama era. After some time the Śakas are said to have been driven from Ujjain by Vikramāditya, only to return in 78 A.D. The identification of the Śakas of the Kālaka legends with the Kṣaharātas is rendered difficult by the fact that while the son-in-law of Nahapāna is called a Śaka, Nahapāna and Bhūmaka are nowhere so called. Says Rapson, “It is possible . . . that the Kṣaharātas may have been Pahlavas and the family of Caḍāṇa Śakas.” But that they were “of foreign, i.e. non-Indian nationality is certain.” In later Indian tradition they might have figured as Śakas, much like the Kuṣāṇas. But it is highly improbable that the Kṣaharātas are included in the 18 Śakas figuring in the Purāṇas as the successors of the Āndhra Sātavāhanas; these eighteen Śaka rulers are doubtless the kings of the Caḍāṇa line who ruled up to the time when the earliest Matsya account was closed according to Pargiter, C. 255 A.D.

27. Chaharada, Chaharata, Khararata, Khakharata are various Prākṛt forms of Kṣaharāta.
29. CI, Vol. II, xxvi, xxvii. Says Sten Konow, “I cannot see the slightest reason for discrediting this account as is usually done.”
31. Ibid.
32. Vide infra. H.A.—7
The earliest known member of the dynasty of Nahapāna is Kṣatrapa Bhūmaka, known to us from coins only. According to Rapson, considerations of type and fabric of coins and of the nature of the coin legends leave no room for doubting that Bhūmaka preceded Nahapāna. There is, however, no evidence to show the relationship between them. But the forms of Brāhmi and Karosthī letters on their coins make a long interval impossible. According to Bhagavanlal Indrajit, the fact that Nahapāna’s coins are found in the coasting regions of Gujerat, Kathiawad and sometimes in Mālwā proves the Kṣaharāta conquest of Mālwā from the Sātavāhanas and the establishment of Kṣaharāta power in western India. One coin of Bhūmaka comes from Puṣkar near Ajmer.33

On coins he bears the title rājan, and in inscriptions those of Kṣatrapa and Mahākṣatrapa. The inscriptions of his time, his coins and his titles prove the extension of Kṣaharāta power over fresh territory34 including north Mahārāṣṭra, the heart of the Sātavāhana empire. The Sātavāhana power must have been confined to the territory around and to the east of Paithān. We do not know how far Nahapāna succeeded in the south, though it seems probable that portions of southern Mahārāṣṭra passed under his sway and had to be reconquered by Gautamiputra. The Periplus has preserved something of the Kṣaharāta-Sātavāhana struggle in the statements, that the Kingdom of Mambanes35 (Nambanus—Nahapāna) began with Ariake and that the Greek ships coming into the Sātavāhana port of Kalyān were diverted to Barygaza.36

34. Vide supra.
35. JRAS, 1916, pp. 836-37. Kennedy says, “the MS is so illegible that it is impossible to restore his (the ruler of Ariake’s) name with any confidence. It has been read as Manbaros, Mambaros, and Mambanos. Fabri-cius says that only the final letters (Barou) are certain. Boyer proposed to read Nambanos, and in an essay full of learning and acuteness identified him with Nahapāna ……….” (JA, July-Aug. 1897, pp. 120-51) Kennedy thinks that like Pandion and Kerebotros the name of the ruler of Ariake may be a general designation. But Sandanes (Sundara) and Saraganes (Sātakarni) are personal names. Dr. Fleet has shown how Nahapāna could have been misread into Mambanes (JRAS, 1907, p. 1043 n. 2).
Prof. Rapson refers the dates in Nahapana's inscriptions (years 41, 42, 45 and 46) to the Śaka era (78 A.D.). According to him the evidence of Nahapana's coins restruck by Gotamiputa Siri-Satakani, Nāsik No. 2 and Nāsik No. 4 issued from a victorious camp, and the ascertained date (S. 72) of Rudradāman show that Gotamiputa was the conqueror of Nahapana. "... it would seem improbable that Nahapana's reign could have extended much beyond the last recorded year 46 = 124 A.D. Gautamiputra's conquest of Nahapana seems undoubtedly... to have taken place in the 18th year of his reign. We therefore have the equation: —Gautamiputra's year 18 = 124 A.D., or 124 A.D. + x. On this synchronism, on the recorded regnal dates in the inscription of other Andhra sovereigns, and on the known date 72 = 150 A.D. of Rudradāman as Mahākṣatrapa rests at present the whole foundation of the later Andhra chronology."

Cunningham proposed to refer the dates in Uṣavadāta's and Ayama's inscriptions to the Vikrama era; Rapson objects to it and quotes, "the empirical remark" of Kielhorn that "in the majority of the Śaka dates the term year is rendered by varṣa" and that in "the inscription of the Western Kṣatrapas.....the word for 'year' everywhere is varṣa .......". 38

It may be noted here that the unit figure in Kārlā No. 19 read as 8, by Rapson has been read as 4 by Bühler. Senart thinks that it may be any number between 4 and 9. 39  A study of the inscription from the stone itself and of an impression of it taken by me, shows that 7 is more probable than any other figure. No doubt it would then be a later form of the symbol for seven. But it is certainly not 8 as assumed by Rapson or 4 as read by Bühler since it is quite unlike the symbols for 8 and 4. 40  This would show that Gautamiputra's conquests were accomplished at least in part in or before the year 17.

Since Rapson wrote, the Andhau inscriptions of Caṣṭana and Rudradāman's time (year 52) have been studied and edited by

40. The symbol for 4 appears in the same inscription.
scholars like D. R. Bhandarkar and R. D. Banerji. The Andhau inscriptions shatter the theory of the Gotamiputa-Nahapāna synchronism. Scholars are not agreed as to whether the inscriptions should be referred to the joint reign of Caṭṭana and Rudradāman, or the reign of Rudradāman. In all the four inscriptions we have: 'Raño Caṭṭana-asa Ysāmotika-putrasa, raño Rudradāmāsa Jayadāmāsa putrasa vasa 52 . . . ' Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar originally thought that pautrasya (which the construction would not allow us to insert) had been omitted. But later he states that "Mr. R. C. Majumdar of the Calcutta University has kindly offered the suggestion that the date had better be referred to the conjoint reign of Caṭṭana and Rudradāman," R. D. Banerji objects: "Apart from the possibility of such an event in India, nobody having ever thought or tried to prove conjoint reigns of two monarchs except Messrs Bhandarkar, there is sufficient evidence in the Andhau inscriptions themselves to prove that the author of the record was quite ignorant as to the exact relationship between Chāśhtana and Rudradāman . . . . the Andhau inscriptions are the only records known which mention Chāśhtana or Rudradāman as Rājās and not as Mahā-Kshatrapas, The only possible explanation of this is that in a remote place like Andhau on the Rann of Cutch the people were not aware of the new titles of the new dynasty of rulers, titles on which Rudradāman set great store . . . . The cause of the absence of any word or phrase indicating the relationship between Chāśhtana and Rudradāman now becomes clear." There is many a weak link in this argument. In the genealogical portion in all other inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas of the Caṭṭana line, the great-grandfather is mentioned first, then the grandfather, then the father and then the son. In the Andhau inscription the names of Caṭṭana and Rudradāman precede those of their fathers. One cannot believe that the people of Cutch who knew the relationship between Ysāmotika who does not seem to have been even a Kṣatrapa and Caṭṭana did not know the relationship between the latter and Jayadāman. On his coins Nahapāna is known as 'rājan' only. Does it mean that the people were ignorant of his titles of Kṣatrapa and Mahā-Kṣatrapa which he bears in the inscriptions of his son-in-law and minister ? The objection to the joint rule of Caṭṭana and Rudradāman does not seem to be well taken; for as Rapson has observed: "Among the later Western Kṣatrapas we find

the father and son ruling concurrently as Mahākṣatrapa and Kṣatrapa." This would explain why Jayadāman bears only the title of Kṣatrapa.44

If then Cašṭana was a Mahākṣatrapa in the year 52 (130 A.D.) with Rudradāman as Kṣatrapa, he must have been a Mahākṣatrapa during the reign of his son Jayadāman as Kṣatrapa. As on the testimony of the coins Cašṭana was a Kṣatrapa for some time, if Nahapāna's dates are referred to the Śaka era, a three years' interval between Nahapāna and Cašṭana is the utmost that can be postulated. Even taking for granted that Nahapāna was defeated in year 46 itself (124-25 A.D.), we are led to the paradoxical conclusion that a year after the rooting out of Khakharāta race and the destruction of the Śakas, Pahlavas and Yavanas, Cašṭana was on the scene avenging Śaka defeat.45 The Nāsik record of Balasri which mentions in such glorious terms Gotamiputa's conquests of Anūpa, Ākara, Avanti, Suraṭha, Kukura, Asaka and Mujaka would become a record of a fleeting conquest. Was then the 'Sātavāhanakulayā-śapraiṣṭhāpana' referred to in an inscription incised 25 years after the event such a shortlived glory?46 Ptolemy's (139 A.D.) statement that Özene was the capital of Tiastanes (Cašṭana), and the Andhau inscriptions which show that Cutch was in possession of Cašṭana and Rudradāman in 130 A.D., are clear proofs of the re-establishment of Śaka power in the lands between Mālwa and Cutch at least.47 It has been pointed out by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri

44. Rapson's view that between the reigns of Cašṭana and Rudradāman there was an interval during which there was no Mahākṣatrapa and that this may have been the result of a defeat, is no doubt partly based upon the fact that Jayadāman bears only the title of Kṣatrapa.

45. The theory by Bühler in JRAS 1890 that Nahapāna and Cašṭana were contemporaries was abandoned by him later. ASWI, Vols. IV and V.

46. Says Rapson, op cit., xxxvii: "Rudradāman's conquest took place c. 150 A.D., and before the 19th year of Puḷumāvi. The inscription of Balaśri seems to be a record of glory which has only recently passed away."

47. R. D. Banerjī (JRAS, 1917, pp. 286-87) not only holds with Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (JBBRAS, Vol. XXIII, pp. 68-9) that Rudradāman had conquered all the dominions mentioned in the Gīrnār prāsasti before S. 52, but also says that it would not have been possible for Rudradāman to conquer Aparānta (N. Konkan) without conquering north Mahārāṣṭra (Nāsik and Poona districts). We cannot subscribe to these views. The former lacks conclusive proof. The identification of Mujaka and Asmaka with N. Mahārāṣṭra, and the absence of their mention in the Gīrnār prāsasti are conclusive arguments against the latter.
that there is nothing in the inscriptions of Puṣumāvi's time to show that his dominions had shrunk so much in their area as the Andhau and Girnār inscriptions would show. The silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa [Hi]ru Hātakaṇi (or ni), (Siri-Satākaṇi) which like similar coins of Siri-Yaṇa would seem to have been current in Aparānta, and the Kaṇhērī inscription of Rudradāman's daughter, prove that Aparānta was held by the son-in-law of Rudradāman, a successor of Puṣumāvi.

The chronological scheme of Rapson requires that Vāsiṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Puṣumāvi should be the son-in-law of Rudradāman and the Satākaṇi of the Girnār inscription twice defeated in fair fight by him. I was fortunate enough to trace in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, a silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa Siri-Satākaṇi; this closely imitates as regards type, size and weight the silver coinage of the Western Kṣatrapas. And we have the Kaṇhērī inscription of Vāsiṭhiputra Satākaṇi's queen, the daughter of Mahāksatrapa Rudra (dāman). These make it difficult for us to identify a king who, on coins and in inscriptions, is called Satākaṇi, with Puṣumāvi who does not bear the surname Satākaṇi either in inscriptions or on coins. He must therefore be a successor of Puṣumāvi. In the Purānic lists Śivaśīri, the Vāsiṭhiputa sīva Siri-Satākaṇi of the coins, figures as the successor of Puṣumāvi (perhaps his brother). As 'sīva' and 'sirī' are honorific prefixes, no insuperable difficulty is involved in the identification of Vāsiṭhiputa Siri-Satākaṇi with Vāsiṭhiputa sīva Siri-Satākaṇi. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has rightly pointed out that it is improbable that Puṣumāvi, who according to Ptolemy was a contemporary of Caṇṭana, married the latter's great grand-daughter.

The Satākaṇi of the Girnār inscription

As Rudradāman is said to have defeated Satākaṇi not distantly related to him sambamdhāvidūrayā (ratayā), the Girnār Satākaṇi is to be sought for in one of the successors of sīva Sirī-Satākaṇi, not far removed from the latter in point of time. In the Purānic lists Śivaskanda Satākaṇi (the Śivamaka Sada of an Amaravati inscription) and Sirī-Yaṇa figure as his successors. The difficulty in identifying the Girnār Satākaṇi with Sirī-Yaṇa is that Puṣumāvi would then have to be placed between 86 and 110 A.D., while the contemporaneity of Caṇṭana and Puṣumāvi mentioned by Ptolemy would bring Puṣumāvi to 130 A.D. at least. So the Girnār Satākaṇi must be Sivamaka (Śivaskanda) Satākaṇi, probably a brother or nephew of śīva Śri-Satākaṇi. Working
backwards with the ascertained regnal periods of these Sātavāhana kings we get the following scheme of chronology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King Name</th>
<th>Regnal Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gotamiputra Sātakanī</td>
<td>82–106 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsithiputa Pulumāvi</td>
<td>107–131 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva Śrī-Sātakarni</td>
<td>132–145 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivamaka Sada</td>
<td>146–153 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It now becomes still more impossible to place Nahapāna between 119 and 124 A.D.

Then how are the dates in the inscriptions of Nahapāna's son-in-law and minister to be interpreted? In 1908 R.D. Banerji revived a point made by Prof. Bhandarkar years before that Uṣavādāta's inscriptions are palaeographically earlier than that of Šodāsa of the year 72, and added, 'it is extremely probable that as Nahapāna is prior to Šodāsa the dates in his inscriptions refer to the era in which the dates in the inscriptions of the Northern satraps are dated.' Subsequently he refers these dates to the regnal years of Nahapāna. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has lately revived Cunningham's theory that Nahapāna's dates must be referred to the Vikrama era. His arguments are as follows:

The letters of Uṣavādāta's inscriptions resemble those of the inscription of the Northern Satrap Šodāsa and Bühler admits that in the former southern peculiarities are wanting. The discus, arrow and thunderbolt on the coins of Nahapāna and Bhūmaka remind us (as V.A. Smith has pointed out) of the coins of Hāgāna and Hāgāmāsa, the Northern Satraps. In El. Vol. XIV, Dr. Sten Konow has referred the year in Šodāsa's record to the Vikrama era. Rev. H. R. Scott has observed that the letters on the coins of Nahapāna belong to the near middle of the period from 350 B.C. to 350 A.D. "...the state of Kharosthi on Nahapāna's coins...seems now to secure for him a place distinctly earlier than Caṭṭana." The Uṣavādāta bha, va, and sa, a and ka with longer verticals than those of Šodāsa a and ka, the more angular ja, da with better curved back and the ornate i sign, show that Uṣavādāta alphabet was later than Šodāsa alphabet. Conclusions based on similarity of alphabets and the northern affinities of Nahapāna's family cannot be final; as Sten Konow has observed, "We do not know for certain in which era the Šodāsa inscription of Saṁ 72 is dated. I do not think it can be the same as

48. IA, Vol. XXXVII, p. 43.
in the Taxila plate of Saṁ 78. I think that Patika, who issued that record, is identical with the Mahakśatrapa Padika of the Mathurā lion capital which mentions Śuḍāsa, i.e., Śoḍāsa as Kśatrapa.” A comparison of coin legends with stone inscriptions cannot yield safe conclusions. The palaeography of the Andhau inscriptions renders an interval of more than 160 years between the Girnar inscription and the inscription of Usavadāṭa, as Prof. Nilakanta Sastri would postulate, too long. Noteworthy are the form of a ka ra and pa which approach those of Usavadāṭa alphabet. The state of Kharoṣṭhī on Caṣṭana’s coins does not point to a long interval between them, for, as on Nahapāna’s coins, and on the silver coins struck by Caṣṭana as Kṣatraps, Kharoṣṭhī is used to transliterate the Brāhmī legends in full. It is only on coins struck by Caṣṭana as Mahākṣatraps that Kharoṣṭhī shows decline—it is used only for the genitive of the king’s name. This fact points to a rapid decline of Kharoṣṭhī rather than to a long interval.51

The development of the Brāhmī alphabet in the Nāsik and Poona districts in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. makes a long interval between Nahapāna and Gautamiputra highly improbable. According to Bühler there is a striking similarity between the alphabet of the Nāsik inscriptions of Gautamiputra Sātakaṇi and Usavadāṭa.52 Prof. Nilakanta Sastri rejoins ‘it is a similarity which is only to be expected if the area of their location had been ruled by the Khakharātas for some time before Gautamiputra recovered it for the Sātavāhanas.’53 The Nāsik alphabet of Pūlamāvi’s time especially ca, ja, da, na, and ṅa, (with a slightly curved base), ta, bha, ya, ha (with a notch at the left), which is more developed than the alphabet of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi’s inscriptions, deprives this argument of its force. The Nāsik inscriptions of Gotamiputa Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṇi only three generations later than those of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi show letters of the ornate type. The Kārlā inscription attributed to Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi is not only engraved immediately below that of Usavadāṭa, but also shows only slightly developed forms over those of Usavadāṭa’s inscription (e.g., ta, pa, bhi, va, ra and ma). In the inscriptions of the time of Pūlamāvi

51. According to Rapson on the copper coins of Nahapāna, only the name Nahapāna in Brāhmī legend can be deciphered. “It is uncertain whether or not this was accompanied by an inscription in Kharoṣṭhī characters.” Op. cit., clxi.
53. JRAS, 1926, p. 652.
the ornamental type has appeared.\textsuperscript{54} The quick and distinct development from Gotamiputa to Pulumāvi of the alphabets at Kārlā and Nāsik does not allow us to place a long interval between Nahapāna and Gotamiputa.

The Jogalthembi coins of Nahapāna, more than two-thirds of which are restruck by Gotamiputa, point to the same conclusion. If Gotamiputa defeated a remote successor of Nahapāna, we would have found in the hoard, coins of Nahapāna’s successors restruck by Gotamiputa. The coins of Bhūmaka show, that among the Kṣāharātatas other princes than Nahapāna, if they existed, would have struck coins; and there is more point in restricking the coins of the vanquished ruler rather than those of a remote predecessor of his.

The village of Karajaka which is granted by Gotamiputa to the monks of the Kārlā caves is surely the Karajaka granted to them previously by Uṣavadāta. Nāsik No. 4 records the grant of a field in western Kakhaḍi, a field which was held by Uṣavadāta. Bühler and Bhagwanlal Indraji look upon ajakālākiyam in the phrase ‘ya khetam ajakālākiyam Usabhadatena bhūtam’ as a Prākṛt form of ajakāla (Sans. adjakāla) and translate ‘the field which has been possessed by Rṣabhadatta up to the present time.’ Senart looks upon it as the name of the field.\textsuperscript{55}

Lüders’ No. 795 where Ajakālaka is the name of Yakṣa makes Senart’s suggestion extremely probable. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri denies that the Uṣavadāta of No. 4, the possessor of a single field, was the Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna. But it is not impossible that Uṣavadāta held all the fields in the village and that Gotamiputa gave one field to the monks retaining the rest for himself.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{54} Ei, Vol. VII, Pl. III, No. 20.
\textsuperscript{55} Ei, Vol. VIII, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{56} It is, however, risky to look upon Uṣavadāta as a rare name, and identify all the Uṣavadātas of epigraphic records with the son-in-law of Nahapāna. ‘Datta’ as a name ending is very common and ‘Ṛṣabha’ often enters into the composition of names (Ei, vol. XVI, p. 24; Lüders, List, Nos. 56, 69a). A Śaillārwāḍi inscription (Śaillārwāḍi is near Kārlā) mentions Uṣabhāṅaka native of Dhenukākāta.

An inscription in a pillar of the Kārlā Cetiya cave records the donation of a pillar by Mitadevanaka, son of Uṣavadāta from Dhenukākāta. According to Senart, the ‘mita’ in the name of the donor and that of Ṛṣabhadatta’s wife (i.e., Daksamitrā) supplies “a link which may perhaps connect..."

H.A.—8
The guiding points in the determination of Kṣaharāta chronology are the short-lived reigns of Nos. 18, 19, 20 and 21 in the Purāṇic lists of the Āndhras (44-54 A.D.) and reference to Mambanes in the Periplus; the kingdom of Mambanes (corrected by Schoff into Nambanus and identified with Nahapāna) is said to have begun with Ariake, which according to Lassen would represent the territory on either side of the gulf of Cambay. Scholars like K. P. Jayaswal have challenged this identification. But as Nahapāna is known to have ruled over Surāṣṭra and as the seaboard of the kingdom of Mambanes was, according to the Periplus, Surastrene, and as the capital of Nambanus, viz., 'Minnagara' also shows Scythian or Śaka associations (Min=Scythian) this identification is highly probable, and Schoff has shown that a consideration of the authorities Roman, Parthian and Arabian fully supports 60 A.D. for the Periplus, and Nahapāna would seem to have been ruling 22 years before the accession of Gautamiputra Śrī-Sātakarnī.

The question whether Nahapāna's dates should be referred to an era or to his regnal years, is not then so important as it might be if we had no independent grounds to fix his date. The old view that it is dangerous to assume the existence of eras other than the Vikrama and Śaka eras is not accepted by Dr. Sten Konow. The years may then refer to an era which started somewhere in the closing years of the first century B.C., or in the beginning of the first century A.D. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has admirably met Rapson's objection to referring the 'vāsa dates' to any other than the Śaka era. He says, "... it must be noted that there are very few dates in these records, and even among these few, we are unable to trace any consistency in the manner of dating. An important inscription at Nasik is undated; only the year and month is mentioned in another, though the day of the month is also added elsewhere in the same inscription. The use of vāraṣha for year does not seem to have been so rare in early dates that are not in the Śaka era." R. D. Banerji's view that these dates must be referred to the regnal years of Nahapāna is supported by them."

57. JBORS, 1932, p. 9.
the numerous coins of Nahapāna and by the tradition preserved in the Paṭḍāvaḷi Gāthas and Jinasena’s Harivamśa which assign a period 40 and 42 years respectively to Naravāhana (a corruption of Nahapāna). Rapson makes Nahapāna a feudatory of the Kuśānas, on the strength of the mention, in a Nāsik inscription of Uṣavadāta, of suvarṇas which according to him must refer to the gold currency of the Kuśānas “which we must suppose to have been current or prevalent in Nahapāna’s kingdom.” But suvarṇa as a coin was prevalent in India as early as the Vedic times; the suvarṇa under reference need not necessarily refer to the gold currency of the Kuśānas.

Prof. Bhandarkar has advanced another argument for connecting Nahapāna with the Kuśānas. To him the Kuśaṇa of Nāsik No. 12, “appears to have been (the name) given to the silver coinage of Nahapāna, because he issued it for his overlord who must have been known as Kuśaṇa i.e., Kushana.” He continues “Was there any Kushana king who was also known by the mere name Kushana? Certainly this must be the Kushana sovereign referred to in the Taxila scroll inscription of the year 136. . . . . . . I have elsewhere shown that he can be no other than Kujula Kadphises, or Kadphises I as he is also known.” Apart from the objections to kuśaṇa being a form of Kuśaṇa or Guṣṇa, the sense of the passage does not admit of Bhandarkar’s interpretation. In line 2 civarika and kuṣaṇaṃūla are mentioned together as the purpose for which the money was invested in a guild. In line 3 we have ‘civarika-sahasrāṇi be 2000 ye pādike sate eto mama lene vasavuthāṇa bhikkhunam viśāya ēṣikasa civarika bārasaka, yā sahasa prayutāṁ pāyùnapadike sate ato kuṣaṇaṃūla.’ But though the evidence cited for Kuśaṇa overlordship over Nahapāna cannot be relied upon, the chronological scheme adopted here makes Kuśaṇa overlordship not improbable (Kujula Kadphises 50-75 A.D.).

60. Rapson remarks (Op. cit., cx): “Pandit Bhagvānlāl Indrājī supposed that the portraits of the Nahapāna on the silver coins indicated a very long reign; but now that a vast number of specimens are available for comparison, it is clear that no such conclusion can be safely drawn from these representations of the king’s head. . . . . . . They cannot possibly have been portraits, in the true sense of the word, of any single individual.”
61. CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas, clxxv.
62. Vedic Index, Keith and Macdonell, Suvarṇa Yajña q. v.
63. IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 76.
(iv) Gotamiputa Sātakani cannot be identified with Gotamiputa Vilivāyakura of the coins

A number of lead and copper coins from Kolhapur have revealed to us the names of 3 princes: on the evidence of restruck coins, the order would be as follows:

Vāsiṭhiputa Vilivāyakura
Māḍhariputa Sivalakura
Gotamiputa Vilivāyakura.

The current theories about these princes are far from being satisfactory. Says Rapson,\(^{64}\) Vilivāyakura and Sivalakura "are probably local titles in the dialect of the district of Kolhapur . . . . The question remains whether these peculiar titles are to be regarded as the designations of members of the imperial Andhra Dynasty or of viceroys governing the district of Kolhapur. Although the question cannot be decided with certainty, the former view is perhaps the more probable, since there is some evidence to show that Andhra monarchs were known by different titles in the different divisions of their empire (cf. sup. § 48, 50)." Long ago Sir R. G. Bhandarkar said that Vilivāyakura and Sivalakura are names of the feudatories whilst the metronymics are those of their suzerains.\(^{65}\) The metronymics attached to the names of Mahāraṭhis are not those of their suzerains—the Sātavāhanas.\(^{66}\) The father of a Mahāraṭhi who dates his inscription in the regnal years of Vāsiṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi, bears a metronymic not borne by the Sātavāhanas viz., Kosikiputa. 'Kura' as a name appears in Bhaṭṭiprōlū. Sivala as the name of a queen occurs in one of Barhut inscriptions,\(^{67}\) and at Amarāvati we come across an upāsikā Sivalā. La is a common ending in names, e.g., Bhadila, Bhāyila, Dronala, Sivakhadila, Buddhila, Sarpila, and Rudrila;\(^{68}\) Vilavanaka is the name of a village.\(^{69}\) Regarding Ptolemy's mention of Pulumāvi of Paithān and Baleokuros of Hippokura (identified by R. G. Bhandarkar with Vilivāyakura), Rapson remarks that his Siri-Pulumāvi and Vilivāyakura might be one and the same person. "A foreigner might be excused for not knowing, that in our own country, the Prince

---

[^64]: Ixxxvii-lxxxviii.
[^66]: Kārlā No. 14, EI, vol. VIII.
[^67]: Cunningham, Stūpa of Bharhut p. 131; Lüders, List, No. 1268.
[^68]: Lüders, List, Nos. 125a, 149a, 1124, 1247, 1292 and 1054.
[^69]: EI, Vol. XV, pp. 41 and 43.
of Wales, the Earl of Chester and the Duke of Cornwall were the same person.” But Ptolemy mentions the capital ‘Hippokura’ (a ‘kura’ ending in the name of the capital too!), which has been identified by Bhagwanlal Indraji with the modern Goḍabandar. To accuse a contemporary of ignorance we require strong proofs. In seeking to identify these princes with the Sātavāhana rulers Rapson places too much reliance on metronymics, yet we know that the Sātavāhana and Ikṣvāku metronymics were borne by their feudatories, the Mahāraṭhis and the Mahātalavaras. Rapson’s identification upsets the order of Gotamīputa Sātakaṇi and Vāsiṭhīputa Puḷumāvi among the Vilivāyakuras; and Māḍharīputa Sivalakura has no place between Gotamīputa Sātakaṇi and Puḷumāvi in the Purāṇic lists.70 Prof. Rapson himself points out that the Ujjain symbol which is employed by all the later Sātavāhanas on all their coins is not found on the Kolhapur coins71 and that the ‘bow and arrow’ on these coins is nowhere found on the Sātavāhana coins. To a certain extent the type (the tree within railing) and size of these coins (lead) resemble those of the Cūṭu and Mahāraṭhi coins.

The pieces of evidence which make it probable that they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas are that one of the Vilivāyakuras was a contemporary of Puḷumāvi, that Gotamīputa’s dominions extended as far south as Vaijayantī and that they used Sātavāhana metronymics. The title ‘rājan’ does not prevent them from having been feudatories, for Nahapāna, who was undoubtedly a feudatory, bears the title ‘rājan’.

(v) Gotamīputa’s empire

To return to Gotamīputa, he would seem to have wrested from the Kṣaharātas not only the ancestral dominions, but something more. The epithet ‘Sātavāhana-kula-yasa-patithāpana-kara’ applied to him is no idle boast, for before his reign, the Sātavāhana power would seem to have suffered considerable loss of territories. According to Rapson, the countries which are mentioned in Nāsim No. 2 as having been under his sway, “in no way represent the extent of his empire.” “The names themselves are those of the kingdoms which had submitted to Gautamīputrā”,72 Rapson is evidently thinking of the Andhradeśa. Not all the conquered kingdoms would seem to have been mentioned, e.g., S. Mahārāṣṭra as far south.

as Vaijayanti (Nāsik No. 4 speaks of the Vejayantī army as 'senāye Vejayamtīye'). Even so the extent of his kingdom is indicated by the mountains of which he is said to have been the lord—the western and eastern portions of the Vindhya range (Vijīha and Pāricāta), the Satpura hills extending through the middle of Berar nearly into west Bengal (Achavata), the northern and southern portions of the Western Ghāts (Sahya and Malaya respectively). There is then no epigraphic evidence to show that Gautamiputra's sway extended over the Andhradesa.73 The reference to his chargers having drunk the waters of three oceans need not necessarily mean that his kingdom extended from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal.74 The most important countries mentioned are Asaka, Mulaka75 (Northern Mahāraṣṭra) Asika, Kukura (Eastern

73. A life-size statue of a person, in the Madras Museum Amarāvati collections, holding a lotus in the left hand, bears the inscription Gotami nama (o*). From the dress we can infer that it is not a statue of the Buddha. Even supposing that the inscription records an adoration to Gotami, the mother of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakani, it is possible that during the reign of Vāsithiputa sāmi Siri-Puḷumāvi (when the Amarāvati Stūpa underwent alterations and perhaps enlargement) a statue of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakani was set up; and from Nāsik No. 2 (in which both grandson and grandmother have eulogised Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakani) we know that Gotami Balasiri was living in the 19th year of her grandson's reign.

74. In Bāna's Harsacarita (Trans. Cowell and Thomas) the Sātavāhana contemporary of Bhikku Nāgārjuna is styled "lord of the three oceans" (p. 252).

75. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (Fausboll, Vol. V, pp. 317, 24; and 318, 6), Assaka and Avanti are mentioned together (Assakāvantim; Assakāvantim ti Assaka raṭṭham va Avantiraṭṭham va etc.). For the precise identification of Assaka (Sansk. Aśmaka not Aśvaka). Pāṇini mentions Aśmaka iv, i, 173) and Mulaka a clue comes from an unexpected quarter. Verse 1011 of the Sutta Nipāta (Alakassa Patiṭṭhanam purimami) mentions Patiṭṭhana of Aḷaka and verse 977 mentions Aḷakā as a country in the neighbourhood of Assaka (Asaka), a country on the banks of the Godāvari. (So Assakassa visaye Alakassa samāsane vasi Godavarikule uñcena ca phalena ca). But in three manuscripts (a MS in the Phayre collection in the India Office Library, a Burmese MS in the Royal Asiatic Society, London, and a MS in the Mandalay Collection of the India Office Library) it reads as Mulaka or Muluka. Mulaka is made more probable by the following facts. Asaka and Mulaka are mentioned together in the Nāsik No. 2. According to the Purāṇas Mulaka was the son of Aśmaka of the Ikṣvāku line. (Wilson, Viṇṇa Purāṇa, p. 382). Patiṭṭhana is modern Paithān on the banks of the Godāvari; as Assaka is said to have included Godāvari there is no doubt that N. Mahāraṣṭra, at least the Nāsik district and the territory around Paithān, is to be identified with Asaka and Mulaka; see also IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 150 f.n.
Rajputana) Akara (East Malwa), Avanti (West Malwa), Suraṭha (Surāṣṭra), Anūpa (a district in the upper Narmadā), Vidarbha ("the western part of modern Berar and the valley country west of that")

76 and Aparānta (N. Konkan).

77

(b) Puḷumāvi II.

Gotamīputa was succeeded by his son Puḷumāvi who according to the inscriptions would seem to have ruled for 24 years at least. The Purāṇas assign a period of 28 years. Since they assign only 21 years to Gotamīputa Siri-Satākani who from inscriptions is known to have ruled for 24 years, it is probable that the Purāṇic total 49 has to be divided between them as 25 and 24 or 24 and 25.

Messers R.G. and D.R. Bhandarkars' theory of the conjoint rule of Gotamīputa Siri-Satākani and Puḷumāvi

The theory of the conjoint rule of Puḷumāvi and his father, which was proposed by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar long ago, did not find a single supporter. As it has been restated by Prof. Bhandarkar as late as 1914 and 1918, a discussion is necessary. According to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the Purāṇic discrepancy in the matter of the duration of the Śatavāhana dynasty (Mt. 460 years, Va. 411 years and Viṣṇu 300 years) is to be explained "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 Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty". According to V. A. Smith this discrepancy arises on account of some of the Purāṇas omitting the Śuṅga and Kanya years (112+45) or the latter from the Śatavāhana total. The other arguments of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar repeated by Prof. Bhandarkar are: —

76. Pargiter: Mārkandeya Purāṇa, p. 335.

77. For a detailed discussion of these names BG, Vol. XVI; EI, Vol. VIII; Rapson: op. cit., and Bhandarkar's EHD.

78. His name is spelt as Puḷumāvi on coins and in Nāsik Nos. 3 and 20 and Kārlā No. 20; as Puḷumāyi in Nāsik Nos. 1 and 2 and Kārlā No. 20; and as Puḷumai in Nāsik No. 25. Puḷumāvi would seem to be the right form to start from. Rapson thinks that Puḷumāyi like Viḷivāyakura is a name whose meaning is not clear.

79. JBBRAS, Vol. XXXIII, Epigraphic Notes and Questions; IA, 1918, Dekhan of the Śatavāhana period.


81. ZDMG, 1902, p. 6.
(a) In Nasik No. 2 dated in the 19th year of Pulumāvi II, Gotamī Balasiri is called Mahārājamātā and Mahārājāpitāmahā. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

(b) Gotamīputa is called 'Dhanakaṭasāmi' (Dhānyakaṭakasamā) in No. 3 and Pulumāvi ruled at Paithān. It has been shown elsewhere that Dhanakaṭasamanehi refers to Dhanakaṭa monks or sāmanas and that Dhanakaṭa cannot be a form of Dhamnakataka. In No. 4 Gotamīputa is called 'Benākaṭakasāmi.' Every queen is the mother of a king and grandmother of a king. In the Nāṇeghat record Sātakaṇi I is eulogised and yet he was dead when the record was incised. In the inscription Pulumāvi makes over the merit of the gift to his father in the expression 'pitupatiyo.' Such an application of merit can be made only in favour of a deceased person. As Prof. Nilakanta Sastri has asked, why should not the queen who refers to her son as one living (jivasutāya) in No. 5 dated in the 24th year of Gotamīputa refer to him so in No. 2? According to M. Dubreuil the inscription is the funeral oration of a disconsolate mother.

(c) If it was a fact that Gautamiputra was dead when the cave temple was dedicated and Pulumāvi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription, but there is not a word in praise of him. It is improbable that a king who had been dead for nineteen years should be highly extolled in the inscription and the reigning king altogether passed over in silence. It will be shown below that the cave with all its cells was planned even during the reign of Gotamīputa, but executed only in part. Balasiri completed the cave later and made it equal to the cave of Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, whose dynasty Gotamīputa had extirpated; then the train of thought suggested to a mother explains this puzzling fact.

The arguments adduced by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar are:

1. Since Pulumāvi is a contemporary of Caṭṭana, who died before year 52 (130 A.D.) and since the dates in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Ayama are to be referred to the Śaka era, we should postulate a theory of conjoint rule if we are not to run into

82. Chap. II.
84. JRAS, 1926, The Later Sātavāhanas and the Ģakas.
85. Nasik No. 2.
chronological absurdities or impossibilities. Bhandarkar himself has admitted that Caṣṭana was living when the Andhau inscriptions were incised; it has been shown above that the inscriptions of Nahapāna's reign must belong to a time before 100 A.D.

2. If cave No. 3 was granted in the 19th year of Pulumāvi's reign, and if in the year 24 his father Gautamiputra speaks of it as his own gift, is not the conclusion irresistible that Gautamiputra was living when the cave in question was made over to the Buddhist monks, i.e., in Pulumāvi's 19th regnal year, and that the year 24 of the other inscription although it records a donation of Gautamiputra must be referred not to his, but to Pulumāvi's reign? No. 2 dated in the 19th year of Pulumāvi records a non-official or private grant by the queen, while No. 5 (dated in the 24th year) like No. 4 is an official grant. What stamp No. 4 and No. 5 as official records are the order of the king to the officer in charge of the district where the object of the grant lay, and the mention of the formalities connected with the grant, i.e., oral order, drafting, preparation of the charter, preservation in the archives of the State and delivery. Nāsik No. 2, where neither the order of the king nor the formalities connected with grants are mentioned, is then a non-official record. The grant of the cave and lands by Gotamiputa mentioned in Nos. 4 and 5 must be different from the grant of the same cave by Balasiri. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri has admirably pointed out that all official grants open with the order of the reigning king and end by giving the date, while in all private records (at Nāsik and Kārlā) the date is mentioned at the beginning. He concludes that Nos. 4 and 5 must therefore be referred to Gotamiputa's reign.86

But how can one cave be granted by two persons at different times? The statement that Balasiri made the cave equal to the mansion in Kailāsa and the plan of the cave give us the clue. Gotamiputa who emulates Uṣavadāta in his grant of lands to the Nāsik and Kārlā Buddhist monks would certainly have planned a cave as beautiful, perhaps more beautiful than Uṣavadāta's cave (and in general appearance and arrangement the Queen's cave resembles that of Uṣavadāta). According to Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, the raised verandah with a bench at the left end and two cells, one at the right and the other at the left end, show that the verandah with its two cells and the bench was a self-sufficient unit and was

86. Op. cit., p. 650. It may be pointed out that in private records of the Ikṣvāku period the date comes at the end.
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the Śivaśrī of the Purāṇas, we have to take it that by some process which is not now traceable Sivamaka was transformed by the Purāṇic writers into Śivaśrī, and Rapson is inclined to identify him with the Śivaśrī of the Purāṇas. Sivamaka as the name of Śātavāhana is quite probable. In Kuḍā No. 6, Sivama as a personal name occurs, and in the Śātavāhana official records Śiva often enters into the composition of the names of officials under them. Ka as a suffix to personal names is also common in the records of the Śātavāhana period, e.g., Sivaka, Saghaka.

(e) Mādhāriputa Sakasena Sātakaṇī

But for the find of coins bearing the legends Saka Sada (Sakasena Sātakaṇī, (vide supra), the inclusion of his name in the list

96. Dhanama in Nāsik No. 25 (El, Vol. VIII), is another instance of a name with a ma suffix. For the Kuḍā inscription see ASWI, Vol. IV.
97. Lüders, List, Nos. 1177 and 1189.
98. This king bears the title 'sāmi.' Though Gotamāripuṭa Sīrī-Śātakaṇī bears the title Benākaṭakasāmi his son Pulumāvi is the first among the later Śātavāhanas to bear the honorific prefix 'sāmi' in addition to the usual 'sirī.' Pulumāvi's successors Mādhāripuṭa Sakasena, Sīrī-Yaṇa Śātakaṇī and Cāda Śāti bear it. In the Chinna Ganjam inscription Śīrī-Yaṇa bears the titles of 'araka' and 'sirī'. Therefore 'araka' would seem to be a prefix identical in meaning with 'sāmi' (lord). Since Nahapāna and his successors, princes of the Caṣṭana line, regularly bear the title 'svāmin', it may be asked whether the later Śātavāhanas did not borrow the prefix 'sāmi' from the Kaṭrāpas. Since in a Deotek inscription a 'sāmi' (lord, king) addresses his official (amaça) at Cikambari, we have to cry halt to such a conjecture. The eye copy of the inscription compared with the estampage of the inscription recently prepared by Prof. Mirashi, and exhibited at the Oriental Conference at Mysore (1935) furnishes the following reading:

1. Sāmi amṇapayati Cikambari-sa sa
2. hanavito bāndhamto vā tasāradaṁ kuruvūdheva
3. Amacana la-nannaga
4. Dato lego (kho) he pa l di 4 baḍho

(The eye copy is in Cunningham's CII, vol. I, old series, p. 102 and Pl. XV)

In the paper read before the Conference (Proceedings pp. 613-22) the Professor called it an Asokan inscription. But the later forms of ta ca, and da (in dato), ya, and the angular pa, make it difficult for us to subscribe to the Professor's views. Cunningham was nearer the truth when he opined that the inscription was not earlier than the first century B.C. The inscription would seem to be a Śātavāhana inscription for the following reasons:

In the first century B.C. and even earlier the Śātavāhanas were in possession of East and West Mālwā. The inscription is dated in the Śātavāhana fashion by the seasons and fortnights. It also begins like the later
of our kings would have been rendered difficult, for do not his metronymic and personal name draw him nearer to Mādhariputra Īśvāsenā, the Ābhīra? Even so he cannot be identified with any of the kings of the Purānic lists; we have to depend on the palaeography of the two Kanheri inscriptions of his time. Their alphabet so closely approaches the alphabet of Siri-Yaṇa at Kanheri that it is probable that one closely succeeded the other. But we are not in a position to determine who preceded whom. Whilst the looped ta (ll. 10, 12 and 13), and the rounded va (as opposed to the triangular va in No. 14), and the more cursive ha in No. 15 stamp it as later than No. 14, the other letters stamp Sakasena's inscription (No. 14) as earlier than Siri-Yaṇa's (No. 15). No. 14 which was incised on the 10th day of the 5th fortnight of the rainy season on the 8th year of the king, records the excavation of a cave by a merchant and householder, the son of Veṇhunaṇḍi an inhabitant of Kālāṇa along with his father, brother and mother (Bodhisamā). The other inscription (No. 19) records the excavation of a cave by Hālanikā, wife of the donor in the previous inscription.

Like Siri-Yaṇa, Mādhariputa Sakasena Sātakaṇi ruled over both western and eastern Deccan. This fact also places him before Caṇḍa Sātakarnī who would seem to have ruled over only the eastern Deccan. His coins bearing the lion device have been picked up in the Kṛṣṇā-Godāvari districts. The 'sena' ending in his name makes it probable that he was a son of siva Sīra-Sātakaṇi, the son-in-law of Rudradāman.

(f) Gotamiputa Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṇi

His relationship to siva Sīra-Sētakaṇi and Sivamaka Sāda cannot be ascertained. Formerly Bhagwanlal interpreted the reverse legends on his silver coins in such a way as to make him the son of Catarapana.99 Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar interprets it so as to make him the father of Catarapana.100 "But there can be no doubt that

100. JBBRAS, Vol. XXIII, p. 66.
this reading and interpretation are incorrect. The rest of the *rev.*
legend agrees word for word with *obv.* legend; but all that can be
said about the doubtful word, which was read as 'Caturapana rasa',
is that it was one of five or six syllables, the last two only of which
are legible with certainty, and that it was probably the equiva-

tent to the first word of the *obv.* legend—Rañö."101

His inscriptions at Kanheri, Nāsik, Chinna Ganjam, his silver
coins of Sopāra fabric, his numerous coins from Kṛṣṇā and Godā-
vari districts, his potin coins from the Chanda district (Cen-
tral Provinces), clearly show that he not only maintained the
eastern possession but also wrested from the Western Kṣatrapas
Aparāṇa and North Mahārāṣṭra.102

The Chinna Ganjam inscription dated in the 27th year of his
reign shows that the Purāṇas are probably correct in assigning
him a reign of 29 years.

In the Harṣacarita Bāṇa refers to a mendicant by name
Nāgārjuna who was brought to Hell by the nāgas; he begged for
(a wreath of pearls) from the snake King as a gift and received
it. When he went out of Hell he gave it to a king, his friend, i.e.,
Sātavāhana, "the lord of the three oceans." Cowell and Thomas
say that the latter therefore ruled over Jambudvīpa, Plakṣadvīpa
and Śāmaldvīpa.103 The Nāsik record of Balasiri makes it clear that
the three oceans or seas are the seas to the west, east and
south of the South Indian Peninsula. Hiuen Tsang refers to
Nāgārjuna P'usa, a contemporary of the king styled Sha-to-p'o-ha
or Leading Light (Yin-Leng). The latter quarried for him a
monastery on the mountain Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li, 300 li to the south-
west of the capital of South Košala. His date is variously given
as 700, 500 and 400 years after the death of the Buddha.104 Says
Watters, "the names of the kings Kanishka and Kilika, of Vasu-
mitra, Asvaghosha, Kātyāyaniputra, Dharmagupta, and Rāhu-
labhadrā occur in the writings ascribed to Nāgārjuna, and we may
with some probability assign him to the third century A.D." (we
may say even to the end of the second century A.D.). Since the
probable date of Nāgārjuna coincides with that of Siri-Yaña and

101. Rapson op. cit., xci.
102. If Madhariputa Sakasena came between Siri-Yaña and Sivamaka
Sade, the credit for recovering the Aparāṇa would go to him.
103. p. 252 f.n. 1.
104. Watters, On Yuan Chwang, ii, p. 204.
since Siri-Zaña would seem to have been the last great Sātavāhana king to rule over eastern and western Deccan, he may be the Sātavāhana contemporary of the P'usa Nāgārjunā. Māḍharīputa Sakasena has equally good claims.

(g) Vāsīṭhiputa Caḍa Sāti

Prof. Rapson identifies Vāsīṭhiputa Siri-Caḍa Sāti of some coins from the Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā districts with the Skandavāti of the Purāṇas on the score that he is closely connected with Puḷumāvi II by the type of his coins and metronymics; according to the same scholar Caḍa Sāti of some lead coins is probably the Caṇḍaśṛṅi who occupies the last place but one in the dynastic lists in the Purāṇas. It has been shown that Sivaskanda Sātakaṇṭi of the Purāṇas is the Sivamaka Sada of the Amarāvatī inscription. ‘Caḍa’ is a variant of ‘Caḍa’ much like ‘Ruda’ and ‘Ruḍa’. The Kodavolu inscription dated in the regnal years of Vāsīṭhiputa Caḍa Sāti makes two Caḍa Sātis improbable. If the Purānic account can be relied upon, the Ābhīras would seem to have risen to power in North Mahāraṣṭra 15 years before the rise of the Ikṣvākus, i.e., about 193 A.D. This makes it probable that the western dominions of the Sātavāhanas were lost during his reign. His Kodavolu inscription shows that during his reign Kaliṅga or a part of it came under Sātavāhana sway.

(h) Puḷumāvi III

An inscription from Myākadoni (in the Bellary district) recording the construction of a tank by a certain householder, resident in the village of Vepuraka under Gāmika Kumāradatta, in the S[ā]tavāhāni-hāra under Mahāsenāpati Khaṃdanāga, is

106. Rapson: op. cit., p. 46.
107. The inscription records a donation by an officer (amaca) and is dated in the second year of Caḍa Sāti, the Caṇḍaśṛṅi of the Purāṇas. What is read as ‘amacasa bhūmīveṣa’ by Sten Konow should be read as ‘amacasa bhūmikhaṣa’. Bhūmika is perhaps the name of the amaca.
108. Vepuraka may be tentatively identified with Virāpuram in the Adoni Taluq. Vepāḷa in the Haḍagallī taluq and Virāpuram in the Haḍagallī and Rayadrug taluqs have good claims to be identified with Vepuraka inasmuch as Haḍagallī would also seem to have been included in the Sātavāhāni-hāra or Sātāhāni rāṭṭha. The Chilla(le)rekakodumka of the Hira-Haḍagallī inscription of Śiva-Skandavarman is perhaps Chilla[kaladona in the Adoni taluq.
dated in the 8th year of a Siri-Pulumāvi of the Sātavāhana family (raño Sātavāhanānam s[i]ri-Pulumā[ā]visa). Mr. V. S. Sukthankar who has edited the inscription has identified Siri-Pulumāvi with Vāsiṭhilputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi, son of Gotamīputa Siri-Sātakaṇi. The absence of the metronymic and the honorific prefix ‘sāmi’ which are always borne by the son of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi, and the alphabet of the Myakadoni inscription, which approaches that of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Jagayyapēṭa inscriptions, make it highly probable that the Pulumāvi of this inscription is the last of the Sātavāhanas in the Purāṇic lists. True, the Purāṇas assign him a period of 7 years. But this fact presents no insuperable difficulty. Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi ruled for 21 years according to the Purāṇas. Yet we know from epigraphic evidence that he ruled for at least 24 years! Vāsiṭhilputa Catarapana Sātakaṇi ruled for at least 13 years; yet the Purāṇas assign him a period of 7 years only!

Since all Purāṇic lists stop with Pulumāvi it is highly probable that he is the last representative of the great dynasty.

110. Following V. A. Smith, Sukthankar makes out four Pulumāvis in the Purāṇic dynastic lists (Nos. 15, 24, 26 and 30 in the Matsya List). In fact the Purāṇas mention only three Pulumāvis. The line ‘Sivasri vai Puroma tu saptaiwa bhavitar nrapah’ must be translated as: “after Pulumāvi Śivaśri will be king seven years” and not as “Śivaśri Pulumāvi will be king 7 years” if we accept the reading ‘Pulumāt tu’ (Pargiter, Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 71, f.n. 18).
CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN THE SÀTAVÀHANA EMPIRE

Royal Succession

The Sàtavàhana polity conformed to the rule laid down in the Sàstras; its keystone was the sovereign. Monarchy was hereditary. Though the Sàtavàhanas bore metronymics, though they do not mention their fathers in their inscriptions, succession was always reckoned in the male line.¹ The expression ‘kulapurisa-parapara-gata’ in which the term ‘purisa’ implies, according to Senart, ‘descent by males’, is corroborative evidence in the same direction.² Generally the eldest sons inherited the crown. It is remarkable that though polygamy seems to have been the rule, we have no evidence, either in the lithic records or in the Purànas, of disputed successions.³ During the minority of the Crown-Prince, especially in times of stress, succession passed on to the brother of the late king. Kanha Sàtavàhana, brother of Simuka,⁴ the founder of the dynasty, would seem to have come to the throne during the minority of the latter’s son. Sometimes the Queen-mother assisted by her father acted as the regent and according to Bühler performed some sacrifices like kings.

The King

The King was the commander in war and led his armies personally to the battle-field. The detailed instructions issued to amacas (amâtyas, governors of provinces)⁷ bear testimony to the

¹. The Purâna texts and Nàsik No. 3 make this clear; also among the Mahàràthís bearing metronymics, titles and office pass from father to son (Lüders, List, No. 1100).
². EI, Vol. VIII, p. 63.
³. Vide supra.
⁴. All princes are called Kumâras. The Pallava practice of calling the Crown-Prince Yuvamahàrâja and of associating him in the administration of the country is unknown to this period.
⁵. Kàñno brâtâ yavâyâmuṣtu aṣṭàdâśa bhaviṣyatì.
⁶. But it has been shown above that the sacrifices mentioned in the Nâneghâṭ inscription were performed by Siri-Sàtakaṇi.
⁷. Kàrlâ No. 19, EI, Vol. VII.
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effective control exercised by the king over officers in every part of the empire; and kings were not merely content with issuing orders. They took the necessary steps for realising their intentions. It is no wonder that in a simple administrative machinery as the Sātavāhana one, the king was powerful both in theory and practice.

But the king was no capricious Sultan. As the guardian of the social and religious order, his "fearless hand" was to be "wet by the water poured out to impart fearlessness." He was to prevent "the contamination of the four castes." The true father of his people, he should "sympathise with the weal and woes of his citizens" and "never employ taxes except in conformity with justice". He was to be the "furtherer of the homesteads of the low as well as of the twice-born".8 He should properly "devise time and place for the triple object of human activity." A king educated in these precepts among a moralising people would have been more than human if he had escaped the obsession of this conception of his duties. Moreover he was aided by ministers some of whom were confidential ministers (viśvāsyā amātya).

It has been shown that Dr. Bhandarkar's theory of dual monarchy is unproven and improbable.9 But sometimes kings associated their mothers with them in the administration of their country. Nashik No. 510 (dated in the 24th year) is a joint order of Gotami Balasiri and her son Gotamiputra Siri-Satākani, to the officer in charge of the Govadhanahāra. Prof. Rapson attributes this arrangement to the failing health of the King. It might have been so. It might also be, that the absence of the Queen-mother's name in Nashik No. 4 (dated in the 18th year) is to be attributed to the fact that it was issued from a military camp in Govadhanahāra,11 whilst the other was issued from the capital. If so, the arrangement might have been due to reasons other than ill-health. A Kanheri inscription speaks of a confidential minister who executed certain works, and of the queen

9. Vide, supra.
10. EI, Vol. VIII.
11. According to Senart, the genitive Govadhanasa is better construed with skandhāvātrat than with Benākataka. 'The sequence of words would then appear somewhat less regular; but the presence of another genitive, senaye Vejayantiye, may have caused Govadhanasa to be placed after khamdhavārā.'
of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Śatakarnī. Unfortunately the inscription is mutilated and the missing words may show us the part she played in the government of the empire.\textsuperscript{12}

**Feudatories**

(a) Petty Princes.—The administration of the empire was carried on by the agency of ordinary officials, and feudatories, \textit{i.e.}, petty princes, the \textit{Mahāraṭhis} and the \textit{Mahābhōjās}. Kolhāpur and the district around it would seem to have been governed by a line of princes with Dravidian associations (2nd cen. A.D.). That they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas is made clear by the following facts:—Ptolemy places one of these princes in the time of Vāsiṣṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Puḷumāvi; their coins are found at Kolhāpur. Gotamiputa Siri-Śatakari’s empire included lands as far south as Vaijayanti, and Kolhāpur is north of Vaijayantī; these princes bear Sātavāhana metronymics. Like the Kṣatrapas of the Khakharāta and Caṇṭana line they bear the title of rājan. Rājan Cuṭukaḍānaṁda and Rājan Muḍānaṁda of the coins from Kāwrwār in North Kanara according to Rapson belong to the same period as the \textit{Mahāraṭhi} of the Chitaldoorg coins (lxxvii), a period long before that of the Cuṭu kings of inscriptions (lxxxv). From the fact that Rapson has included these coins in the catalogue, it may be inferred that he considers them as feudatories of the Sātavāhanas.

(b) \textit{Mahāraṭhis} and \textit{Mahābhōjās}.—Rapson and Senart consider the derivation of the term \textit{Mahāraṭhi} uncertain.\textsuperscript{13} The analogous titles, \textit{Mahāśāmanta}, \textit{Mahāsenāpati}, \textit{Mahādaṇḍanāyaka}, leave no doubt that the prefix \textit{mahā} denotes an officer of higher rank. The word\textsuperscript{14} ‘ratī’ connects it with the Raṭṭhika of Asoka’s and

\textsuperscript{12} No. 31, ASWI, Vol. V.
\textsuperscript{13} JRAS, 1903, p. 297 EI, Vol. VII, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{14} The orthography of the inscriptions Nāneghāṭ, Kaṅhēri, Bedsā, Kārāṇa No. 2 (EI, Vol. VII) and Chitaldoorg coins (except Bhājā No. 2) (CTI) and Kārāṇa No. 14 (EI, Vol. VII) is ‘raṭhi’ and not ‘rathi.’ E. Senart thinks that \textit{ṭhi} is probable in Kārāṇa No. 2 and \textit{ṭh} probable in Kārāṇa No. 14, 1. 1; but an examination of the stones makes the \textit{ṭhi} certain in No. 2 and very probable in No. 14, 1. 1. Since in the numerous inscriptions there is not one instance of a mistake of \textit{ṭha} for \textit{ṭha} and ‘raṭhi’ occurs more often than ‘rathi’, the former is the proper form to start from.

The terms ‘Raṭhi’ (Rāstrin) and Raṭṭhika (Rāstrika) have the same meaning. Also the elision of \textit{ka} in ‘Raṭhi’ may be compared with the elision of it in Bhoja of Asoka’s edicts (the Bhojaka of the Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela).
Khāravela's inscriptions; what is more striking, the Mahāraṭhis are as much associated with the Mahābhojas as the Raṭṭhikas with the Bhojas (Bhojakas).\textsuperscript{15}

The Mahāraṭhi and Mahābhoja inscriptions are in western India; and the Raṭṭhikas and Bhojas of Asoka's inscriptions are to be sought for in western India.\textsuperscript{16}

Asoka's inscriptions mention the Raṭṭhikas and the Bhojas in the plural along with border peoples like the Āndhrs, the Pulindas, Kāmbojas and the Yavanas. These terms would therefore seem to refer to tribes or peoples. Raṭṭhika (Rāṣṭrika) means "ruler" or "governor of a province." In the Āṅguttara Nikāya, Raṭṭhika implies a hereditary office.\textsuperscript{17} The Raṭṭhikas\textsuperscript{18} and Bhoja-kas of the Hāthigumphā inscription would seem to be local chiefs, since, when referring to Khāravela's conquest of them, it mentions the smashing of their coronets, helmets, umbrellas, etc.—insignia of a ruler.\textsuperscript{19} According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Mahā-

\textsuperscript{15} The Hāthigumphā inscription of Khāravela (EI, Vol. XX, p. 79 l. 6); in Asoka's edicts the Raṭṭhikas are not mentioned with the Bhojas, but the Petenikas are mentioned with the Raṭṭhikas in R.E.V. and with the Bhojas in R. F. XIII; see also Bedsā No. 2, CTI; and Kanheri Nos. 15, 24, 29. ASWI, Vol. V. The proximity of the Thāṇa and Kolābā Districts, which would seem to have been held by the Mahābhojas, to Poonā and the surrounding districts, held by the Mahāraṭhis, should also be noted.

\textsuperscript{16} Unlike the Andhras and the Pulindas, the Raṭṭhikas, Bhojas and Petenikas are called "the western borderers" (R.E.V. Girnār, t. 1. 5; Śāh. t. I. 12).

\textsuperscript{17} The Pañcakaṁmapāta in the Nivarana-Vagga mentions as Mahānāma Kulaputtas, anointed Kings, Pettanika-Raṭṭhikas, Senāpatis, Gāmagāmanikas and Pūgagāmanikas. D. R. Bhandarkar is of opinion that 'Pettanika,' which is explained in the commentary (Indices, Vol. VI) as 'Pitarā dattam sāpateyam buñjati,' is an adjective qualifying Raṭṭhika. Pettanika-Raṭṭṭhika therefore means 'hereditary Raṭṭhika.' Yādīvā which separates Senāpati from Gāmagāmanika and the latter from Pūgagāmanika does not separate Raṭṭhika from Pettanika. This is the only argument in favour of his view though he does not mention it. He is also of opinion that Raṭṭhika-Pitiniḳeṣu and Bhoja-Pitiniḳeṣu of Asoka's inscriptions also mean 'among hereditary Raṭṭhikas' and 'among hereditary Bhojas.' The parallel cases of Aṃḍha-Pulidesu and Yona-Gaṇḍhāra-Kāṃbojėṣu make such an explanation improbable; and in Śāh V., we have Raṣṭikānaṃ Pitinikanam.

\textsuperscript{18} These coupled with the fact that in Asoka's inscriptions Pitinika is the regular form makes the identity of the Pitinika of Asoka's inscriptions with the Pettanika of Āṅguttara Nikāya problematical.

\textsuperscript{19} Lüders translates 'sava Raṭṭhika-Bhojakę' as 'of the Provincial and local chiefs'.
bhārata, the term Bhoja denotes a prince; 20 In a Mahā inscription a Kānabhoa (Kānabhoja) is called a Kumāra, a title applied to princes (CTI, No. 1). If ‘bhojaka’ of the Hira-Haḍashāli plate can be taken to mean “free holder” it can by a stretching of the meaning, imply a local ruler or chief. 21 In the Mahāvamsa, it means ‘village headman.’ It is probable that these titles have a geographical or ethnical meaning. For all that we know, it may be that the ethnical meaning started from the official title.

The important place assigned to Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro father of Nāyanikā, wife of Sātakani I, 22 (2nd century B.C.), a place just below that of the Crown-Prince and above that of the two younger princes may give the clue to the origin of the title. In the days of their service under Mauryan suzerains, the predecessors of Sātakani I must have been in a close alliance with the powerful Raṭhikas of the west, a source of strength for them; they would have enlisted Raṭhika help in their coup d’etat. The coup d’etat being successful, the Raṭhikas would have been given a higher title and status, but they had to exchange Mauryan suzerainty for the Sātavāhana. The silken bond of marriage which made and unmade empires in Mediæval Europe must have been forged to strengthen Sātavāhana imperialistic position.

Sānti Parvan, chapter LXVIII,
Rājā bhojo virāt saṁrāt
ksatriyo bhūpatirṁrapah /
yə ebhīh stūyate kabdath
kastam nārcitumarhati ||

21. In the Ait. Brāh. one who is installed on the throne for the sake of enjoyment (bhōjyaṁata) alone is called a Bhoja.

22. Bühler’s (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 60, n. 3) restoration of the word before Mahāraṭhi (in the long inscription) as ‘[bā]lāya’ is open to question. General usage requires that [bā]lāya’ which again should be considered a mistake for bālīkāya, should follow Mahāraṭhino. According to Prof. Rapson (JRAS 1903, p. 238; and op. cit., xx) the Chitaldroog Mahāraṭhi coins make the restoration of the word as ‘(Kaḷa)lāya’ probable. Then the long record does not show the Mahāraṭhi’s relations with the royal family. Even so, the Mahāraṭhi of the long record is identical with Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro of the reliefs, which show him in the company of two kings, one queen and three princes, apparently in the order of precedence after one of them and before the other three. He could not have been a Brother of Sātakani I, for he is not called a Kumāra. He could not have been a minister only, for ministers have no place in the royal family. The laudatory epithets used by the Queen towards the Mahāraṭhi following closely those used towards her husband, could only represent an outburst of filia
The titles of Mahābhoja and Mahābhoji might have had a similar origin. But since they occur in the Kuḍā or Beḍsā inscriptions which yield no date or point of contact with any known dynasty, it is not easy to determine the period at which they came into existence. That they existed under the Cutus is certain. As the ornamental alphabet of the Mahābhoja inscriptions at Kuḍā is found also in the approximately datable inscriptions of Vasiṣṭhiputa Siri-Puḷumāvi or his time, and of the minister of the Queen of his successor Vasiṣṭhiputa Siri-Sātakani, it may be ascribed to the second century A.D. True, local influences may have played their own part. Two Mahābhoja inscriptions from Kuḍā do not exhibit the ornamental variety and are earlier than Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9. The primitive form of the dental da (open to the left), and the ornamental treatment of medial i and u signs, of the lower end of the verticals of ka and ra and the upper end of the verticals of ha and la and finally the rounded bottom of ma and la, stamp No. 19 as very early in the series. No. 17 with its somewhat angular ma and cursive da, which occurs in later inscriptions represents a transition to the ornamental alphabet. An interval of two generations between the alphabet of No. 19 and the ornamental alphabet may, therefore, be safely postulated. The office and title of Mahābhoja, then, came into existence not later than the 1st half of the first century A.D.

Nature of the titles: Mahābhoja

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa gives the meaning ‘great prince’ to Mahābhoja. Since no Mahābhoja inscription is dated in the fashion in which kings’ inscriptions are generally dated, it is certain that they were not independent rulers; and it is very difficult to separate the title from the feudatory titles Mahāraṇi and Mahāsāmanta. Like all feudatory titles, the title Mahābhoja is also a

23. Lüders, List, Nos. 1021 and 1186.
24. CTI, Nos. 1 and 9.
26. CTI, Nos. 17 and 19.
27. Petersburg Dict. (q. v).
28. A title originally applied to princes can become a feudatory title. The title Mahārāja, which in the Gupta inscriptions is associated with the feudatory titles, Mahāsāmanta, Mahāpratihāra, Mahāsenāpati and Mahādandanāyaka, is an instance to the point (CII, Vol. III, pp. 252, 289, 290, and 296, n.).
hereditary one and became fixed in a few families or clans. That the Mahābhhojas were feudatories of the Satavāhanas is proved by the fact that there could not have been a rival power in the western Deccan in the first century A.D. (Kuḍā where most of the Mahābhhoja inscriptions are found is only 150 miles from Kārlā which was certainly included in the Sātavāhana empire), which could have claimed their allegiance; they are moreover related to the Mahāraṭhis (feudatories of the Sātavāhanas) by family ties and were the feudatories of the Cūṭus who succeeded the Sātavāhanas in northern Mysore and parts of the western Deccan.

29. Kuḍā, Nos. 1 and 9, CTI.

30. Māṇḍava and Sādacakara (kera). What is read as Sādacakara (in Kuḍā No. 19) may well be read as Sādacakra. When we remember that in the same inscription as well as in Kuḍā No. 9, CTI, the ā and e signs are very short strokes (e.g. Vijayānikāya and lena) and that sometimes the sign for ā is the o sign—mālākārasa Kuḍa, No. 16 (CTI), we may treat what appears as a nail head over ka in Sādacakara as the sign for medial e. Considering the da in Sādacakara and Sādacagera (the mas. form of Sādacageri in Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9, CTI) and the use of ga for ka (the Sopāraka of Nos. 988 and 1095 is called Sopāraka in No. 995 Lüders, List, one may equate Sādacakra with Sādagera. A lady of the Sādagera family bears the name Vijayā. The daughter of Sādacakara Sudāmsana bears the name Vijayanikā, a variant of Vijayā. Do not these names also suggest the idea that they belonged to the same family circle? Pandit Bhagavanlal Indraji remarks (CTI p. 15): "Vijayanikā is apparently the same as the Vijayā of Nos. 1 and 9: the epithets Mahābhoya and Sādacakra applied to her father here (No. 19) corresponding with the feminine forms Mahābhōjī and Sādagēri applied to Vijayā". But it has been pointed out already that Kuḍā No. 19 is separated from Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9 by at least two generations.

According to the same scholar, Māṇḍava may designate either the gotra name Māṇḍavaya or the title Māṇḍapa 'lord of a town called Māṇḍapā.' Says he:—"This latter seems to be the preferable explanation as Māṇḍapa in the name for towns all over India, and three small villages called Māḍād or Māṇḍādh i.e., probably Mandapagādh lie close to Kuḍā". (p. 4). But the use of the dental d in Madavānam and Māṇḍava renders either explanation problematical. Moreover 'Māṇḍavasāmisā' and not 'Māṇḍavasa' can mean 'lord of the town of Māṇḍava'. If Māṇḍava should designate the country, the cognate inscription would lead us to expect Māṇḍavakasa. In only one inscription have we Kaliṅkasa for Kaliṅnakasa (Lüders, List No. 1179), but it is easily understood as a scribal error. The occurrence of 'Madavana' (Māṇḍavānām) in Kuḍā No. 14 CTI, coupled with the fact that in several instances (Junnar Nos. 5 and 6, the Jaṅgali Gūṇḍu inscription of Pujumāvi and the Pallava and Kadaṁba inscriptions) the proper name of a person is preceded by the name of the title or family to which he belongs in the genitive plural, makes it certain that 'Māṇḍava' is a family name.

31. Lüders, List, Nos. 1021 and 1186.
It has been generally supposed, that the title Mahābhoja is exactly co-ordinate with that of Mahāraṭhi. But the Mahābhojas seem to have enjoyed more independence than the Mahāraṭhis, for unlike the Kārlā Mahāraṭhi inscription, no Mahābhoja inscription is dated in the regnal years of a Sātavāhana king; a Kuṣa inscription comes very near to being dated in the years of a Mahābhoja (Mahābhoja Maṃdave Kōchipute Velīdate). Whereas Senart has said that title Mahāraṭhi cannot imply a title of nobility superior to that of Mahābhoja, we can on the strength of the evidence cited here go further and say that the title Mahābhoja was superior to that of Mahāraṭhi.

Mahābhoji

Like the title Mahāraṭhi, Mahābhoja became a title applied even to women. The title Mahābhoji is borne only by the wives of Mahābhojas and not by the daughters also as Bhagwanlal thought. In Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9 (CTI) Mahābhoji Sāḍagerī Vijayā is mentioned along with her son Mahābhoja Khandapālita to the exclusion of her husband's name; this may go to show that, like some of the Sātavāhana queens, the Mahābhojis sometimes shared political power with their sons. There is so far no evidence to show that a Mahāraṭhini ever enjoyed such a position or influence.

Mahāraṭhis

What stamp the Mahāraṭhis as feudatories are the fact that they were hereditary governors of provinces, and the rank and

32. CTI, No. 23.
33. Senart says (EI, Vol. VII, p. 50, n. 4):—“in this instance (Beḍsā No. 2 CTI) Maṇḍavī precedes Mahāraṭhini. Seeing that Mahābhōja always precedes either attribute when connected with it, this position does not seem to indicate that Mahāraṭhi could imply a title of superior nobility, and consequently still less that it could designate a very high dignity.” But it is a correct view based on wrong premises. Not much can be based upon Mahābhoja preceding Mahāraṭhi as it is Mahābhoja-Bālikā that precedes Mahāraṭhini, and in a Banavasi inscription, (Lüders, List No. 1186) Mahābhuvia (Mahābhoji) precedes Mahārāja. As for Maṇḍava the donor in Beḍsā No. 2 (daughter of a Mahābhoja and a Mahāraṭhini) might have combined the Mahābhoja practice of mentioning the family name after the feudatory title with the Mahāraṭhi practice of mentioning it before the feudatory title (Kārlā No. 14, EI, Vol. VII).
34. The daughters of Mahābhojas are, however, referred to as Mahābhoja-bālikā. Mahābhuvī in a Banavāsi inscription is either a mistake or a variant of Mahābhoji.
35. “... whatever the derivation of the term may have been,” says Prof. Rapson (JRAS, 1903, p. 300) “such an expression as Okhaṭakīyānaḥ Mahāraṭhi (Kārlā No. 14) shows conclusively that it denoted the governor over
power enjoyed by them, a rank and power far superior to those of ordinary governors or amacas in charge of districts. Whilst amacas make grants of lands and villages to religious bodies under the explicit commands of the sovereign (the detailed instructions issued to them by kings would seem to have left no room for their discretion), the Mahāraṭhi, like a feudal vassal, grants villages with the fiscal immunities attached to them, in his own name. That they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas is shown, as was pointed out by Bühler, by Kārlā No. 14, which is dated in the regnal years of Vāsiṭhupūta Sīri-Pulumāvi. It is not, however, known whether they had the right of waging war with one another. But their semi-independence is shown by the absence of any reference to their suzerains in their inscriptions (except Kārlā No. 14). The Chitaldooorg Mahāraṭhi coins make it very probable, that during

a part of the kingdom.” Senart has shown (EI, Vol. VII, p. 50) reasons for abandoning this construction and making Okhaḷākiyānain depend upon Somadevena; it would then denote not the people over which the Mahāraṭhi ruled, but the tribe or family to which he belonged.

Senart further says:—“the occurrence of the feminine Mahāraṭhini in Beḍā No. 2 also indicates rather that the term does not imply the actual office of governor of a district or province, but an honorific or nobiliary title.” But in a Nāsik inscription of Sīri-Ḍaṇḍa Sātakaṇi’s reign (No. 24, EI, Vol. VIII) the wife of a Mahāsenāpati is known by her husband’s title. From the Jāṅgli Gūṇḍu inscription of Pulumāvi Ill’s reign, we learn that a Mahāsenāpati ruled over an āhāra much in the same way as an amaca. Modern instances of finding appellations for women in the official titles of their husbands are afforded by Viceroy, Pūtlin and Gandāsāmi. That Mahāraṭhis governed is shown by Kārlā No. 14, where a Mahāraṭhi grants on his account a village with its taxes and by the Chitaldooorg coins bearing the legends Sadakana Kalāḷāya Mahāraṭhisa. If Mahāraṭhi is not an official title, we are led to the paradoxical conclusion that the feudatories are known in their coins and official grants by their nobiliary titles, whilst their official titles (given for even minor officers, Nāsik Nos. 4 and 5) are the only ones we miss here. Etymologically too, the term, which Senart himself admits presupposes a Sanskrit form Māhārāṣṭrin implies an office (vide supra).

36. Kārlā No. 14. We owe to Senart a proper explanation of the terms sakarukaro and sadeyameyo which Bühler and Bagwanlal translate as ‘this gift is in order to keep the Valūraka caves in repair’. Senart splits sakarukaro into ‘kara’ and ‘ukara,’ the exact equivalent of which appears at the head of customary formulas which begin generally with sōḍṛāṅga sōparikara. According to him while kara is known in the sense of dues payable to government, the meaning of uparikara is as unsettled as that of sōḍṛāṅga. But upari means ‘above’ and uparikara may be taken to mean taxes over and above the ordinary ones. The adjective Sadeyameyo is etymologically translated as ‘what is taken (in money) and what has to be measured (meyya = to be measured, ādeya = to be taken).”

H.A.—11
the second century A.D. the Mahāraṭhis were contributing their share to the dismemberment of the Sātavāhana empire.37

Like many feudatory titles, that of Mahāraṭhi had purely a local significance. The Mahāraṭhi and Mahāraṭhini inscriptions are found in northern Mysore and the Thāṇa and Kolābā districts of the Bombay presidency. The expressions Okhala kiyānam Mahāraṭhi, Sadakana Kalalāya Mahāraṭhi, and Aṅgiya kulavadhana Mahāraṭhi suggest the idea that the title was restricted to a few families or tribes.38 Senart says:—"It may be noted that to..........Mahāraṭhi Agimitraṇaka corresponds a Mahāraṭhi Mitdeva in No. 14; that this Mitdeva is a Kausikīputra, like Vishṇudatta at Bhājadi (No. 2); and lastly that the Mahāraṭhini Samaṇīkā at Bēḍā (No. 2) was married to an Āpadevaṇaka. Do not these different names look as if they were connected with each other in such a way as to suggest the idea that they may have belonged to the same circle of families or relations?" Much cannot be built on similarity in names, especially when they are very common. Names like Mitabhuti and Mitadeva occur very often in the western cave inscriptions. Surely the bhayata Mitabhuti of the Kaṇhēri inscription (Lüders, List, No. 1012) has nothing to do with the Mitdeva of No. 1187 and both have nothing to do with the Mitadevaṇaka of No. 1097.

The Nāneghāṭ and Kaṇhēri inscriptions show that the Mahāraṭhis had marriage relations with the ruling family much in the same way as the Mahātalavaras of the Ikṣvāku period. Professor Rapson remarks:39 "That they were.....closely connected with the Andhra kings by family or by caste seems to be shown, as Paṇḍit Bhagwanlāl observed, by the use of metronymics which they have in common with them." But metronymics are not peculiar to a caste or family. They are borne by Brahmans,40 artisans,41 and even Buddhists, monks and laymen.42 Unlike the Sātavāhanas, Mahāraṭhis sometimes bear metronymics not derived from Vedic gotra names, and give their father’s name also.

It must however be noted that unlike the inscriptions of feudatories of later times, the Mahāraṭhi and Mahābhōja inscriptions are

37. El, Vol. VIII, Pl. III.
38. Kārla, No. 14; Chitaldroog Mahāraṭhi coins; Nāneghāṭ inscription of queen Nāyanīkā.
39. JRAS, 1903, p. 299.
40. Lüders List, Nos. 1195 and 1196.
41. Ibid., No. 346.
42. Ibid., Nos. 657; 661; 662; 663; 664; 665; 667; and 1271.
as short as the votive inscriptions of ordinary persons. We miss in
them the laudatory epithets applied to feudatories of a later time.

Mahāsenāpatis

Another dignitary in the empire was the Mahāsenāpati, next in
rank above the Senāpati. The first known epigraphic record to
mention a Mahāsenāpati is the Nāsik inscription of the 22nd year
of Vāsīṭhīputa sāmi Sirī-Pulumāvi. In the records of his succe-
sors the title is mentioned twice and in Ikṣvāku records often. It
may, therefore, be presumed, that the title is not as old
as that of Mahārāṭhī. Its origin is perhaps to be sought
in the rapid expansion of the empire from sea to sea in the second
century A.D.

The Mahāsenāpatis of the Sātavāhana period have non-mili-
tary duties; but this confusion of functions though it may seem
curious to moderns was a common feature in Indian polity. In
Nāsik No. 3, the drafting of the royal order is attributed to a Mahā-
senāpati. (Mahāsenāpatinā Medhunena Nokhādāsātara (ne) na
chatho). While editing the inscriptions Senart remarks:\—"As
to the Mahāsēnāpati, the proper name alone seems obliterated or
doubtful; but the lacuna may have contained something else than
his name. Other inscriptions do not attribute to the Sēnāpati the
menial work of drafting, but perpetuate his name as that of a high
officer entrusted with this charge at the end of the grant; see e.g.
Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscr. Nos. 55 and 56. In a still higher
degree the title of Mahāsēnāpati, which comes very near to that
of Mahārāja.......seems to place the person who is honoured with
it above any such mean task. This is why I suspect that the obli-
terated letters, if exactly known, would let his part appear in a dif-
ferent light.” No doubt in cognate inscriptions (Nāsik Nos. 4 and
5) the drafting of the royal order is attributed to minor officials.
But here the third case ending in Mahāsenāpatinā precludes any
chance of his lekhaka's name having been on the stone. A close
examination of the stone renders ‘Nokhādāsātara (ne) na’ probable;
and in western inscriptions ‘dāsa’ often enters into the composition
of names. The Hira-Hadagalli plates mention a Rahasādhikata,

43. The office of Senāpati (Commander of forces) would seem to have
been coeval with the beginnings of Indian polity itself. We hear of it in
the Vedas (Vedic Index Senāni) the Jātakas, the Arthaśāstra, and
the Purāṇas; and an inscription from Ayodhya (EI, Vol. XX, p. 57) shows
that Pusyamitra was a Senāpati under the last of the Mauryas.
44. EI, Vol. VIII, p. 70,
the Khoh copper plate of Mahārāja Hastina Mahāśāndhivigrahika and most of the Valabhi grants of the sixth century A.D. a Sāṃdhivigrahika, as writers of charters. The title Sāṃdhivigrahika is sometimes used in connection with that of Mahādaṇḍanaṇyaka which is associated with the great feudatory titles of Mahāsaṃpāti, Mahārāja, Mahāpratihāra and Mahāsāmanta. Mahāsāṃdhivigrahika would seem to be an officer equal in rank, if not superior to Mahāsaṃpāti. In the case of such high officials the mean task of drafting would have been done by clerks under them. What would be a conjecture is raised to a certainty by the expression sayam chato in the Koṇḍamudi plates. The task of reducing royal writs to writing was a responsible one; the dangers attendant upon a careless drafting and the large number of orders to be drafted might have necessitated a lekha department under a responsible officer.

The Mahāsaṃpāti of the Jangli Gundu inscription of the time of the last king of the Sātavāhana line, is, like the amaca, in charge of only an āhāra. As late as the reign of Cāḍa Sātakanṭha, the eastern provinces, divided into āhāras, would seem to have been under amacases. It is, therefore, probable that in the days of the Saka attacks and the dismemberment of the empire, the outlying or vulnerable parts were put under Mahāsaṃpātis who would naturally have seized the opportunity to gain feudatory rank and power. Jangli Gundu is midway between the

46. IA, Vols. IV, etc.
47. CII, Vol. III.
48. Vide infra.
49. The Arthaśāstra says that only persons possessed of ministerial qualifications, acquainted with one kind of customs, smart in composition, good in legible writing and sharp in reading should be appointed as rājālipikaras (chap. IX; Bk. I).

Sometimes Dātakas carried the orders to local officers whose duty it was then to have the charters drawn up and delivered (Nāsik No. 5, op. cit., CII, Vol. III, p. 100, n.)

51. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar holds that Mahāsaṃpāti of Nāsik No. 21, is a feudatory on the ground that the Āṅguttara Nikāya mentions Senāpati along with kings, hereditary Raṭṭhikas and heads of villages. But the office of Mahāsaṃpāti was a generic one, and the three Mahāsaṃpātis of the Sātavāhana inscriptions appear in three different capacities. So an inference based on such argument cannot be conclusive.

V. S. Sukthankar remarks (EI, Vol. XIV, p. 155); "The relation in which the mahāsaṃpāti and the gumika stand to the janapada and the gāma
Myakadoni and Chinnakaḍaburu, villages in the Bellary District which along with parts of northern Mysore and Kanara would have represented the southern limits of the Sātavāhana empire in the second century A.D. It is also probable that Sātavāhanihāra was exposed to Cutu and Mahāraṭhi attacks. That, under the Iksvakus, the title had become a feudatory one is certain.

These feudatory titles seem to have not only survived the Sātavāhana rule in the Deccan but spread as far south as Mysore. We hear of a Mahāraṭhi in the Chitaldoorg District, who struck coins in his name and of a Mahāraṭhiṇī in Kanheri and Banavāsi inscriptions of the line of Hāritīputa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakaṇī. The same inscriptions show the Cūṭus intimately connected with the Mahābhojas and Mahāraṭhis. It may be that the Cūṭus (who succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the south and in parts of the western dominions), themselves started as Mahāraṭhis or Mahābhojas. But unlike the title of Mahāsenāpati, these titles do not seem to have spread to the Andhra dominions of the Sātavāhanas; much less did they become Mahāsāmanta.

......is not explicitly mentioned. But, considering the position of these persons, one might hazard the guess that these......were feudal lords of the lands, holding them in the form of jāgirs." For reasons given below, what is read as Gumika is to be read as Gāmika; and this considerably weakens the force of his arguments.

D. C. Sircar (Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan, p. 15) says that under the Sātavāhanas, the Mahāsenāpati were feudatory chieftains in charge of rāstras. We do not know upon what evidence this statement rests.

52. It is tempting to connect the Bhojaka and Mahābhoja of our inscriptions with the bhogika and the Mahābhojika of the later records. In the Gupta inscriptions the son of a Bhogika is in charge of the drafting of the order or charter. (Fleet GL, pp. 100, 105, 109, 120, etc.). In the inscriptions of the Gūrjara Buddhārāja (Kalacūri Śāivat 361 EI, Vol. VI, p. 296), Dadda II, Prasāntarāga (Kalacūri Śāivat 380 and 385 respectively, IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 82-88) and Jayabhāṣṭa III (IA, Vol. V; p. 110); the Bhogikas are mentioned after Rājas, Sāmantas and before Viṣayapati and Rāstrādikārikas. What is interesting, both Bhogika and Bhoja literally mean ‘one who enjoys’. Both refer to rulers of districts also. (Bhogika may also be connected to Bhogapati, i.e., a governor or officer in charge of revenue). According to the lexicographer Hematicandra, both Bhogika and Bhoja mean ‘village headman.’ But the fact that the Mahābhojas are not referred to in any inscription after the second century A.D., the long interval that separates the Mahābhojikas from the Mahābhojas and the technical nature of the titles, make any connection between them problematical.
Officials and administrative divisions

Barring the districts enjoyed by the feudatories, the empire was divided into āhāras (including the Andhra province), e.g. Sopārahāra, Govadhanahāra, Māmālāhāra and Sātavahani-hāra. An āhāra would represent the same territorial division as the rāṣṭra of Pallava records, the viṣaya of the records of kings of the Śālankāyana gotra, and the modern district. Can we draw from the compound arathasamvināyikam, which is translated by Senart as ‘exempt from the magistrate of the district or of the Rāṣṭrin,’ the inference that some divisions of the Sātavāhana empire were called rāṣṭras? Such technical expressions are often, conventional and in not one of the inscriptions of the Sātavāhana period is a territorial division called rāṣṭra. Āhāras were under governors called amacas (Sanskrit, ṛṣṭrya) who were non-hereditary officers. Quinquennial transfer was in force. Each āhāra presumably received its name from the headquarters of the governor (nagara); Kūḍūra (the Koddura of Ptolemy) is known to us from an Amarāvatī inscription of the second century A.D. and yet we hear of Kūḍūrahāra only in a copper-plate grant of the third century A.D.

In a Kanheri inscription, which, on palaeographical grounds, can be ascribed to the time of Siri-Yaṅa Sātakani, we have the expressions Patithāne and Rājatalāka-Paithānapathe. Could we translate the latter as “the village of Rājataḍāka (King’s Tank) in the Paithāna division”? If Rajatalāka is a mistake for ‘Rajatalāke’ it would mean “in Rājataḍāka in the Paithāna division.” The analogous expression Aṁḍhāpata (Andhrapatha) in the Mayidavolu plates, which is synonymous with Andhrarattha, makes it

53. Kanheri No. 5, Vol. IV.
54. Nāsik No. 3, El, Vol. VIII.
55. Kārāla No. 19, El, Vol. VII.
57. Vide supra.
58. Nāsik Nos. 3, 4, and 5, El; Vol. VIII. Also VII; p. 68.
59. The amaca of the Koḍavolu inscription of Caḍa Sāti and the ṛāja-maca of Kuḍā No. 18 (CTI), might have been governors of āhāras. Sometimes, however, treasurers and officers in charge of the drafting of charters bear the same title (Nāsik Nos. 4 and 19).
60. Lüders, List, No. 1295.
62. No. 5 ASWI, Vol. V; Compare No. 4.
63. Lüders leaves the expression untranslated.
highly probable that ‘patha’ literally ‘path or road’ is synonymous with āhāra (district);\(^{64}\) may be the district of Paṭhāna which contained the seat of the king and was perhaps under the direct control of the king, was distinguished from the other divisions in this way.\(^{65}\)

The next division below that of āhāra is gāma (grāma). From the Saptaśatakāṁ of Hāla we learn that the officer in charge of a village was called Gāmika (Grāmika). In the Jángli Guṇḍu inscription of Puṣumāvi we come across a Gāmika.\(^{66}\)

The other functionaries known to us are the Mahatarakas, Mahā-āryakas,\(^{67}\) Bhāṇḍāgārikas,\(^{68}\) Herānikas,\(^{69}\) Mahāmātas

\(^{64}\) It has been shown that the Pallava raṭha is synonymous with āhāra.

\(^{65}\) In the Alina copper plates of Śilāditya VII (year 447) we have the expression Śri Kheṭakhārē Uppalāheṭa pathakē Mahila(?lā)balī n(ā)ma-grāmāh. Pathaka which Dr. T'leet (CII, Vol. III, p. 173, n.) connects with pathin or patha represents here a territorial division between āhāra and grāma.

\(^{66}\) V. S. Sukthankar would read it as ‘Gumikasa’ (Gaulmikasya =of the Captam) which, according to him, would agree with the Mahasenad-patias of the preceding line. True in the Hira-Haḍagaḷḷi plates, coming from the same district, Gumikas are mentioned. But since, the officer over a gāma (grāma) is mentioned and as the u sign is not visible on the plates, it is safer to read it as ‘(G)āmika’.

\(^{67, 68, 69}\) Mahataraka means the Great Chamberlain. Hemacandra in the Deśikosa (i. 16), gives ara in the sense of an official, e.g., the lord of a village. Etymology would therefore seem to be unsafe guide in the interpretation of official terms. As regards the Mahā-āryaka mentioned in Nāsik No. 3, Senart says (EI, Vol. VIII; p. 68: “....the part the monks are playing in the first sentence seems to point to the name being that of a religious personage. Even admitting that the title araka given to Yaṇasirī-Sātakani (Śiri-Yaṇa Sātakani) by an inscription (Ep. Ind. Vol. I, p. 96) be really= āryaka, that would in no way prevent this epithet, which is commonly used with reference to Buddhist monks, being applied to some religious functionary. I am the more inclined to think so, because I find the similar title Chula-ārya conferred on the Ārya Buddhakṛshita ; who is styled Arhat (Burgess’ Buddhist Stūpas of Amaravati, Plate lix. No. 39, p. 104).” He also compares this title to that of Mahāsāmiya in Nāsik No. 4. But Mahā-ārya is used in the singular, while the title of Mahāsāmiya is used in the plural. The latter is perhaps an instance of pluralis majestatis, in which case it would not point to a college of religious functionaries. Mahat-araka (Sansk. Mahat-āryaka), an official title, is mentioned in the Chinna Ganjam inscription of Śiri-Yaṇa Sātakanī, and the way in which our Mahā-āryaka is connected with the village of Samalipada (‘This village of Šamalipada.... by the Mahā-āryaka, you (amaca), must deliver to be owned by the Bhikṣus, of the school of the Bhadāyaniyas), seems to point to a secular official, one in charge of a
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(Mahāmātras) in charge of Buddhist monks,70 the Nibandhakāras or officers in charge of the registration of documents (the Aksapatalikas of later times),71 the Pratihāras, the Dūtakas who carried royal orders, and the Amacas in charge of drafting royal orders. From a Nāsik inscription of Uśavadāta we learn that every town had a records office.72

APPENDIX A

The Allūru Inscription

One of the notable discoveries of the Epigraphy Department in the year 1924 was that of a Brāhmi inscription on a fragment of a marble pillar at Allūru, a village in the Nandigama taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district. The pillar under reference must originally have belonged to the Buddhist Stūpa which stands at about two furlongs to the west of the village. The Epigraphy Report for the year ending with March 31, 1924 contains a photograph of a facsimile of the inscription and a short note on it. It was subsequently edited by Dr. R. Shamaśastry in the Calcutta Review for the year 1925. His reading misses the truth in many a place.

gāma perhaps. Lastly in the Amarāvatī evidence cited by Senart, Cula-Ārya is a name and not a title conferred on Ārya-Buddharakṣita. (68) Nāsik No. 19, El. Vol. VIII. Bhāṇḍagārika which may mean both store-keeper and treasurer is better construed here as store-keeper as in cognate records. Heranīka, is the term for treasurer. (69) The various forms are Heranīka, Heranaka, Heranika, Hiranakāra; this term which occurs in the inscriptions at Kanheri, Nāsik, Amarāvati, and Bhaṭṭiprōlu is better construed as treasurer, as in them suvaṇakāra is the term for goldsmith (Lüders, List, Nos. 986 and 1117). If the treasurer Dhaṅmana of No. 993, is identical with Dhaṅmanaka, son of the treasurer Rohanimita of Nos. 996 and 1033, the office would seem to have been, at least to some extent, hereditary. At times we come across a treasurer who was the son of a merchant or a gahapati (Lüders, List, Nos. 1239 and 1249).

70. Senart (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 93) however considers the translation of Nāsikakena, samaṇena Mahāmātena as 'by the officer in charge of the monks of Nāsik,' as hypothetical.

71. Senart (ibid., p. 74) takes them to be Dūtakas carrying the orders for registration. Senart himself has happily explained the meaning of nibandh by a reference to Yajñavalkya I, 317. Says he: "nibandh was perhaps a kind of the royal decision in the archives of the state." In such a case the meaning given to Nibandhakāra here is more apt than the one proposed by Senart.

72. 'Nigamasabhyāya nibadha ca phalakavāre', ibid., No. 12.
My reading of the inscription is as follows: The beginning line or lines of the inscription are lost.

1. (ai) lasa Maṭa (vi) sa ca............
2. sa rámo vihāro deyadhama parica....
3. nigala-simāya Vetarakuḍo Na (ga)...
4. ti Khetasārāsa Pāpikala simāya...
5. nivatanāni rāja datini. Caraṭhe Macha..
6. (pa) da-simāya batisa nivatanāni Rā..
7. (c) erapura-simāya ca (tu) visa-nivatanāni..
8. ḍalasa gāvina pacasatāni (co) yathī balīva (da)
9. sakadani pesa-rūpāni dāsi-dāsas catā 1 (isa)..
10. kubhi kaḍāhases catari lohiyo be kaḍ (ā) hāni (kasa)...
11. (sa) bhāyanaṁ catāri vadāḷabhikaro karodīyo (yo)
12. (na) ka-dīvikāyo ca Ataragiriya pica-pake talāka (ni)
13. kāhāpanāna ca purāṇaṁ sahasam akhayani v(i)
14. esā mahātalavarasa deya-dhama paricako
15. ata Pedatarapase bāpana-nivatanāni
16. eta sabhāriyasa saputakasa sanatukasa
17. Ayirāna Puvaselīyāna nigāyasā ....

The rest of the inscription is lost. It mentions the gifts made by many, including a king, who perhaps out of modesty omits his name, a unique feature in our records. The first two lines speak of an Aila (Aīra, or Ārya) Maṭavi. Then comes the gift of something within the limits of Vetarakuḍa. Next is mentioned the gift of a beautiful vihāra, perhaps by the side of the Stūpa, of some nivatanas of land within the limits of Pāpikala (for the identification of Pāpikala, see the chapter on the Iksvākus). Then come the gifts of 32 nivatanas of land within the limits of Maça-pada in the raṭha of Ca, and 24 nivatanas of land within the limits of the town of Rā- cerpura, 500 cows, 64 bullock carts, 40 servants some cauldrons, especially two brass cauldrons, 4 bronze vessels, some hand lamps of the vādala fish shape, some Yonaka lamps, a tank in the vicinity of Ataragiri, and one thousand purāṇa kāhā-panas as a permanent endowment; 52 nivatanas of land were the gifts of a Mahātalavara along with his wife, son and grandson. All these gifts were for the (acceptance of) the school of the Pubbaseliyas....

The use of a peculiar form of āi which comes close to the Vaṭ-ṭeluttu āi is noteworthy. I am indebted for this reading to Mr. K. N. Diksit. It is clear that in this record the Mahātalavara is playing a more important role than even the king.

H.A.—12
As D. C. Sircar has also pointed out what was read by Dr. Shama Sastry jayadhama is only deyadharma (l. 2). What has been read as caradhama is undoubtedly Carathe Mat̲̃-pada (l. 5). What is read as Sanasa kata (made by Sana) King of the Ayis (Ayirāṇam is interpreted as King of the Ayis), is only sanatu kasa (with his grandson) (l. 16) and Ayirāṇam refers to the school of Pubbaseliyas mentioned in the same inscription.
CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

I. SOCIAL CONDITIONS

The Bhattiprolu, Amaravati and western cave inscriptions give us an insight into the social organisation of the Deccan from the second century B.C. to third century A.D., and from the Amaravati sculptures we get a vivid picture of life in the Andhradeśa. The fourfold division of society—the caste system—prevailed. We hear of Uşavadāta's charities and gifts to numerous Brahmans. Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakañi boasts of having prevented the contamination of the four castes and of having been the true supporter of Brahmans. Yet one of his descendants took his wife from the Śaka satrapal family and the Śakas were looked upon as degraded Kṣatriyas. It is doubtful whether Buddhism toned down the caste system even to the extent to which these foreign elements in society did. At Kuḍā an upāsaka Ayitilu calls himself Baṁmhana. His wife is called Baṁmanī. Mahādevaṇaṇa of a Kālā inscription who would seem to be Ayitilu's son bears the title of gahata (Sans. gṛhasta). In the sarman ending in the names of Buddhists, monks and laymen, we have probably one of the Brahmanical vestiges in the Buddhist communities. Kṣatriyas would sometimes seem to have followed the profession of the Vaiśya caste. In a Kanherī inscription Gajasena and Gajami (ta), the Khātiya brothers, follow the profession of vāṇijakas. Unfortunately the lacunae before khātiyasā, makes the meaning of the word not quite certain. The sub-castes met with in inscriptions are those of the hālaka or hālika (ploughman), mūrdhaka (according to the Śabdaratna

2. ASWI, Vol. IV, Junnar No. 19, p. 96; Lüders, List, Nos. 1101 and 1102. However sarman ending in names does not always indicate Brahmanical origin. In an Amaravati inscription a vāṇiya (belonging to the Vaiśya caste probably) bears the name Bodhisārman (TSW 1873, p. 261, No. 8). See also Fleet CII, Vol. III, p. 11, n.
4. Lüders is in doubt as to whether hālika in No. 1084, is only a personal name, or a variation of hālaka. An Amaravati inscription (EI, Vol. XV; Some Unpublished Amaravati Inscriptions, No. 56), makes it certain that hālika is not a personal name. Wherefore it must be identical with hālaka.
Foreign Elements in Hindu and Buddhist Society

(i) Yavanas.—Yona or Yavana is an Indian form of the word Ionian. In literature Yavana refers to all kinds of foreigners or Mlecchas. At the present day the term Yona is applied by the Sinhalese to the ‘Moormen’ or Arabs some of whose families have been settled in Ceylon for centuries. It is however more than probable that Yavana of our inscriptions denotes the Greeks. For, the Yonas of Asoka’s inscriptions placed with the Kāmboja’s and the Gāndhāras in the north-west are certainly the Greek element that Alexander’s invasion and Seleucus’ empire left in the north-western India; as our inscriptions mention Śakas and Yavanas, a confusion between Śakas and Yavanas is ruled out; as the term Yavana occurs in the inscriptions of the foreigners also, it is improbable that they did not clearly state their racial affinities.

We do not know how and when these Yavanas entered western Deccan. According to the Mahāvaṁsa, some 250 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha, the Yona priest Dhammarakshita was sent to Aparānta as a missionary, while the priest Mahārakshita was sent to the Yona country. This shows that there was already in western Deccan a large element of foreign—Yavana—population. Yavana Tuṣāspha was governor of Surāśṭra under Asoka. According to Strabo, Menander, the Greek prince, penetrated into ‘Isamus’ (Jumna) and subjugated Patalene (the Indus delta) and Saraostes (Surāśṭra). This statement is corroborated by the curious observation of the author of the Periplus that the coins of Apollodotus and Menander were current in his time at Barygaza. Of a crowd of Yavanas in western India thoroughly Indianised we hear in the inscriptions at Kārla. A Sāncī inscription mentions a Yavana.

5. ASWI, Vol. IV, Junnar No. 2 pp. 92 ff.
7. Mahāvaṁsa, Geiger p. 82 and Intro. xxxi; Ivii.
8. Schoff, The Periplus, pp. 41; 42, and Sec. 47.
9 & 10. Sten Konow is of opinion, that the ‘Yavana’ of the Kārla inscriptions wherever it is followed by a name in the genitive plural, is a personal name. Lüders looks upon Yona in No. 547 also as a personal name. There are weighty considerations to be brought forward against this view. Firstly it is improbable that many persons bore the same name Yavana. The ethnicon Yavana denoted to the Indian a foreigner whom he looked upon as a de-
As these inscriptions are incised on the Cetiya cave pillars, they are as old as the cave itself. The palaeography of the oldest Kârlâ inscriptions would support a first century B.C. date for the Cetiya cave. It is possible then, that the Yavanas entered the graded Kṣatriya; it is therefore improbable that Indians bore ‘Yavana’ as a personal name. Much less could a Yavana have done so.

While Sten Konow looks upon the names in the plural found along with the word ‘Yavana’ as a family or corporation name, Senart looks upon them as personal names in the genitive plural. Senart looks upon the genitive plural in Śīnaḥdaḥhayānaṇa in Kârlâ No. 7 (EI, Vol. VII), as a personal name in the plural (pluralis majestatis), and following him M. Swarup Vats has treated the other names in the genitive plural in the other Yavana inscriptions as personal names. In all the Kârlâ epigraphs and in the Yavana epigraphs at Junnar (CTI Nos. 5 and 33), the personal name is in the singular while the family name is in the plural—‘Okhalakiyāno Mahāraṭhīsa Kosīkupūṣas Mitadevāṣa’ (Kârlâ No. 14 EI, Vol. VII), ‘Yavanasa Irilasa Gataṇain’ and ‘Yavanasa Cītasa Gataṇain’ (Junnar, Nos. 5 and 8; ASWI; Vol. IV, pp. 93 and 94). It is therefore, not proper to consider Cāṇadānāṇi (Junnar) Culyakhāṇaṇi, Dhamadhayānaṇi, Vitasamghatāṇaṇi, Śīnaḥdaḥhayānaṇi and Yasavatdhānaṇaṇi (Kârlâ) as personal names. The Junnar inscription under reference is assigned by Dr. Burgess to the first century B.C. on palaeographical grounds, and it is the period of the Kârlâ Cetiya cave. In the Sāṅcī Yavana inscription we miss the personal name—‘Setapathiyasa Yonasa dānain.’ In Lüders, Nos. 82 and 1035 the personal names of the donors are omitted though their gotras are mentioned. While editing the Sāṅcī inscriptions, Dr. Bühler remarks (EI, Vol. II, p. 94): ‘Peculiar and noteworthy are the names of monks and nuns, which like Kāboja, Prātiṭhāna, Chirāṭi, and perhaps also Oḍi, consist of adjectives derived from the names of countries, towns and races. In these cases it would seem that the real name of the donors has been left out.’

Senart translates the compound ‘Dhāṁma-Yavanasa’ in Kârlâ No. 10 in the same way as Bühler did viz., ‘of Dhamma, a Yavana.’ He adds: ‘..... the simple name of Dhamma applied to a Buddhist surprises me......I feel tempted to take Dhamma......in a specifically Buddhist sense, and to understand by dhammaṇigama ‘a member of the guild of Buddhist merchants’; compare niṇamasabha at Nāsik (No. 12, 1. 4). On this analogy Dhamma-

Yavana would be ‘the community of the Buddhist Yavanas’ or rather a Bud-

dhist Yavana who has modestly omitted his personal name” (EI, Vol. VII, p. 56). Lüders considers Dhamma-Yavana as the name. But in a Nāgārjunikonḍa inscription Dhamma occurs as a personal name (EI, Vol. XX, Ins. J). Dhammila, a name of very common occurrence, is only Dhamma with the la suffix. Names Cetiya and Sāgha are of the Dhamma class. Nor is the compound a source of difficulty. In the Nāsik inscription of the time of Abhirā-Iśvarasena we have the compound Śudatt-

Abhirapatrasya; the analogy is not, however, very close, since a compound is necessary in the latter case and since the one inscription is in Prākṛt and the other in Sanskrit. In an Amarāvati inscription (EI, Vol. XV, No. 11) we have Sa[m]ghalasamanaṇa; Sa[m]ghala cannot be anything else than a
Sātavāhana dominions in the wake of Śaka conquest. The Yavanas who are credited with donations at Kārlā are: one of the Simhadhaya family, one of the Yasavadhana family, one of the Dhamadhaya family, and one by name Dhama.

As all the Kārlā Yavanas except one, profess to be natives of Dhenukākāta, this place would seem to have contained a Yavana settlement. As most of the donors in the Kārlā inscriptions, come from Dhenukākāta, and as the place name occurs frequently in Kārlā epigraphs and once in an inscription at Śailārwāḍi, a place very near Kārlā, it has to be sought for in the vicinity of Kārlā. It would therefore seem to have been included in Māmālāhāra.

A point that deserves mention is that these Yavanas besides embracing Buddhism adopted thoroughly Hindu personal and family names. They use Prākṛt in their inscriptions and it is not unreasonable to infer that they adopted Hindu manners and customs. This is no wonder since even a casual visitor to Ujjain from the kingdom of Antalkidas became a Bhāgavata. So completely did the Yavanas merge into Hindu society that Indian Buddhists had no scruples whatsoever in joining with these foreigners in making donations. The Kārlā Cetiya cave was a result of such a joint effort.

(ii) Sakas.—Like the Yavanas, the Śakas too merged into Hindu society. The Śaka son-in-law of Nahapāna bears the Indian name Uṣavadāta (Sans. Rṣabhadatta), while his father bears the un-Indian name Dinika. Another Śaka bears the name Agnivar-
man, and his daughter that of Viṣṇudattā. A fourth bears the name Vudhika (Sans. Vṛddhika). If Nahapāna was a Pahlava, even Pahlavas would seem to have followed the example of Yavanas and Śakas, for Nahapāna’s daughter bears the Indian name Daksamitrā.

Unlike our Yavanas all of whom are Buddhists, Śakas embraced both Brahmanism and Buddhism. Kuśa inscriptions mention a Brahman upāsaka named Ayitilu, and according to Senart, it is a foreign name corrupted and curiously reminding us of Azilizes. Śaka Uṣavādāṭa’s charities to Brahmans and Brahman institutions stamp him as a staunch adherent of the Brahmanical religion. We are told that he gave money and tīrtha on the river Bārnāsā and also 300,000 cows and 16 villages to Brahmans. He bathed at the Pokṣara tanks and gave the Brahmans 3000 cows and a village. He also gave eight wives to Brahmans and fed thousands of them all the year round. The Carakas also received something at his hands. In a Nāṣik inscription, however Uṣavādāṭa says that “inspired by true religion, in the Trirāṣmi hills at Govardhana” he caused a cave to be made. Says Senart: “I dare not decide if this phrase (dharmātmanā) implies an express conversion to Buddhism, or only puts a first gift in favour of Buddhism in contrast with the previous grants which were inspired by Brahmanical feelings. I do not think the wording allows us to settle this shade of meaning. On the strength of this explanation I propose in N. 18 to take dhāṃmātmanā in a similar way. I believe the reading 'tmanā, not 'tmano, is certain, and the manner in which the construction is interrupted after the preceding genitives confirms the impression that dharmātmanā is intentionally put forward, in order to dwell on the fact of a change having taken place in the religious belief or inclination of the donor Indragnidatta,” (a Śaka). If reliance could be placed upon names, Indragnidatta’s father and son would both seem to have been Buddhists. As three years after the foundation of his Nāṣik cave Uṣavādāṭa makes donations to Brahmans, his change of faith is extremely improbable.

15. In No. 26, EI, Vol. VIII we have Śakasa Dāmacikasa lekhakasa Vudhi-kasa Viṣṇudata-patasa Dasapuravāthavasa. As the donor’s race and father’s name are mentioned Damacika is the name of his native town. Senart, however, does not agree with Bhagwanlal who looks upon it as a corruption of Damascus.


18. The cave was consecrated in the year 42.
Viṣṇudattā, the daughter of Śaka Indrāgniḍatā, was an upāsīka. As Dr. Bhandarkar observes: "These Śaka kings (Western Kṣatrapas) had thus become so thoroughly Hinduised that another Hindu royal dynasty (the Sātavāhana) had no scruples whatever, social or religious, in entering into matrimonial relationship with them."  

We do not hear of the Śakas and Yavanas in the Sātavāhana dominions in the western Deccan after the second century A.D. The epithet Saka-Yavana-Palhava-nisūdanasa applied to Gotamiputa Śrī-Sātakaṇi seems to be no mere boast; evidently he drove out these foreigners from his newly rebuilt empire—the Śakas were only to return in the wake of Rudradāman's conquest for a short time.

Yavanas and Śakas in Eastern Deccan

Of Yavanas in the eastern Deccan we hear nothing; it is however certain that Graeco-Roman influences played a great part in the fashioning of the Amarāvati tope, and as will be shown below the inscription from Allūru is another piece of evidence for Greek influence. Of the Śakas we hear something, An Amarāvati inscription of the second century A.D., mentions a Saka-giri (not (Ś)akagiri as read by Chanda, or Pi (Si?) giri as read by F. W. Thomas). Another mentions a ‘…….ratika Nekhavana,’ and Nekhavana curiously reminds us of the Persian name Nahapāna. More Śakas would seem to have entered eastern Deccan in the wake of the marriage of Virapurisadata with the daughter of a Western Kṣatrapa. A Nāgārjunikoṇḍa epigraph mentions a Śaka Moda, and his Buddhist sister Budhi. Among the sculptures excavated by Mr. Longhurst at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa there are two showing a warrior in Scythian dress.

Family

At Amarāvati not only father and mother, but also sons and daughters, sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, and brothers and
sisters, are associated with the donor. The wife has a place above the brothers and sisters, the son enjoys precedence over the daughter and the daughter over the daughter-in-law. At Kanheri and Nāsik the donor is mentioned with all his blood relations, and so high was the social sense in the Buddhist world that the donor shared the merit of his donations with all his fellow beings. Could we infer from what we have stated above that the joint-family system was in vogue? Could Amaravati No. 38, which speaks of Khadā and 'his daughter-in-law in her house' show that it was at the time going to pieces or had done so?

Women

Women occupied a prominent position in society. The idea of woman being the chattel of her lord with no rights and privileges which make life worth living, was quite alien to the period. In the western cave and Amarāvatī inscriptions we come across a bevy of ladies making sometimes very costly donations. A great number of the exquisitely sculptured rail pillars, torāṇas and stūpa slabs at Amarāvatī were donated by ladies. Of the nearly 145 epigraphs from Amarāvatī 72, out of the 30 at Kuḍa 13, out of the 29 from Nāsik 16, either record gifts by ladies or gifts in which the ladies are associated. The Cetiya-gharas at Nāsik and Kuḍa were founded by ladies. Women joined hands with men in the construction of the Cāitya cave at Kārla, 'the most excellent (?) mansion in Jambudvīpa.' The base to the right of the central door carved with rail pattern, and a similar piece on the left were the gifts of two nuns. A belt of rail pattern on the inner face of the gallery was also a bhikkhuṇi's gift. The remaining pillar on the open screen in front of the verandah was the gift of a housewife. These instances unmistakably show that ladies were allowed to possess property of their own. At Nāsik, a Saka lady (Viṣṇudattā) gives to the Saṅgha of Nāsik more than 3500 kārṣāpaṇas. Ladies even

26. The word saparivāra in the Nāsik Kanheri and Junnar epigraphs is translated by Senart as 'with his (or her) next.' He remarks (El, Vol. VIII, p. 77): "It is, I think, too precise to translate saparivāra by 'with his family'. .......... Parivāra may, together with the family or even excluding it, apply to companions of the donor, fellow-workers or caste-partners." In Junnar No. 7 (ASWI, Vol. IV) the donor associates with him his son in the merit of his donations and in No. 9 his parivāra. As it is probable that in both cases he has associated with him the same kind of persons, parivāra would refer to members of the family only. In Kanheri No. 18, (ASWI, Vol. IV), we have bitiyikāya ca sahā parivāra and in No. 27 sarvaseva kulasya.

H.A.—13
got the titles of their husbands e.g., Mahābhojī, Mahārāthinī, Bhoji-kī, Kuṭumbinī, Gahini, Vaṇīyinī etc. In the Amrāvatī sculptures we often come across ladies, worshipping Buddhist emblems, taking part in assemblies, playing on instruments, enjoying music and dance and entertaining guests along with their husbands. In one of the panels of an outer rail pillar,27 we find depicted a disputation between a chief and another, and the audience consists mostly of women who are represented as taking keen interest in what is going on. In some panels they are represented as watching processions. Widows were to shun ornaments and to be bent on self-control and restraint and penance.28

On dress and ornaments, the Amarāvatī stones, and the figures cut in the western caves, furnish ample information. Except in some minor details, the dress and ornaments in vogue on both sides of the Deccan are the same. The most striking item of the dress of ladies and men is the head-dress as in the Indus valley. The former have their hair divided in front and running down to a knot at the back. Hung on the knot is a cord of twisted cloth or hair drawn in two or four rows. Sometimes we come across two strings in four rows ending in tassels. Some ladies have their hair done in a pointed knot sideways.29 In some the knot is done near the forehead with a string of beads. In western Deccan ladies sometimes cover their heads with a piece of cloth.30 Sometimes a thick cloth runs round their head. At Kuḍā a lady wears a long cap of conical shape. Perhaps it is the coiffure done to that shape. Generally a string or strings of beads adorn the forehead and the knots. Men wore high head-dress. The general custom was to have hair knotted in front and covered to a great extent by twisted cloth running down. The knot was adorned in front by a horse-shoe-shaped or caitya-arch-shaped ornament. Some Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa men wear knots unadorned by ornaments. Lay disciples and even servants have hair done in knots. In one of the Amarāvatī sculptures a groom has let the hair run down and secured it by bands at three places. One of the male figures in the façade of the Caitya cave at Kanḫēri has a very low turban fully ornamented, the ornaments even hiding the knot of hair on the left.

27. ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. XI, Fig. 2.
30. The Kārlā Caitya cave figures.
Women are as scantily dressed as men, and sometimes even more so. Twisted cloth running in two or three rows below the waist and knotted at the right, the ends, however, hanging from the knots, and sometimes also four or five strings of beads held together by a clasp, constituted the main part of their dress. Men wear an undercloth. There is only one instance among our sculptures of a woman covering her breasts. Laymen and monks and perhaps others also had also a loin cloth, part of which was thrown over their shoulders. The cloth worn by Brahmans covers them down to their knees. Some men have twisted cloth thrown over their shoulders. At Amarāvati and Nāgārjunikonda we also come across men in breeches and long tunic—perhaps Śākas.31

Men and women alike wore ornaments. Heavy rings, sometimes two in each ear, sometimes rows of beads joined together, constituted their ear ornament. Even kings wore ear ornaments. The representations of Vāsiṣṭhiputa Siri-Sātakani and Siri-Yaṅa Sātakani on their silver coins show us well-punched ears.32 Both men and women wore bracelets and bangles with this difference, that sometimes women wore bracelets covering the whole of the upper arm, and bangles running up to the elbow. Men did not wear anklets while all women had them.33 Sometimes the anklets are heavy rings, two for each leg, while in other cases each is a spiral of many columns. Both men and women, even servants, wore necklaces—strings of beads and of medallions. The noses of women were unadorned as it seems to have been at the Indus Valley. In this connection it is interesting to note a description of some of the Bhāṭṭiprōlu remains given by Rea in his South Indian Buddhist Antiquities. They are coral beads, beryl-drops, yellow crystal beads, amethyst beads, double hollow beads, garnet, trinacrias, pierced pearls, coiled gold rings and gold flowers of varying sizes.

Luxuries

Jugs, jars, and vessels of attractive shapes, chairs, tables, stools and cots seem to have been used by many. Whilst kings, great

31. ASSI, Vol. I, PI. xlviii No. 2; ABIA 1927, PI. vi.
32. In this connection it is interesting to note the head-dress worn by Sātavāhana kings as represented on their coins. Siri-Yaṅa's head-dress consists of a strap on the forehead and from the temple locks of combined hair fall over the strap. Behind the head hangs a string knotted at the end, probably a braided lock of hair. Vāsiṣṭhiputa Siri-Satakani is represented with short curly hair.
33. For the solitary exception see TSW, 1868, PI. No. LXII.
padaka on the south-west side of mount Tiranhu (Trirāmi), and Sudisāna on the southern road in the Govardhana district. The other places mentioned in Nāsīk inscriptions are Chākalepa, Pimditakāvada, Suvarṇamukha, Ramatirtha near Sopāraga, Cecirnā, Sākhā, Anugāmi and Daśapura. As regards Daśapura mentioned in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Śaka Vudhika, Senart says: "I see no means of choosing between the Daśapura in Rajputana (Bühler), that in Malwa (Bhagwanlal), or others which might be added, as Mandasor, etc. In No. 26 we see that some Śakas dwelt in that place; this is at least a hint that it ought to be searched for towards the north." D. R. Bhandarkar prefers Mandasor since Uṣavadāta's inscriptions mention places in the

47. Nāsīk, Nos. 12 and 20, EI, Vol. VIII.

48. As regards the two villages Senart remarks (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 65): "Bühler seems to entertain no doubt as to the identity of the village named here with that mentioned at the beginning of the following inscription. It is certain that the date of the donation mentioned there is exactly the same as in the present epigraph, and that this donation is made in favour of the same sect of Bhādayaniyas. It is above all evident from the place it occupies, and from the fact that the following text has been compressed in order that it might be inscribed here, that that place has been chosen intentionally. It must, however, be stated that the village called here Piśājipadaka, i.e., I suppose Piśācipadaka, gets in the following epigraph the name of Sudisāna, and that the description is not identical in both texts, Piśājipadaka being located at the S. W. of Tiranhupavata, and Sudisāna at the south of the Govadhanāhāra. The two may after all be the same; but the difference in the name and description deserves to be noted, especially because a perfect agreement would naturally be expected. Further N. 3 brings in the Śramaṇas from Dhanakāṭa, who are not mentioned in connection with the donation which N. 2 records. It is therefore impossible to affirm that the beginning of N. 3 refers to the present donation; nor is it absolutely impossible that the king should have consented on the same day to a double donation, although it would, in that case, be difficult to understand why he should not have combined the mention of both." It has already been shown that there can be no connection between No. 3 and No. 2 as one records an official grant while the other records a non-official grant. Even the grant of the village of Sudisāna was an official grant as the recording of it in the archives of the state is implied in the words 'Sud. . . . na gāmasa ca Sudasānāna vinibadhaṅkārehi anātā' (1.14). The non-mention of the previous donation in a separate inscription is of course inexplicable under the circumstances.

49. "Chhākalepa or Chhāgalepa, a village or a town, a region or clan; has not yet been identified." (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 90). Lüders, List, Nos. 214, 477, 547, 626 and 937, make a place name more probable. On the analogy of Pārvatiya, Chākalepakā is more probable.

50. EI, Vol. VIII, p. 79.
pradaksīna order—Bharukacha, Daśapura, Govardhana, and Sopāraga. As Ujjain which was for some time the Śaka capital was included in Nahapāna’s kingdom, the choice is between Mandasor near Ujjain and Daśapura in Malwa.

The places mentioned in the Junnar inscriptions which from the context of the inscriptions would seem to have been near the caves are Puvānadāgāma, Koṅacika Vaḍālikā, the village of Mahāveja, the village of Seuraka. Kapicita would seem to be the name of the locality in which the cave containing the Junnar inscription No. 15 is situated.51 Mānamukaḍa is the Mānmōdi hill.

As regards Māmāḍa and Māmāḷāhāra52 mentioned in Kārlā inscription Burgess remarks: “The name Māmāḷa is evidently the ancient form of the modern Māval (Māul) : the change of medial ma to va is common in Marāthi; Māval being still the name of the tract along the Sāhyāḍri or Ghāṭ range, fully corresponds with the position of the ancient Māmāḷa. We have thus another proof that the lapse of two thousand years has not changed much the geographical names of Western India and its territorial divisions.”53 Valuraka mentioned as village in Māmāḷāhāra designates, according to Burgess and Senart, the modern village of Kārlā a few miles from the caves. It is probable that Vihāragaon which the caves overlook designates Vāluraka.

The places mentioned in the eastern inscriptions are however difficult of identification. Velagiri mentioned in the Jagayyapēṭa inscriptions would designate the modern village of Jagayyapēṭa, probably deriving its name from the hill on which the ruins of Stūpa complex stand. Toḍatūra of the same inscriptions was situated in the Kammākaraṭha. Mahākamundūra would seem to have been outside Kammākaraṭha as unlike Toḍatūra it is not stated to be in the Kammākaraṭha.54 The places mentioned at Amarāvati are Hirālūra, Kevurura, Kudūra, Turuḷūra,55 Devaparavana, Mahava (in) - nasa (e)la, Mahēmkmhānāja, Narasa (se)la, Māṇḍara and Rājagiri. The last mentioned would seem to be identical with Rāyasela; Virapura of the same inscriptions may be the Viripara of the Mayidavōlu

53. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 113, n. 4.
54. The situation Kammākaraṭha has been discussed in the chapter on the Ikṣvākus.
plates. As Chadaka is mentioned twice at Amarāvatī, and as Chadapavata is mentioned once in a Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription, they must not be far away from Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. A feature to be noted is the ura and sela ending in names. Amongst divisions may be mentioned Toṁpukī (?) district, Caraṭha and Aya-Sakasaṭhi in which Suvarṇamukha was.

**Military Arrangements**

An Amarāvatī inscription of the third century B.C., speaks of a Senāgopa Mudukutala. In later times Mahāsenāpatis would sometimes seem to have been in charge of armies. The traditional fourfold division of the army mentioned in the Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela, obtained in the Satavāhana dominions. An Amarāvatī rail pillar shows vividly the art of war and military organization of these times. Cities were well defended with high walls, ramparts and gates. Walls and gateways were often built of brick and mortar and the gateways were surmounted by toranas as at Sānci. In battle the foot soldiers armed with round shields, and short swords, with a band round their abdomen intended to protect them from the enemy's spears, led the army. The infantry was flanked by the cavalry and elephants and the rear was brought up by bowmen. Soldiers used sometimes long spears. The battle-axe is little different from that used in mediaeval and modern times. Mallets also were used. While the cavalrymen and elephant drivers have turbans, the foot-soldiers have no turban. Does this indicate a higher status enjoyed by the cavalrymen and elephantmen?

**II. Economic Conditions**

*Foreign Trade: Seaports: Eastern Ports*

The eastern and western ports in the Satavāhana empire were throbbing with trade, though the former were not either as many or as important as the latter. To take the eastern Deccan first, Ptolemy notes that Kantakossyla (Kaṇṭakasela of epigraphic records), Koddura (modern Gūḍur in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district), and Allosygne were ports in the Maisōlia region which, according to the author of the Periplus, 'stretched a great way along

58. Lüders, *List*, No. 1303, and EI, Vol. XX, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscriptions, F.
the coast before the inland country'. 59 North of Allosygne was Apheterion, the starting-point of ships bound for Golden Chryse, i.e., Farther India, the Malay Peninsula and the Archipelago. A stūpa pillar fragment bearing an inscription of the time of Siri-Yāna Śātakāni was found at Chinna Ganjam (Repalle taluq, Guntur district) near the sea-shore. A fragment of a stūpa pillar was also found at Kollitippa a few miles to the north of Chinna Ganjam. In the vicinity of Chinna Ganjam, Rea found the remains of three stūpas. As Jouveau-Dubreuil has pointed out, an inscription dated Saka 1166 mentions Motupalle as a port, 60 and Motupalle is only three miles to the north-east of Chinna Ganjam. It is therefore highly probable that Motupalle or its vicinity contained a port or ports through which a part of the trade of the Maisōlia region flowed. And the Maisōlia region was also located between two great navigable rivers. Lower down the Maisōlia region also, there would seem to have been ports though their names have not been preserved. Coins bearing the device of ship with masts and the legends, 'sāmi Pu (ḷumā) visa' and coins with simha device bearings the legends, 'sāmisa s(i)r(i)' have been picked up on the Coromandel Coast between Madras and Cuddalore. 62 Rapson remarks: "The maritime traffic to which the type 'a Ship,' whether on Andhra, Pallava or Kūrumbar coins, bears witness, is also attested by the large numbers of Roman coins which are found on the Coromandel Coast". Regarding the migration of the Hindu colonists to the Far East in the first century of the Christian era and later, Prof. Nilakanta Sastri remarks "...it seems.... probable that the movement towards the East was the work of the entire coastal tract on the eastern coast of the modern Presidency of Madras, and that the Andhra Country in general, and the Kingdom of Vēngi with it, had a good share in this movement." 63 Krom re-

59. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, ed. Schoff, Sec. 62.
61. The inscription mentions the remission of taxes on articles of export and import at the harbour of Moṭupalle alias Bisyuyyaṇḍapāṭṭaṇa. Nos. 601 and 602 mention a concession given to merchants at sea.
62. Regarding the coin G. P. 3, Pl. CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas etc., Rapson reads '—— (——) Pu (——)'. Says he (p. 24): "The restoration īu seems possible, but by no means certain." The two obliterated letters before pu are sa and ma. After īu there are traces of ma. We have then 'sami-Puḷu(ma).............'. Regarding G. P. 2, Pl. V. Rapson reads sara[——] (X) Samisa. The more plausible way of reading the legends is Samisa Siri(——).
63. Telugu Academy Silver Jubilee Volume (English Sec.) p. 11.
marks: "We understand from Vogel's study, that the history of the Pallava princes first attains prominence at a time which must be considerably later than the first setting out of the Hindus towards the east; direct connection between the data here and those from the other side is not thus to be expected." Again: "What we know of the history the Pallavas concerns the later fortunes of a land which must have served as the starting-point for the trade voyages of the Hindus towards the East; they do not relate to that period when such expeditions had their beginning. We are thus at a time much earlier than Sivaskandavvarman, and it is wholly uncertain if the dynasty or the kingdom of the Pallavas in general can be taken to a time earlier than the fourth century; and none can guarantee that the Pallava script was begun by the Pallavas or during their rule and had not received earlier the characteristic traits which distinguish it from other scripts. . . . We must leave open the possibility that the 'Pallava' script was brought to foreign lands not from the Pallava kingdom itself but from a kingdom which preceded it in the same locality."  

Western Ports

According to the author of the Periplus Barygaza, the Bharukacha of a Junnar inscription and modern Broach, and at his time a Saka port, was the northern-most port in the Dachinabades. Its imports and exports so graphically described by him are: Italian, Laodecian and Arabian wine, copper, tin, lead, coral, topaz, fine and rough cloth, storax, sweet clover, flint, glass, realgar, antimony; gold and silver coin, "on which there is a profit when exchanged for the money of the country," and small quantities of ointments. For the use of the Saka Satraps were brought very costly vessels of silver, fine wines, beautiful maidens of the harem, thin clothing of the finest weaves, and the choicest ointments. The exports were spikenard, costus, bdellium, ivory, agate, cornelian, lycium, silk cloth, mallow cloth, long pepper; and "such other things as are brought from the various market-towns." He adds: "Those bound for this market-town from Egypt make the voyage favourably about the month of July, that is Epiphi." The inland commer-

64. Ibid., pp. 10-11.
65. No. 19, ASWI, Vol. IV. It records the foundation of a two-celled cave by the brothers Budhamita and Buddharakhita (Buddhista) of the Laṅkākūḍiyas, and sons of Asasama (Āsvaśarman), the Bharukachas.
cial entrepots from which streams of trade flowed to Barygaza are Ozene, Paethan and Tagara. To quote the author of the Periplus: "There are brought down to Barygaza from these places by waggons and through great tracts without roads, from Paethana carnelian in great quantity and, from Tagara much common cloth, all kinds of muslins and mallow cloth, and other merchandise brought there locally from the regions along the sea-coast." 68 Tagara has been identified by Dr. Fleet with modern Tēr or Thair. 69 The question arises, why

69. JRAS, 1901, pp. 537 ff.

Bhagwanlal Indraji identified Tagara with modern Junnar, IA, Vol. XIII, p. 366. Fleet has identified it with Tēr on the following grounds: Tēr or Thair represents a variation of Tagara which is mentioned under that name in two Silāhāra records (El., Vol. III, pp. 267 and 273, II. 43-44, and CTI, pp. 102-103, II. 26-27); the author of the Periplus says that Tagara is nine days' journey from Paithān. As Paithān is twenty days' journey from Broach, and Tēr is half as distant from Paithān as Paithān is from Broach, there can be no objection to the identification; modern Tēr is as big a town as Paithān.

Fleet continues (p. 548): "A study of the maps has shown me the former existence of an early trading route, of which well-marked traces still remain, from the east coast through Golconda or Haidarābād, Tēr and Pai-than, to Broach...... There were two starting-points. One was Masulipatam, on the coast, in the northern part of the Kistna district; and the road from this place took, not only the local traffic from the coast districts, on the north of the Kṛṣṇā but also the sea-borne traffic from the far east. The other starting point was probably Vinukonda, inland, in the southern part of the same district, which would serve admirably as a collecting centre for the local products of the sea-side country on the south of Kṛṣṇā. The roads from these two places joined each other at a point about twenty-six miles towards the east-by-south from Haidarābād, or perhaps at a point about twenty-three miles further in the same direction. And from that point the single road ran in the most natural manner, through easy country via Haidarābād, Kalyānī, Tēr, Paithan and Daulatābād, to 'Chandore' and Mārkiṇḍa in the west of the Nāsik district. And only there, in the Western Ghauts ...... commenced the real difficulties of the journey......"  

According to the author of the Periplus most of the seaport towns, especially Barygaza, were connected with inland market-towns like Paethana, and Tagara by great tracts without roads; and waggons drawn by bullocks could do only twenty miles a day. This might have been the case. But the difficult nature of the country described has to be taken into account. Nāsik official records speak of roads. We have the benefactions of the natives of Nāsik at Barhut of Vaijayanti at Kārlā, of Bharukacha and Kālyān at Junnar, of Sopāra at Nānegrātī and Kārlā. Usavadata's constant and wide pilgrimages in the north-western parts are well-known. It is therefore
should goods from Tagara and Paethan be sent to a distant port like Barygaza, in preference to the ports of Kalyän and Sopāra which were less distant. Was it because as the author of the *Periplus* himself says the Sakas had closed the port (Sātavāhana port) of Kalyän? According to the author of the *Periplus* again from Ozene were brought to Barygaza all things needed for foreign trade,—agate, cornelian, Indian muslins, mallow cloth, and much ordinary cloth.

Below Barygaza stood the Sātavāhana port of Sopāra, the Soupara of Ptolemy, the Sūpara of the *Periplus*, the Sopāraka or Sopāraka of epigraphic records and modern Sopāra, a few miles to the north of Bombay. Of the two Kanheri records which mention the place, one mentions a jeweller and the other a merchant from Sopāra. The Sāgarapaloganas (?) of a Kanheri inscription70 are probably the sea-faring traders at Kalyän or Sopāra.

Sopāra would seem to have been a port of great antiquity. It is mentioned as Supārapatiṇa in the *Mahāvaṃsa*.71 The early Buddhist story of Pūrnamaitra speaks of Sopāraka as a great seaport and the residence of a king Pūrṇa, a very prosperous merchant of the city, who had made several successful voyages in the great ocean. The Buddha is said to have visited the town and preached his law to two Nāga kings there. Pūrnamaitra Yaniputra built a vihāra to the Buddha.72 There are at Sopāra even to-day the remains of Buddhist Stūpa.73 Jaina literature and the Rāmāyaṇa also mention Sopāra.74

The greatest port in Sātavāhana western Deccan was Kalyän, on the eastern shore of the Bombay harbour, the Kaliana of inscriptions and the Calliene of the *Periplus*.75 Of the two Junnar inscriptions mentioning Kalyän, one records gifts by a trader and the other gifts by a goldsmith, from Kalyän. Of the seven inscriptions at probable that the less mountainous country was covered with roads whilst in the mountainous regions only great tracts without roads were found possible.

71. VI, 1. 46. The *Mahāvaṃsa* is not older than the fifth century A.D. But it embodies earlier tradition.
73. *Antiquities of Sopāra*, by Bhagwanlal Indrajj, pp. 4 ff.
74. Ibid.
75. The various forms in inscriptions are Kaliṇa, Junnar Nos. 11 and 13, ASWI, Vol. IV; Kālyāna, Kanhēri No. 15; Kāliṇa, Kanhēri No. 5; Kāliṇa, Kanhēri No. 18; Kālīyina, Kanhēri No. 25; *ASWI*, Vol. V. These are Prākritic variations of Kaliṇa meaning 'blest'.
Kanheri mentioning the port, four record gifts by merchants or their sons, and two record gifts by artisans (goldsmith and blacksmith). It is clear that Kalyāṇa was a prosperous trading and industrial centre. This is also known from the fact that the Sakas captured it with a view to destroy the resources of their enemies, the Sātavāhanas. Of the three dated inscriptions at Kanheri two are dated in regnal years of Mādhhariputa Sakasena and one in the regnal years of Siri-Yāña Sātakani (after 160 A.D.). Could we infer that as the port was closed by the Sakas in the closing years of the first century A.D. it was not functioning as a port when Ptolemy wrote, and that it regained its old position in the reigns of Mādhhariputa Sakasena and Siri-Yāña? As late as the sixth century A.D. Cosmas Indicopleustes found it one of the five chief marts of western India and the capital of the powerful Cāḷukya kings with a trade in brass, blackwood logs, and articles of clothing.

The other ports mentioned by the author of the Periplus and Ptolemy and identified with places in the Sātavāhana western Deccan are: Mandagora (Mandaragiri) identified with Bānkot at the mouth of the Sāvitrī river, and now a fishing village of no importance; Palaepatmae (Ptolemy’s Balipatna) probably modern Dābhol; Melizagara (Malayagiri) placed by McCrindle and Müller at the modern Jaigarh, formerly a port of importance but now little more that a fishing village, and by Schoff at the modern Rājpur near which the Kudā caves are situated; Simylla (the Symulla of Ptolemy, the Chimulo of Yuan Chwang and the Cemula of two Kanheri inscriptions),76 certainly modern Chāul about twenty-five miles south of the Bombay harbour; Hippokura,77 which Campbell would identify with Ghoregaon in Kolāba; and Byzantion identified with Vijayadurga the south entrance of the Vāghotan river.78

Market-towns in the interior: Western Deccan

The market-towns in the interior besides Paithān and Tagara were Junnar,79 Karahākaṭa,80 Nāsik,81 Govardhana,82 and Vejayanti.83

76. Lüders, List, Nos. 996 and 1033.
77. Hippokura is not mentioned in the Periplus. It is however different from the capital of Bāleokuros mentioned by Ptolemy. The latter is an inland town.
78. IA, Vol. XIII, p. 327.
79, 80, 81, 82 & 83. The inscriptions at Junnar refer to a town near the caves, and Junnar is situated in a pass in the Western Ghāṭas, which is on
Eastern Deccan

The market towns in the eastern Deccan would seem to have been not as many or as important as those in the western Deccan. Even as early as the third or the second century B.C., Dhaññakaṭaka was a market-town. In some Amarāvati inscriptions Kevurūra, Vijayapura and Nārasala (sela?) are mentioned as the residence of merchants. Lüders, No. 1261 mentions a sethipamukha and a member of a guild of merchants from Cadaka.84

Merchants

Merchants are generally all called vanija or negama.85 A member of a guild of merchants is known as nigama; the alderman of the guild is called sethin (Sans. śreṣṭhin). Sathavāha (Sans. Sārtha-vāha) means 'caravan trader'. The wife of a vaniya is called vaniyini, and the wife of a sathavāha, a sātakavāhini.86

the line of communication through the Nāneghāṭ pass to the ports in the west. Moreover in the Junnar caves a number of senis or guilds are mentioned. The traveller's rest house at Nāneghāṭ shows undoubtedly that much trade flowed through it. A Sopāraka executed a cistern at Nāneghāṭ hill (Lüders, List, No. 1119) called the Satagara mountain in another inscription. ([JBBRAS, Vol. XV, pp. 313 ff]). (80) Modern Karādh 70 miles from Mahād. It is mentioned as a nigama in a Barhut inscription (Cunningham, Stūpa of Barhut, p. 131, No. 16); it is mentioned also in a Kuśā inscription as the residence of an ironmonger (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 87, No. 18). (81) A Bēdsā inscription speaks of a sethi from Nāsik (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 89 No. 1). (82) An inscription of Uṣavadāta mentions a number of guilds, and the guild-hall (nigamasabha) at Govadhana (Nāsik No. 12, EI, Vol. VIII). (83) Vide supra.

84. The inscription (No. 1261) runs as follows: “Cadakicasa sethipamukhasa (bha)-daniga(ma) sa suci dāna.” Lüders translates it as follows: “the gift of a rail bar by the pious town Chadakica.” On the analogy of Junnar No. 4 (ASWI, Vol. IV) where Virasenaka is a personal name and dhaññamanigama has therefore to be interpreted as ‘the member of Buddhist guild of merchants’ as pointed out by Senart, bhadanigama has to be interpreted as ‘members of a Buddhist guild merchant.’ Chadakicasa would then mean ‘native of Chadaka’ and sethipamukhasa prominent among the sethis’. Instances of the omission of the personal name in votive inscriptions are not wanting.

85. In Lüders, List, No. 987, both vanijaka and negama are used in such a way as to show that they had identical meaning.

86. Ibid., No. 30,
In our epigraphs merchants bear the title of gahapati, gahata (Sansk. grhasta) being a title applied to Brahmans who had passed the pupil or the Brahmacarya stage. According to Senart the use of gahapati in Nasik No. 6 "favours the opinion I have formerly stated, and which I must maintain against the doubts that have been raised by a learned opponent (Fick, Sociale Gliederung zu Buddha's Zeit, p. 164), viz. that grihapati is, in the Buddhist language, specially restricted to people of various castes, who are included in the large class of Vaisyas." In the Saptasatakam we have references to the philandering of the gahapati with a girl of the hālika class; a Sālārwāḍi inscription mentions a hālakiya (cultivator) kuṭubīka Uṣābaṇaka whose son is called gahapati. In Kanheri No. 15 and Nāsik No. 6, the wives of negamas are called kuṭumbinis. Therefore kuṭumbika and gahapati are identical titles applied to persons of the cultivator class also. In Nāsik Nos. 11 and 13, the wife of Rśabhadatta styles herself kuṭumbini. Does this show that the word also meant wife, or does it show that the Kṣatriyas also styled themselves as kuṭubin and kuṭubini? Later on kuṭubin came to mean 'cultivator.' A point against Senart's conclusion is that in the Amaravati inscriptions many a gahapati and merchant is mentioned, yet we have only one instance of the father of a vanīya bearing the title of gahapati, but even here the latter is not styled a vanīja. In the western cave inscriptions too, not all the merchants bear the title of gahapati.

**Coins and Trade**

If the state of trade, internal and external, can be judged by the coinage i.e., by the variety and number of coins used or issued, it would appear that western Deccan thrrobbed most with trade and industry during the period of the early Sātavāhanas (third and second centuries B.C.), and during the first period of Kṣatrapa occupation (first century). The Nāneghāṭ inscription of queen Nāyanikā describes the dakṣīṇas given on the occasion of the various sacrifices performed by the queen and her husband Siri-Sātakaṇi I. They are 1700 cows and 10 elephants, 11000 cows, 1000 horses, 17
silver pots and 14000 kāṛṣāpāṇas, one horse chariot, 30002 cows, silver ornaments and dresses, 1100 cows on three occasions, 1000 cows on four occasions, 40001 kāṛṣāpāṇas on three occasions, 12 golden .......?, and 14000 (?) kāṛṣāpāṇas etc. As for the first period of Kṣatrapa occupation, do we not possess a hoard of Nahapāna's silver coins? Does not Usavadata endow large sums of money, viz., 70,000 kāṛṣāpāṇas and 3000 kāṛṣāpāṇas? The vast trade of the period is also indicated by the other charities of Usavadata. Some may be inclined to look upon them as the results of oppressive taxation or successful wars.

We have not a single Sātavāhana coin of the period from the first century B.C. to the reign of Gotamiputa Siri-Satakaṇi (end of the first century A.D.). Even the latter only restruck the coins of Nahapāna unless it be that some copper coins attributed by Rapson doubtfully to him, were struck by him. Even among the coins of the later Sātavāhanas from western India, we have more coins from the Chanda district (Central Provinces), than from Mahārāṣṭra, and Aparānta.

Eastern Deccan where lead coinage predominates over copper and where not even a single silver coin has been picked up, would seem to have entered upon an epoch of great commercial and industrial activity during the reign or Pulumāvi II, an activity which reached its culminating point in the reign of Siri-Yaṇa. Pulumāvi issued \( \frac{1}{16}; \frac{1}{4}; \frac{3}{8}; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{5}{8}; \frac{3}{4}; \frac{7}{8}; 1, kāṛṣāpāṇas \). The reign of Siri-Yaṇa not only saw the issue of a large number of coins which an empire from sea to sea demanded, but a correspondingly larger issue in the Andhradesa than in the western Deccan. In addition to coins of the denominations already mentioned 1\( \frac{7}{8} \), and

92. Rapson has pointed out that the kāṛṣāpāṇas of this inscription, as well as those of Kanheri No. 15 (ASWI, Vol. V) and Nāsik inscriptions of Usavadāta, are silver kāṛṣāpāṇas. CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas, etc., clxxiii, n. 1. The ratio was 35 kāṛṣāpāṇas to one Suvarṇa.
93. Nāsik Nos. 10, 12 and 14a, El, Vol. VIII.
94. The Allūru inscription which is a composite record of gifts, mentions an investment of 1000 kāṛṣāpāṇas as permanent endowment. As this is mentioned along with a gift of 53, 32, and 24 nivartanas of land and 500 cows, 64 bullock carts, some Greek lamps and a tank, it is all but certain that only silver kāṛṣāpāṇas are meant. It must be noted that this is the only inscription where a kāṛṣāpāṇa is called purāṇa or old coin.
95. 1|16 is more probable than 1|12, as the other denominations follow the division into 16, and as an inscription at Nāgārjunikonda mentions dināri-
māpakas. Māṣaka is the weight five ratis and 16 māṣakas = 1 kāṛṣa.
1¼, kārṣāpanas were issued, an indication of increased trade. 96 Mādhariputa Sakasena's and Caḍa Sāti's reigns did not witness such varied and large issues. The large lead and potin coins from Kolhāpur, also attest a busy trade in the south-western part of the empire which was left under feudatories.

Industrial and Commercial Organization

The inscriptions introduce us to various classes of workers—dhamnikas (corn-dealers), mālakāras (florists), kolikas (weavers), tilapiṣakas (oilpressers), odayantrikas (fabricators of hydraulic engines), kāsākāras (braziers), tesakāras (polishers), kamāras (iron-workers), lohavāniyas (iron-mongers), kularikas (potters?), 97 avesānis (artisans), and lekhakas (writers) some of whom were in the service of kings and Mahābhhojas, Cammakāras (leather-workers), gadhikas (perfumers), suvaṇakāras (goldsmiths), mani kāras (jewellers), mithikas (stonemasons), and vaḍhakis (carpenters). Workers connected with buildings are nāyakamisas, kaḍhīcakas 98 and mahākatakas. Among these workers only gadhikas, kammakāras, avesānis and lekhakas, are mentioned in epigraphs from the eastern Deccan.

Most of these craftsmen were as well-to-do as the craftsmen of the Middle Ages. Their artistic taste was something unsurpassed. 99 It is to their munificence that we owe some of the Buddhist monuments of our period. 100

96. It is here necessary to bear in mind the remark of Rapson that: “... it is important to insist on the fact that any supposed uniformity in the weight-standards of the ancient coins of India appears on examination to be quite illusory. It is impossible to read the various passages quoted from Sanskrit authors in the Vācaspatya Dictionary, s.v. 'kārṣa,' without realising that the diversity of weights may have been very considerable. This diversity seems certainly also to be proved by the actual specimens, many of which cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, be satisfactorily assigned to any particular denomination.” (op. cit., clxxxii).

97. “For kularika at least I see nothing better than Bühler's conjecture, taking it to be, kulāla = 'a potter'.” Senart, EI, Vol. VIII, p. 89.

98. According to Bühler, kaḍhīcaka may be the Gujerati kaḍhiyo=brick-layer.

99. A gadhika has lavished all his art on an Amarāvatī pillar (TSW, 1888 Pl. LXXXIX).

100. Mugudāsa, a fisherman (dāsa), excavates a cave at Nāsik (Nāsil Nos. 8 and 9, EI, Vol. VIII). As the donation of one cave is mentioned in two epigraphs Senart thinks that the word lena in No. 9, points no more to the verandah but "to the cell which the same donor Mugudāsa, must have H.A.—15
Some and perhaps most of the crafts and trades mentioned above were organized into guilds. We hear of a Dhamnikaseni, a Kasakaraseni, and a Tesakdraseni in Junnar inscriptions; Kolikanikayasenis at Govardhana; of a Kularikaseni, a Tilapisakaseni, and an Odayantrikaseni we hear in an inscription from Nāsik. Each guild had an alderman called sethin (śreṣṭhin). Guilds had their office in the town-hall or nigamasabhā. Usavadata's investment in guilds were read (srdvita), and registered in the nigamasabhā.

Permanent endowments, especially in favour of religious institutions were sometimes invested in fields, and sometimes in these guilds. Since Usavadata invests some of his religious charities in guilds, does it mean that the guilds were looked upon as very stable organizations, as stable, if not more so than the government?

In India the rate of interest is stated monthly. Some of our western cave inscriptions show conformity to this method. A Junnar inscription mentions investment of money in two guilds at the rate of paṇaduka māsa in one guild and at the rate of pāo māsa in the other. Usavadāta invested two thousand kāṛṣāpaṇas in one weaver's guild at Govardhana, at the rate of pratika per cent (12% per annum), and 1000 kāṛṣāpaṇas in another weaver's guild at the same place at ¾ pratika per cent (9%). But the normal rate of interest would seem to have been 12 per cent per annum. Guilds were like the goldsmiths of the Middle ages in Europe bankers receiving deposits and lending out money.

Land

In the Sātavāhana empire, as in India at all times, agriculture was the main industry. Western and eastern inscriptions record

added to his cave. This interpretation seems the more tempting as the second donation has for its object, to supply with clothes the pavaijita, i.e., the monk residing in the cell.” But in our epigraphs there is not a single instance of the confusion between lena and ovariaka; and the money for clothes is to be applied to the monk or monks living in the cave. It is possible that while making another donation for monks, the previous donation was recapitulated.

101. Lüders translates sethin as 'banker'.
102. A Bhattiprolu inscription mentions a negama (guild), and a number of persons, the members of the guilds. (El, Vol. II, No. VIII d.)
103. Akhayaniivi. We do not hear of permanent endowments in the Amarāvatī, Jagayyapeta and Nāgarjunikondā inscriptions. The Alluru inscription however mentions it.
104. Manu, VIII, v. 141.
gifts of villages and fields (for cultivation and plantation of trees) to monastic institutions. The king had what in the Middle Ages was called the royal domain. The king did not expropriate the lands of the subjects but bought them, even when whole villages were granted to monastic institutions.

Sometimes the field was possessed by more than one person; the share of each person in the field was specified in fractions of a pāṇa. A Kaṅhēri inscription mentions the owner of an ādhaṇa-kheta.

Land was subject to more than one tax. Salt was a royal monopoly.

III. RELIGION

Buddhism in Eastern Deccan

The stūpas at Allūru, Gummadidurru, Ghaṃṭaśālā, Bhaṭṭiprōlu, Guḍivāḍa, and Göli, and the Amarāvatī sculptures and epigraphs give us in their own way the history of Buddhism in Andhradesa from the second century B.C. to the third century A.D. Much credence may not be placed in the story that the Buddha miraculously visited the Andhradesa. As Andhradesa is not mentioned among the countries to which monks were sent by Tissa after the Third Council and as the Bhaṭṭiprōlu inscriptions show that even before 200 B.C. Andhradesa had become a stronghold of Buddhism, it is very probable that it embraced Buddhism long before the time of the Third Council and the reign of Asoka. It is also probable that Buddhism spread more quickly among the non-Aryan Andhra tribes than in Aryan societies. A feature of Bhaṭṭiprōlu Buddhism is the worship of the relics of the Buddha (sarira) placed in crystal caskets which were in turn placed in stone caskets. The faithful in each village organised themselves into groups e.g. Śīhagotii, Aya-Sakasāthīgotii etc.

The objects of worship at Amarāvatī are the stūpas, small and big, the sacred tree with the empty throne, the footprints (pāḍuka) of the great teacher on a stool in front of the throne, the triśūla
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The Nāga cult in Buddhism is also noteworthy. Serpents are represented as entwining stūpas. Nāgas and Nāga Rājās and their wives are represented as worshipping the stūpa and hearing the sermons of the master. Both at Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikonda, the Buddha is represented as seated on Nāgās with their hoods just above his head. As there is no halo behind these figures, and as Nāgas are sometimes represented on stūpa slabs, in the place of the Buddha preaching, as the figures under mention have turbans and his followers from very early times. "And special representations of it supposed to have been left by the Buddha himself as that on Adam's Peak in Ceylon were objects of pilgrimage. And the legends that enumerate the thirty-two marks of personal beauty or superiority ascribed to the Buddha, specially mention two beautiful brilliant wheels (cakra) with a thousand rays on the soles of his feet." But though the essential feature in the representation of this footprint called carana-nyāsa or Śākya-carana is the cakra on the middle of the sole, there were almost always others also and in the eastern peninsula they have been multiplied largely. The Saptākatakaṁ speaks of the worship of the feet of the Buddha (g. 308).

114. Regarding the triśūla emblem and the pillar supporting it Burgess says (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 30): "The sides of the pillar supporting the triśūla are always represented as in flames, and, as Mr. Fergusson has remarked, this seems to be the counterpart of the Agni-liṅga of Śiva." An examination of the sculptures shows clearly that what is taken to represent flames, is only a representation of twisted cloth, much like that worn by men round their waist and hanging from the top of the pillar. In one of the sculptures (TSW, 1865 Pl. LVIII, No. 2) offerings of cloth to the tree is represented.

115. In the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu Stūpa 24 silver coins arranged in the Svastika shape were found along with other relics. · (Rea, South Indian Buddhist Antiquities, Pl. IV, p. 12).

no upper cloth, it is probable that they are Nāga Rājas. One is tempted to identify them with Nāgārjuna, but the snake cult was so widely prevalent in these parts that such an interpretation must remain doubtful until fresh evidence turns up. As we shall see, any supposed connection between Nāgārjuna P'usa and the Andhradeśa of the second century A.D., is open to doubt.

**Western Deccan**

The earliest Buddhist remains from western Deccan come from Pitalkhorā and Kolhāpur. The former has yielded us a number of caves and epigraphs which palaeographically belong to the third century B.C., and which record the gifts of Buddhists from Paithān and other places. (The most prominent among the donors is a royal physician). The Kolhāpur Stūpa has yielded a stone box and relic casket on the square lid of which is cut in pure Maurya characters (earlier than the Pitalkhorā inscription), the inscription:

*Bamhasa dānain
Dhamayutena kāritam.*

In one of his former births the Buddha is said to have gone to Suppāra, in Aparānta or north Koṅkaṇ, at the request of Pūrṇa, the son of a slave girl, who had risen to be one of the chief merchants of Suppāra; then a Brahman and some widows got relics over which they built a Stūpa.

Bhagwanlal Indraji has excavated the remains of a Stūpa at Sopāra. According to the Mahāvaṁsa and a Nāgārjunikonda inscription, Aparānta was converted by a missionary Dharmaṇarakhita, a Yavana sent by Tissa after the Third Council. Pitalkhorā and Kolhāpur show that Buddhism had made rapid strides in western Deccan even before the Third Council. Next in age to Pitalkhorā come Nāsik, Bhājā, and Bēḍsā. The Kārlā Caitya cave belongs to the first century B.C. It is however the first and second centuries A.D. that constitute the glorious epoch of Buddhism in the western Deccan. Kings patronised various sects. Rival powers vied with each other in scooping vihāras or caves at Nāsik, and in making grants of villages, lands, and money to monks spending the vassa in such caves. Mahābhojas, Mahāraṭhis, ministers, and minor officials, merchants, craftsmen and ladies of all rank and denominations, vied with one another in making donations to the order. Monks and nuns vied with laymen in donating caves, cisterns, caityas, stūpa-marbles and permanent endowments. They readily joined with

117. Kanheri Nos. 17 and 21, ASWI, Vol. V.
laymen in such enterprises. No less than six monks and nuns joined hands with Yavanas and laymen from Vejayanti, Nasik, etc., in constructing the Kārlā Cetiyaghara. Were these expenses met from the savings effected out of the cloth money and the *kuṣāṇamūla* given to them? Did enterprising monks who were enjoined to beg for alms only, go about collecting money for such pious works? Whatever might have been the case, the possession of money by monks and nuns was evidence of relaxation of the rigid rules of the Order. The Buddhist monuments at Kuḍā, Mahād, Kol, Bhājā, Bēḍsā, Kārlā, Junnar, Nasik, and Kanhēri are such donations. A Kanhēri inscription mentions the construction of a Cetiyaghara, *upathāṇasālā* (hall of reception), three cells in the Abālikāvihāra at Kalyān, a Cetiyaghara and thirteen cells at some vihāra at Patiṭhāna, a *kuṭi* (temple), and a *kodhi* (hall) at Rājatalāka in Paiṭhāṇapatha, and a *saghārāma* at the vihāra at Sadasevājū (?)\(^{118}\)

**Sects: Buddhist Sects in western Deccan**

Our epigraphs introduce us to a number of sects. The Bhadāyaniyas were the most favoured at Nasik and at Kanhēri. Dhammottariyas flourished at Sopāra and in the town near the Junnar caves. The Mahāsāṁghikas had their stronghold at Kārlā and its vicinity. Both Bhadāyaniya and Dhammottariya are subdivisions of the Theravāda school. In two Junnar inscriptions we have *Sidhaganēsu Aparājītesu* and *Apajītesu gane*.\(^{119}\) *Apajītesu* is evidently a mistake of the scribe or the engraver for *Aparājītesu*. *Siddhaganā* denotes a holy assembly. Another Junnar inscription\(^{120}\) mentions a *ganācārya*. As in our inscriptions teachers are generally mentioned with reference to sects,\(^{121}\) *gana* of the inscriptions under reference also refers to a school or sect. The Aparājīta sect is not mentioned in the books.

It does not however mean that only one sect flourished at a place or in a group of caves. Caitikas flourished at Nasik, and Usavavādāta’s inscriptions show that monks of different sects kept the *vassa* in the same cave. We know that Mahiśāsakas, Bahusutiyas, Aparamahāvinaseliyas and Ceylonese monks and nuns lived in the Nāgarjunikonda valley. A preacher of the Dhammottariya sect donates

---

118. Lüders, List, No. 988.
120. No. 17.
a pillar of the Kārlā Cetiyağhara which would seem to have been the property of the Mahāsāṃghikas.

Unlike Gotamiputa Siri-Satākani and Puḷumāvi II, Uṣavadāta patronised all the sects. At Kārlā and Nāsik, the benefits of his donations are assigned to ascetics of every denomination or residence, who could be brought to take their abode in the caves at Kārlā and Nāsik, along with their resident hosts, during the vassa. Another foreigner donates a navagabha maṇḍapa at Kārlā to the Saṅgha as the special property of the Mahāsāṃghikas. Senart remarks that this grant seems “to stipulate that gifts attributed to particular sects should be meant for monks of every origin and of every denomination without distinction; compare No. 13, 1.4”

On the other hand Gotamiputa Siri-Satākani’s donation at Kārlā is ‘for the support of the sect of the Mahāsāṃghikas of the mendicant friars dwelling here in (these) caves of Valūraka…’. Balasirī’s cave at Nāsik was for the acceptance of the Bhadāyaniyas. The official grants of land or village recorded in Nāsik Nos. 3, 4, and 5, were in favour of the same sect.

**Eastern Deccan**

The Amarāvatī epigraphs mention some sects that flourished during the Sātavāhana period. The earliest among them would seem to be that of Caitya vara (Caityavada), or Cetika, or Ceti-kiya, which is mentioned in four epigraphs. This is the only sect mentioned both in eastern and western inscriptions. Since an Amarāvatī epigraph speaks of Cetikas at Rājagiri, and as the commentary on the Kathavatthu mentions Rājagirika as one of the Andhaka sects, it is probable that this sect was an offshoot of the Cetika nikāya. Whilst the Pubbasela (mentioned in the Allūru inscription), and Avarasela schools, (Andhaka schools), are known to the commentator on the Kathavatthu, the Mahāvinasela (not to speak of its later offshoot Aparamahāvinasela) and Ayira-Utayipabhāha nikāyas

122. Eto mama leṇe vasatānāṁ cātudisasa bhikhusaghasa mukhāhāro bhavisati, Nāsīk No. 10. Saṅghasa cātudisasa ye imasim leṇe vasāṁtānāṁ bhavisati cīvarika, No. 12, EI, Vol. VIII.


124. Utayipabhāha is perhaps Sans. Utara Prabhāsa. Prabhāsa is the name of a place of pilgrimage in western Deccan. (Nāsīk, No. 10, EI, Vol. VIII) Most of the schools that took their rise in the Āndhradesa, derive their names from places, presumably places where the sects in question took their origin. ‘Ayira’ or ‘aira’ (Sans. Ārya) is at Allūru, Amarāvatī, and Nāgāruṇikonḍa
are not so known. The latter group was therefore later than the commentary on the Kathavatthu. But the epigraphs which mention them cannot, however, be ascribed to a period later than the second half of the second century A.D. The Mahācaitya at Amaravati was dedicated to the Caitikas. As another but smaller Stūpa in the same place was dedicated to the Utayipabhāhis they were perhaps an offshoot of the Caitikas. Rājaigiri would also seem to have been a stronghold of the Caitikas. Each sect had its Mahānavakāmnas and Navakāmnas, monks some of whom were sthaviras, mahāsthaviras and bhadantas.¹²⁵

Monks and Nuns

Monks are called bhikhus, pavajitas, samanās, and āpdmāpātikas. Nuns are called samanikās, pavajitikās, and bhikkhunīs. It is no wonder that the flourishing Buddhist communities in western and eastern Deccan abounded in great teachers. In western Deccan, mahāsthaviras, sthaviras, bhāṇakas, and tevijas (sans. Traividyas—those who know the Tripiṭaka; also adopted by the Buddhists as an epithet of arhats)¹²⁶ trod the land, enlightening the faithful on the law of the master. In eastern Deccan, monacks, nuns and laymen flocked to teachers versed in the Vinaya and Dhamma (Dhammakathikas) and had bhāṇa under them. Even nuns were teachers (upajhiyā-

¹²⁵ Navakāmnas is a religious building dedicated by some lay member to the Samgha in general. While in the western cave inscription 'aya', 'ayya', and 'ayira' (ārya) is a title prefixed to the names of Buddhist arhats, teachers, monks and nuns.

¹²⁶ Rhys Davids, Buddhist Suttas, p. 162.
yini), and had scores of female pupils (atevasini) under them. Some monks and nuns were persons who had led the life of gṛhasthas. Monks and nuns were recruited from the lowest classes also.127

The monks spent the rainy season (kept their vassa) in the caves scooped out on prominent rocks or in monasteries built by the faithful.128 The remaining part of the year was spent in religious tours. That is why most of the Buddhist monuments were erected in trade centres like Dhammakaṭaka, Kalyāṇ, Paithān and Nāṣik, and at Kārlā, and Junnar which are situated in the passes leading from Konkan to the Ghats. The caves at Kanheri, which is near the sea and the sea-port of Kalyāṇ, and Kudā, Mahād, and Chiplun situated on creeks, show that monks and nuns travelled by sea also.

Monks and nuns lived in caves called lenas (Sans. layana) or vihāras. Vihāras cut out of rock, open with a verandah; inside is a hall surrounded on three sides by rows of cells, each with a stone bench for the monks to sleep on. Structural vihāras were also built on the same plan. Attached to the vihāra or as parts of it are bhojanamaṭapa or bhojanacatusāla (refectory), upathānasāla (hall of reception), saṅgharāma,129 pāṇijapodhīs, and saṅapodhīs. The bhojanamaṭapa at Junnar130 is an open hall 19 feet wide by 14½ feet deep and 8 feet high, with a bench round the three inner walls; the upathānasāla at Kārlā is a hall 21 feet wide by 11 feet deep and seven feet high, and is the upper story of a vihāra 24 feet wide by 22 feet deep and 7½ feet high, with ten cells four in the back and three on each side, but half of them in an unfinished state. The vihāra hall is sometimes called kōḍhi. Thānaka would also seem to be another name for vihāra, as the cave in which the inscription containing the former word is incised bears a close resemblance to the small vihāra at Bhājā. The Buddhist temples attached to vihāras are called Cetiyaṭhāras or Selegharas, or Cetiyaṭhāris. Cetiyaṭhāras are of two main types, both dāgoba shrines. One is the flat-roofed vihāra—like cave with a dāgoba shrine at the back and with cells on the sides or in front of the hall. The other is

128. In Kanheri No. 18, ASWI, Vol. V the vassa is said to have been kept in summer.
129. Lūders translates saṅgharāma No. 988 as 'monastery'; but in the inscription (ASWI, Vol. V, No. 6, p. 77) it is spoken as part of a vihāra. Arāma means 'garde.' and saṅgharāma means 'the garden around the monastery'.
vault-roofed, has horse-shoe shaped windows over the entrance and has an interior consisting of a nave and side aisles with a small circular *Stūpa* at the inner circular end, the object or centre of cult. To the former class belong those at Mahāḍ, Kuḍā, and Junnar. In a *Cetiya* at Mahāḍ the *dāgoba* is in half relief. At Kuḍā the abacus of the capital of the *Cetiya* just touches the roof and the cell has a stone bench or bed. At Junnar the *Cetiya* consists of a verandah with a flat roof forming the porch to the cave. Behind the arched nave of a *Cetiya* stands a *dāgoba* of the same style as at Bēḍsā. The next step was to pierce the rock over the verandah with an arched window. The *dāgoba* shrines at Bhaja, Bēḍsā, Karlā, Nāsik, Konḍāne, and Kaṃ̨hēri, some of them belonging to a period considerably anterior to the Christian era, are of the latter type. One on the Mānmōḍī hill (Junnar) is of this type. But those at Nāsik, Konḍāne, Bhājā, and Bēḍsā, have no screen in front, though at Bēḍsā the returns of the rock at each side of the façade of the *Caiṭya* cave favour the idea that something in the front was intended. Burgess remarks: “Judging from the examples at Bēḍsā, Karlā, and Kaṃ̨hēri, it seems as if the great windows in the original wooden structures from which these Caiṭya caves were copied were always covered by a screen in front, which partially hid them while it protected them from the weather.”

Brahmanical Religion

Brahmanism was also in a flourishing condition. Most of the Sātavāhana kings were followers of the Brahmanical religion. The third king of the line performed a number of Vedic sacrifices and named one of his sons *Vedisiri*. In the *Saptasati* an anthology of erotic verses attributed to Ḩāla, adoration is paid to Śiva. Later Sātavāhanas were also followers of the Brahmanical religion. Gotamiputa Siri-Satākani was not the only supporter of the Brahman. He was not only learned in the traditional lore, but emulated epic heroes like Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna, Bhīmasena, and Purānic figures like Nābhāga, Nahuṣa, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, and Ambariṣa. Since Gotamī speaks of Kailāśa, were she and her son devotees of Śiva? Another king bears the name Yaṇa.

132. The minister to whom the daughter of prince Hakusiri was given would seem to have been a Buddhist, as he bears the name Arahalaya, and as his daughter excavates the only *Caityagrha* at Nāsīk, (Nāsīk, No. 19, El, Vol. VIII).
133. First and last verses.
Uśavadāta’s inscription134 speaks of Carakas, a special category of ascetics at Ramatirtha in Sopārāga, Suvarṇamukha, Govardhana and Pīndātikāvaḍa. Uśavadāta’s inscriptions however, show that Brahmanism was more flourishing outside Sātavāhana dominions, viz., in Gujerat, Kathiawad, Rajaputana, and Ujjain; all his Brahmanical austerities are located in them.135

The Nāneghāṭ record begins with adoration to Dharma, Samkarṣaṇa, Vāsudeva, Indra, the Sun and the Moon, the guardians of the four quarters of the world viz., Vāsava, Kubera, Varuṇa and Yama. The Saptasatakāṁ mentions wooden images of Indra which were worshipped.136 Worship of Kṛṣṇa is indicated by the names like Govardhana, Kṛṣṇa, and Gopāla. In the Saptasatakāṁ we find the Kṛṣṇa legends fully developed. Here Kṛṣṇa is called Madhumathana137 and Dāmōdara. Gōpis and Yaśōdā are also mentioned.138 We also hear of the jealousy of shepherdesses against Rādhā.139

Names like Sivapālita, Sivakhadila, Sivadatta, Kumāra etc., point to a worship of Śiva, and Skanda. The Saptasatakāṁ furnishes us interesting data in this direction. In the opening and closing verses Paśupati and Gaurī are adored. Temples of Gaurī are mentioned in gāthā 172. Śiva is also called Paramatādhipa (Prākṛt. Paramahāhāvīyam) in gāthā 440. Kāpālinīs or ash covered and skull-bearing women ascetics are also mentioned.140 Gaṇeṣa is mentioned as Gaṇādhipati.141

134. Nāsik, No. 12, EI, Vol. VIII.
135. According to the Mahābhārata, a forest near Sopāra was in times of yore, the scene of austerities and sacrifices performed by kings. It also contained the holy shrines of Vasu, of the Marutganas, of Aśvini, Vaivasvat, Ṛṣṭyā, Kubera, Indra, Viṣṇu, etc. (Vanaparvan, Chapter CXVIII).
136. Saccam cia kaṭṭhamao
Suraṇaho, jena halkabhūte |
Hatthehi kamaladalako
Malehi cikko na pallavio ||
Weber, Das Saptacatakam des Hāla, p. 470, g. 864.
138. Ājja vi vālo Dāmo- 
avo tti ia jāmpe jasoae |
Kanhamhapesiaccham
nhuam hasiam Vaavahūhim || g. 112.
139. Weber, op. cit., p. 31, g. 89.
140. Gāthā, 408.
141. Gāthās 403, 372.
Names like Vinhupalita, Venhu, and Lachinikā point in the same way to the worship of Viṇṇu. In the Saptaśatakam, Hari or Trivikrama is said to be superior to other gods. Birth of Lakshmi from the ocean of milk is also mentioned.\textsuperscript{142}

In conclusion it may be noted that one of the interesting religious data supplied by Saptaśatakam is the vrata of fire and water.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{142} Gāthās 411 and 388 respectively.

\textsuperscript{143} Gāthā, 185.
CHAPTER VII
THE IKŚVĀKUS—THIRD CENTURY A.D.

The Purānic label for the Ikṣvāku kings

The Ikṣvākus of the Nāgārjunikonda and Jaggayyapēta records are none other than the Purānic Śrīpārvatīyas1 i.e., the dynasty whose capital or home or kingdom lay in the Śrīparvata region,2 also called Āndhras3 of the lineage of the servants (bhṛtyāḥ) of the Āndhra Sātavāhanas.4 This identification which Mr. K. P. Jayaswal5 was the first to suggest is supported by the following pieces of evidence6:—The Nāgārjunikonda epigraphs make it clear that during the period under review 'Śrīparvata' signified not any particular hill on the Nāgārjunikonda site or 'Śrīsailam'7 but the whole range of Nallamalai hills of which the hills surrounding the Nāgārjunikonda plateau and the 'Śrīsailam' peak are offshoots.8

1. a, c Mt. The rest 'Śrīparvatiya,' Pargiter, Purāna Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 46, n. 30.
2. 'Chākalepakiyasa' of an inhabitant of Chakalepa (Nāsik No. 17, EL, Vol. VIII, p. 90; 'Paḍukulikiya' (Lüders, Nos. 571 and 576) of an inhabitant of Paḍukulika.
4. In the early Mt, Vā, Bd. and Vṣ. accounts.
5. JBORS, 1933, Parts I and II, p. 171.
6. These were not worked out by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal.
8. In the Nāgārjunikonda ins. giri is the word for 'peaks' and 'hillocks' (Cula-Dhaihmagiri is certainly the hillock now called NāharjūJabotfu on which the apsidal shrine built by Bodhisiri stands. Ins. F.). So 'Śrīparvata' of the same inscription cannot refer to a peak or hillock but to a whole range. The later Śrīparvata in the Kurnool District makes it improbable that the hills surrounding the Nāgārjunikonda site monopolised that name.

Scholars like Burgess and Dr. J. Ph. Vogel take seriously the Tibetan tradition preserved by Tāranātha that Nāgārjuna, the expounder of the Mādhyamika philosophy (second century A.D.), lived at Śrīparvata. Whilst they are agreed in identifying it with Hiuen-Tsang's Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li where a Sātavāhana is said to have quarried a monastery for Nāgārjuna, Burgess identifies them both with 'Śrīsailam' in the Kurnool District, and Dr. J. Ph. Vogel and the Epigraphy Department with Nāharāllabōdu or Nāgārjunikonda, a lofty hill overlooking the Kṛṣṇa at the northern end of the plateau. The Chinese pilgrim places Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li in Daksīṇa Kōsala in a place 300 li (50 miles) to the south-west of its H.A.—17
No dynasty other than the Ikṣvāku could have ruled over the Kṛṣṇa-Guntur region immediately after the Satavāhanas. The ornate alphabet, with long verticals, of the Ikṣvāku records shows only slightly developed forms over those of the Chinna Ganjam inscription of Sri-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi and the Jangli Guṇḍu inscription of Pulumāvi III (probably the last of the Satavāhanas). That the Ikṣvākus were once ‘bhṛtyas’ of the Satavāhanas is shown by the Satavāhana metronymics and prefixes to the names which they bear capital. While speaking of T'o-no-kie-tse-kia (Ḍāṇyakaṭaka where the Nāgārjunikonda plateau would have lain) he speaks of neither Nāgārjuna nor his monastery. To identify Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li of the Dakṣina-Kosala, which is placed by Hiuen Tsang 1200 lì to the north of T'o-no-kie-tse-kia, with ‘Śrī-parvata’ in the Guntur and Kurnool Districts is to go too wide of the mark. General Cunningham has identified Dakṣina-Kosala with the province of Vidarbhā, modern Berar, and its capital with modern Nagpur AGI, p. 595. This agrees with the Tibetan tradition that Nāgārjuna was a native of Vidarbhā (Wassiljeu, Appendix to Tāranātha, pp. 301, 303). The Tibetan tradition that Nāgārjuna surrounded the Stūpa at Ḍāṇyakaṭaka (the Amarāvatī Stūpa) with a railing is supported by none of the extant Amarāvatī rail inscriptions of the second and third centuries A.D. N. Dutt has pointed out (IHQ, Vol. VII, p. 639) that the Gaṇḍavyūha, a work of about the third century A.D., speaks of Ḍāṇyakara as a great city of Dakṣināpatha and a seat of Mañjuśrī, who lived in an extensive forest and converted a large number of Nāgas and inhabitants of the place, but refers neither to Nāgārjuna nor to Śrīparvata.

A Jaggayyapeta inscription which, on palaeographical grounds, should be ascribed to the seventh century A.D., mentions Candraprabha, his teacher Jaya- prabha and the latter’s teacher Nāgārjuna (Nāgārjunacārya, ASSI, Vol. I, p. 112. Pl. LXIII). The Sādhanaṁālā mentions a tantric Nāgārjuna, one of the 84 Mahāsiddhas, who came after Sarha. B. Bhattacharya places the former in the seventh century A.D. (Sādhanaṁālā, Vol. II, Intro. xliv-xlvi, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, XLII). The tradition preserved in the Pag-bsam-ljon-bzan (p. 86) is that, according to the account of the 84 Mahāsiddhas, one Nāgārjuna was born at Kahora, a part of Kānci, and educated at Nālandā, where he practised the siddhis and visualised the goddess Tārā. He came to Śrīparvata, (IHQ, Vol. VII, p. 637). Tāranātha also mentions him (ibid., 638, n. 1). While there is thus evidence, literary and epigraphic, for connecting the second Nāgārjuna with Śrīparvata, there is at present no evidence which allows us to associate the first Nāgārjuna with Nāgārjunikonda.

“The Mātṣya Purāṇa speaks of a family of Śrī-Parvatiya Andhras, which may refer to a petty dynasty either at Śrī-Sailam itself or across the river at Chandaguptapaṭṭam in the vicinity,” ASSI, Vol. I, p. 7.

According to Prof. Rapson, “they were probably the Cuṭus, who rose to power in the western and southern districts after the reign of Śrī-Yaṅa” CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas, Intro. lxix. But the identification suggested here makes Rapson’s conjecture wrong.
(e.g., siri and sámi)9; and it will be shown below that they were Mahátalavaras under the Sátavāhanas. Names into the composition of which ‘Skanda’ enters and the ‘anaka’ ending in names also point to Sátavāhana influence.10 The Ikṣvāku capital Vijayapuri is, in inscription F, stated to have been situated to the west of the Lesser Dhammagiri (Nāharāllabōdu mound.)11

The find of nearly 148 lead coins of the Sátavāhana period at Nāgārjunikonda12—they are now in the Calcutta Museum and are said to be much corroded—indisputably shows that the kingdom of the Ikṣvākus or at least a part of it was included in the Sátavāhana empire. Whilst then, the south-western parts of the Sátavāhana empire fell to the Cuṭus, and the western parts to the Sakas, Abhiras and Gardabhillas, the eastern parts passed into the hands of the Ikṣvākus.

Duration of the dynasty

According to the Purāṇas, there were seven kings in the dynasty. But epigraphy has disclosed the names of only three. As regards the duration of the dynasty, the Purānic account is far from being clear. The Matsya which gives us the oldest version has ‘dvi pañcaSatam’ which, according to Pargiter, may mean 52 or 100. The Vāyu and Brahmanda accounts, which according to him are corrupted, give ‘dve ca šatam.’ However, c Vāyu which next to the Matsya gives us the oldest version has ‘dve ardha

11. “Siripavate Vijayapuriya puva-disā-bhāge vihāre Cula-Dhammagiriyaṁ cetiyagaḥrahā . . . at Siripavata (the Nāgarjunikonḍa site with the hills which form parts of the range which went by that name), a cetiya on the Cula-Dhammagiri standing to the east of Vijayapuri.” In the central part of the valley which is now marked by cultivation and which is certainly to the north-west of the Nāharāllabōdu, Mr. Longhurst discovered a palace site (ASR, 1928-29, p. 104). From the elaborate ornamentation and the curious semi-classical objects portrayed on some of the pillars, it would seem that they once supported the roof of some royal palace. The pillar set up in memory of Sirī-Cāntamula lay buried in the north-western part of the valley, not far from the river. Moreover, several ruined mandapas or pavilions mark the site of the ancient city. Finally, the plateau shut in by hills on which there are remains of fortifications offered an ideal site for a capital. The Vijayapura of the Amarāvatī inscription (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 85, No. 30, Pl. LVIII) is perhaps identical with the Vijayapuri of our inscription.
12. ASR; 1928-29; p. 103.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE ANDHRA COUNTRY

śata' which is undoubtedly 52. This conclusion is arrived at in another way. The earliest Matsya account which mentions the seven Śripārvatīya Andhras ends with the mention of Kilakila kings; even the Vākāṭaka Vindhyaśakti is not mentioned in this recension. The synchronism between Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II and Devagupta (Candrāgupta II 380-419) would place Vindhyaśakti between 260 and 285 A.D. The earliest Matsya account was, therefore, closed before 260 A.D. The Satavāhanas could not have disappeared from the political stage before 205 A.D. The Iksvākus, their successors, could, therefore, have ruled for only 52 and not 100 years. We know from inscriptions that Siri-Vīrapurisadata and Ehuvula Cāṁtamūla divided between themselves at least 31 years. A reign of 15 years may be assigned to Siri-Cāṁtamūla, 'the Unobstructed,' who is credited with many sacrifices and dānas and who seems to have lived to middle age. The short reigns of the last four kings would be evidence of the troublous times.

Home of the Iksvākus

Dr. Sten Konow seeks their home in the western Deccan. The sources of his suggestion are the 'anaka' suffix to personal names in the Nāgārjunikonda and western cave inscriptions and the possibility of explaining some terms in the former through Kanarese. According to him, 'Khanda' is Kanarese 'Kanda,' meaning 'child.' 'Caliki-remmanaka' is probably Kanarese 'Calikirānaka' 'moon.' "It also strikes me that Kanarese karrambu means 'envy.'" "The h for s also points to Kanarese." We may point out, however, that 'Khandha' is a Prākrit form of 'Skanda.' 'Karumbudhina' is a contraction for 'Karumbudhīnaka' and 'karum' in Tamil means 'black' (adj.), and 'anaka'

15. Pargiter arrives at the result in another way. Op. cit., Intro. xxv, Sec. 44.
17. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel says (El, Vol. XX, p. 6): "Dr. Bühler's assumption, based on palaeographical evidence that Siri-Vīrapurisadata flourished in the third century of our era, may be accepted as probably correct." The identification suggested and the chronology worked out above definitely place the Iksvākus in the first half of the third century A.D.
19. Virarhna in Inscription F. is a contraction for Viramānaka.
is a name ending; and names like Ehuvula, Aḍavi-Cāṁtisiri and Damila-Kaṅha betray Tamil influence. Since in an Ṛamarāvatī inscription of the time of Vāsiṭṭhīputa sāmi Sirī-Puḷumāvi, an ordinary person bears a name with ‘anaka’ suffix, the western influences shown by the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions are best considered as the result of Sātavāhana rule over the eastern Deccan and have no significance for the question of Ikṣvāku origins.

According to Bühler and Prof. Rapson the southern Ikṣvākus were Rajputs of northern descent—a dynastic drift of which we have instances like the Mauryas of Konkaṇ, the Guttas of Guttal and the Cōḷas of Rēnaṇḍu. According to the Vāyu Purāṇa, Ikṣvāku, the progenitor of the Solar race, was the eldest among the nine sons of Manu; he ruled from Ayodhya and had a hundred sons of whom Vikukṣī was the eldest and successor; of the other sons fifty were entrusted with small states in the north and 48 in the south. According to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Kośala (southern) was founded by Kuśa who ruled from Kośasthali. The foundation of Aśmaka and Muḷaka on the upper Godavari is ascribed to princes of Ikṣvāku descent. The Ikṣvāku drift into the Āndhraḍēśa must have taken place very early for them to have merged in the Āndhra tribe, for according to the Purāṇas the Ikṣvākus were Āndhras. A Kanarese work entitled Dharmāmṛta affords evidence of an early drift. In the time of the 12th Tīrthaṅkara Vasupūja (third or second century B.C.), Ikṣvāku Yaśodhara of Aṅga carved a kingdom for himself in the Vēṇgī country, to use the later designation of the heart of the Āndhradeśa, and founded the town of Pratipālapura identified by Mr. M. S. Sarma with Bhaṭṭiprōḷu.

Scholars like Burgess (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 111) and Caldwell (Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages, p. 115) look upon the Ikṣvāku descent claimed by the southern princes as an idle boast. Writes Caldwell: “The Aryan immigrants to the South appear to have been generally Brahmanical priests and instructors rather than Kshatriya soldiers; and the kings of the Pāṇḍyas, Cholas, Kaliṅgas and other Dravidians appear to have been simply Dravidian chieftains whom their Brahmanical preceptors and spiritual directors . . . . taught to imitate and emulate the grandeur and cultivated tastes of the Solar, Lunar and Agnikula races of kings.” What, however, invests the claim of the Ikṣvākus with authenticity is that while

20. Vide supra, p. 66; Lüders’ List No. 1248.
22. Chap. 88, 8 ff.
24. In a paper on Jainism in South India read before the Archaeological Society of South India.
Rise of the Ikṣvākus

The Allūru Brāhmī inscription (Allūru is a village in the Nandigāma taluq of the Kṛṣṇā District) discovered a decade ago throws welcome light on the rise of the Ikṣvākus to power.\(^{25}\) The āyaka-pillar inscriptions from Jaggayapēta\(^{26}\) prove beyond doubt that the Nandigāma taluq or part of it was included in the Ikṣvāku kingdom. The Allūru inscription which, on palaeographical grounds, is slightly earlier than the Amarāvatī inscription of Vāsiṭhīpura sāmī Siri-Puḷumāvī, mentions a Mahātalavara and a king.\(^{27}\) As the

the Gaṅgas (EC, Vol. VII, Sh. Nos. 4 and 64) and the Cōlas (EI, Vol. XVIII; p. 26 and Kalinīgattuppārāṇi) trace their descent from Ikṣvāku, they did not assume Ikṣvāku as their dynastic name.

27. The epigraph does not give us either the name of the king or that of the Mahātalavara. In the Calcutta Review for July 1925 Dr. Shamasstry edited this inscription. According to him, ll. 16-17 refer to Sana king of the Ayis; ll. 16-17 of the inscription however read:

"kahapāvana(m) ca pura(na)ka sahasam akhayani(n) esa Mahā-
talavarasa deya-dhama parītκko ata utarapase bāpana-nivatanānī
eta sa-bhūrīnasa sa-putakasa sanātukasa ayirana(m) Puvaseliyāna
nigāyasa . . . . . ."

The third letter in sanātukasa read as sa is clearly tu; a mention of the grandsons of the Mahātalavara (and not of the name of a king), after the mention of the wife and sons, is what is to be expected.

In the ARE, 1923-24, it was stated that “palaeographically it (the inscription) may be assigned to about the second century A.D. Most of the characters resemble those of the inscription of Siri-Yaṅa Sātakani, while others are like those of Sātakani I and Uṣavadata.”

The Chinna Ganjam inscription of the time of Siri-Yaṅa written in the ornate alphabet of the Nāgarjunikonda epigraphs, is admittedly later than the Allūru inscriptions. A comparison with the Amarāvatī inscriptions would have served the purpose far better; the early square characters of the Allūru type are to be found in some of the Amarāvatī inscriptions which, belonging as they do to the various periods between the second century B.C. and third century A.D., (the Nāgarjunikonda alphabet is to be found in Nos. 36 and 42, ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 91 and 104, Pls. LVIII, LIX; and EI, Vol. XV, Nos. 27 and 54), enable us to trace clearly the evolution of the Brāhmī alphabet in the Kṛṣṇā valley. The Allūru characters resemble clearly those of No. 16 (ASSI, Vol. I, page 63 and Pl. XLIV, ta, ya, sa, ja, ma, ha, a, ka, da and le). True, the Allūru na, ta, a, da and ka somewhat resemble those in the inscription of the time of Puḷumāvī II, but the i and u signs in the former inscription as in Nos. 16 and 18, and the rounded form of pa are certainly earlier than those of Puḷumāvī’s time. It might be argued that No. 16 is on a coping stone and must, therefore, belong to the reign of Vāsiṭhīpura sāmī Siri-Puḷumāvī when the railing was
title and office of Mahātalavara combined with those of Mahāsenapati and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka was a feature of the Ikṣvāku period, and as the Ikṣvākus like the Mahāraṭhis were matrimonially connected with the Sātavāhanas, they were, like the Mahāraṭhis, feudatories under them. The feudatory title often met with in the Andhradeśa is Mahātalavara. We would be justified in concluding that the ancestors of the Ikṣvākus were Mahātalavaras under the Sātavāhanas. After their fall Sirī-Cāṃtamula28 founded his dynasty much in the same way as the Mahāraṭhi Cuṭus in the southwestern parts and the Ābhīras in the western parts.

The founder of the line—Sirī-Cāṃtamula 'The Unobstructed'29

Whilst Vāsiṭhīputa Sirī-Cāṃtamula is extolled by his sisters, his father is not even mentioned in their inscriptions.30 Cāṃta-

enlarged and new stūpa slabs set up. No. 52 is on a coping stone of the outer railing, but in early square characters. An inscription of the reign of Sivamaka Sādi (kaṇi) which is palaeographically later than that of Vāsiṭhīputa sāmi Sirī-Pulumāvi, is also on an outer rail coping stone. It would, therefore, seem that alterations in or additions to the railings of the Stūpa (Mahācetiya) were made from time to time.

28. Cāṃtamula in A2, A3, A4, C1, C2, C3, D4, and X; Cāḍā is clear in E, G, and H.

Cāṇīta is clear in C4, G2, G3, L, M, etc. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel thinks that probably Cāṇīta is the correct form. The dictum of Senart that when the anusvara is found in some cases and absent in others, it is certain that the scribe or engraver omitted it by mistake makes it certain that Cāṃtamula is the correct form.

Prākṛt Cāṃtamula has been Sanskritized by D. C. Sircar and K. P. Jayaswal as Śāntamula and by Dr. Vogel as Kṣāntamula. Cula which in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions is opposed to Mahā is certainly Sanskrit Kṣudra—small. On this analogy Cāṇīta would be Kṣānta only. In the inscription under reference śa becomes sa and not ca. (See Childers Pali-Eng. Dic., cullo).

29. Apatihatasamkapa.

30. On the other hand he is mentioned by his daughter Aḍavī-Cāṃtisiri. Among Ikṣvākus there is a preference for names beginning with cāṇīta. A sister of Sirī-Cāṃtamula is called Cāṃtisiri. His grandson is called Ehuvula Sirī-Cāṃtamula.

Cula-Cāṃtisiri of the Kulahaka family would seem to have been a descendant of an Ikṣvāku princess married into the Kulahaka family; as the office of the Mahātalavara would seem to have been hereditary in the Kulahaka family as in the Dhanaka and Pūkiya families, as Cula Cāṃtisirinikā is herself married to a Mahātalavara and as the Ikṣvākus are matrimonially connected with the Mahātalavaras such a conjecture has strong support.
mūla would therefore seem to have been the founder of the line.\textsuperscript{31} That he possessed sovereign powers is indicated by the title 'Mahā-ṛāja'\textsuperscript{32} attached to his name, and fittingly enough his sisters, mother and consorts erected a pillar and perhaps a stūpa also in his honour.\textsuperscript{33} But we have no lithic record of his reign. All that we know about him is furnished by the memorial pillar and by the inscriptions of the reigns of his son and grandson.

His reign

In a passage which occurs in most of the inscriptions, Siri-Caṅṭamūla is credited with the performance of Agniṣṭoma, Agniḥotra, Aśvamedha, and Vājapeya sacrifices. Whilst Jyotir-Agniṣṭoma is the simplest of Soma liturgies and Agniḥotra a modest Havir-Yajña, Vājapeya was a complex rite at the end of which the performer sat upon the throne and was hailed 'Samrāṭ'—'emperor'. The fact that only three south Indian princes of the early period are said to have performed it (Siri-Sātakaṇī I, Pallava Śīva-Skandavarman and Siri-Caṅṭamūla) shows how powerful Siri-Caṅṭamūla must have been. In the Satapatha Brahmana\textsuperscript{34} and Kātyāyana's Śrauta-sūtra\textsuperscript{35} it is said that by offering Rājasūya one becomes a

\textsuperscript{31} The Memorial Pillar Inscriptions (EI, Vol. XXI, L.) shows that Siri-Caṅṭamūla's father indulged in a plurality of wives (mātāhi) unless indeed it be that the term is an honorific plural employed by the daughters of his only wife. But even a plurality of wives does not indicate the father's kingly position, for even nobles and high dignitaries of state would have followed the example set up by kings, as their metronymics would show.

\textsuperscript{32} Caṅṭamūla is referred to as Rājan in the Memorial Pillar Inscription. K. P. Jayaswal's contention that the title of Mahārāja applied to Siri-Caṅṭamūla indicates his feudatory position whilst the title of Rājan applied to Siri-Virapurisadata shows that the royal position was assumed by the latter cannot therefore be upheld. In the Ikṣvāku records the titles Rājan and Mahārāja are indifferently used. Siri-Virapurisadata bears the title of Rājan in most of the inscriptions and Mahārāja in inscriptions G and H. (EI, Vol. XX). Ehuvula Siri-Caṅṭamūla is styled Mahārāja in G and Rājan in G2 and G3.

\textsuperscript{33} Though the inscription records the setting up of the pillar only, the dome with the railing, having cetiya-arches over the gates, in the first panel might be a representation of a stūpa erected in his honour. However Stūpa No. 9 near which the pillar lay buried, contained only the bones of an ox, deer and hare along with a broken doll's head made of red pottery. ASR, 1929-30, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{34} V, 1.1.13.

\textsuperscript{35} XV, 1.1.2.
Rājan, and by offering the Vājapeya a Samrāt. According to them the office of 'Rājan' is the lower and that of 'Samrāt' the higher. The passage in the inscription also credits Siri-Cāṁtamūla with gifts of lumps of gold, ploughs of land and cows and oxen. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel looks upon the passage as conventional. But in the fifth panel of the memorial pillar Siri-Cāṁtamūla is represented as standing in plain attire, bareheaded, wearing sandals and holding a staff in his hands. But for the parasol over his head he would look an ordinary person. By his side is an attendant holding a vessel containing libation water. Before him are five Brahmans; one of them who is very young is stretching his right hand to receive a gift from the king. On the ground is seen a heap of round pieces of uncoined metal. Here is undoubtedly a representation of the gift of crores of 'hiramna' (hiramnapinda or uncoined gold pieces of a definite weight) with which Siri-Cāṁtamūla is credited.

His personality, sisters and queens

Of the representation of the Sātavāhanas or kings of their bhrtya lines on stone, we have only two clear instances. One is that of king Simuka, his son Siri-Sātakaṇi I and the latter’s family, the other is that of Siri-Cāṁtamūla on the memorial pillar. In all the four panels he is represented as a corpulent person. In the second and third panels he wears a low cap. The fourth panel shows him riding the state elephant fully caparisoned, with the attendant seated behind him holding a parasol over his head. He is followed by five or six marching attendants, one of whom is a dwarf.

36. 'go-satasahasa-hala-satasahasa padāyisa.' Regarding the various kinds of measure of land called ‘plough’ see Kullūka on Manu VII, 119.
37. EI, Vol. XX, p. 6.
38. Dr. Vogel calls them monks. (EI, Vol. XXI, p. 63). According to Mr. Hiranda Sastri they are royal ladies and officials; the young person is prince Virapurisadata. ASR, 1929-30, pp. 165, 166.
39. Unlike coins they are thick globules.
40. D. C. Sircar would see in the compound ‘aneka-hirana-koti-go-satasahasa’ a reference to some of the mahādānas. Probably the gift of cows or oxen and gold pieces was made on the occasion of sacrifices. It is noteworthy that in the last panel Siri-Cāṁtamūla with his hair cut and carrying a staff is like a performer of Agnistoma. What appears to be thrown over his shoulders is perhaps the skin of an antelope. Barnett, Antiquities of India, p. 162.

H.A.—18
Unlike his father and son who indulged in many wives, Siri-Cāntamūla had only two queens. In the panels he is represented as sitting with two queens. In the inscription where his 'mahā-devis' are mentioned we have 'subhatarikāhi ca Sarasikāya, Kusumalatāya.' 'Subhatarikāhi' is a mistake for 'Subhaṭarikāhi' (Sansk. Svabhaṭṭārikābhīḥ)—'by his own ladies' or wives. Thus in the inscription also only two queens are mentioned.

Harhmasirinika and Camtisiri are the sisters of Siri-Cāntamūla. The former would seem to have died before the twentieth year of Siri-Virapurisadata and the latter between his eighteenth and twentieth regnal years. Unlike Siri-Cāntamūla, a staunch follower of the Brahmanical religion, the two sisters were ardent Buddhists (lay disciples), and it is to the latter's munificence that we owe some of the most important monuments in the Nāgārjunikonda plateau.

Conclusion

Since the portrait representation of Cāntamūla shows us a middle-aged person, he would seem to have died at middle age; this is made very probable by the fact that his mother and step-mothers (mātāhi) lived up to the twentieth year of his son's reign. No Buddhist monument in the valley can be definitely attributed to his reign. He was, like some of the Western Cālukya kings, a protégé of Mahāsena, 'the Virūpakhapati' ('lord of Virūpākṣa hosts'). Until fresh evidence turns up, his attitude towards Buddhism and the Buddhist activities of the royal ladies must remain unknown. Since daughter, sister, grand-daughter and daughter-in-law are all anxious to state their relationship to him, Siri-Cāntamūla was evidently looked upon as the most famous in the line.

41. Cāntisiri who was born of a Vāsithi, was married to a Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara Vāsithiputa Khanidasiri of the Pukiya clan. Such an endogamous marriage seems peculiar. As the Mahātalavaras borrowed metronymics from their kings it is no wonder they did not look upon the former as an institution for regulating marriages.

42. "From the expression Virūpakhapati-Mahāsena-parigahitasa, which is applied to Chāntamūla, it may perhaps be concluded that he was a votary of the god Mahāsena or Skanda, 'the lord of the Virūpakhas'. The term Virūpakha (= Skt. Virūpākṣa) seems to be used here to indicate the hosts of which Skanda is the lord and leader." "The word Virūpakha (Skt. Virūpākṣa), indicating a class of snakes, occurs in an ancient snake-charm. Vinaya Piṭakam . . . . ." ibid.

Virapurisadata

Mādhārīputa Siri-Virapurisadata was not as great as his father Siri-Cāṁtamūla. Even so his reign marks a glorious epoch in the history of Buddhism in the Kṛṣṇa valley. Probably one or two matrimonial alliances of far-reaching importance were contracted during his reign.

Alliance with the powerful house of Caṭhana

Like their masters the Sātavāhanas, the Ikṣvākus also contracted matrimonial alliance with the Śaka dynasty of Ujjain. An āyaka pillar epigraph dated in the sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata records the donation of a pillar and 170 dināri-māsakas by 'Mahā-devi Rudradhara-Bhaṭṭārikā, an 'Ujenika Mahārājābālikā.' Now that we know the names of the two queens of Siri-Cāṁtamūla it is

44. Bühler, (IA, vol. XI, p. 257) and following him Burgess (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 111) take both 'siri' and 'vīra' as honorific prefixes. Bühler’s argument is that a name like 'Virapurisadata' would compel us to assume the existence of a deity called 'Vīrapuruṣa' which hitherto is not known. (datta=given by, Puruṣa=Viṣṇu). Names like Vīraṁnikā and Vīraṁna (inscription F.) make 'vīra' part of a personal name. When two or more honorific prefixes adorn a name, they always precede 'siri'; i.e., what immediately follows 'siri' is the personal name, e.g., Siva Siri-Apiḷaka, Siva Siri-Sātakani. Lüders, op. cit., No. 1127.

45. D. C. Sircar would attribute the presence of dināri-māsakas to Śaka matrimonial alliance. Dr. Vogel would attribute it to the vast seaborne trade between the Kṛṣṇa-Godāvari region and the West through the emporiums of Kantakossyla, Palūra, Kodūra, etc. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel’s theory is supported by the following facts:—The find of Roman coins of the period from 68-217 A.D. (JRAS, 1904, pp. 599 ff.), at Vinukonda in the Guntur district and in the Nellore and Cuddapah districts; the mention of a 'vaddālabhikaro(ra) yonaka divikayo' (a Greek lamp resembling the ‘vaddāla’ fish in shape) in the Allūru inscription (A lamp of the fish shape has been found at P'ong Tuk. It might have gone there direct from Europe or Asia-Minor or the eastern coast of South India, ABIA, 1927, Pl. 8); and the Graeco-Roman influences discernible in the Amarāvati sculptures of the middle of the second century A.D. As Gotamiṇḍa Siri-Yaṇa Sātakani and Vāṣiṭhīputa Siri-Sātakani struck silver in imitation of Ksatrapa coinage with the Head of the King (the Ksatrapas derived the obverse of their coins, i.e., Head of King from the denarius brought into India by way of commerce, Rapson, op. cit., cixli and cix), it is improbable that the denarius was introduced in the wake of Sātavāhana conquest of the eastern Deccan. The relic casket from Stūpa No. 6, has yielded two coin-like medallions of thin gold ½ inch in diameter, each embossed with a head which makes the impression of being meant for a portrait (ASR, 1929-30, Pl. 37).
not possible to consider her as his queen; she would therefore appear to have been a queen of Virapurisadata. As she is said to have donated money for the building of the Mahācetiya while the work was going on, the matrimonial alliance must have been contracted before the sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata's reign, possibly even during the reign of his father. As Ozène is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of Tiastanes (Caṣṭana) and as 'Rudra' often enters into the personal names of Western Kṣatrapas of the Caṣṭana line who style themselves Rājan, Dr. Vogel's conjecture that Rudradhara-Bhattārikā belonged to the house of Caṣṭana is very sound. As Siri-Virapurisadata's reign would fall in the second and third decades of the third century A.D. she might have been a daughter of any one of the following Western Kṣatrapas: —Rudrasena I (Ś. 122-44), Rudrasimha I (son of Rudradāman), Prthivisena (son of Rudrasena I), Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena (Ś. 144-58), sons of Rudrasimha I. The alliance would have gained Kṣatrapa recognition for the new dynasty.

Other queens

Other queens of Siri-Virapurisadata were Chathisirī and Bapisirinikā, daughters of Harhmasiri, and Bhattidevā, the daughter of Cāṃtisirinikā. The marriage between the king and Bhaṭṭidevā would have taken place between the sixth and fifteenth

46. Unlike the other queens of Virapurisadata, Rudradharabhāttārikā does not state her relationship to him.
47. The year in which the Mahācetiya was consecrated.
49. Rudrasena III is styled Mahārāja on some coins of Mahākṣatrapa Sinhasena. Rapson, op. cit., p. 190.
50. Dr. Vogel reads 'Ujanika Mahārabālikā' but the e sign over ja is partially visible (the Prākrt form of Ujjain is Ujjeni or Ujjeni). The learned doctor's correction of 'Mahārābālikā' into 'Mahārājābālikā' is certainly warranted by the sense of the passage and the numerous mistakes of the scribe or the engraver to be found in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions.
51. This alliance accounts for the sculpture of a Śāka warrior on one of the Nāgārjunikonda pillars (ABIA, 1927, Pl. VI), and for the donations by a Śaka girl (EI, vol. XX, p. 37).
52a. Bhaṭṭidevā does not however expressly call herself a daughter of Cāṃtisirinikā. It can only be inferred from the facts that both of them were Vāṣithis. and that Cāṃtisirī calls Siri-Virapurisadata, 'her own son-In-law' (apano jāmātuka) in some inscriptions (E, M1, etc.).
years\textsuperscript{53} of his reign. As Bhaṭṭidevā's son ascended the throne not long after the twentieth year of Siri-Virapurisadata's reign, the marriage must have taken place soon after the sixth year.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{Alliance with the Cuṭūs}

Another power of importance in south-western India of the third century A.D. was the Cuṭū whose kingdom extended as far north as Kanheri and as far east as Anantapur. The political sense of the Ikṣvākus that dictated an alliance with the Western Kṣatrāpas also dictated an alliance with the Cuṭūs. An inscription dated in the eleventh year of Ehuvula Siri-Cāṁtāmula records the benefactions of Mahādevi Kōđabalisiri,\textsuperscript{55} daughter of Siri-Virapurisa-data, half sister (bhaṭginī, not sodāra bhaṭginī) of the king and wife of a Vanavāsaka-Mahārāja.\textsuperscript{56} Scholars are agreed that Banavāsi

\textsuperscript{53.} Dr. J. Ph. Vogel is of opinion that the marriage took place between the 6th and 18th year. But inscriptions M\textsuperscript{1} to M\textsuperscript{5} (EI, Vol. XXI) dated in the 15th year mention Siri-Virapurisadata as the son-in-law of Cāṁtisiri; the latter calls herself his aunt (pīṭuce) in an inscription of the sixth year of his reign.

\textsuperscript{54.} The significance of the Ikṣvāku system of marriages has been discussed along with metronymics (\textit{vide supra}).

\textsuperscript{55.} Ins. H, EI, Vol. XX.

\textsuperscript{56.} Both forms Vanavāsa or Vanavāsi occur in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions (H and F). Vanavāsakas or Vanavāsins are mentioned in the \textit{Mahābhārata} (6,366) as a people dwelling in South India. The \textit{Mahāvaṁśa} mentions the conversion of Vanavāsi by Rakkhita (Chap. XII, p. 84, evidently the kingdom).

The ka suffix indicates the place to which the king belonged, i.e., his capital or his kingdom e.g. Kantakasolaka= 'inhabitant of Kantakasola' (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 106); and Nāsikaka= 'inhabitant of Nāsik,' (EI, Vol. VIII; Nos. 20 and 22). The compound \textquoteleft Ujanika-Mahāraja (ja) balikā\textquoteright makes it more probable that the capital is referred to here. We may also note the forms \textquoteleft Vaiṅgeyaka Hastivarma\textquoteright and \textquoteleft Kānceyaka Visnugopa\textquoteright which occur in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (CII, Vol. III, p. 3 t. 1. 4). Dr. Vogel places modern Banavāsi, which represents the remains of the old town, in the Shimoga Dt. of the Mysore State (EI, Vol. XX, p. 8). It is, however, in the Sīrsī taluq of the North Kanara Dt. (Bombay Presidency) (Survey map 48 F\textsuperscript{14}; Imperial Gazeteer of India, New Series, Vol. VI).

Dr. Bühler has quoted St. Petersburg Dictionary to the effect that Vaijayantī occurs both in Brahmanical and Jain books as the name of a town in the coast of the Konkan, and has suggested that it is the seaport Byzantion of the Greeks. (CTI, p. 28, n.). The identity of Vaijayantī with Banavāsi is however established by the following points: Jayantī as the name of Banavāsi occurs in many records notably in an inscription at Banavāsi itself at the temple of \textit{Madhukeśvara} which records that the stone cot of \textit{Madhukeśvara}
Vanavasi, or Vanavasa is another name for Vaijayanti (Prakrt, Vejayanti). The Malavalli pillar inscription of a Cuţu Sātakaṇi mentions Vaijayanti as his capital. Since Kaţhēri, which, as late as the reign of Siri-Yaņa, was in the Sātavāhana empire, came into the possession of the Cuţus, and since neither the Banavasi nor the Malavalli inscriptions can be ascribed to a period later than the third century A.D., it is certain that the Cuţus rose to power in the third century on the ruins of Sātavāhana power. The Cuţus bear the title of 'Mahārāja.'

The Buddhist monuments of his reign

The central royal Buddhist figure in the reign is Cāṁtisiri. To this donatrix, the 'mahādānapatini', the 'velāmika dāna paṭibhāga vochimna dhāra padāyini' goes the credit of having given an impetus to the beautification of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa valley, which bids fair to prove of more interest than Amarāvatī. She would even seem to have been responsible for the Buddhist leanings of Rudrādhara-Bhaṭṭarika, Chuṭhisiri Cula-Cāṁtisirinikā and Bāpisirinikā. The most important foundation of Cāṁtisiri was the 'Mahācetiya' enshrining the 'dhātu' of the Great Teacher, consecrated in the

was presented at the town of Jayanti (IA, Vol. IV, p. 207, No. 8), and this god who was the family deity of the Kadambas of Hanagal is always called in their records Madhukesvara of Jayanti.

Senart remarks (EI, Vol. VII, p. 49): "In addition to the instances quoted by Dr. Burgess, where Jayanti seems to represent Banavasi, one might perhaps ask if in the Banavasi inscription the letter which has been read sa or sain before jayantakasa (1.2) might not be a ve, in which case the sculptor Damokara would be designated as a native of Vaijayanti." The letter is clearly sa and nothing else.

58. Lüders' List, No. 1021.
62. The reason for her choice of this site must have been its vicinity to the capital.
63. They want to attain Nirvāṇa. B4, B5, C2, and C4.
64. Whilst Dr. Vogel thinks that Cāṁtisiri built the Mahācetiya, Mr. Hirananda Sastri maintains (ASR, 1928-29) that she only rebuilt or enlarged an older stūpa. The latter view rests upon the following arguments, some of them not expressly stated:—The Amarāvati, Ghantasala and Jaggayyapēṭa Stūpas, which on epigraphical evidence belong to a period much earlier than the second century A.D., were enlarged, and āyaka platforms were added to them during the second century A.D. If the Stūpa was built by Cāṁtisiri, the inscriptions would have told us how the relics of the Teacher which the
sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata. The Stūpa which is fifty feet in diameter, is in the shape of a wheel, with spokes, hub, tyre and all complete. Cāmintisiri was aided in the undertaking by other Bud-

Stūpa is said to be enshrined were obtained; whilst the terms ‘patithapita’ and ‘thāpitá’ are used, with reference to the erection of ‘āyaka-khaṁbhas, ‘cetiya-gharas’ and ‘sela-maṇḍavas, ‘samuthāpiya’ and ‘nīthāpitā’ are used with reference to the Mahācetiya (Bś and C1). Dr. Vogel cites the authority of the Mahāvanaśa (EI, Vol. XX, p. 30) to show that ‘nīthāpitā’ means completed. In inscription C1, the Mahācetiya is called ‘navakaṁmam’; the ‘navakaṁmika’ is said to have been the Reverend Ananda, who knew the Majjhima and Dīgha Nikāyas by heart. According to the Vinaya Pitaka (SBE, XX, pp. 189 ff) a ‘navakaṁmam’ is ‘a religious edifice’ erected by a lay member (upāsīka or upāsaka) for the Saṅgha.

Whilst the fact that the outer drum and the interior of the Mahācetiya are built of bricks of the same size negatives the theory of enlargement, the fact that it is built of bricks of the same size as those used for the apsidal temples built during the Iksvāku period (20”x10”x3”) and other Buddhist monuments in the valley, and the fact that the relic caskets in the Nāgarjunikonda stūpas are all nearly alike, prove Dr. Vogel’s theory. If the Mahācetiya is older than the Iksvāku period, we would have found older epigraphs and sculptures of which no traces remain; no doubt if the pot containing the silver relic casket found in one of the northern chambers of the Stūpa had been intact, it might have given us an inscription and proved beyond doubt the age of the Stūpa. (The relic consists of a fragment of bone of the size of a pea found inside a tiny round gold box ¾” in diameter. This with a few gold flowers, pearls and garnets was placed in the silver casket shaped like a stūpa. The latter was, however, found corroded and broken to pieces).

Vogel translates “namo Bhagavato …… sāmīma sambudhasa dhātuvara parighatita Mahācetiya” into “adoration to the Blessed one the supreme Buddha absorbed by the best of elements at the Mahacetiya……………..” Dr. Hirananda Sastri links dhātuvavaraparighita with Mahācetiye and thinks that the Mahācetiya was protected by the corporeal remains of the Buddha. I am wholly unable to accept this as we cannot link the genitive parighatita with the locative Mahācetiye (EI, Vol. XX, p. 29 note 1). The interpretation proposed by Vogel on the authority of M. L. de la Vallé Poussin for the difficult phrase dhātuvavaraparighita is quite acceptable. Mahācetiye commences a fresh sentence and must be linked up with āyaka-khaṁbho thāpitā.

While stūpas of less importance at Nāgarjunikonda (Stūpa No. 6 and Stūpa No. 9 especially) were decorated with carved marble slabs and coping stones, the Mahācetiya would seem to have been executed in simple style like the stūpas of Ceylon. As will be shown below, there was active communication between Ceylon and the Nāgarjunikonda valley.

The remains of the Mahācetiya are the drum fifty feet in diameter, and twenty feet high at the centre, the āyaka platforms, āyaka-khaṁbhas, some of them in fragments, the foundations of the enclosure wall and the gateways.

65. According to Mr. Longhurst, all the Andhradesa stūpas are built in
dhist and non-Buddhist royal ladies and private individuals. Mahādevī Rudradhara-Bhattārikā donated money and an āyaka pillar. Aḍavī-Cāṃtisirī, Chaṭhisirī, Bapisirinikā and Cula-Cāṃtisirīnikā of the Kulahaka family, each contributed an ‘āyaka-kham-bha.’ A slab and a coping stone were donated by a Chadakapavatica and his wife Padumavāṇī together with their sons and daughters. However, nine āyaka-pillars or more were set up by Cāṃtisirī.

The practice of erecting vihāras and cetiyagharas or apsidal temples by the side of stūpas was followed in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa valley also. Close to the Mahācetiya on the eastern side is an apsidal temple; an inscription incised on the marble floor of the shrine in two lines records its foundation by Cāṃtisirī in the eighteenth year of Virapurisadata’s reign ‘for the sake of his victory and longevity of life.’ To the east of the apsidal temple are fragments of thirty-six pillars, some of them just rising out of the ground, pillars which must have supported the roof of a maṇḍapa. Fragments of this style (IA, Vol. 61, p. 185). But the Jaggayyapēṭa Stūpa was formed of earth in layers about two feet thick over each of which was laid a close flooring of very large bricks closely fitted together (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 108).

66. EI, Vol. XX, p. 25, Inscriptions I and J.
67. The meaning of ‘āyaka’ is not settled. Some would connect it with ‘ayako’, ‘ayaka’ (āyaka) meaning ‘venerable or worshipful’. In our epigraphs we have ‘āyaka’ not ‘ayaka’; ‘ayaka’ is used as a noun; and the fact that āyaka pillars bear inscriptions (EI, Vol. XX, H; Vol. XXI, G2, G3) little favours the theory that they were objects of worship. Āyaka is rendered by Lüders and Burgess as ‘entrance’. Dr. Vogel objects to this rendering on the ground that in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Amarāvati inscriptions, the word for entrance or gate is ‘dāra’ (F. EI, Vol. XX; ASSI, Vol. I, No. 44). An inscription on a coping-stone (ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. XLVIII; fig. 4) of a Cetiya platform has ‘utarāyake paṭo dāna’ (ibid, p. 93). Another inscription (No. 47, p. 86) on an āyaka-pillar (Pl. XLV, No. 1), records the gift of a ‘Cetiya-khabha’ (āyaka-pillar) at the ‘dakhināyaka’ (dakhināyake not dakhināyaka as Burgess has read it). But in No. 15 Pl. Ivi we have ‘utarāyake unisa dānam.’ Since the inscription is on an outer rail coping, ‘āyaka’ here means ‘gateway.’ Pali ‘ayo’ means ‘entrance.’ Thus in the Amarāvati inscription ‘āyaka’ is used to denote ‘something at the entrance,’ as well as projections facing entrances. It would, therefore, seem that the projections received that name from the fact that they faced entrances or ‘gateways.’

68. ‘Cetiya-ghara’. It seems that ‘ghara’ was restricted to halls used for worship, e.g., ‘sela-ghara’ Kāḷā No. 1, (EI, Vol. VII); Cetiya-ghara Kuḍā Nos. 15 and 23 (CTI), Nāsik Nos. 18 and 19 (EI, Vol. VIII).
69. Plate VI, Nos. 2 and 3.
70. apano jām(ā) tukasa raṇo M(ā)ṭhariputasa-īkha(ā)kunam Sīrī-Virāpurisadatasā ṛj-yudhanike vejayike, (EI, Vol. XX, E.).
ments of inscriptions on those pillars put together, record the foundation of a pillared-hall surrounded by a cloister (cātusāla-parigahitam)\(^\text{71}\) and its consecration in the eighth fortnight of the rainy season of the fifteenth year of the reign.

A private donatrix who emulated Cāntisiri was the lay disciple Bodhisiri, daughter of the householder Revata and Budhāṃnikā, belonging to Govagāma\(^\text{72}\) and niece of the treasurer (Koṭhāgārika) Bhada (Sanskrit Bhadra). The foundations attributed to her are two ‘Cetiya-gharas’—(one on the Lesser Dhammagiri by the side of a vihāra\(^\text{73}\) as the special property of the theris (nuns) of Ceylon,\(^\text{74}\) and another at Kulaha-vihāra,\(^\text{75}\) a shrine for the Bodhi-tree (i.e.,


72. As Bodhisiri dedicates her apsidal-temple to the theris of Ceylon, she was probably a native of Ceylon. N. Dutt identifies Govagama with Gonagamaka, mentioned as a port in Ceylon in the Mahāvamsa (IHQ. Vol. VII, p. 653, n. 2).

73. The vihāra referred to still stands on the Naharāllābōḍu mound.

74. Dr. Vogel’s translation of ‘(bha)danita (rā)jācariyānām Kasmira-Gandhāra – Cīna-Çilāta-Tosāli-Avāramita – Vanīga-Vanavāsi-Yavana-Da(mila) (Pa)lura-Tambapāṇī-dipa pas(ā)dakānām theriyānam Tambapa(nī) nakānām-suparigahe . . . . . . . . . . . . . Cetiya-nāgaram kārītām’ (F, t. I. 1) as “Caiṭya-shrine erected for the acceptance of the fraternities of Ceylon who have converted Kasmira etc.,” is not satisfactory. Not even the Mahāvamsa does credit Ceylonese monks with the conversion of various countries. Keeping in mind the analogy of the Karla and Nasik inscription (Karia Nos. 19 and 20, Nāsk Nos. 2, 3 and 4; also El Vol. I, p. 240), we might translate thus— “Caiṭya shrine erected for the venerable teachers who converted Kasmira etc., . . . . . . . . . for the special acceptance of (as the special property) of the theris of Ceylon.” This agrees with the account of the Ceylonese chronicles (the Dipavamsa and Mahāvamsa) that Ceylon, Kasmira, Gandhāra, Mahiṣa-mandala, Vanavāsa, Aparāntaka Mahārāṭṭha Himālaya and Suvannabhūmi, were converted by monks sent from India by Moggaliputta Tissa. Ceylon is said to have been converted by Asoka’s son Mahinda (Mahāvamsa Chap. XIII, pp. 88 ff). The inscription “Moggaliputasa” on relic caskets from Anther and Sānci stūpas makes Moggaliputta Tissa a historical personality (Lüders’ Nos. 664, and 682).

In a learned paper in the Indian Historical Quarterly (Vol. VII, pp. 651 ff) N. Dutt has objected to Vogel’s translation of pasādakānām as ‘who converted.’ According to Dutt as ‘pasāda’ in the Mahāvamsa means ‘serene joy,’ pasādakānām ‘of those who brought serene joy.’ But the account of the conversion of countries given in the Mahāvamsa makes Vogel’s translation acceptable (Childers, pasāda).

75. Vide supra.
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a railing around it) at the Sihala-vihāra, a railing around it) at the Sihala-vihāra,\textsuperscript{76} one cell at the Great Dharimmagiri,\textsuperscript{77} a maṇḍava pillar at the Mahāvihāra,\textsuperscript{78} a hall for religious practice at Devagiri, a tank, verandah and maṇḍava at Puvasela,\textsuperscript{79} a stone maṇḍava at the eastern gate of the Mahācetiya at Kanṭakasela,\textsuperscript{80} three cells at Hirumṭhuva, seven cells at Papilā\textsuperscript{81} a stone maṇḍava at Puphagiri, and a stone maṇḍava at the...... vihāra.

\textit{Ehuvula Cāṇṭamūla}

The son of Maḍhariputa Siri-Virapurisadata by Vāsiṭhi Bhaṭṭidevā was Ehuvula Cāṇṭamūla, the last known king of the dynasty.\textsuperscript{82} That he ruled for at least eleven years is shown by the inscription of his half-sister Kodabalisiri (H).

\textsuperscript{76} On the analogy of Kulaha-vihāra, Sihala-vihāra would mean the vihāra built by the Ceylonese monks or nuns or laymen. Perhaps a branch of the Bodhi-tree at Ceylon was planted at Nagārjunikonda.

\textsuperscript{77} Could it be the mound to the north-west of, and not far away from the Cula-Dharimmagiri? On this mound are the remains of a stūpa and sela maṇḍava; the latter consists of a series of four cells on each of the north-east and west sides and a pillared hall 30' 6" x 30' in the south with an open court situated between the pillared hall and the stūpa. The roof of the hall rested on sixteen pillars; all of them with the exception of two at the south-east and south-west ends have fallen down. (Plate V Nos. 1 and 4 ASR 1926-27, pp. 158-59).

\textsuperscript{78} Could this be the Mahā-vihāra (lit. Great monastery) to which the ‘Mahācetiya’ is said to have been attached (B5).

\textsuperscript{79} According to Hiuen-Tsang it stood to the east of the capital of Tona-kie-tse-kia (Dhānyaakaṭaka). It gave its name to a Buddhist school.

\textsuperscript{80} The name occurs in an Amarāvatī inscription (ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. Ixi; No. 54); Burgess and Lüders have read it as Kaṭakasola. But the anusvāra is clear on the plate. An inscription from Peddavēgi mentions Kaṇṭakosala (MER, 1926-27 No. 219). It is certainly the port Kontakossyla which is mentioned by Ptolemy (Bk. VII, Chap. 1, Sec. 14) and placed by him just north of the mouth of the Kṛṣṇā and which transliterates Kanṭakasula (the spear of thorns) the Sanskrit form of Kanṭakasola. The name is preserved in the modern Ghanṭasālā, a village thirteen miles to the west of Masulipatam and the sea. There is a Cetiya in the village (Rea, \textit{South Ind. Bud. Antiquities}, pp 4 ff) and on the southern boundary of the village there is a mound named Polimēradibba on which loose bricks appear. Surely these are traces of Buddhist buildings (Ibid., p. 42). But no trace of the sela-maṇḍava at the eastern gate of the Mahācetiya is available.

\textsuperscript{81} Papilā is perhaps identical with the Pāpikala of the Allūru inscription.

\textsuperscript{82} H. t. ll. 3 and 10, Ehuvula; G2 t. 1. 8, Ehuvula; G3 Ehuvula. Only in G3 is e turned sideways. K. P. Jayaswal agrees with Hirananda Sastri
Buddhist monuments of his reign

The second year of his reign witnessed the completion of a monastery called 'Devī-vihāra', provided with everything, by queen (Devī or Mahādevī) Bhaṭṭidevā for the grace and acceptance of the masters of the Bahusutiya sect. This monastery, with a roofless maṇḍapa, stands at the north-east foot of Nāgārjunikonda on the Itikarāḷlabodū where stand also a stūpa (No. 5) and two apsidal temples. Inscriptions G-2, G-3, are borne by the āyaka-khambhās belonging to Stūpa No. 5. Perhaps Bhaṭṭidevā built the stūpa and apsidal temples, in addition to the Devī-vihāra, thereby emulating her mother. In the eleventh year Kodabalisiri consecrated to the masters of the Mahisasaka school a monastery and a cetiya. The cetiya is probably Stūpa No. 6 on the top of the hill above the monastery. The latter, which is on the Koṭṭampalagu mound a few furlongs to the north of Nāgārjunikonda, and commands a fine view of the Krṣṇā, has a pillared hall or pavilion in the centre with a row of twenty cells all round. The hall is sixty-one feet square and provided with a flat wooden roof supported by thirty-six lofty marble pillars. Stūpa No. 6 has yielded a number of sculptured beams, two small medallions, a silver relic in reading 'Bahuvala'. Says he:—"In the plate G, the letter b is misformed, but the full form is seen in H, where it occurs twice and is clearly the four-cornered b" (JBORS, 1933, p. 173, n. 1). The so-called ba has no resemblance whatsoever with the four-cornered ba occurring in these inscriptions. It certainly resembles the Jaggageyapetā e (ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. LII; t. 1. 5).

Like Puḷumāvi it is a Dravidian word and both are difficult of interpretation. 'Ehu' of the name may be Tamil Ehu 'steel', a very old Tamil word.

83. This is another instance of a religious foundation named after its founder. Here the monastery receives the latter part of the queen's name.

84. savajāṭanīyuta.


86. Structural apsidal temples of the very early centuries A.D., are very rare in India. Barring those at Nāgārjunikonda, one has been discovered at Sānci, two at Taxila, and one at Sārnāth.

87. Dr. Vogel reads imaṁ khaniyam vihāro ca and explains khaniya by a resort to 'khaṇu pillar' (Childers, Pali-Eng. Dict. khaṇu). What is read as ni is certainly ti, for unlike the loop in na the loop in ta ends in a downward curve. The word is clearly cetiyam. At Nāgārjunikonda cetiyas and vihāras are found together.

88. Pls. VI, 4; VII, 1, 2, 3 and 4, VIII, 1 and 2.

89. ASR, 1929-30, Pl. 37 d and c, one is embossed with the head of a Greek male figure and the other with the head of an Indian lady. They are not king and queen as they do not wear crowns.
casket much like the one found in the Mahācetiya and bone relics.90

The monuments which would seem to belong to the Ikṣvāku period, but which cannot be assigned to any reign definitely, are two cetiyas (Nos. 3 and 4) and a vihāra91 on the hill to the north-west of and near the Nāharāḷlabōḍu, the vihāra on the Nāharāḷlabōḍu and Stūpas Nos. 5, 7, 8 and 9.

Buddhism of the period

Like the Amarāvatī inscriptions the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions introduce us to a number of Buddhist schools; the Mahīśāsakas, an offshoot of the original Sthaviravādās; the Bahusutiyas, a sub-division of the Gokulikas who belonged to the Mahāsāṃghikas, the original schismatics;92 the Puvaseliyas (offshoot of the Mahāsāṃghikas) who find place in Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Kathāvatthu, along with Avaraseliyas, Siddhathikas and Rājagiriyas, are called Andhakas, i.e. schools that took their rise in the Andhradesa,93 and the Avaramahāvinaseliyas, who were patronised by Cāmintisiri. According to Dr. Vogel 'Avarasela' is perhaps the abbreviated form of 'Aparamahāvinasela' of our inscriptions.94 Since a 'Mahāvinasela' school is mentioned in an Amarāvatī inscription,95 since we meet with 'Puvasela' and not 'Puvamahāvinasela' in a Nāgārjunikonḍa (Inscription F.) and the Alluru inscriptions, Dr. Vogel's suggestion cannot be accepted. A fragmentary inscription from Amarāvatī has 'liyānāni' and before it space for four or five letters (Mahāvinase?). The teacher belonging to this school is referred to as "Mahāvinayamdhara"96 (versed in the Great Vinaya). Can Mahāvinasela be a form of Mahāvinayasela, the elision of ya being not uncommon? Like Puvaseliya and Aparaseliya, Puva-

90. Dr. Vogel thinks that the eastern side of the stūpa is the most important one. But the relic caskets from the Mahācetiya and Stūpa No. 6 were found in chambers on the north-eastern side.
91. Vide supra.
92. Walleser, Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus, pp. 6 and 21.
93. Edited by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 104. Avarasasela is also mentioned by Hiuen-Tsang as a hill which stood near the capital Dhānyakataka (Ibid.).
96. Ibid., p. 102.
mahāvinaseliya and Aparamahavinasiya schools might also have arisen. It is well to remember the remark of Rhys Davids:—

"As the so called sects were tendencies of opinion, the number of them was constantly changing." Dr. Vogel takes Ayira-Haṁgha (C1, C2) to be the name of a school. In his paper, entitled 'Notes on the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscriptions,' N. Dutt contends that 'Ayira-Haṁghānam' is another form of 'Mahāsāṅghikānam'.97 But 'Āira-Utayipabhāhinām' in an Amarāvatī inscription,98 'Āryamahāsāṅghikānāṁ Lokottaravādīnāṁ Madhyadesikanāṁ pathena Vinayapiṭakasya, Mahāvastuyēdi,99 'Āyirānaṁ Puvaseliyaṁ' in the Allūru inscription, prove that Ayira (Ārya) is not used even with reference to sects in the sense of 'mahā' but only in the sense of 'venerable.' 'Ayira-Haṁgha', like 'Catudisa Sagha' of the Nasik and Karla inscriptions, would, therefore, mean the venerable Saṅgha.100

Cāṁtisiri's wish that the families to which she belonged and the whole world might attain happiness in both the worlds, reminds us of the Mahāyānist who places the attainment of Bodhi knowledge and liberation from worldly miseries of all creatures, before his own.101 According to Huien-Tsang monks studying the 'Great Vehicle' lived in the Andhradesa. Nāgārjunikoṇḍa sculptures also show the Mahāyānist tendencies at work (worship of large Buddha figures. one of which was found in the large square chamber at the north-west end of the monastery on the mound to the north-west of the Nāhārālabōḍu; three others were found at site No. 4).102 Where, among all the Hinayāna schools mentioned, does Mahāyānism come in? The answer is given by Mrs. Rhys Davids:—"The extension of the Mahāyānist school was and is of a very vague and fluid kind. Those to whom it applied formed no close corporation."

Mr. Rhys Davids compares the relation of the Mahāyāna to Hinayāna schools with that of the various Roman and Greek Catholic schools to those of the early Christians.104

---

97. ERE, q. v. Hinayāna.
98. Lüders, No. 1276; ASSI, Vol. I, p. 87, No. 45, Pl. LX.
100. M. 15, El, Vol. XXI, mentions (Mahābhi)khu Saṁ(gha).
101. This ideal finds expression in Kārāṇḍavyūha where Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva is represented as refusing to accept Nirvāṇa, until all creatures were in possession of the Bodhi knowledge and were freed from worldly miseries (Sārasvāmi's ed. p. 121).
102. ASR, 1926-27.
103. Points of controversy, Preface, XLVI.
104. ERE, Hinayāna.
Ceylon and Nāgārjunikonda

Ceylon and Ceylonese Buddhism were in touch with Nāgārjunikonda. Āryadeva, a disciple of Nāgārjuna (3rd century A.D.), was a native of Ceylon, but spent the greater part of his life in India. The pot containing his relics has been found in the Guntur District. Theris of Ceylon would seem to have lived in the Nāgārjunikonda valley, for the apsidal temple on the Nāharāllabōḍu is dedicated to them. A vihāra built by a Ceylonese Buddhist is also mentioned (Sīhāḷa-vihāra, inscription F.). Probably the trade routes from the eastern ports and the Mahācetiya enshrining the ‘dhātu’ of the Great Teacher attracted these pilgrims to eastern Deccan.

Buddhist Canonical Books Mentioned

A point of interest is the mention of the Dīgha and Majhima sections of the Sutta Piṭaka and of the five Mātukas. The Mātukas are the condensed contents especially of the philosophical parts of the Canonical books in the Abhidhānīma. On the authority of Burnouf's translation of the Saddharma Pundarīka, Childers says that it means also the list of Vinaya precepts omitting all the explanations and other details.

Administration: Administrative divisions

The biggest administrative division was the rāṣṭra, a division identical with the Sātavāhana āhāra. But the rāṣṭra division was known to the pre-Iksvāku period in the Āndhradesa. The Allūru and Amārāvati inscriptions mention rāṭhas. The division below the rāṣṭra was gāma.

105. Vide infra.
106. ‘Dīgha-Majhima-paṭca-Mātuka-osaka (desaka) vācakānāṁ ācaryānam Ayira-Hāṁghānam a(m)tevāsikena Dīgha-Majhima-Nikāya-dharena bhaja (da)ṁt Ānadena’ (C1, C2). Pali-English Dict. q. v. māṭikā.
According to Burgess adhiṭhana may be the name of a town or may mean capital. After adhiṭhane we have a lacuna with traces of four letters and after it vathavasa. The lacuna would then seem to have contained the name of a town.
108. The villages mentioned in the Iksvāku records are Paṁṇāgāma at which masters of the venerable Saṅgha are said to have resided, Govagama, Naḍatūra in Kammākaraṭha, Mahākāṁḍurūra and Velagiri.
Officials

The official titles known to us are those of Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka and Kośṭhāgārika.109 A feature of the Ikṣvāku period is the bearing of two or more titles by the same person.110 Vāsiṣṭhiputa Kāṁdasiri, Vāsiṣṭhiputa Mahā-Kāṁdasiri and Vīnhusiri of the Pūkiya family111 and Vāsiṣṭhiputa Khamdacalikiremmanka of the Hiraināka family, bore the titles of Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara; the son-in-law of Sīrī-Cāṁtamula bears the titles of Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara, and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka; perhaps this indicates a higher position than that of the other Mahātalavaras, which he enjoyed in virtue of his being the son-in-law of the king.

Official Titles: Mahāsenāpati

Vogel looks upon Mahāsenāpati as a nobiliary title on the score that the Sātavāhana Mahāsenāpati was in charge of rāṣṭras. It is highly improbable that high dignitaries are known in their inscriptions by their nobiliary titles only. In the Janglī Guṇḍu inscription a Mahāsenāpati in charge of an āhāra is mentioned along with a Gāmika, an official. A Mahāsenāpati with non-military duties was possible in an age of confusion of titles and duties. In all the records of the Ikṣvāku period the title Mahāsenāpati precedes that of Mahātalavara and except in one instance the wives of Mahātalavara-Mahāsenāpati-Mahādaṇḍanāyakas bear the title of Mahātalavari only.112 Could this indicate that the title of Mahāsenāpati was superior to that of Mahātalavara?

109. Since Kośṭhāgāra means ‘storehouse’; Prākṛt Koṭhagarika is best construed as ‘keeper of royal stores.’ See also Lüders’ No. 937, Koṭhagaral.

110. In the Cinna Ganjam inscription of the time Sīrī-Yaṅa Sātakanī we have Mahatārakasa Mahā-e—–’ The latter is perhaps the mutilated form of Mahāsenāpatisa; in that case the combination of two or more titles in the same person is not peculiar to the Ikṣvāku period.

111. According to Vogel Mahā-Kāṁdasiri of C5 is identical with Kāṁdasiri the husband of Cāṁtisirinīkā C3. He however considers the lady mentioned in C5 as a co-wife of Kāṁdasiri, for while Cāṁtisirinīkā mentions Kharinda-sāgaraṁnakā as her son, the other lady mentions Mahāsenāpati-Mahātalavara-Vīnhusiri as her son, and both C3 and C5 were incised on the same day. In our epigraphs ‘Mahā’ and ‘Cula’ are used to distinguish a younger from an elder person, that is when they both bear the same name, e.g., Cāṁtisirinīkā and Cula-Cāṁtisirinīkā (B4, C5); Damila-Kanha and Cula-Kanha (Lüders’ No. 1243). On the analogy of these names Mahā-Kāṁdasiri is either an elder brother, or some senior member of the Pūkiya family.

112. B2, EI, Vol. XX.
Makātalavara

In his note on the Nagarjunakonda inscriptions Vogel says

"The curious term Mahātalavara which is also met with in other inscriptions of Southern India must likewise denote a high dignitary, whose exact function, however, is not clear. The second member of the compound is not a Sanskrit word, but seems to be a term borrowed from some Dravidian language." As 'mahā' is a prefix denoting a higher title, 'talavara' is the term to be explained. Says Vogel: "We must leave this question to the decision of students of South Indian Languages. Can the word have any connection with Tamil talavāy (=a general), Tamil talaiyāri (=a village watchman) or Canarese talavara, talavāra (=a watchman, a beadle)?" Since Canarese talavara (=a watchman) very nearly corresponds to our Talavara, since Tamil talaiyāri also means watchman, talavara and talaiyāri are the words with which Talavara should be connected. The title of Mahāsenāpati borne by Mahātalavaras may also exclude Tamil talavāy (commander). Talaiyāri as Tamil form of Talavara or Talavara as a Prākṛt variation of talaiyāri is phonetically possible.

Since Talavaras are mentioned in the Kalpasūtra with eighteen gaṇarañjas, Vogel looks upon Talavara as military title. But the Subodhikā, a commentary on the Kalpasūtra, shows that it was an official title. The Mahātalavaras would seem to have been viceroys. As has been suggested above, the office of Mahātalavara was a Śatavāhana one derived from the local office of Talavara much in the same way as the offices of Mahābhoja and Mahāraṭhi were from those of Bhoja and Raṭhika.


114. Pischel, op. cit., Sec. 254.

115. Talavaraḥ tuṣṭā-bhūpāla-pradatta-paṭṭa baṅḍhā vibhūṣīta Rājasthāniyāḥ. This passage has been quoted by Vogel himself.

116. On the evidence of the Allûru inscription we may say that during the Śatavāhana period the title of Mahātalavara is not found in combination with those of Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara. On this score even the Ramareddipalle inscription which mentions a Mahātalavara would also belong to the Śatavāhana period.
"... It penetrated also into Northern India, for there can be little doubt that it is identical with the mysterious word *taravara* which coupled with *mahāpratihārā* (= "a great chamberlain") is found in the legend of one of the clay sealings excavated by the late Dr. Bloch at Basārh, the site of ancient Vaiśāli. This document belongs to the Gupta period. It was suggested by Dr. Bloch that the word *tarika*, which occurs in the lists of officials in mediaeval copper-plate charters, may quite well be a corrupted form of *taravara.*\(^{116a}\) These instances show that the office of *Talavara* survived the Ikṣvāku period. The Koṇḍamūrī plates mention a *Mahātala-vāra-Mahādāṇḍanāyaka*. Besides the instances cited by Vogel we have the Deo-Baranārk inscription of Jivitagupta II of Magadha, which mentions a *Talavāṭaka*;\(^{117}\) the Kudopali plates of Mahābhavagupta, assigned by Keilhorn to the first half of the twelfth century A.D.,\(^{118}\) mention a *Talavārgin*; and the Kaṭāk plates of Mahāśivagupta mention a *Talahi (?)ta*,\(^{119}\) and in an inscription of the Kalacuri king, Rāyamurāri Sovideva (A.D. 1173), the son of the governor of Ehūr is called *Tālavara Caṁdeya-nāyaka.*\(^{120}\)

**Mahādāṇḍanāyaka**

The title *Mahādāṇḍanāyaka* is unknown to the Sātavāhana period. As *dāṇḍa* means 'rod' as well as 'army' (*dāṇḍa-nīti*= administration of justice), the title can be explained as judicial or military. Since *Mahāsenāpati* was in origin a military title *Mahādāṇḍanāyaka* would be a judicial one. All these titles were hereditary and sometimes more than one son inherited the father's titles.

**Other Conclusions**

The few glimpses that the Ikṣvāku records and sculptures afford into the social life of the period have been discussed in the chapter entitled 'Social, Economic and Religious Conditions', as it represents a continuity with the conditions in the Sātavāhana period and in many aspects presents no break with the past. According to Vogel seaborne trade was "no doubt also largely responsible for

120. El, Vol. XII, p. 335.
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the flourishing state of Buddhism in this part of India. The devotees of the Good Law were largely recruited from the commercial classes and it was their wealth which enabled not only the merchants themselves, but also their royal masters, to raise monuments of such magnificence as the great stūpa of Amarāvatī." The remains of an ancient quay discovered by Longhurst on the right bank of the Kṛṣṇā near the Nāgārjunikonda plateau,121 and the emporiums of Kaṇṭakossyla and Allōsygne would seem to be evidence of a vast seaborne trade with Ceylon, Farther India, and the West. This trade was perhaps responsible for the gifts of crores of gold with which Siri-Cāṁtamūla is credited. But the Buddhist monuments of the Ikṣvāku period were almost all of them constructed neither by merchants nor by their royal masters. All of them were, except the foundations attributed to Bodhisiri and a slab donated by Cada-kapavatica, set up by royal ladies. It is then seen that Nāgārjunikonda cannot by itself prove that the flourishing Buddhism was a result of flourishing trade. It must also be noted that Nāgārjunikonda does not introduce us to such a glorious epoch of Buddhism as Amarāvatī, Gummaḍidurru, Allūru and Kaṇṭakasela, for we do not find at Nāgārjunikonda such a crowd of Buddhist devotees as at Amarāvatī. Evidently the rise of the Brahmanical dynasties was silently undermining Buddhism from the beginning.

Of the Ikṣvāku currency we know nothing except that the denarii were current. Not a single Ikṣvāku coin has been picked up. As the Śātavāhanas made large issues of lead and copper coins which are discovered in heaps in the Kṛṣṇā, Godāvari and Guntur districts even to-day, especially at Nāgarjunikonda, it is possible that the Ikṣvākus did not find it necessary to issue new coins.

121. IA, 1932, p. 188.
CHAPTER VIII

KINGS OF THE BRHATPHALAYANA GOTRA

The material for a study of the dynasties that succeeded to the political heritage of the Sātavāhanas in the Andhradeśa and in the areas south of the Kṛṣṇā as far as Pālār is scanty. Of the kings of the Brhatphalāyana\(^1\) gotra, we have but a single copper-plate grant (the Koṇḍamudi plates of Mahārāja Jayavarman).

Chronology

The chronology of the period is far from being satisfactorily settled. While editing the grant just mentioned Dr. Hultzsch says\(^2\):—“The alphabet of his (Jayavarman’s) inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava king Śiva-Skandavarman who issued the Mayidavolu plates.” This view has been followed generally by other writers on South Indian History. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil not only follows Dr. Hultzsch but even says that the unknown predecessor of Śiva-Skandavarman Pallava ruled between 225-250 A.D.\(^3\) A fuller knowledge of the Ikṣvāku dynasty than was possible before the discovery of the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions has led Prof. Dubreuil to change his views. He now places the Ikṣvākus in the third century A.D. and shifts the early Pallavas to the fourth; but even here he maintains that Mahārāja Jayavarman and Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman were

1. Brhatphalāyana as a gotra name is not to be found in other records. But the phrase Brhatphalāyana-sa-gotto occurring in the Koṇḍamudi plates of Jayavarman leaves no doubt on the point. In these plates as well as in the records of the kings who are said to have belonged to the Śālaṅkāyana and Ananda gotras we miss the dynastic names. This recalls to our mind some of the Sātavāhana inscriptions and coins where we have metronymics derived from Vedic gotra names, but miss the dynastic name. In the total absence of their dynastic names scholars have labelled the former group of kings as ‘the Brhatphalāyanas, the Śālaṅkāyanas and the Anandas.’ It is like calling the Pallavas and the Kadambas as the Bhāradvājas and the Mānavyas respectively. We would avoid the confusion between the dynastic and gotra names if we call these kings ‘kings of Brhatphalāyana gotra,’ ‘kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra’ and so on.
contemporaries. Dr. K. R. Subramaniam has also followed Dr. Hultzsch. He would make the Ikṣvākus, Jayavarman and the Pallavas contemporary powers and give them a third century date.

A comparative study of the alphabet of the Kōṇḍamudī and the Mayidavolu plates throws some doubt over the contemporaneity postulated by Dr. Hultzsch. No doubt the alphabets of the two grants have some common characteristics. Both exhibit a cursive writing. Both have the peculiar e which according to Dr. Hultzsch resembles the archaic Tamil sa, the ma with a loop at the bottom, and the semicircle or triangle open at the top, replaced by a rudimentary vertical to which is attached on the left a curved stroke. Sometimes the curved stroke does not touch the vertical as in 'Yuvamahārāja,' 'bāṃhadeyam' and 'vitarāma' (Mayidavolu ll. 1, 12 and 13 respectively); and in 'Mahēśvara,' 'Jayavāmīma' and 'aṁhe' (Kōṇḍamudī ll. 3, 5 and 7 respectively). The sa consists of two curves one below the other but not connected still. Besides these common features mentioned by Dr. Hultzsch there are others like the peculiar forms of ku, ke, ha, la, and na. These common peculiarities are evidently to be explained by the fact that the records come from one and the same area, from adjoining taluqs in the Guntur District.

   'The Mayidavolu plates are written in the same alphabet as the plates of Jayavarman'—Ibid.

5. "At the time of his (Śiva-Skandavarman's) rule, about the middle of the third century A.D., the Brhatphalāyanas ruled what was later known as the kingdom of Veṅgi (Veṅgi) and the Ikṣvākus were in possession of the Andhra country stretching from about Śrī Śailam northward and extending indefinitely into Dakhina Kosala and along the coast north of the Godāvari." Buddhist Remains in Andhra and Andhra History, p. 78.

While writing this chapter I got D. C. Sircar's monograph entitled The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan. He has also followed the old view.


7. It is interesting to note that the cursive ha which agrees with the northern Gupta form (Bühler, Tables IV, 39) occurs in the Jaggayyapeṭa inscriptions of the time of the Ikṣvāku king Virapurisadata, but does not occur in the Nāgarjunikoṇḍa inscriptions of his reign. It occurs in a Kārlā inscription EI, Vol. XXIV, p. 282 and Pl. XVI 1. 3). The peculiar ha on some of the coins of Gotamiputra Śrī-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi was probably developed out of this ha.

8. Mayidavolu is a village near Narasaraopet, the headquarters of the taluq of that name, and Kōṇḍamudī is a village in the Tenali taluq. It is only to be expected that alphabets vary not according to dynasties but according to localities, and in establishing any comparative system of palaeo-
By the side of these common characteristics stand out certain differences in the Mayidavolu grant which seem to indicate a further stage of development from the Konḍamuḍi alphabet. Says Dr. Hultzsch: "The group jā (Konḍamuḍi plates II. 5, 11 and 34) has a different shape, the vowel-mark being attached on the right, and not at the top of the letter as in the Mayidavolu plates (II. 18 and 24). The n (or ŋ) is identical in shape with the lingual d but the dental d is represented by a separate character while in the Mayidavolu plates no distinction is made between all the four letters." The other differences which are more important for settling the relative chronology of the two dynasties and which have not been pointed out by Dr. Hultzsch are as follows:

(a) Whilst the Mayidavolu sa consists of two equal curves, the upper curve of the Konḍamuḍi sa is bigger than the lower one and resembles the upper curve of sa in all other inscriptions. This fact and the peculiarity common to the Mayidavolu sa and the Konḍamuḍi sa which has been noted above make it probable that the latter represents a transition to the former. Whilst the two curves of the Mayidavolu sa, which are more developed than those of the Konḍamuḍi sa, end in strong hooks on the left, the curves of the latter have no such finish.

(b) The broad-backed na of the two grants differs from the nna of the Hira-Hadagalli and the Gunapadeya grants, which has

graphy we must select territorial rather than dynastic names. The highly cursive writing of the Hira-Hadagalli grant shows in its ductus a certain relationship to the Jangli Gsandu (in the Bellary District) inscription of Sīri-Pulumāvī, the last of the Sātavāhanas. The similarity between Gotamiputpa Siri-Sātakani's and Uṣavadāta's Nāsik and Kārla inscriptions is explained by the area of their location. (JRAS, 1926, p. 625). The differences between the Mayidavolu and the Hira-Hadagalli grants of Śiva-Skandavarmān Pallava must be explained by the same principle. The peculiar ma, sa, ha, la, na, and e are not to be found in the Hira-Hadagalli grant. The Udayagiri cave inscription of Candragupta II of the year 82 (G. Era) is the box-headed variety of the Central Indian alphabet. The Sānśi inscription of the same king is in the character of the southern alphabets (CII, Vol. III, p. 4). Instances of this kind can be multiplied.

9. na does not occur in the Konḍamuḍi plates.

10. It may be argued that this greater absence of differentiation in the Mayidavolu plates may indicate an earlier period. But differentiation does not always represent a later stage of development. The looped ta and na are later forms of the na with the horizontal or curved base and the ta with the semicircle at the bottom, and yet there is less difference (sometimes no difference) between the former than between the latter.
a strongly curved base line, the beginnings of which we see in the Girnār prāsāti of Rudradāman\textsuperscript{11} and in some Kuśāṇa inscriptions.\textsuperscript{12} The Mayidavōlu na is more broad-backed than that of the Koniḍamuḍi plates and this fact certainly points to a later period.

(c) Whilst the e of both the grants has a form not met with elsewhere the Mayidavōlu e is more cursive and ends in stronger hooks than the Koniḍamuḍi e.

(d) Whilst the verticals of both the Koniḍamuḍi and the Mayidavōlu la are bent to the left, they have longer tails and smaller bodies than those of some of the Amarāvatī inscriptions of the first and second centuries A.D.\textsuperscript{13} The body is smaller in the Mayidavōlu than in the Koniḍamuḍi grant. This development can be traced further. In the western script of the sixth and seventh centuries the body becomes smaller and the tail correspondingly longer. True in the la of the grant of Cārudevi\textsuperscript{14} (later than the Mayidavōlu grant) the body is more prominent than in the Mayidavōlu la, but even so the former registers a development over the latter in the enormous tail which is a feature of the la of the Eastern Cāḻukya and later Pallava charters.

Again the Koniḍamuḍi la has not the angular or slightly curved base of the Mayidavōlu la.\textsuperscript{15} However the la in ‘alonakhāḍakām’\textsuperscript{16} resembles the Mayidavōlu la (angular base) but even here the upper vertical is not bent to the left as in Mayidavōlu and the medial o sign over it is an earlier form of that found in the Mayidavōlu plates.\textsuperscript{17} The vertical of the Koniḍamuḍi la does not continue the curve of the body but starts from the middle of its right arm so that even careful epigraphists like Dr. Hultzsch cannot distinguish between la and gi. In line 42 Dr. Hultzsch reads ‘tagivarena’ for ‘talavarena,’ and Dr. Vogel\textsuperscript{18} thinks that the former is a mistake

\textsuperscript{11} Bühler, Tables III (vi).
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., V.
\textsuperscript{13} ASSI, I. Nos. 8, 16, 32 and 44.
\textsuperscript{14} The Cārudevi grant was mistakenly called a grant of Nandivarman of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra by Dr. Fleet in IA, Vol. V, p. 176. However, he corrected himself in Vol. IX. Since writing these lines I find that D. C. Sircar has also noticed the mistake, vide infra.
\textsuperscript{15} la with the curved base occurs in ll. 13, 15 and 22 while la with the angular base is found in ll. 2 and 6.
\textsuperscript{16} Koniḍamuḍi line 32.
\textsuperscript{17} Vide infra.
\textsuperscript{18} El, Vol. XX, p. 7, n.
of the scribe for the latter. This error arises from the rudimentary form of the Koṇḍamūḍī la.

(e) The curved horizontal member of the Mayidavōlu ka like that of the Cārudevi grant is surely later than the straight line of the Koṇḍamūḍī ka.

(f) The ba of the Koṇḍamūḍī grant with the notch in the left vertical which does not, except in a few cases, show a serif at the upper end (ll. 4, 10, 37 and 38) and is slightly open on the left at the top is less cursive than the closed ba of the Mayidavōlu and the Cārudevi grants. The Koṇḍamūḍī pa in its narrow and curved base is an obviously earlier form.

(g) The letter ya shows practically the same features of development from the Koṇḍamūḍī to Mayidavōlu as the letter pa.

(h) The vertical member of the Mayidavōlu a like that of the Cārudevi grant is longer than that of the Koṇḍamūḍī a. The lower end of the vertical of the former shows sometimes a bend and sometimes a reascent to the left. The reascent is more pronounced in the Cārudevi than in the Mayidavōlu grant; in the later Pallava charters there is a reascent to about half the length of the vertical. The curves at the base of the verticals of the Koṇḍamūḍī a are rudimentary, as those in Uśavatā's inscriptions from Kārlā. The upper and lower limbs of the two Pallava grants under reference are connected to the middle of the vertical by a straight line; in the Koṇḍamūḍī grant they are represented by a wavy line connected to the top of the vertical by a slanting stroke. While the vertical and left upper limb have nail heads which in the Cārudevi grant are turned into small curves attached to the top of the vertical (ll. 8 and 10), the Koṇḍamūḍī one has no such nail-head or curve. The general appearance of the Koṇḍamūḍī a is altogether more primitive.

(i) The medial ā, i and o signs of the Mayidavōlu plates show a more developed form than those of the Koṇḍamūḍī plates. While in the Koṇḍamūḍī plates the sign expressing the length of the vowel in ā is a short stroke attached to the middle of the vertical (ll. 6 and 9), in the Mayidavōlu plates it is a curve (line 4.) which becomes stronger in the Cārudevi plates. (ll. 6, 8, 10 and 16). Even where the strokes are attached to the top of the letter those in the

19. ll. 6, 8 and 9.
20. Bühler, Tables VII, i, xx and xxii.
Mayidavolu plates end in better curves and have longer tails (as in the Carudevi grant) than those of the Konḍamuḍi plates. In the latter the medial i sign is a semi-circle; in the other two it approaches the closed circle. The medial o sign in the Mayidavolu lo (line 13) is a wavy line while in Konḍamuḍi (line 32) it is a horizontal stroke. Even where it is a horizontal line over the letter, the tail on the right is longer in the Mayidavolu than in the Konḍamuḍi grant. In the Carudevi grant it is longer still.

Scholars are agreed that the CarudevI grant is later than the Mayidavolu grant. The line of development is therefore from the Konḍamuḍi to the Mayidavolu grant, and then on to the CarudevI grant. Even where the Mayidavolu alphabet does not approach the CarudevI alphabet, it shows more developed forms than those of the Konḍamuḍi plates.

The Mayidavolu plates were issued by Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman during the reign of his father (Bappa). The palaeography of the plates makes it therefore highly probable that Jayavarman reigned at least a generation before the predecessor of Śiva-Skandavarman.

The general facts of history point to the same conclusion. It may be presumed that the find place of the Konḍamuḍi grant (Tenali taluq) is not far from the object of the grant. Then Jayavarman's sway would have extended over lands south of the Kṛṣṇā. The alphabetical peculiarities common to the Mayidavolu

21. The orthography of the grants furnishes corroborative evidence. Whilst the writer of the Konḍamuḍi plates follows the practice of the Sātavāhana inscriptions where every double consonant is expressed by a single letter (the exceptions are 'bāmmhadeyam' and 'Jayavāmmo'), the writer of the Mayidavolu plates adopts the etymological spelling in 'paṭṭika', 'datta', 'sa-gotto' and 'kārāpejja'. In the Hira-Haḍaṭṭalī grant the etymological spelling of the Pandit is more pronounced than in the other two. The orthography of the Cārudevi grant is in accordance with that of literary Prākrt. Dr. Hultzsch himself remarks (El, Vol. VIII, p. 144. n. 5) that in this respect the two grants of Śiva-Skandavarman occupy an intermediate position between the Sātavāhana inscriptions and the Cārudevi grant.

22. supra, p. 152.

23. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil sees in the Kūḍūrā and the Kūḍūrahāra, according to him roughly corresponding to the modern Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā District, the capital and the kingdom respectively of Mahārāja Jayavarman. The Prof. has narrowed down too much the kingdom of Jayavarman. Scholars like Dr. Hultzsch and Kielhorn (El, Vol. VI, p. 316; Vol. IV, p. 34; Vol. V, p. 123) are agreed that the Kūḍūrahāra of the Konḍamuḍi plates is the same as the Kudrahāra viśaya of some of the Sālankāyana...
and the Koṭḍamuḍi grants are corroborative evidence in the same direction.24

Whilst the Mayidavolu grant of Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman proves that the Guntur District or part of it was included in the Pallava division of Aīndhāpata,25 the Čārudevi grant shows that the Guntur region continued to be part of the Pallava Dominions during the reigns of Dharmmamahārājādhirāja Śiva-Skandavarman and his immediate successors Skandavarman and Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman.26

Inscriptions and the Gudrahāra, Gudravara and Gudrara visāya of the Eastern Cañukya grants. In a Kakatiya inscription on the right door-pillar of the Bhūmēśvara temple at Gudīvāḍa (593 of 1893), Gudīvāḍa is said to have belonged to the district of Gudārā. Dr. Hultzsch has identified Kūdūrā with Gudīvāḍa, the headquarters of the taluq of the same name in the Kṛṣṇā District. A grant of Mahārāja Nandivarman Belanakayana from the Kollair Lake in the Kaikalur taluk of the Kṛṣṇa District makes it probable that the latter was also included in the Kudūrahāra or Kudrahāra visāya of the grant. Thus the Kudūrahāra of Jayavarman’s time included besides the Bandar taluq the territory as far west as Gudīvāḍa, as far north as the Kollair Lake and as far south as the northern part of the Guntur District. Besides, in the Sātavāhana and Kṛṣṇākāyana records hāra (or hāra) and visāya denote a division of the kingdom, not the whole kingdom. Kūdūra mentioned in the Koṭḍamuḍi grant is spoken of as the headquarters of the governor of the district, and as a ‘vijayakhamdāvāra’ i.e., royal headquarters in camp. According to Hemacandra (Desikoṣa q.v.) it may also signify a capital. In Nāsik No. 4 (inscription of Gotamiputra Sīri-Sātakana) which the inscription under reference resembles in phraseology, a ‘vijayakhamdāvāra’ in Govadhana hāra is mentioned. The capital of Gotamiputra Sīri-Sātakana was Paithan, far away from Govadhana or Govadhanahāra.

24. Pāmṭūra, the village mentioned in the grant as ‘bamhadeya,’ can be identified with Pottūru in the Guntur taluq. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil identifies it with Pandurū in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā District (Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 85).

25. ‘Viripara,’ the village situated in the Aīndhāpat(h)ā and the object of Śiva-Skandavarman’s grant is certainly the Virpūru mentioned in the Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II (EI, Vol. XVIII, p. 258) and perhaps the modern Vipparla in the Narasaraopet taluq of the Guntur District.

26. Śiva siri-Apilaka, sīva Sīri-Sātakaṇi, śiva Skanda Sātakarnī; the prince called Khamda-nāga in a Kānhei inscription (ASWI, Vol. V, p. 86) is called sīva-Khamda-nāga-siri in a Banavasi inscription (IA, Vol. XIV, p. 5). These instances of the use of ‘śiva’ in the inscriptions and on the coins of the second century B.C. and second century A.D., make it highly probable that ‘śiva’ in the expression Śiva-Skandavarman is an honorific prefix and that therefore Śiva-Skandavarman and Skandavarman are identical. Sometimes ‘śiva’ enters into the composition of names, e.g., Sivamaka.
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It is thus clear that the reign of Jayavarman in the same region must be placed before that of Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman.

The rise of the dynasty

The rise of the dynasty of Mahārāja Jayavarman is shrouded in mystery. Even so, the Ikṣvāku records from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and Jaggayyaṇḍa make a tentative suggestion possible. The cursive writing of the Kondamudi grant obviously places it after the Ikṣvāku inscriptions. It has been shown above that the Ikṣvākus ruled not only north and south of the Kṛṣṇā, but as far east as the delta of the Kṛṣṇā; then their dominions must have included at least a part of what was later on the kingdom of Jayavarman. The continuance of the Ikṣvāku offices of Mahātalavara and Mahādanḍanāyaka under Jayavarman is another link in the chain of evidence that suggests that Jayavarman or his predecessors had a large share in weakening the power of the Ikṣvākus.27

As in the case of the Pallavas we are in the dark as to the founder of the dynasty. The Kondamudi plates do not mention the father of Jayavarman even in the Pallava or Śālaṅkāyana fashion, i.e., under the form Bappa.28 But could Jayavarman have carved out a kingdom for himself out of the debris of the Ikṣvāku kingdom, built up an administrative machinery, earned the title of Mahārāja29 and entered upon a career of further conquests30 within the short span of ten years?31 Obviously Jayavarman’s dynasty rose to power before Jayavarman came on the scene.

The Capital of Jayavarman

It has been shown that Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil’s and Dr. Hultsch’s view that Kūḍūra was the capital is untenable.

27. Sircar boldly attempts to carry Jayavarman’s dynasty to the second century B.C. He says:—“If we ..............accept the reading Pithuḍa in a passage in the Hāthighuniṇī inscription (I. 11) of Khāravela and the interpretation that King Khāravela of Kaliṅga besieged the city of Pithuḍa, it is not impossible to think that the Bhāratpalāyanas were ruling at Pithuḍa= Pitunḍra as early as the time of Khāravela (second or first century B.C.)”, op. cit. p. 38.
28. Like Pallava kings Jayavarman assumes Brahmanical gotra, has a name ending in ‘varman’ and does not bear a metronymic.
29. He is called a Mahārāja on the seal and a Rāja in the plates.
30. The source of this assertion is the term ‘Vijayakhamādvāra’ (Kondamudi I. 1).
31. The Kondamudi plates were issued in the tenth year of his reign.
D. C. Sircar would locate it in Pityendra,\textsuperscript{32} mentioned by Ptolemy as the metropolis of the Maisōlia region.\textsuperscript{33} But Ptolemy places it in the interior of the Maisōlia region and there is no evidence to show that Jayavarman’s dominions extended beyond the modern Guḍiḍvāda taluq in the west. Ptolemy wrote in the middle of the second century A.D., and the Ikṣvākus of the third century A.D. had their capital in Vijayapuri. Nothing compels us to look upon Pityendra as the established capital of every dynasty that ruled over the Āndhradeśa. Under the Pallavas who would seem to have succeeded Jayavarman in the Guntur region Dhaṁnakāḍa (ka) is the headquarters of the Āndra province and the town is as old as Pityendra if not older.\textsuperscript{34} Dhaṁnakāṭaka has equally good claims to be considered as Jayavarman’s capital.\textsuperscript{35}

**Administrative Organisation**

The kingdom was mapped out into districts called āhāras as under the Sātavāhanas, each under an executive officer called Vāpataṁ. The Sanskrit word corresponding to Vāpataṁ is ‘Vyāpra.’ Pṛta is the past participle of pr; with the prefix vyā it means ‘busied with or engaged.’ Viyapata in the sense of ‘engaged’ occurs in the Edicts of Asoka.\textsuperscript{36} The Kāśikā, a commentary (probably seventh century A.D.) on Paṇini by Vāmana and Jayāditya, equates Vyāpra with the Āyuṅta of Paṇini (II, 3, 40). The latter term (Pāli ayutto) means ‘superintendent or agent.’ It occurs in the Cārudevī grant and with the ka affix in later inscriptions.\textsuperscript{37} In the Damodarpur inscription of Budha-gupta (fifth century A.D.), it is said that Koṭivarṣa viśaya was administered by the Āyuṅtaka Saṇḍaka. Vyāpra and Āyuṅta were therefore officers in charge of districts much the same as the amacas of the Sātavāhana records and the Viṣayapatis of later inscriptions. The office of Vāpataṁ is met with in the Koṇḍamuḍi, the Mayidavōlu and the Cārudevī grants only.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{32} The Pithuṁḍa of the Hāthigumpha inscription of king Khāravela.
\textsuperscript{34} It is mentioned in two Amarāvatī inscriptions of the second century B.C. (El. Vol. XV, “Some Unpublished Amarāvatī Inscriptions”).
\textsuperscript{35} McCrindle (IA, XIII, p. 370) would go to the length of identifying Pityendra with Dhaṁnakāṭaka. But the fact that the former is placed by Ptolemy north of the Maisōlos (the Kṛṣṇā) is against such an identification.
\textsuperscript{36} Shāh. V, Kal. V, Man. V, etc.
\textsuperscript{37} El. Vol. XI, p. 175. t. l. 17; XII, p. 154; t. l. 60.
\textsuperscript{38} Dr. Hultzsch corrects ‘viya’ of the Cārudevī grant to ‘viya’ and
Another, perhaps higher, dignitary in the kingdom bore the titles of *Mahātalavara* and *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*. These titles stand out in the Iksvāku period as prominently as those of *Mahābhoja* and *Mahāraṭhi* in the Sātavāhana period and Jayavarman’s dynasty is obviously indebted to the Iksvākus for these titles.

It may be puzzling that a *Mahātalavara Mahādaṇḍanāyaka,* probably a feudatory like the Iksvāku *Mahātalavara* and *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* and the Sātavāhana *Mahāraṭhi* is entrusted with the task of preparing the plates, a task ordinarily entrusted to minor officers in the Sātavāhana stone records, where also engraving does not mean the preparation of the stone, but that of the copper-plates or palm-leaves. Like the *Mahāsenāpati* of Nāsik No. 3 and the *Rahasādhigata* of the Hira-Ḥaḍagalli plates who are said to have been entrusted with the drafting of the charter and who, as has been shown above, would have only supervised the drafting, the *Mahātalavara* under mention was perhaps in charge of the department for the preparation and custody of the charters. In the same grant the king is said to have drawn up the protocol (saṣāṁ chato) which can only mean that a lekhaka drafted it under the immediate supervision of the king, for the king is also said to have issued the order by word of mouth (aviyena ānataṁ).

restores ‘viya(patam).’ The occurrence of ‘viyapata’ and ‘vapata’ in Asokan edicts (vapaṭa: Shah. V; and viyapata: Man V makes ‘viyapatam’ another Prakṛt form of ‘vapatam’. In the edicts ‘viyapata’ occurs more often than ‘vapata’ or ‘vaputa’.

39. Dr. Hultzsch who edited the Kondamuḍi plates long before the Nāgārjunikonda, Allūru, and Rāmareddipalle inscriptions were discovered read ‘Mahātagivarena’ and conjecturally translated it as ‘the best of the Mahātagi family.’ The peculiar form of la in ‘Bṛhatphalāyana’ (1. 4) i.e., the vertical starting from the right arm of the curve leaves no doubt that the letter read as gi is to be read as la. In his edition of the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions Dr. Vogel and following him other writers have merely remarked that ‘Mahātaṇivarena’ is a mistake of the scribe or engraver for ‘Mahātalavarena’.

40. The Kondamuḍi plates II 36 and 37; Nāsik Nos. 3, 4 and 5. EI, Vol. VIII.


42. Following Senart who derives the word from ‘ksan’ (to cut) Dr. Hultzsch translates chato by ‘signed’. He says (EI, Vol. VI, p. 319): “The king’s signature may have been affixed to the original document, which was deposited in the royal secretariat, and from which the copper-plates were copied.” This leads us to the paradoxical conclusion that the operation i.e., the drafting of the charter which is not wanting in the cognate inscriptions (especially the later Sātavāhana inscriptions which the inscription
Whilst grants of villages to religious bodies or Brahmans is a feature of every reign, the similarities of Jayavarman's grant to the later Sātavāhana grants, which show the extent to which Sātavāhana administrative traditions were carried on to the period of their successors in the Andhradesa, invest it with special interest. The immunities expressly attached to the bamhadeya in Jayavarman's grant are the same as those conferred on the bhikhuhala in the Sātavāhana charter.\footnote{43} The operations or formalities connected with the grants are in both cases verbal order, drafting, preservation of the record in the archives of the state, engraving, and delivery. The parihāras mentioned in and the operations connected with the Mayidavolu grant are different. More striking is the similarity in the wording.\footnote{44} Dr. Hultzsch remarks\footnote{45} \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots the language and phraseology of the inscription (Kon<Jamu<Ji) are so similar to the Nä̤śik inscriptions of Gautamiputra Satakarni (Nos. 4 and 5) and Vāsi̊ṣṭhiputra Pulumāyi (No. 3) that Jayavarman's date cannot have been very distant from that of those two Andhra kings.” This statement which implies Jayavarman's indebtedness to the Sātavāhanas for his political lessons was made long before the Nä̤garjunikoṇḍa remains were brought to light. It has already been shown that some of the political institutions of Jayavarman's dynasty were inherited from the Ikṣvākus. Since the Ikṣvākus took up the thread where the Sātavāhanas left it, it is not improbable that Jaya-

under reference closely resembles in phraseology) is the only stage of which there is no trace in this inscription.

43. Kārlā and Nä̤śik inscriptions of Gotamipuṭa Siri-sāṭakāni and Vāsi̊ṣṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi.

44. The Kondamudi grant opens in the same manner as Nä̤śik No. 4 (El, Vol. VIII). The parihāras are expressed by the terms apāpesaṁ, anomasaṁ, alonakhādakam, araṇhasamvinayikam and savajātapaṁhirārikam. The instructions to officials are also couched in the same language: compare the Kondamudi grant “etamsi taṁ gāma Pāṭuṇa baṃmhadeyam kātuṇa oyapāpehi”, “etasa casa gāmasa Pāṇṭūrasa bamma纻e̊yam kātuṇa parihāre vitarāma” and “etehi nam parihārehi pariharāḥi etam casim gāma[ṁ] Pāṭuṇam ba(ṁ)mhadeyam kātuṇa etha nibhamdāpehi” with Kārlā No. 19 “etesa (tu) gāma Karajake bhikku[hala deya (oya) pāpehi” “etasa casa gāmasa Karajakāna bhikku[hala-parihāra vitarāma,” and “etehi na parihārehi pariharāḥ et. casa gāma Karajake bhikku[hala-parihāre ca etha nibadāpehi”. The formalities connected with the grants are expressed in the same terms. This is all the more interesting since the formulae of immunities were variable.

varman is indebted immediately to the Ikṣvākus. No copper-plate grant of the Ikṣvākus and the later Sātavāhanas has been found in the Andhradeśa (the western cave inscriptions of Gotamī-puta Sātakaṇi and Vāśiṭhīputa Puḷumāvi are merely copies of inscriptions engraved on paṭṭikā, i.e., copper plates or palm leaves or cloth). It is, however, highly improbable that the former who outshone the latter in their zeal for the Brahmanical religion, and who were as tolerant of the Buddhist religion as the later Sātavāhanas, did not make grants of lands to Brahmans and Buddhists; in such a case the phraseology of the Sātavāhana grants would have been kept up by them and transmitted to their political successors.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{46} The disappearance of the charters or paṭṭikā, of which the cave inscriptions of Gotamīputa Siri-Sātakanī and Vāśiṭhīputa Puḷumāvi's time are copies is to be attributed to the fact that they were written not on copper-plates but on perishable materials—cloth and palm-leaves.
CHAPTER IX

THE VAINGEYAKAS

Śālāṅkāyana—A Gotra and Not A Dynastic Name

While editing the Ellore plates of Devavarman¹ Dr. Hultzsch remarked that Devavarman and his successors might be designated the Śālāṅkāyana Mahārājas of Veṅgipura. He has been followed by other scholars. Says K. V. Lakshmana Rao: “The earliest of the dynasties of kings that Epigraphy has disclosed to us as having ruled at Veṅgi in the Krishna district² is that of the Śālāṅkāyanas”.³ Says D. C. Sircar: “It is therefore not quite impossible that the Bull banner of the Śālāṅkāyana kings was connected with the name of their family.”⁴

Śālāṅkāyana is a gotra and not a dynastic name. The Pallava Vākāṭaka and Kadamba charters which give the kula and gotra names make the distinction between them clear. The Vaṅgeyaka grants also make a distinction between kula and gotra names.⁵ In all the records ‘Śālāṅkāyana’ occurs in the singular (Śālāṅkāyanasya, Śālāṅkāyanaḥ). In the Śatavāhana, Pallava,⁶ and Vākāṭaka records the dynastic name is always in the plural, while the gotra name is in the singular;⁷ and the alphabet and phraseology of the early Pallava Sanskrit charters bear a striking resemblance to those of the charters of the kings of Śālāṅkāyana gotra. In the

2. Now West Godāvari District.
5. ‘asmat kula gotra dharmasya yaśobhivyādhyaartham.’
7. In the Kadamba charters the dynastic and gotra names of kings are in the plural.

Sometimes ‘vaṁśa’, ‘jāti’ and ‘kula’ names occur in the singular e.g. ‘ksaharātasa Nahapānasa’ (Nāsik No. 10 El, Vol. VIII., ‘Khakharāta’ is referred to as a ‘vaṁśa’ name in Nāsik No. 2); Ābhīrasya Īśvarasenasasya, ’ (Ābhīra is a tribal name); ‘Ikhākusya’ (Nāgārjunikonda Inscriptions). But our records do not resemble these in any respect. Sometimes ‘Ikhāku(ku)lasa’ or ‘Ikhākunam’ occurs.
records of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman, Mahārāja Siṃhavaran-
man and Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu, the family name immediately
precedes the personal name whilst the gotra name is separated
from the latter by laudatory epithets. In the Ellore grant of
Devavarman Śālaṅkāyana, Śālaṅkāyana is separated from his
name by the epithet assamedhayājino. It may be argued that the
‘sa-gotra’ which is added to the gotra names of the donors in the
Vaiṅgeyaka grants themselves is not added to Śālaṅkāyana. But
the remarkable similarity in the phraseology of these grants and
the fact that sometimes gotra names occur without the suffix
sa-gotra knocks the bottom out of this argument. It would seem
that in spite of the reference to their kula, the kings of the Śa-laṅ-
kāyana gotra, like Jayavarman of the Brhatphalāyana gotra bore
no dynastic name; they were probably upstarts without any
renowned ancestors, real or eponymic.

While editing the Kollair plates Dr. Fleet remarked that the
Śālaṅkāyanas were descendants of Viṣvāmitra and of lunar extrac-
tion; he added “Perhaps these are the ‘Solankis’ of Col. Tod, who
are included in the catalogue of the thirty-six royal races, and who
for a long time ruled over ‘Anhilvāḍpattana’ in Gujarāt.” Else-
where, he speaks of Śālaṅkāyana as a gotra name. However, he did
not refer to the Pravaraṅkāṇḍas, nor did he emphasise the difference
between Śālaṅkāyana, son of Viṣvāmitra and Śālaṅkāyana. Four
gotra ṛṣis bear the name Śālaṅkāyana.

Śālaṅkāyana not the name of a tribe

The attempts of some scholars to see in Śālaṅkāyana the name
of a people, becoming subsequently the name of a dynasty also, is
wasted effort. Dr. Rayachaudhuri has identified the ‘Salakēnoi’

8. ‘Maudgalya-sagotrasya’ The Kanteru plates of Nandivarman, I.
9. ‘Bhāraddāyāssa’ (The Čārudevi grant); ‘Bhāraddāyō’ (The Hīra-
Haḍagalli grant); ‘Bhāraddāya’ (The Pīkira and Cendalūr plates); ‘Kaśyapa
10. In the Komarti plates of Čandaivarman and the Chicacole plates of
Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman (EI, Vol. IV, pp. 142 ff, and IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 48 ff)
we miss the dynastic and the gotra names. We miss the dynastic name, in
all but three Sātavāhana records.
12. Ibid., p. 102. There is a Śālaṅkāyana gotra which has the pravaraṅ
Viṣvāmitra, Kaṭya, and Ātkila.
13. Sircar, op. cit., p. 70.
of Ptolemy with the ‘Śālaṅkāyanas’ of Veṅgi. D. C. Sircar accepts this identification and adds: “It has been noticed that the terms Śālaṅkāyana and Śālaṅkāyanaka (country of the Śālaṅkāyanas) are mentioned in the Gaṇapāṭha of Pāṇini. It is certain that the Śālaṅkāyanas (Greek Salakēnai) ruled over the Veṅgi region as early as the time of Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.).” He would further consider Benagouron as a mistake for Bengaouron which would represent Veṅgipura. Having regard to the fact that in Ptolemy’s Book the ū sound is not suppressed e.g. Gaṅgaridai (Book VII, Chapter 1, Section 81) and Perṅgkarei (Section 89), Salakēnai can be rendered Sālakana and not Śālaṅkāyana. The Salakēnai are placed north of the river Mana-das which is almost certainly the Mahānadi, the great river of Orissa, far north of the Āndhradesa of literature. Kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra ruled over the heart of the Āndhradesa and the suggestion of some scholars that they ruled over Kaliṅga and Magadha (!) lacks proof; and Ptolemy’s description of the eastern part of the peninsula is not as much vitiated by errors as that of the western and southern parts. The Śālaṅkāyanaka of Pāṇini does not mean ‘the Country of the Śālaṅkāyanas’; it is the adjectival form of Sālaṅkāyana which belongs to the Rājanyādi class. Names like Athenogouron make it highly improbable that Benagouron is a mistake for Bengaouron. Benagouron would correspond to Benānagara; and as several Beṇas are known, and the Benagouron of Ptolemy is on the banks of a river, a Benānagara is not impossible. The Benagouron of Ptolemy is not called a metropolis, while Veṅgipura was certainly the capital of the kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra.

Śālaṅkāyana of the inscriptions has nothing to do with the bull banner of the Vaṅgeyakas

According to the Trikāṇḍaśeṣa and the Medinikāśa, Śālaṅkāyana also means Nandin, the vehicle of Śiva. It is interesting

---

17. The letters might have been transposed in copying.
18. Vide infra.
19. A Benākaṭaka is known from Nāsik No. 4, EI, Vol. VIII.

HA.—22
to note that the crest of the kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra is the bull. Since Śālaṅkāyana of our inscriptions is a gotra name, the heraldic device cannot be connected with either the gotra or the dynastic name but must be explained on other grounds. Neither the bull banner of Pallavas nor the boar banner of the Cāluṅkyaś had anything to do with their dynastic names. Jayavarman of Brhatpahāyana gotra was a worshipper of Mahāsena, and on the seal of his plates we have a representation of the trident of Śiva. Some coins of Wima Kadphises bear the representation of Śiva with the combined trident and battle-axe, and the legends ‘Mahā-rājaśa-Rājādirājasa sarvaloga Īśvarasa-Mahiśvarasa Wima-Kathphiśasa’. On some others we have a representation of Śiva and his vehicle. In the Mandasor pillar inscription of Yaśodharman there is a reference to Nandi as an an emblem on Śiva’s banner. On the seals of the grants of paramamāhēśvaras like Dharasena II the Maukhari Śravavarman, the Gaṅga Indravarman and the Gaṅga Devendrarvarman we have a representation of the bull. The bull badge of the Vaiṅgeyakas is therefore almost certainly connected with their sectarian leanings. Once adopted by paramamāhēśvaras like Devavarman it was continued by even paramabhaṅgavatās like the Nandivarman.

The Dynastic name adopted here is ‘Vaiṅgeyaka’

Since, as has been shown, the only name occurring in the records of these kings is a gotra name, we would avoid a confusion

21. Of the five grants of these kings the seals of the Kollair and Peddavēgi plates are much defaced. On the seal of the Kanteru grants of Nandivarman I (No. 2 of 1924-25) and of Skandavarman a couchant bull facing left with its hump is clearly visible. (However the horns and in the latter the legs are not visible). The plates are now in the Government Museum Madras. The device on the seal of the Ellore plates was thought by Mr. Venkayya to be that of ‘some quadruped, perhaps a tiger.’ An examination of the seal shows the body of a bull, facing left, much the same as that on the seal of the Kanteru grant of Skandavarman. The hump is partially visible.

25. Ibid., p. 164.
27. Ibid., pp. 273 ff.
28. We may liken this to the Śaivite names borne by the paramabhaṅgavatās, Kumāragupta and Skandagupta and the Nandivarman referred to above.
between gotra and dynastic names, if we cease to call them Śālaṅkāyas and tentatively gave them another dynastic name. Fortunately, the Allahabad prāśasti of Samudragupta calls Hastivarman of this line a Vaiṅgeyaka. As kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra are the earliest known ones who ruled from Veṅgūpura, their dynasty may be styled Vaiṅgeyaka.29

**Origins of the Dynasty**

A thick veil is drawn over the origins of the dynasty. It has, however, been shown that D. C. Sircar’s theory of the existence of the dynasty as early as the time of Ptolemy, and perhaps of Pāṇini, lacks proof. The passing away of the great Sātavāhana power would have given a tremendous fillip to the disintegrating forces already at work during its decline. Whilst the southern part of the empire came under the Pallavas, the south-western parts of the empire under the Cuṭus and after them the Kadambas, the Andhra-deśa fell under less powerful and more short-lived dynasties. In less than four and half centuries it saw the Ikṣvākus, the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra, the Vaiṅgeyakas, the Kandaras and the Viṣṇukundīns, rise and fall in quick succession. Since the later kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra were in possession of Kudrāhāra which is identical with the Kūḍūrahāra of Jayavarman’s plates, it is certain that the former rose to power at the expense of the rulers of the Brhatphalāyana gotra. The general opinion of scholars is that the Vaiṅgeyaka did not rise at the expense of the Pallava. It is argued that the starting-point of Vaiṅgeyaka power was Veṅgī identified with Peddāvēgi,30 near Ellore in the West Godāvari district, and therefore north of the river Kṛṣṇā. There is no evidence to show that the Pallavas ever crossed the Kṛṣṇā.31 Even so the Mayidavōlu plates show that Dhamnakataka (modern Dharanikot) and the Guntur and Narasaraopet taluqs were reached by the Pallava arm; as this part of the Guntur district came under the Vaiṅgeyakas later on, it is highly probable that the latter rose to prominence at the expense of the former also.

29. We do not know whether Vaiṅgeyaka refers to the kingdom of Veṅgī or the city of Veṅgī. In the same inscription some kings are known by the name of their country e.g. Daivarastraka Kubera and others by the name of their capital e.g. Kaṅceyaka Viṣṇugopa.


31. All the Prākṛt and Sanskrit grants of the early Pallavas have been found south of the Kṛṣṇā, in the Guntur, Nellore and Bellary Districts.
Devavarman: He was not the first king of the line

The earliest known member of the dynasty is Devavarman. But the expression *bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādabhakta* in his Ellore grant makes it certain that his father (*bappa*) was an independent ruler, for *bhaṭṭāraka* of the Vaṅgeyaka and Pallava grants, like *paramabhaṭṭāraka* of the Gupta and Valabhi records, is a title applied to independent kings. The old view that Devavarman is the first king must needs be given up and the origins of the dynasty traced to the first quarter of the fourth century A.D.

32. Like the other Vaṅgeyakas Devavarman has the honorific prefixes *śri* and *vijaya*. Dr. Fleet (IA, Vol. V, p. 175) and Dr. Hultsch (EI, Vol. IV, p. 143) considered *vijaya* as an integral part of personal names. Later on Dr. Hultsch somewhat modified his view by putting a hyphen between *vijaya* and the name proper. (EI, Vol. IX, p. 58). Even here, he spells *vijaya* before *Vēṅgipurā* and *saṅvacchara* with small v and that before personal names with capital V. In the expressions *vijaya saṅvacchara,* *vijaya rājya saṅvatsara*, *śri vijaya Vēṅgipurā* which occur in the Vaṅgeyaka grants *vijaya* is certainly, an honorific prefix like *śri* ‘śrimādi’ *śiva*, *jaya* (Bhandarkar List No. 1528) and *deva* (Allan, *Catalogue of Indian Coins, Gupta Dynasties, Index*). The Kāṇcipurā of the Mayidavolu and Hira-Hadagalli grants is called *vijaya Kāṅcipurā* in later records. In the Kadamba grants we have *śri vijaya Palāśika* and *vijaya Vaijayantipura*. True these prefixes sometimes enter into the composition of names e.g. Jayavarman and Devavarman. What makes it certain that in the Vaṅgeyaka charters *vijaya* like *śri* is an honorific prefix, is the fact that Nandivarman II calls himself simply *Śrī-Nandivarman* in the Peddavēgi plates and Śrī vijaya-Nandivarman in the Kollair plates.

33. This expression occurs in all the Vaṅgeyaka grants.

34. *Bhaṭṭāraka* is a title applied to gods and priests (CII, Vol. III, Nos. 28 and 46 and Lüders’ List, Nos. 43 and 1076). In a Nāsik inscription of Uṣavadāta (EI, Vol. VIII, No. 10) ‘Rājan Kṣatrapa Nahapāna’ is styled *bhaṭṭāraka* (*bhattāraka*). That it was a title applied to Pallava Mahārājas is shown by the Urvupalli grant where it is coupled with the title of Mahārāja (*bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-Mahārāja-pāda-bhaktah*). Dr. Fleet has pointed out that in the Gupta and Valabhi records *bhattāraka* and *paramabhattāraka* are titles applied to paramount sovereigns (op. cit., p. 17 and n. 1); that *bhaṭṭāraka* in the expression under reference is a title applied to kings is evident from the fact that in Pallava grants of the same period (which resemble the Vaṅgeyaga grants in many respects) it is applied to Mahārājas.

No term is so difficult of explanation and yet occurs over all parts of India as the term *bappa* in the expressions *bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah* (in the Pallava, Vaṅgeyaka and some early Kalinga grants, EI, Vol. IV, pp. 142ff., Vol. XII, pp. 4ff., Vol. XXI, pp. 24ff.), *bappa-pādānu dhyātaḥ* and *bappa-pādāparigṛhita* (in inscriptions from Nepal and in the copper
THE VAINGEYAKAS

But was the predecessor of Hastivarman

Before the Peddavēgi plates were discovered Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao considered Devavarman as the successor of Hastivarman of the posthumous pillar inscription of Samudragupta, whom he rightly conjectured to have been a king of the Śālankāyana gotra. Even with the Peddavēgi plates (No. 3 of 1924-25) before him, Mr. M. S. Sarma\(^35\) considered Devavarman as the son of Hastivarman and as the elder brother of Nandivarman I. The mistaken notion that a Prākrit grant of Nandivarman I existed in Sir Walter Elliot's facsimiles was partly responsible for this view. It was plate grants of the Cālukya dynasty—JBBRAS, Vol. XVI, pp. 3, 4 and 5), and 'parama-bhāttāraka-Mahārājādhīrāja-paramēśvara-śrī-bappa-pādānu-dhīyātah' (in the Valabhi grants). Dr. Fleet's theory (CII, Vol. III, p. 186 n.) is that since in the Valabhi grants (we may add in the Uruvupalli grant too) 'bappa' is connected with the paramount titles of Mahārāja, Mahārājādhīrāja, Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Paramēśvara, since aṭṭaka, (Pāli aṭṭaka, see Pischel, *Gram. Der Pra. Spra.* Sec. 252) in the expression 'aṭṭaka-pādānu-dhīyātah' applied to Dharasena IV (JBBRAS, Vol. X, p. 79 and IA, Vol. I, p. 16), is the old Prākrit form of the modern Canarese 'aṭṭa' and Marāṭhi 'aṭa', 'bappa', suggests itself at once as the old Prākrit form of the modern 'bāp, 'father,' (We may add of the Canarese 'bappa' 'father').

But while 'aṭṭaka' is certainly a Prākrit word, 'bappa' meaning father cannot be traced. Pāli 'bappa' (Sans. bāspa) means 'tear', since the founder of the Mewar dynasty is called 'bappa' in one inscription (Prākrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions from Kathiawar, pp. 88-89) and 'bāspa' in another (ibid., pp. 75, 78), 'bappa' of our inscriptions also would seem to be the Prākrit form of 'bāspa'. What then is the meaning of 'bappa'? A way out of the difficulty is suggested by the personal names Bapisiri (Bappisiri) and Bāpaka (Bappaka, see Pischel, op. cit., sec. 305) which occur in inscriptions of the second century A.D. (Lüders' List, No. 1213 and El, Vol. XVI, p. 235). In Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions a royal lady bears the name Bapisiririkā. In the Hira-Hadagalli grant a predecessor, probably the father of Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman, is called Bappasāmi. This is a personal name for the following reasons:—in later inscriptions Bappasāmin is a personal name, (El, Vol. XIX, pp. 247 and 249, Vol. XI, p. 19). Bappisiri is the feminine form of Bappasiri and 'sirī' like 'sāmin' is a suffix. In the Hira-Hadagalli inscription itself Bappa is the name of a donee. It is then reasonable to suppose that an early member of the dynasty of the Pallavas or the Vaingeyakas, perhaps a founder, bore the name Bappasāmin or Bappa. His son or descendants may have referred to him in the expression 'bappa-bhāttāraka-pādabhaktāḥ.' Subsequently the practice of referring to father and the unwillingness to change an old expression might have resulted in the same expression being kept with 'banpa,' however, referring to or meaning 'father'. This conjecture is made probable by the fact that in Marāṭhi 'bāp' means 'father'.

35. ARE, 1924-25, II 2.
argued "that the assignment of the kings Vijaya Devavarman, Vijaya Nandivarman and Yuvarāja Buddhavarman of the Prākṛt grants, to a period subsequent to Samudragupta whose inscription is in classical Sanskrit is not tenable." Here is indeed a weak argument for the correct view. In the Peddavēgi plates which probably trace the descent in one line from Hastivarman to Nandivarman II, Devavarman's name is not found and therefore Devavarman must be placed either before Hastivarman or after Nandivarman II. Devavarman's inscription is in literary Prākṛt and as Dr. Hultsch has noticed, in one respect the language is more archaic than that of literary Prākṛt, i.e., single consonants between vowels remain unchanged. The inscriptions of Nandivarman II (the Kol-laïr and Peddavēgi plates) are in Sanskrit; since it is an accepted view that in official grants Sanskrit replaced Prākṛt, Devavarman cannot be placed after Nandivarman II. The palaeography of the plates under reference furnishes corroborative evidence. The general appearance of the Ellore plates is more primitive than that of the plates of Nandivarman II. The Ellore subscript va (t. II. 8, 9, 14) which resembles the Kondamudi and Mayidavōlu va, the tha with the dot in the centre which, in later inscriptions, is replaced by a short stroke in the centre or a curve attached to the left, and the sa are prominent instances.

**Date of Devavarman**

Since Devavarman's inscription is dated in his regnal year (13th year) it is not easy to fix his date. The lower limit is the date of Samudragupta's southern campaign; in the Allahabad inscription Hastivarman Vaṅgeyaka, who came after Devavarman, figures as one of the kings of the Daksināpatha 'captured and liberated' by that Indian Napoleon during his 'digvijaya,' and all that we can say at present is that Samudragupta's digvijaya took place before 380 A.D. The upper limit is arrived at thus:—The Sātvāhanas passed away about 200 A.D. According to the Purāṇas, the Iksvākus who succeeded them in the Kṛṣṇā-Guntur region, ruled for fifty-two years. A period of twenty-five years may be allowed to Jayavarman's dynasty that succeeded to the political heritage of the Iksvākus in parts of the Kṛṣṇā-Guntur region. It has been already shown that at least a generation separates Jayavarman from Bappasāmi, a predecessor (probably the father) of

Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman. It has also been noted that the Śiva-Skandavarman of the Mayidavolu grant is in all probability the Vijaya-Skandavarman of the Cārudevi grant. Calculating on the basis of the usually accepted rate of twenty-five years for a Hindu generation, we arrive at 340 as the approximate date of the Cārudevi grant. The language, orthography and the Sanskrit verses of the Cārudevi and Ellore grants would favour the same period for both. But the phraseology of the Ellore grant which came to be widely accepted later on (especially in the Pallava grants) favours a slightly later period for it.

Events of his reign

Sometime before the thirteenth year of his reign Devavarman performed the Aśvamedha; for he styles himself 'Assamedhayājī.' Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao disposes of this epithet as a vain boast that minor dynasties indulged in to emulate the Guptas; examples being the Cedis, the Vākāṭakas, the Kadambas, the Śālankāyanas, and others. The Nāṇeṛghāṭ sacrificial inscription (2nd century B.C.) enumerates the numerous sacrifices performed by an early Andhra ruler and goes into details about the daksīṇas offered. It states that a second horse-sacrifice was performed. The Viśnukundin king Mādhavar-

38. The date of the grant is lost.
39. Both are in literary Prākṛt. In both the etymological spelling of the Pandit is adopted. In both grants every side of the plates is numbered. Palaeographically the two grants are apart. There is on the other hand much resemblance between the archaic Telugu-Canarese script of the Vaingeyaka grants and the grantha script of the Pallava charters of the 4th or 5th centuries. (The few points of difference have been noted by Bühler in his Ind. Pal. pp. 70-71, Sec. 31). The Ellore grant is the only Prākṛt inscription where the letter ṇ occurs (Veṅgi and Śālankāyana). In other Prākṛt inscriptions including the Cārudevi grant it is represented by the annuvāra (the letter occurs in early, mixed dialect inscriptions Lüders' List, Nos. 64a, 129, 130, 131, 133, etc.); and in Prākṛt ṇ sound is sometimes retained. (See Pischel op. cit., Sec. 381, 386, etc.). This fact also favours a later date for the Ellore grant.
40. The 13th year of Devavarman would then be somewhere between 360-370 A.D. On palaeographical grounds, Dr. Burnell refers Nandivarman II to about the fourth century A.D. (S. Ind. Pal., p. 14, n. 2) and Dr. Fleet quotes him approvingly (IA, Vol. V, p. 176). Bühler leaves the question unsettled (Ind. Pal., p. 65, Sec. 29A). Since Devavarman is removed from Nandivarman II by at least four generations, the chronological arrangement proposed by Dr. Burnell cannot fit into known facts.
41. 'Asamedho bitiyo (yi)tho'—II B, t. 1 1.
man I is said to have performed eleven Aśvamedhas. The Vākāṭaka
ing Pravarasena is credited with the performance of four Aśva-
medhas.\(^{42}\) The number of sacrifices mentioned makes the theory
of boast untenable. The Ikṣvākū king Cāṁtamūla is credited with
the performance of Agniḥotra, Agniṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aśva-
medha. Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman is also styled an Aśvamedha-
yāji. The Aśvamedha was performed either before a king set
out on a campaign of conquest (digvijaya) or in celebration of con-
quests. It involved an assertion of power and a display of politi-
cal authority. There is no reason why the king of a small kingdom
should not have celebrated his conquests and asserted his authority
over the various parts of his kingdom in this manner. Economically
too, the Aśvamedha was not impossible for a petty prince. If
‘Aśvamedhayāji’ were a mere boast, every king could have styled
himself an ‘Aśvamedhayāji.’ Among the Ikṣvākūs only Cāṁtamūla,
among the early Pallavas only Śiva-Skandavarman, and among the
Vaṅgeyakas only Devavarman, bear this title.

Much less can this title be traced to a Gupta source. It is
borrowed from the Ikṣvākūs and the Pallavas. The titles applied
to Samudragupta are ‘Aśvamedhaparākramaḥ’ on some coins attri-
buted to him, and ‘Aśvamedhāharta’ in the inscriptions of his suc-
cessors.\(^{43}\)

The only other event of his reign of which we have record is
that in the thirteenth year of his reign, he granted 20 nivartanas of
land to Gaṇaśarman of the Babhra(?)\(^{44}\) gotra and house sites
for the Brahman, his tenants and doorkeepers.

\(^{42}\) CII, Vol. III, No. 55.

\(^{43}\) Mr. Divekar is of opinion (ABI, Vol. VII, pp. 164-65) that, since
the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta does not make mention of the
Aśvamedha performed by him, he performed it after the Allahabad inscrip-
tion was engraved.

In many cases, the Guptas seem to have been the borrowers. The
earliest known inscription in which the expressions ‘paramamāheśvara’
(paramabhaṅgaṇavata is a similar expression) and ‘vijayasamvatsara’ occur, is
that of Devavarman.

\(^{44}\) Dr. Hultzsch read this word as 'Ba(bhura).’ Prof. Keilhorn suggest-
ed that it might be meant for ‘Babhru’. Considering the facts that the inscrip-
tion presents archaic and modern forms of some letters (compare va in ll. 1, 6
and 7 with va in ll. 8 and 14; and bhu in l. 9 with bhu in l. 10 and bha in
l. 18), and that the u sign in ku in the word ‘Kuravaka’ (Kollair plates) is
not represented by a short curve attached to the right of the vertical but by
a modification of the reascent of the vertical to the left, ‘Babhura.’ (Sanskrit
Extent of his kingdom

Whilst it is certain that Maharaja Devavarman ruled over a small territory around Vêngî, we do not know whether Kudrâhâra of the later Vaingeyaka grants was included in his kingdom or not. If Prof. Kielhorn's identification of Kurâja (Allahabad pillar inscription) with the Kollair Lake can be accepted, the Kollair region (excluding modern Ellore) with probably Kurâja as its capital was ruled over by a separate line of kings, one of whom was Mântarâja, a contemporary of Hastivarman.

Importance of Devavarman's Grant

Devavarman's grant is the most interesting of the Vaingeyaka grants. It is the earliest known inscription in which occur the expressions 'paramamâheśvara' and 'bappa-bhaṭṭâraka-pâḍa-bhaktâḥ,' which are of frequent occurrence in later records all over India. It is the first record in this side of India to abandon the Sâtavâhana method of dating (by the fortnight of one of the three seasons of the year, i.e., gîmhaṇapakha, vâsânapakha and heman-tânâpakha) for that of dating by the month and tithi. This method of dating is followed in the early Kaliṅga Sanskrit charters, in the inscriptions of the Pallavas, the Guptas, the Vâkâṭakas and the Kadambas.

Bâbhru, i.e., Bâbhra gotra) is the proper reading. (EI, Vol. IX, p. 59, n. 7).

45. According to Prof. Kielhorn (EI, Vol. VI, p. 3, n. 3) 'jalam Kauṇâlaiṁ' of the Aihole inscriptions can only mean the 'Kollair Lake' as the description of the water given in the poem would be applicable to it even at the present day and as Kolanu of the later inscriptions is a corruption of Kûnaḷa. Kûnaḷa and Kurâja of the Allahabad pillar inscription are identical, because the former is mentioned just before and the latter after Piṣṭâpuram. Could it be that Kurâja changed into Kunâḷa in less than three centuries much in the same way as the latter changed into Kolanu in inscriptions of the eleventh century?

46. In the Chellûr plates of the reign of the Eastern Câḷukya Kulottuṅga Cōḍa II (Ś. 1056) we are told that in the midst of a great lake in the Vêngi-maṇḍala (the Kollair Lake) there is a town named Sarasîpuri.

47. Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta.

48. The Western Ksatrapa records are dated by the month and tithi of the year, but the expression 'vijayasaihvatsara' does not occur in them.

49. The exceptions are the Devagiri plates of Kadamba Mṛgēśavarman (IA, Vol. VII, p. 37), the Dûdia plates of Vâkâṭaka Pravarasena (EI, Vol. III, p. 260), the Halsi plates of the reign of Kadamba Ravivarman (IA, Vol. VI, p. 28), the Omgotfu plates of Skandavarman II (EI, Vol. XV, p. 249), the
The chronological arrangement proposed above not only makes the identity of Hastivarman of the Peddavēgi plates with the Hastivarman of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta certain,\textsuperscript{50} but also makes it probable that he was the immediate successor of Devavarman. Much cannot be made of the epithet ‘samarāvāptavijayino’ applied to him, as the credit for having won many battles is taken by every prince and as similar epithets are indifferently applied even in the case of sovereigns not far removed from one another.\textsuperscript{51} But it is certain that the whirlwind campaign of Samudragupta, perhaps because of its transient nature in the south, did not interrupt the fortunes of the Vaiṅgeyakas, and Hastivarman must have resumed his normal course, when the brief disturbance of Samudragupta’s inroad passed away.

\textit{Nandivarman I: A misconception about him}

The son and successor of Hastivarman was Nandivarman I; in the Peddavēgi plates he is credited with many gifts. An oversight has vitiated all theories about Vaiṅgeyaka genealogy. While editing the Kollair plates of Nandivarman II Dr. Fleet remarked\textsuperscript{52}:—

“In Sir Walter Elliot’s facsimiles I have another copper plate inscription of Vijayanandivarmanā and his Yuvamahārāja, whose name seems to be Vijayatungavarma or Vijayabuddhavarma; .......... the characters are, in fact, so rude and indistinct, that I doubt whether a transcription of it can be made. The language, ..........seems to be Prākrit or Pāli, as the first line commences ‘(Sva)sti-śrīvijayanandivarma-mahārājassa, ..........’” Subsequently\textsuperscript{53} Dr. Fleet gave a transcript of the inscription and observed

\textsuperscript{50} It is curious that in Sewell’s \textit{Historical Inscriptions of South India} (1932), Hastivarman of Vēngi is called a Pallava Viceroy.

\textsuperscript{51} The epithets applied to Skandavarman in the Uruvapalli grant are applied to his son, Viravarman in the Pīkira grant. Epithets like ‘pratāpapana-tājamanḍalasya’ and ‘abhyaṅcita bakti Siddhi sampannasaya’ are applied to Yuvamahārāja Vaiṅugopavarman’s father in the former grant and to his grandfather in the latter. Instances can be multiplied.

\textsuperscript{52} IA, Vol. V, pp. 175-176.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., Vol. IX, p. 101.
'Vijayabuddhavarma is said to be a Pallava and of the Bhāraṭṭāyaṇa or Bhāradvēja gōtra. There is, therefore, no genealogical connection between the Vijayabuddhavarma of this grant, and Vijayanandivarman of the Vengi grant at Vol. V, p. 175, who was of the Śālankāyana gōtra.' We might add, the father of Buddhavarma is Skandavarman. This grant, now called the British Museum plates of Čārudēvi, has been edited by Dr. Hultzsch in the pages of *Epigraphia Indica*. This correction has been overlooked by almost all scholars. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil identified Nandivarman of 'Elliot's unpublished Prākṛt grant' with Nandivarman of the Kollair plates! K. V. Lakshmana Rao, while repeating the mistake, placed 'Vijayanandivarman' and 'Vijayabuddhavarman' after Devavarman and before Caṇḍavarman. With the Peddavēgi plates before them the Epigraphy Department identified 'Vijayanandivarman' of 'Elliot's unpublished Prākṛt grant' with Nandivarman I of the Peddavēgi plates and made Buddhavarman the elder brother of Caṇḍavarman. If only Dr. Fleet's correction had been noted, all these mistakes could have been avoided.

*Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is probably Nandivarman I*

While editing the Kanteru grants, K. V. Lakshmana Rao identified Nandivarman of one of them with Nandivarman II (known to us from the Kollair and Peddavēgi plates). He has been followed by D. C. Sircar and others. This view cannot, however, be upheld. In both the grants Nandivarman II calls himself the eldest son of Caṇḍavarman. Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is not so called. True in two grants, Kadamba Mṛgeśavarma is called the eldest son of Śāntivarma, and in one, as simply the son of Śāntivarma. Even so, Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is not even called the son of Caṇḍavarman; and when we consider the remarkable similarity in the phraseology of the Vaingeyaka grants, this omission is all the more significant. In both

55. D. C. Sircar also has pointed out this error. *(Successors of the Sāta-vāhanas in the Eastern Deccan, pp. 57-58).*
57. No. 2 of 1924-25.
58. 'Mahārāja Caṇḍavarmanas-sūnurjyeṣṭah' Kollair plates. 'Mahārāja jasya Caṇḍavarmanas putro jyeṣṭah'—Peddavēgi plates.
60. IA, Vol. VI, pp. 25-27.
the grants of Nandivarman II,61 a ‘Mūlakura bhojaka’ is mentioned as the ājñapti. The Kanteru plates do not mention any ājñapti.62

The palaeography of the plates also supports our view. In the Kanteru grant of Nandivarman the left half of the horizontal member of ka is looped. This feature is not to be found in any other Vaiṅgeyaka grant. Whilst in the Peddavēgi and Kollair plates the reascent to the left of the verticals a, ka and ra and the u sign in lu, yu, nu and mu, is up to half the length of the vertical and sometimes more, in the Kanteru plates, the reascent is much less.63 This makes their attribution to Nandivarman I’s time possible.64

Extent of his kingdom

If the conclusion tentatively proposed here can stand, Kudrāhāra viṣaya was included in Nandivarman I’s kingdom.65 The extent of this province is not, however, easy of determination. In the ARE of 1924-25, Kuravaṭa (there read as Kurāvāṭa) was identified with Kurāda in the Guḍivāda taluq and Lakumari (there read as Lekumāri) with Lokamuḍi in the Kaikalur taluq. This would make the Kṛṣṇā the southern boundary of the kingdom. Since Kanteru, six miles north of Guntur, is the findspot of two Vaiṅgeyaka grants, since Cittapura can be identified with Cintalapūḍi in the Tenali taluq, it is highly probable that a part of the modern Guntur District was included in Kudrāhāra, as in the time of Jayavarman. What would be a conjecture is raised to a certainty by the term ‘Vēṅgorāṣṭra’ of the Māṅgalūr grant of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavaranman issued from Daśanapura (tentatively identified with modern Darsi by Mr. Venkayya). ‘Vēṅ-
gorāstra’ is probably a scribal error for ‘Veṅgirāstra,’ for in all records we have Vengideśa or Vengimandalam. Māṅgaḻūr may be identified with Maṅgalagiri in the Guntur taluq. Only a part of the Vaṅgēyaka kingdom conquered by the Pallavas could have been so named. No Pallava inscription speaks of the conquest of Veṅgi and the grants of Simhavarman, his father Viṣṇugopavarma, and his grandfather Skandavarman (fourth and fifth centuries), have been found south of the Kṛṣṇā. That part of the Vaṅgēyaka kingdom which was conquered by the Pallavas must have lain south of the Kṛṣṇā.

Caṇḍavarman

Caṇḍavarman was the son and successor of Nandivarman I.  

While editing the Kōmarti plates of Caṇḍavarman of Kaliṅga (Kalingādhipati), Dr. Hultzsch remarked that considering the similarity in names, the expression ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah’ and the close resemblance between the alphabets of the two grants “the father of Vijayanandivarman may have been identical with the Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman who issued the Kōmarti plates. At any rate, the two Caṇḍavarmans must have belonged to the same period. An examination of the seal, which, according to Sir W. Elliot, is defaced, would probably show if it reads Pitribhaktah and if, consequently, the plates of Vijayanandivarman may be assigned with certainty to the same dynasty as the Kōmarti and Chicacole plates.”  

Adopting this suggestion (i.e., that the Vaṅgēyakas ruled over Kaliṅga) Kielhorn classed the Kollair grant as a North Indian inscription. D. R. Bhandarkar who has recently revised and enlarged Kielhorn’s list has not availed himself of the fresh evidence available.

In fairness to Dr. Hultzsch it must be stated that he was aware that the phraseology of the Kōmarti plates resembles that of the copper-plates of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and much more closely that of the Chicacole plates of Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman. Moreover

66. The Peddavēgl plates. ‘Caṇḍa’ means ‘wrathful, violent, fearful’; probably here is a reference to the fearful form of Bhairava (Siva).
67. Ganjam District.
68. EI, Vol. IV, p. 143.
69. Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 686.
70. EI, Vols. XIX-XXI, No. 1908.
71. IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 49 ff. and Pl.
when he wrote, only one Vaṅgeyaka grant was known. He could have however withdrawn his statement when he edited the Ellore grant of Devavarman, but did not do so. The phraseology of the Kōmarti grant is totally different from that of the Vaṅgeyaka grants which exhibit a remarkable similarity among themselves. Caṇḍavarman of the Kōmarti plates is styled ‘Kalingādhipati’ and issued the charter from Simhapura identified with the modern Singupuram between modern Chicacole and Narasannapeṭa; all the Vaṅgeyaka grants were issued from Veṅgipura, and in none of the six Vaṅgeyaka kings known to us is the ruler called ‘Kalingādhipati’. It is not stated that Caṇḍavarman, the ‘Kalingādhipati’, belonged to the Śālaṅkāyana gotra and was a devotee of ‘Citrarthasvāmi’! No conclusion can be based upon the expression ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktāḥ’ as it was used by various dynasties.\(^72\) Similarity in names (in the case of the dynasties of the eastern Deccan between the third and sixth centuries) proves nothing. Caṇḍavarman might have been as much a name common to the Vaṅgeyaka and Kalinga dynasties,\(^73\) as Hastivarman was to Gaṅga Vaṅgeyaka and Kandara dynasties and as Skandavarman and Nandivarman were to the Pallava and Vaṅgeyaka dynasties.\(^74\)

The epithet ‘pratāpopanaṇa sāmantaḥ’ applied to Caṇḍavarman in the Peddavēgi plates would seem to be conventional.

### Nandivarman II

Nandivarman II is referred to as the eldest son of Caṇḍavarman;\(^75\) the latter, then, would seem to have had two or more sons. Of the events of Nandivarman’s reign nothing is known except that he granted the village of Vide(ṛ)tuṇapallikā\(^76\) in Kudrāhāra to

---

72. Pallava and Kalinga dynasties. Also vide supra.

73. Caṇḍa often enters into the composition of personal names. Caṇḍamahāśena (El, Vol. XXI, p. 178), Caṇḍaketu, Caṇḍavikrama, Caṇḍasirinha; Caṇḍaprabha, etc.

74. Dr. Hultzsch has not noted the difference between the alphabets of the Kollair and Kōmarti grants. The thick dots or nail-heads at the top and bottom of letters in the latter grant are not so prominent in the former. The Kōmarti va lacks the notch of the Vaṅgeyaka va.

75. The practice of naming the grandson after the grandfather was not only prevalent among the Ikḥākus, the Guplas, the Vākāṭakas, the Pallavas and the Viṣṇukumṇḍins but was sanctioned in books. (El, Vol. XX, p. 6, n. 2).

76. Dr. Fleet read it as Videnurapallikā. The reasons for adopting the reading given here are stated below.
157 Brahmans of various gotras and caranás living in the excellent Kuravaka agrahāra in the 7th year, and 10 nivartanas of land in Arurṣa, 10 in Muṇḍūru, 6 in Ceñceruva and 6 in Karuṁburān- ceruva as ‘devahalam’ to Viṣṇugṛhasvaṁin (God in the Viṣṇu temple), lord of the three worlds, in the tenth year.

Skandavarman

It is no easy to settle Skandavarman’s place in Vaingeyaka genealogy; those who identify Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant (No. 2 of 1924-25) with Nandivarman II consider Skandavarman of the Kanteru grant (No. 1 of 1924-25) as his brother. The sources of this assertion are the epithet ‘ṣūnurjyeṣṭhaḥ’ applied to Nandivarman II and the common findspot of the two grants. But it has been shown above that Nandivarman of No. 2 of 1924-25, is probably Nandivarman I. Since Skandavarman and Nandivarman grant lands to persons belonging to the same gotra, probably father and son, and since the two grants come from the same place, Skandavarman might have been a brother and successor of Nandivarman I, omitted in the genealogical list much in the same way as Devavarman in the Rāmatirtham plates and Vikramendravarman I in the Ḣpur plates set II. Palaeographically no objection can be taken to this view.77

Contemporary Powers

The theory that the Vaingeyakas were somehow related to the Pallavas of the early Sanskrit charters (i.e., Skandavarman, I Viravarman, Skandavarman II, Yuvaṁahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman, Siṁhavarman etc.) and hence were left unmolested by the latter who were more powerful, lacks adequate proof. Similarity in the names or the bull banner (adopted by both the dynasties) cannot prove matrimonial or family ties. ‘Skanda’ enters into the composition of not only Vaingeyaka and Pallava, but also Sātavāhana and Cuṭu names. Nandivarman, a name of frequent occurrence in Vaingeyaka genealogy, occurs in Pallava genealogy only during and after the sixth century A.D. (i.e., after the Vaingeyakas had passed away). The bull crest of both dynasties has a sectarian, not

77. Since a part of the Vaingeyaka kingdom, probably the whole of it south of the Krṣṇā, would seem to come under Pallava sway during or before the time of Siṁhavarman (middle of the fifth century), it is probable that Skandavarman preceded Nandivarman II who has to be placed in the last quarter of the 5th century A.D.
dynastic, significance.\textsuperscript{78} Since we do not know how Samudragupta's invasion affected the Pallava, we cannot build much upon the fact of the Vaiṅgeyakas not being molested by the Pallavas. Even supposing that the latter were as strong as ever, political and geographical reasons might have prevented them from crossing the Kṛṣṇā to attack Vēngī. It has also been shown that during the decline of Vaiṅgeyaka power, the Pallava sliced off a part of the kingdom—i.e., the territory south of the Kṛṣṇā. This thrust must have been one of the causes of its downfall.

Kaliṅga of the same period would seem to have been ruled by powerful kings. The three kings who, on palaeographical grounds, have been assigned to this period are Caṇḍavarman of the Kōmarti plates, Nandaprabhāṇjanavarman of the Chicacole plates and Mahāraja Umavarman of the Bṛhatprośṭha grant.\textsuperscript{79} One more Kaliṅgādhipati of the same period, who, however, would seem to have belonged to another line, is Vāsiṣṭhiputra Mahāraja Śrī-Śaktivarman.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{Section II.}

\textbf{GOVERNMENT, RELIGION AND SOCIAL LIFE}

\textit{Administrative Units}

The land-grants incidentally throw some light on the administrative system. The kingdom was divided into viṣayas. Whilst it is certain that the territory around the capital was not included in the Kudrhāra-viṣaya, we do not know how it was called.\textsuperscript{81} It has been shown above that āhāra, raṭṭha and viṣaya denote the same territorial division, not more in extent than a modern district. Below the viṣaya was grāma and below that pallikā or pallika-grāma (a hamlet). No division between viṣaya and grāma is mentioned.

\textsuperscript{78} Vide supra.
\textsuperscript{79} EI, Vol. XII, pp. 4 ff.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., pp. 1 ff.
\textsuperscript{81} The Ellore and Peddavēgi grants in which the inhabitants of Elūr (modern Ellore) and Prāḷūra (Paloura, Ptolemy) respectively are addressed, do not mention Kudrhāra-viṣaya. The Kollair plates prove that the Kollair region was included in the Kudrhāra-viṣaya.
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Officers

Each ‘visaya’ was under an officer called Viṣayapati. The Deśadhipati of the Peddavēgi and Kollair plates would seem to be but the same officer under another name. True, under the Eastern Cālukyas, ‘deśa’ denoted a kingdom of which ‘visayas’ were divisions. However, in the Uruvupalli grant, Munḍarāstra is also called a ‘visaya’. Like ‘visaya’ and ‘rāṣṭra’, ‘deśa’ sometimes denotes a kingdom and sometimes a province. Cannot, therefore, ‘visaya’ and ‘deśa’ in the same inscription denote the same territorial division? Since the Vaṅgeyaka kingdom would seem to have comprised only two visayas, a higher division than a ‘visaya’ is impossible. Other officers (but subordinate to the Viṣayapati) whose functions cannot be adequately defined are the Āyuktakas, Niyuktas, Niyogas, Rājapurūsas, and Vallabhas. Rājapurūsas (lit. royal agents) are probably the same as the Śāsanasaṃcārins of the early Pallava charters. According to Hemacandra, ‘Vallabha’ means ‘Adhyakṣa.’ As, according to the lexicographer Jaṭādhara, ‘Vallabha’ is a synonym of ‘Āśvarakṣa’ and as ‘Vallabhas’ are distinguished from ‘Go-vallabhas’, ‘Vallabha’ of our records may mean either ‘keepers of horses’ or ‘keepers of cows’.

Offices Borrowed

The writing of the Peddavēgi plates as that of the Hīra-Haḍagaḷli grant is attributed to a Rahasyādhikṛta (confidential minister). This title would seem to have been borrowed from the Pallavas as also Vallabha. The practice of making bhōjakas (freeholders) executors of grants is also a Pallava practice.

82. C.P. No. 1 of 1924-25.
83. Their kingdom was called Veṅgideśa; and some of their grants (IA, Vol. VIII, p. 76; Vol. XIII, pp. 213 ff.) record grants made in the Pennatavāḍi, Gudrāvāra and Pāgumavara visayas.
84. IA, Vol. V. pp. 50 ff., t. ll. 17 and 28.
86. The Puliṣas of Asoka’s inscriptions (Pillar Edicts) are royal agents whom all officers are asked to obey. Sometimes the word denotes ordinary persons (subjects).

The Vallabhas are mentioned along with the Rājapurūsas in our inscription and with the Śāsanasaṃcārins in the Pikira, Māṇgāḷūr and Uruvupalli grants.
87. We owe this suggestion to D. C. Sircar, op. cit., p. 79, n.1. Dr. Hultzsch translates Vallabha as ‘favourite’.

H.A.—24
'Mutuda' would seem to be the headman of a village. The reading and meaning of the word are not settled. Burnell read it as Munyada. Dr. Fleet was of opinion that for Munyada as a common name no meaning could be found and that Munyada as a proper name was out of place. Reading it as Mutyada he corrected it to Amatyadi. While editing the Ellore Prakrt grant of Devavarman, Dr. Hultzsch read it as Muluda and remarked:— "The plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman seem to read, ...... Munuda; but the apparent nu in the middle of this word may be in reality the obliterated lu." But la has always a short curve attached to right end of its back (the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions and the Māṅgalūr and Chikkulla plates). What is read as la has no such curve. K. V. Lakshmana Rao reads it as Munuda.

The word which occurs in 4 out of the 5 grants can have only one reading. In the Peddavēgi, Kollair and Kanteru plates, the reascent in the u sign in 'nu' is to the left of the vertical, whilst in the letter read as nu, the reascent is to the right as in bhu or bhū. The letter can only be tu. That the last letter of the word is da and not da is shown by No. 2 of 1924-25, where the back of da has a notch at the right and whilst that of da lacks it. Mutuda being the correct reading Dr. Hultzsch's reading in the Ellore grant must be abandoned in favour of Mududa, which would be the Prakrt form of Mutuda.

Though the Prakrt and Sanskrit forms are known, they cannot be traced in dictionaries. Even so, the meaning of the word can be ascertained. Munḍa and Mutālik in Hindi mean 'headman'. In Telugu, Mutṭha denotes subdivisions of districts. Mutalpaṭṭa in Malayalam denotes the office of the headman of the low caste termed Chagon. In the Eḍeru plates of Vijayāditya II, (799-843 A.D. according to Dr. Fleet's calculations) we have the expressions 'Kanderuv(a)di viṣaye va(nd)rupite(y)u-nāma grāmasya Kūṭakapramukhān Kūṭumbinas-sarvvan ittham ājñāpayati.' These are similar to 'Elūre Mududa-pamukho gāmo (gāmeyakā) bhāṅitavvo.'

92. In the Kollair plates the t in the syllable tu has no loop. But both ta with the loop and ta without the loop are used (t. 11. 5, 10.).
Dr. Fleet has shown that ‘Kūṭa’ has the meaning among others ‘highest, the most excellent, first’ derived no doubt from its meanings of any prominence, a peak or a summit of a mountain. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ‘Kūṭa’ is used in the sense of chief. Kūṭaka is a variant of Kūṭa. It is highly probable that the Muduḍas (Sanskrit Mutuḍa) addressed in the same manner are also heads of villages.

**The Citrarathasvāmi Cult**

The tutelary deity of the Vaṅgeyakas was Citrarathasvāmi (‘bhagavat Citrarathasvāmi pādānuḍhyātaḥ’). Sanskrit Lexicons give Citraratha as the name of the sun, the vāhana of Agni and some princes. K. V. Lakshmana Rao thinks that Citrarathasvāmin is the Sun-God. While editing the Ellore plates of Devavarman, Dr. Hultzsch referred to the existence of a mound “which, on a visit to Pedda-Vēgi in 1902, was shown to me by the villagers as the site of the ancient temple of Citrarathasvāmin, the family deity of the Śālanākāyana Mahārājas.” In the Khoṭ copper plate inscription of Mahārāja Šarvanātha, a shrine of Āditya is spoken of. Ancient temples of the sun exist at Asmarka, Gwalior, Deo-Baranārak and Indore. In the Archaeological Survey of India Cunningham has noted an image of the sun at Shahpur, two feet and ten inches high, holding a lotus in each hand, with, on each side, a small standing figure, that on the right being armed with a club. That Sun-worship could have existed along with the worship of Śiva or Viśṇu is shown by Nīrman copper-plate grant of Mahāśāmanta Mahārāja Samudrasena. Here the divine Tripurāntaka is called Mihireśvara. According to Dr. Fleet, the occurrence of the word ‘Mihira’ (the Sun) as the first component of the God’s name seems to indicate that in this particular case, some form or other of solar worship was combined with Śaiva rites. It is, therefore, possible that the Vaṅgeyakas some of whom had Śaiva and others

95. 2, 9, 19.
97. That of the Eastern Gaṅgas was Gokarnasvāmin i.e., Śiva.
97a. Peters, Diet. q. v.
98. CII, Vol. III. No. 28.
Vaiṣṇava leanings were at the same time worshippers of the Sun-God also.

But on the analogy of the compounds Gokarnāsvāmi, (i.e., the God worshipped in Gokarna), Śrīparvatasvāmi (i.e., the god worshipped in Śrīparvata in the Viṣṇukūṇḍin inscriptions), cannot Citrarathasvāmi mean the god worshipped in Citraratha? We do not know of any place called Citraratha.¹⁰⁰ Nor do the Pallava records throw any light on this question.

Religion

The sectarian leanings of different kings are different; some were paramamāheśvaras, others paramabhāgavatas. It has been shown that during the Śātavāhana rule Śaivism was in a flourishing condition. Some of the Ikṣvāku kings and their feudatories had Śaiva leanings. Jayavarman of the Brhatphalāyana gotra was a worshipper of Maheśvara. The earliest known king of the Vaiṅgeyaka line is a paramamāheśvara. Like the early Pallava kings the later Vaiṅgeyakas are styled paramabhāgavatas, i.e., worshippers of Viṣṇu. Perhaps Pallava influence is to be seen in this change.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰. Citrarathā (M.BH. 6, 341; V. P. 184) is the name of a river.
¹⁰¹. Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao is of opinion that paramabhāgavata need not necessarily mean ‘worshipper of Viṣṇu’. He quotes Patañjali to show that followers of Śiva were also called ‘Śiva bhāgavatas’. We may add in some inscriptions ‘bhagavat’ designates Śambhu (Gaḍhwā stone inscription of Candragupta II, CII, Vol. III). Paramabhāgavata of the contemporary Pallava inscriptions cannot mean ‘worshipper of Bhagavat Śiva’ for at least one among them would in that case have styled himself paramamāheśvara. What proves conclusively that paramabhāgavata of our inscriptions means ‘a worshipper of Viṣṇu’ is No. 38 in CII, Vol. III, in which Dharasena I and his younger brother Dronasirha are styled paramamāheśvaras, while their younger brother Dhruva II is called a paramabhāgavata. The Peddavēgi plates of Nandivarman II (a paramabhāgavata) mention grant of lands to a Viṣṇugrhasvāmin, i.e., the god inhabiting Viṣṇugrha (Viṣṇu).
CHAPTER X

THE KANDARAS

Dy nastic Appellation

Kings of this dynasty of whom three are known are said to have belonged to the 'Ananda gotra.' According to Dr. Hultzsch they may be designated as 'kings of the family of the Ananda.' Other scholars have labelled them simply as "the Anandas" or "the Ananda kings of Guntur." We may once more emphasise that confusion between gotra and dynastic names must be avoided. The expression 'Kandara-nrpatikula-samudbhūta,' applied to Attivarman, a distant successor of Kandara, shows that the latter was the first king of the dynasty who gave his name to it. Hence these kings had better be styled 'the Kandaras.'

Kandara: Meaning

Dr. Fleet considered 'Kandara' a variation of Krṣṇa. The Prakṛt forms of Krṣṇa are Kanha (M; AMg; JM; S) and Kasana (M and S) and Kasina (AMg; J.M). The Dravidian form is Kaṇṇa. The variations of Krṣṇa found in the Raṭṭa and Yādava records are Kanhara, Kanhāra, Kandhara and Kandhāra. An argument against Dr. Fleet’s view is that Kandara nowhere occurs as a variation of Krṣṇa. In a Rāṣṭrakūṭa record from Kyāsanūr in the Hāṅgal Taluq of the Dharwar District, Lionel Barnett has read 'Kandara-vallabha' and equated it with 'Kannara-vallabha' of the other Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, some of which are published in the same volume. In these records there is very little difference between

1. (a) Ānanda-kaṛānanda-mahārṣi-ma(hā) gotra-viyadamala-sakala-tu (hi) nakiranasya . . . . Kandarājasya . . . .,’ 155 of 1899.
   (b) Ā(na)nda-sa-goṭrasya . . . . Dāmodaravarmano’—EI, Vol. XVII, p. 329, t. ll. 2 and 3.
   (c) 'Ānanda-mahāṛivaṁśa-samudbhūtena . . . . rājñā Attivarmanā', IA, Vol. IX, pp. 102 and 103, t. ll. 1 and 5.
3. The Gōranṭla Plates, t. ll. 2 and 3.
4. Ikṣvāku, Pallava, and Gupta are some of the kings who gave their names to their dynasties.
6. BG., ibid., p. 526.
Considering the fact that all the records including the Kyāsanūr ones give ‘Kannara-vallabha’ only, what is read as ‘Kandara-vallabha’ is probably ‘Kannara-vallabha.’

‘Kanda’ is a Prākṛt and ‘Kandan’ a Dravidian form of Skanda.8 ‘Kanda’ might have become ‘Kandara’ much in the same way as ‘Kanha’ became ‘Kanhara.’ A fine Śiva temple at Khajuraho erected during the tenth century is called Kandariya Mahādeo. Kings Kandara and Attivarman were worshippers of Śiva. An objection to this view is that in all the Sātavāhana, early Pallava and Kandara records, the Prākṛt form is Kandara.

In Sanskrit and Prākṛt ‘Kandara’ means ‘cave,’ ‘elephant goad.’ As some kings style themselves ‘elephant goad to their enemies.’ Sanskrit or Prākṛt ‘Kandara’ as a name is not improbable.

King Kandara: His Date

The founder of the dynasty was Kandara. Since the Allahabad posthumous pillar inscription which speaks of Samudragupta’s encounter with the Vaiṅgeyaka Hastivarman and Kāṅceyaka Viṣṇugopa, does not mention king Kandara, whose kingdom lay between the Vaiṅgeyaka and Pallava kingdoms, it may be inferred that the Kandaras rose to power after his southern campaign. Palaeography lends support to this view.

For the determination of Kandara’s date, the palaeography of the Chezarla inscription of his grandson supplies positive evidence. On the back of the slab bearing this inscription there is record of Mahendravikrama or Mahendravarman I.9 To all seeming the writing of the two inscriptions is almost contemporaneous. The letters exhibit close agreement even in some details; but a careful examination reveals certain developed forms in Mahendravikrama’s inscription. Only one pa and a few ha-s of the record of Kandara’s grandson reveal notches at the bottom while all the pa-s and ha-s of the other have notches. The more or less angular la with the notch at the bottom in Mahārāja Mahendravikrama’s inscription is to be found only in a few places in the other; and in Chezarla we

8. Tam. Lexicon, S. V. Kandan.
9. In the Mattavilāsa Prāhasana, p. 3, the son of Śrīmahaviṣṇu (i.e., Mahendravarman) is referred to as Mahendravikrama. Mahendravarman II mentioned only by the Kūram plates is not so known. The confusion between the Pallava Mahendravikrama of the Chezarla inscription, and the Viṣu-kundin Vikramendravarman of the Rāmatirtham plates which some scholars have made must be avoided: the Mahendravikrama of the Chezarla inscription belongs to the Bhāradvāja gotra.
find also the triangular va of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions and the British Museum plates of Cārudevi. We may then postulate an interval of thirty to thirty-five years between the two inscriptions. Since Mahendravikrama's reign would fall in the first decades of the seventh century, the Chezarlā inscription of king Kandara's grandson may be assigned to the third quarter and king Kandara to the first quarter of the sixth century.\(^{10}\)

In the Avantisundarikathā of which we have, thanks to the efforts of Rāmakṛṣṇa Kāvi, a fuller text than before, it is said that the wife of Kandareśa (lord of Kandara) who was wounded in battle (with the Pallavas evidently) sent a number of war elephants to a Pallava King, there called a Magadha king.

Rise of the Dynasty

It is now possible to picture to ourselves the circumstances favouring the rise of the dynasty. The Pallavas who were in possession of parts of the Guntur District in the reign of Simhavarman in the early part of the fifth century were later on hard pressed by the Kadambas in the south-west and Cōḷas in the south. The bitter rivalry between the Pallavas and the Kadambas under Mayūra-śarman continued long. Mrgeśavarman, a successor of Kākusthavarman, was ‘a destroying fire to the Pallavas,’\(^{11}\) and Rāvivarman uprooted Candadanda, lord of Kāṇcī. The Anaji inscription\(^{12}\) states that Kṛṣnavarman I’s armies were totally defeated in a battle with those of a Pallava king. From the fact that the early Pallava charters are issued from Palakkaḍa and Daśanapura, and from the fact that Kāṇcī is mentioned only in the Cendalūr inscription of Kūmāraviṣṇu, scholars like Venkayya have concluded a Cōla occupation of Tondaimandalam.\(^{13}\) In the country just north of the Kṛṣṇā, the Vaiṅgeyaka power had yielded or was yielding place to the dynasty of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins. Kandara took advantage of this political turmoil to found a new dynasty. The Viṣṇukūṇḍin and the Pallava perhaps saw in the new kingdom a buffer state and so connived at the coup. But the Kandara was too near the Pallava to avoid conflicts later on.\(^{14}\) One wonders whether the monkey

\(^{10}\) It is not possible to agree with the view expressed in the ARE, 1919-20, p. 95, that “by its early type of Pallava-Grantha character alone the inscription must be referred to about the third century A.D.” The Report assigns Dāmodaravarman to the fourth century A.D.

\(^{11}\) IA, Vol. VI, p. 25.

\(^{12}\) EC, Vol. XI, Dg 161.

\(^{13}\) IA, Vol. XXXVII, p. 284 n.

\(^{14}\) Vide supra.
device on the banners of Kandara and of the Kadambas may be taken to prove an alliance between them.\textsuperscript{15}

Kandara set about strengthening his dynasty by means of a Pallava matrimonial alliance. The Chezarla inscription of Kandara’s grandson who bears the titles of ‘\textit{Satsabhāmallā}’ and ‘\textit{(Rāṇa) mahāmalla}’,\textsuperscript{16} introduces us to his father who bears the title of ‘\textit{Prthivīyuvarājā}’ and his mother, a daughter of king Kandara of the Ananda gotra.

In the Chezarla inscription of his grandson, Kandara is said to have been lord of two provinces or kingdoms and of the best city Kandarapura. He is said to have engaged in sharp battles with the Andhras near the banks of the river Kṛṣṇa and brought about the widowhood of many an Andhra woman.\textsuperscript{18} His enemy was perhaps the Visnukundin. Like the Visnukundin Madhavavarman II, he bears the title ‘lord of the Trikūtaparvata’\textsuperscript{19} Dr. Hultzsch’s view that Trikūta (Trirasmi of the Nasik inscription) in Bombay and Malaya (in the western Ghāts), of which Madhavavarman claims to be lord, were at a safe distance from his dominions, must, it would appear, be abandoned. Any three-peaked hill might have been called

\textsuperscript{15} Rice, \textit{Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{16} Appendix, II. 30, 33-4.
\textsuperscript{17} I owe the suggestion that \textit{Yuvarājāḥ} in this inscription is the genitive singular of \textit{Yuvarāt} to Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. While editing the Kopparam plates of Pulakesin II, Dr. Hultzsch wrongly considers $Prthividuvārājah$ as in the nominative singular. As the sense of the passage requires a genetive singular, he corrects it into $Prthividuvāraśaya$.

The reasons for calling this a Pallava inscription are the following:—

The birudas ‘\textit{Satsabhāmallā}’ and ‘\textit{(Rāṇa) mahāmalla}’ are essentially Pallava. Till the advent of the Eastern Cāḷukyas, the office of \textit{Yuvarājā} or \textit{Yuvamahārājā} was essentially a Pallava institution on this side of South India. In a Dharmaśararatha inscription we have similar birudas e.g., \textit{Bhuvanabhājanāḥ} and \textit{Prthivisāra} (EI, Vol. X, pp. 5, 6; Nos. 1, 3, 7 etc.). The practice of mentioning the birudas to the exclusion of personal names would also seem to be a Pallava practice. True \textit{Prthivīyuvarājā} and \textit{Prthivīvallabha-Yuvarājā} are titles borne by Viṣṇuvardhana in the Kopparam and Satārā grants respectively (IA, Vol. XIX, p. 309). \textit{Prthivīduvārājā} is according to Dr. Hultzsch a form of \textit{Prthivīyuvarājā} (EI, Vol. XVIII, p. 258). And birudas into which ‘\textit{Rāṇa}’ enters are also borne by Kīrttiyarman I, and Mangalesa (BG, Vol. I, ii, pp. 345-7). But the Chezarla inscription cannot be brought to the beginning of the seventh century A.D.

18. Could this mean that king Kandara did not belong to the Andhra tribe? ‘\textit{Prathidāndhra-Prthivīyuvarājāh}’ applied to Kandara’s son-in-law might be corrected into ‘\textit{Prathidāndhra-Prthivīyuvarājāh}’.

\textsuperscript{18} EI, Vol. XVII, p. 388, t.1.5.
\textsuperscript{19} EI, Vol. XVIII, p. 388, t.1.5.
But the association of Malaya with it forces us to look for both in the west. A Vākāṭaka inscription gives us the clue. Verse 18 in it records that Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosala, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa and Andhra were subjugated by one of the later Vākāṭakas. At that time the Viṣṇukūṇḍins were an Andhra power. Such defeats would have been repaid and these victories would have provided the Viṣṇukūṇḍins the occasion for taking over the Vākāṭaka titles and glories.

**Extent of his kingdom**

The extent of Kandara's kingdom is not altogether easy of determination. Dhanyakāṭaka was in possession of his son-in-law, a Pallava. Chezarla, where the inscription of Kandara's grandson (by his daughter) and of Mahendravarman I are found, is in the Narasaraopet taluq of the Guntur District. Dāmodaravarman's grant comes from the Ongole taluk and Attivarman's from the Guntur taluq. The kingdom of Kandara would, therefore, seem to have comprised at the most the Guntur, Tenali and Ongole taluqs of the Guntur District.

**Dāmodaravarman: His place in the Kandara genealogy**

Dāmodaravarman came after king Kandara, for the Matţepāḍ grant of the former is issued from 'Kandarapura' and the Chezarla inscription of Kandara's grandson, which refers to Kandara as 'the lord of the best of cities, Kandarapura' makes it certain that Kandara gave his name to the capital. As Dāmodravarman's father is credited with many Gosahasra and Hiranyagarbha mahādānas, and as Kandara is not credited with them either in the inscription of his grandson, where he is extolled in a lengthy passage, or in the inscription of his distant successor, Attivarman, Dāmodaravarman could not have been a son of king Kandara.

**His date**

Since the grant of Dāmodaravarman gives us neither dates nor names and facts tending to establish definite synchronisms with

---

21. Kangūra mentioned in the grant, which Dr. Hultzsch was unable to identify, may be identified with Kandulūru, six miles to the east of Matţepāḍ, the findspot of the grant.
22. Other instances of kings giving their names to their capitals are, 'Pravarapura' from which Pravarasena II's edict is addressed, Kandharapura, the city of Kṛṣṇa-Kandhara, etc. (CII, Vol. III, p. 236 and BG, I Pt. ii, p. 556).
kings whose dates are known, palaeography is our only guide in the determination of his date. Dr. Hultzsch has only remarked that the alphabet is of an early southern type. We can say that it resembles the alphabets of the later Vaṅgeyaka grants and of the Pikira and Māṅgalūr grants of Śībhavarman. Since Pikira is said to have been included in the Muṇḍarāṣṭra which has to be sought for in the Nellore District and since Maṭṭepāḍ, the findspot of Dāmodaravarman’s grant, is in the Ongole taluq, once part of the Nellore District, a comparison between the alphabet of the Pikira and Maṭṭepāḍ grants is more apt. Striking is the resemblance between the la, va, ya, ba, na, da, and tu of the two grants. The close resemblance between the ja, bha, dbha and li of the Maṭṭepāḍ and Māṅgalūr grants is also noteworthy. The thick dots or nail heads at the top of letters, especially over ga, a feature common to the two Pallava grants under reference, are to be found in the first few lines of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant. The Upadhīmāṇīya occurs in all the grants. It may be argued that the Maṭṭepāḍ śa and sa differ from the Pikira ones as they have bars instead of curves. But the former are not quite unknown to the Pallava grants of the same period. The Maṭṭepāḍ numerical symbols for 1 and 2 are more primitive than those in the two Pallava grants, but as two symbols for one are used in the Maṭṭepāḍ grant, and as the Māṅgalūr symbol for four is slightly different from the Pikira one, much reliance cannot be placed on numerical symbols; nor can archaic forms be the main factor in the determination of dates. Śaka 380 of the colophon of the Jaina work Lokavibhāga would seem to correspond to the twenty-second regnal year of Śībhavarman, king of Kāṇcī, mentioned in the text. According to Krishna Sastri the astronomical details given in the Oṅgōdu grant of Śībhavarman II do not fit into this date, and Śībhavarman of the Jaina work must be Śībhavarman I; and the Pikira grant belongs to Śībhavarman II. On these pieces of evidence, Dāmodaravarman would

24. Muṇḍarāṣṭra is identical with Muṇḍainādu of some Nellore inscriptions (N. 19, 31 and 121) and Kāṇḍukūra which, according to the Uruvupallī grant, was included in the Mundarāṣṭra is perhaps identical with Kāṇḍukūr (IA, Vol. XXXVII, p. 283, n).
25. Dr. Hultzsch has not noted the fact that in the Maṭṭepāḍ grant as in the Pikira and Māṅgalūr grants, final m is once represented by small m (El, Vol. XVII, Pl. v, t. 1. 15).
26. Māṅgalūr grant, IA, Vol. V, pp. 154 ff, Pl. v-b, l. 3; vi-a; ll. 1 and 3.
have to be assigned to the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. But as he was not the son and immediate successor of Kandara, he cannot be placed earlier than 550 A.D.

Dr. Hultzsch assigns Dāmodaravarman to a period earlier than that of Attivarman partly on the strength of the Prākṛt portion of the former’s grant. D. C. Sircar rejoins, Attivarman is a Dravidian form of Hastivarman through the Prākṛt form Hatthivarman. These arguments would compel us to place Dāmodaravarman’s inscription sometime before the Pallava Sanskrit charters of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., which, for reasons stated above, would be impossible. Instances of Prākṛt forms lingering in the records of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., can be cited. The Buddhist leanings of the king can also explain this mixture of Sanskrit and Prākṛt.

**Attivarman**

According to D. C. Sircar, Attivarman is the father of Dāmodaravarman. The only source of this assertion is the expression ‘Aneka-go-sahasra-aneka-hiranyagarbhbodhbhavodbhavasya’ applied to the latter in his grant. He has rightly pointed out that

28. "It may be inferred from the Prākṛt forms used that it could not be far away in point of time from the Prākṛt plates of the early Pallava kings of the third or fourth centuries of the Christian era", ARE, 1919-20, p. 75. El, Vol. XVII, p. 328.


30. According to D. C. Sircar, Dr. Hultzsch’s statement that the inscriptions is partly in Prākṛt is a ‘misrepresentation.’ But Dr. Hultzsch correctly states the position when he says that the personal and most of the gotra names of donees are in Prākṛt and that the Prākṛt ‘śaṅvacecharaṁ’ occurs in the Sanskrit portion while the Sanskrit amśo occurs in the Prākṛt portion. For Prākṛt forms lingering in Sanskrit records see Visnukuṇḍin records generally.

31. Dr. Hultzsch looks upon Attivarman as a Prākṛt or Dravidian form of Hastivarman. Since in Prākṛt, the initial ha is nowhere softened into a, Attivarman cannot be another form of Hatthivarman. Neither in Telugu nor in Canarese can ‘Atti’ meaning ‘elephant’ be found. That ‘Atti’ is sometimes a Dravidian form of ‘Hasti’ is made certain by the Shōlinghar inscription of Parāntaka (El, Vol. IV, pp. 221 ff.) where the Western Ganja Prthivipati II is called Hastimalla (the name of the elephant of Indra) in the Sanskrit portion, and Attimallan in the Tamil portion. Even now ‘Atti’ in Tamil means ‘elephant’. For names and surnames into the composition of which ‘Atti’ enters, see also BG. I, ii, p. 507; SII, Vol. III, No. 60, p. 121; Vol. I No. 74, p. 105; El, Vol. XVI, p. 57; EI, Vol. VII, pp. 195, 196.


33. T. II. 2, 3.
Dr. Hultzsch's translation of this as well as the expressions 'Aprameya-Hiranyagarbhaprasavena'\textsuperscript{34}, 'Hiranyagarbhaprasita'\textsuperscript{35}, and 'Hiranyagarbhasambhuta'\textsuperscript{36} as 'producer of many Hiranyagarbhas' is defective, as the past participles prasīta and sambhūta can enter into Pañcamī Tatpurusa and not Śaṣṭhi Tatpurusa compounds. He has correctly translated them as 'born of the Hiranyagarbha.' The theory underlying the performance of the Hiranyagarbha mahādāna is that the performer is born of the golden womb, etc.—perhaps in the same way as Brahmā.\textsuperscript{37}

But where he brings this translation to bear upon the problem of Kandara genealogy one cannot agree with him. According to him it is not 'quite impossible' that Attivaraman who is credited with the performance of the Hiranyagarbha in the Gōraṇṭḷa plates is the father of Dāmodravarman who is said to have been 'born of one born of the Hiranyagarbha and a performer of the Gosahasra.' He dismisses the palaeographical difficulty cheaply when he makes the gratuitous assumption that the difference in time between the Maṭṭepāḍ and Gōraṇṭḷa plates is so short, and that it is difficult to determine which of them is the earlier.

(a) The grantha alphabet of the Gōraṇṭḷa plates is decidedly later than that of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant, because in them the ra, ka

\textsuperscript{34} The Gōraṇṭḷa inscription IA, Vol. IX, p. 102, t. 1. 3.
\textsuperscript{36} The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription IA, Vol. XIX, pp. 7 ff.
\textsuperscript{37} The Hiranyagarbha jar is of the shape of a lotus; it is provided with a pedestal, golden stalk of lotus and a golden thread round its navel.

During the performance of the mahādāna the performer enters the precincts of the altar where the Hiranyagarbha is placed, holding the images of Dharmarāja and Brahmā in both hands, and takes five deep breaths after placing his head between his ankles. The Brahmans versed in the Vedas perform the Garbhādāna, Puṁsavāna and Simanta ceremonies of the Hiranyagarbha and later on the rites following the birth of a child. Finally the performer addresses Viṣṇu thus:—

"O, the best among gods, before I came out of my mother's womb,
Now that I am born of your womb, mine is a divyadeha."

Moreover, udbhava (adj.) which occurs in the expression 'Aneka-Hiranyagarbhadhavodbhavasya' is mainly used in the sense of 'birth' or 'coming from'—e.g. Rāstrakūṭavamśodbhava, Śailodbhava, etc. As has been pointed out by Sircar, 'Hiranyagarbhadhavodbhavasya' in the sense of 'performer of Hiranyagarbha' is awkward in a prose composition and the Buddhist Dāmodaravarman would not have performed Brahmanical rites like 'Gosahasra' and 'Hiranyagarbha.'
and the subscribed u consist of two vertical lines of nearly equal length; in the Pikira, Māṅgalūr and Uruvapalli grants and even in the Chezarla inscription of Mahendravarman I, it is considerably shorter. In the Kailāsanātha inscriptions the reascent is to the full length of the vertical.

(b) Ja with the upper arm converted into a loop is on the line of development to the Kuram ja which exhibits the head of the modern Tamil ja. The Chezarla inscription has the archaic ja.

(c) The cursive ha and pa with the notch at the bottom occur in the Dharmarājaratha inscription. The Chezarla ha and pa with modest notches are earlier.

(d) The Gōraṇṭla a with a hook at the end of the lower arm is like the Kailāsanātha a and is more developed than that of Mahendravarman's inscriptions. But the treatment of the vertical in Kailāsanātha a stamps it as later than the Gōraṇṭla a.

(e) The hook at the right end of the body curve of the Gōraṇṭla da is absent in Dharmarājaratha, but present in the Kailāsanātha da. The latter is, however, more developed than the Gōraṇṭla one.

(f) bha with two equal curves resembles the Dharmarājaratha bha.

(g) The Kailāsanātha na is more cursive and developed than the Gōraṇṭla na.

(h) The Gōraṇṭla na is more cursive than the Dharmarājaratha na. The development of na is from Siṅhavarman's inscription where it has a long stem to Dharmarājaratha and Chezarla forms and then on to that of the Gōraṇṭla inscription where it is very short.

According to Bühler, the Gōraṇṭla alphabet went out of use before the date of the Kūram plates of Narasimhavarma's grand-

38. The reascent in r l. 3 (paricārṇa) and in u in the syllable ju l. 6, is to the full length of the vertical. Dr. Fleet compared the alphabet of the grant with that of the fragmentary inscription at Badāmī incised, according to his researches, by Pallava Narasimhavarman I during his expedition against the Cālukya Pulakesin II. However, only the notched pa, ha, ma, la and va exhibit any resemblance to the letters of the Gōraṇṭla plates.

39. Bühler's Tables, VII, Vol. XXIII, and IA, Vol. IX, pp. 102 ff., Plate 1; t. ll. 1, 2, etc.

son Paramesvaravarman, which exhibit letters of a much different type. It is thus seen that in many respects, the Gōranṭḷa alphabet stands between the Chezarla and Dharmarājaratha writing on the one hand and the Kailāsanātha writing on the other. Dr. Hultzsch has pointed out that the majority of the epigraphs on the monolith now styled Dharmarājaratha resemble those of Mahendravādi and Siyamaṅgalam, assigned by him to Mahendravarman I\(^41\) (first quarter of the seventh century). The earliest date for Attivarman would, therefore, be the second quarter of the seventh century.

Sircar's assumption that only one prince in the line could have performed the Hiranyagarbha mahādāna enjoined by the Sacred Books on kings and wealthy men of the realm, is a gratuitous one. In the Śrīśailam plates of Virūpākṣa, Harihara, son of Bukka, is said to have performed the 16 mahādānas.\(^42\) In the Udāyanbākam grant of Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya\(^43\) (S. 1450) both Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya and his father are credited with the soḍasa mahādānas. In the Vellāṅguḍi plates of Venkaṭapati Deva Mahārāya I (S. 1520),\(^44\) both Vīra-Bhūpati and his son Kṛṣṇa-Bhūpati are credited with the same. Nor can the numbering of both sides of the Maṭṭepāḍ plates attest the posteriority of Dāmodaravanman to Attivarman. The plates of Devavarman and Nandivarman are numbered in the Maṭṭepāḍ fashion, whilst those of Nandivarman II and Skandavarman are numbered by plates. Yet the latter came after the former.

It is thus seen that Attivarman's reign falls in the second and third quarters of the seventh century. Dāmodaravanman who on palaeographical grounds has to be ascribed to the middle of the sixth century could not have been a successor of Attivarman.

His Grant

Attivarman's Gōranṭḷa plates, which bear no date, record the grant of the village of Antukkūra (according to Dr. Hultzsch probably Gani Ātukūru to the west of Bezwada) and the grant of land called 'Aṣṭāsatapaṭṭi\(^45\) in the village of Tānthikontha or Tānriṅkonra (which according to Dr. Hultzsch is the modern Tādikonḍa, ten miles to the north of Guntur and to the south of the Kṛṣṇā as

---


\(^{44}\) El, Vol. XVI, p. 298 ff.

\(^{45}\) 'Tānthikontha (or Tānriṅkonra) grāme caturddīśam-astiṣatapatṭi kṣetran'; IA, Vol. IX, p. 103. It may mean 108 paṭṭis.
stated in the inscription itself) to a Brahman named Koṭṭisarman who was versed in Rg, Yajus and Sāma Vedas and the Āpastamba Sūtra.

Most of the epithets applied to Attivarman in his grant would seem to be conventional. Such are, ‘anuparata-dharmma-kriyāpara’, ‘sura-guru sadṛśa-buddhiḥ’, ‘sundara-sujāta-śesala-jana paricāra.’ But epithets like ‘Hiranyagarbbtvprasava,’ ‘pratāpopanata-sakala-sāmanta-maṇḍala,’ and ‘samyak-prajā-pālanopārj-jitakīrtti’ would seem to have facts behind them.

Attivarman’s status

Whilst Dāmodaravarman and the Pallava kings of the period bear the title of Mahārāja, Attivarman is styled Rājan. Could this fact indicate a feudatory position? We know that a part of the Guntur district was under Pallava rule in the time of Kandara and Attivarman. But the expression pratāpopanata-sakala-sāmanta-maṇḍala applied to Attivarman, and the fact that Mahendravarman I is styled rājan in some inscriptions and also the absence of any evidence of Pallava rule over the Guntur taluq make it highly probable that Attivarman was an independent monarch.

Religion and Social Life

The available grants of the Kandaras do not give us any direct insight into the administrative organisation. It may be sur-
mised that the traditions of the past were continued. Pallava influence might have played its part. However, we know something about the religion of these kings and their subjects. Unlike the Pallavas with whom they were matrimonially connected and who were ‘paramabhāgavatas,’ the Kandara kings, with the exception of Dāmodaravarman, were protégés of Śambhu Śiva. Their family deity was the God in the Viṃkeśvara temple. Thus the Kandaras continued the Śaiva traditions of the Ikṣvākus, the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra and some of the Viṅgeyakas. If the names of donees can be relied upon as an index to the state of prevailing religions, Śaivism would seem to have had a strong hold over the Kandara kingdom.

But Buddhism was too firmly rooted in the land of the Bhaṭṭiprōlu, Amarāvati and Nāgārjunikonda and Ghaṇṭaśālā stūpas for monasteries to be completely eradicated even by four centuries of Brahmanical rule. Dāmodaravarman was a Buddhist (Samyak-saṅbuddhasya-pādānudhyātaḥ), and the Prākṛt of his grant might be an evidence of his Hinayānist leanings. In his day the toleration which the Brahmanical Sātavāhana and Ikṣvāku kings had shown towards Buddhism was returned by Buddhism to Brahmanism. Like Brahmanical kings, Dāmodaravarman makes grants of lands to Brahmins.

Scattered epigraphic and literary evidence attests the lingering of Buddhism in the Andhradesa for a long time after it ceased to be the dominant religion. Amarāvati has given us not only Buddhist inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries A.D. but also an inscription in early Telugu characters from which we learn that a Simhavarman, son of Nandivarman, on his return from an expedition, came to Dhānyakaṭaka and became a lay worshipper of the Buddha and made donations. An inscription on the base of a pillar bearing the sculpture of a standing figure of the Buddha, in

50. Śambhoś-carana-kamala-rajaḥ-pavitrikṛtē, IA, Vol. IX, the Gorantla plates.
51. The anusvāra over va is clear. Dr. Fleet was not sure of it (IA, Vol. IX, p. 103, n.). Only, as in other places, in the same inscription (Il. 4, 6, etc.) it is not exactly over the letter, but slightly to the right of it.
53. ASSI, Vol. I, p. 106, No. 51 and Pl. LXI, No. 4; for an unpublished Amarāvati inscription of the third century A.D., see Pl. III.
54. SII, Vol. I. No. 32.
Rāmareḍḍipalle in the Nandigāma taluq, Kṛṣṇa District, mentions the setting up of an image of the Buddha by the śramaṇaka Rāhula, the disciple of Ācārya (Mā)deva who was again the disciple of Ācārya Maudgalyāyana. According to Hiuen-Tsang, though Buddhism was on the wane, there were in the Veṅgideśa twenty and odd monasteries with three thousand brethren. In the kingdom of T'e-na-ka-che-ka (Dhanyakataka) there was a crowd of Buddhist monasteries but most of them deserted, about twenty being in use with one thousand brethren mostly adherents of the Mahāsāṅghika system. The play entitled 'Mattavilāsa Prahasana' shows that Buddhist bhikkhus and their vihāras and caityas existed in Kānci in the seventh century, whatever might have been the demoralisation that had set in.

About the social life of the period we do not know anything except that the Brahmanical civilisation had once more gained ground. A point deserving mention here is the 'ārya' ending in the names of the donees of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant. Such name endings are found only in grants coming from the territory immediately south of the Kṛṣṇa (the Koṇḍaṁuḍi, the Mayidavolu, the Ḫira-Haḍaṅgallī, the Kanteru (Nandivarman I) and the Maṭṭepāḍ grants. 'Ārya' (venerable) as an honorific prefix to the names of Buddhist or Jain teachers and saints occurs in inscriptions all over India. It is used as an honorific title in the Háthigumphā inscription of Kharavela. 'Ārya' as initial part of personal names occurs in a Junnar inscription (Ayama) and in a Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription (Ayakoṣusiri and Ayasiri, names of royal ladies). The celebrated disciple of Nāgārjuna, who spent a great part of his life in the Andhradesa, is Āryadeva. But the earliest inscription to exhibit names with 'ārya' ending is the Koṇḍaṁuḍi grant of Jayavarman, where all donees have names ending in 'aja'. The same

55. 218 of 1926-27.
57. Ibid., pp. 214-215.
58. 'Aira mahārāja Khāravela'; an Aya-Sakasathī is mentioned in a Bhaṭṭiprōḷu inscription as the name of a group (goṣṭhi).
59. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 103, No. 11.
60. Ins. L. EI, Vol. XXI.
61. The epigraph on a relic pot from the Guntur District, which has been ably read and interpreted by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (JOR, IX-13, 96, ff.) states that it contains the ashes of Ayamaṇi identified by the Professor with Āryadeva.

H.A.—26
is the case with the Mayidavolu and Maṭṭepāḍ grants. 62 'Ajja' is another form of Prākrit 'ayya' (Sanskrit ārya). 63 'Ārya' started as an honorific prefix and became a name ending much in the same way as 'siri.' 64

APPENDIX B

155 of 1899

1. Sri siddhiśvarāya
2. Kālissara sāravirakeṭoh sva śakti śātita
3. śātrava kari vara ghaṭa samkaṭa Dhānyakaṭa raṇa
4. saptakoṭeh prathitān (dhra*) prthiḥviyuvarājaḥ ā-
5. nanda karāṇanda mahaṛsi mahāgotra viyadamala-
6. sakala tu (hi) na kiraṇasya samavagāḍhāndhrasundarī
7. candanānjanālakta lokāmalā parimoṣaṇa pa-
8. ricaya kṛtāparādha vai (pu) lya sitetarabe (ṇṇā)
9. nāṭhasya Trikūṭaparvvata pate (r*) golāṅgula vijā-
10. yaketanasya hallisaka paṭu paṭabha rava s (a) la (?)
11. ma (tya or sya) ṇadyogasya Kandara-puravara-janapada-
dvitayā-
12. dhipateḥ Kandararājasya priyasutāyāmavantilā-
13. ntava (t)yām mahādevyām sañjātas-satguros-tasyās pa-
   (n) da-
14. madhi (śthe) ya guṇamadhitisthannalamkuvā (ṇaḥ)
   sujātaḥ
15. sujanamanaḥ śravanaśukharacita-bhājano janodita
16. sakalayaśoviseṣaḥ roṣasthira vṛttā-jānu-karaḥ
17. Karibhaḷa viṣasta śātrava śārira sakalamālaṃda-
18. ṇa bhāvyamāna pareta kaṇṭaguno gunonnata virodhi
19. parajan (au)gaha nivāraṇō vāraṇottamabalo balonnatasya-
20. .... (ma) kusumake (tu) rabalājana manaḥ pramathana-
   paṭura-
21. .gu......rabhilaśita phalapradānakṛtamati-rahimagi-
22. ririvā......vilanghāniya mahima-gurus-salila nidhira

62. Ajja of the Hira-Hadagalli and Maṭṭepāḍ grants is the etymological spelling of the Pandit; 'aja' is the cave inscription form of 'ajja.'
63. Pischel. op. cit., Secc. 236 and 252.
64. It is used as a prefix in 'Rāya Simuka Sātavāhana sirimato' (Nāne-
   ghāṭ relivio figure inscription) and as a part of names in 'Vedisiri' 'Hakusiri'
   'Balasiri' (Nāsik No. 2) 'Bodhisiri,' 'Bapisiri' etc. (Amarāvati and Nāgārjun-
   koḍa inscriptions).
23. gādha gāmbhīrya dhairyaśālāghī sagaruḍa-muraripu-sanā-
thāsaśānaḥ
24. paramasamṛddha pallijanapadādhipati-raribala-jayamatiḥ
25. sama (ra*) samaya samunnata grddhrādhyāsita-ketanaḥ
   pratiniḥ-
26. pa vanitāśrutipathā-śrotabharaṇa gauravavai phalya...
27. ..pasāmu..mu...ta (ra) vārināsaghoṇaṇassamarapaṭu-
28. paṭahara(va*) śravanaḥ dviguṇa maḥaguoṇa guṇa-
   sāgaraska-
29. ....(vijaya) sajayānuraktānurāga gururabhiṣṭuta
30. guṇavāsasakalalakā viśārada sa (t) sabhāmallaḥ
31. (svaku)la salila nidhi samabhivarddhana tuhinakaranara
   tilaka
32. ....duṣṭanigrahograviṣṭagātaḥ śiṣṭaparipālana
33. ....prasanna nrpavara guṇatulya kāntiḥ śrīmān śri (ra-
34. ṇa) mahā (mallaḥ) sakta...tva (to) nvayasya prthujaya-
   balā-
35. yurārogyābhilasītartha siddhayā punaratratīrtha-
36. ....rvvannata samamahimānasya...bhila
37. ....bahūni bahu devatāyanāni sthira
38. ....ardhātsarvaparīhāra sampa...grāmā
39. ....maya..ra...vrṣabhagaṇa
40. ....saklasādhanānāṁ godha
41. ....saha......
42. ....pārvatīpara....ru
43. .........manekavi....nu
44. ....rājitarajata (kapālapāli)
45. ....ka...ghanṭākamsatāla chaṭra
46. .........nise...ḥāṭabhā...devopakara
47. ....sampradāyā manvantaraṁabhīrāmabhī
tayapratyadhikā (ra miṣṭā)
48. ....bhagavān paramesvarastu...
49. ....prasannasobitāṁ
CHAPTER XI

THE VISNUKUNDINS

The Viśnukūḍin is the last of the many minor dynasties that ruled over the destinies of the Andhra Country since the disappearance of the Sātavāhana. Whilst writers have emphasised the fact that it was contemporary with the Pallavas in the south, the Kaliṅga dynasties of the fifth and the sixth centuries A.D., the Vākāṭakas, the Maukharis and the Guptas, they do not say that immediately south of the Viśnukūḍin kingdom lay the Kandara kingdom. The chronological scheme adopted here makes the Kandaras the contemporaries of the Viśnukūḍins, and the Viśnukūḍin-Vākāṭaka matrimonial alliance was perhaps a political one intended as an offset to Kandara-Pallava matrimonial alliance. The fortunes of the Viśnukūḍins were bound up with the fortunes of the dynasties of the north and their sphere of action lay in the north, especially, in Kaliṅga. It is with the Maukharis, the Vākāṭakas and kings of Kaliṅga, that the Viśnukūḍins waged a series of wars that finally left them exhausted before the flood of Cāḷukya invasion came upon them.

Of this dynasty we have five records. That this dynasty rose on the ruins of the Vaingeyaka dynasty is made clear by the fact that the Chikkulla plates were issued from Lendulūra, modern Deṇḍalūru. Peddavēgi, the site of the capital of the Vaingeyakas, is only five miles to the north of Lendulūra. And in both places there are ruins of a large of Siva temples and extensive mounds. True some records were issued from other places, Īpūr II from (Ama)rāpura, Īpūr I from vijayaśaṅkandhāvāra Kudāvāḍa. But as both Kuḍāvāḍa and Amarapura are called vāsaka, the former also was a temporary residence.

The Rāmatīrtham plates were issued from Puranisaṅgama, a vāsaka. Some scholars think that the Viṣṇukūḍins were a northern dynasty. They connect Trivara from which Mādhavavarman I took his wife with Tewar in the Central provinces and Trikūṭa with Trirāṣmi and Malaya with the Western Ghāts. They also point to the northern wars of the Viṣṇukūḍins as furnishing evidence in the same direction. Amarapura cannot be identified with distant Amroati in the Central provinces. Nor can it be identified with ‘Amarāvati as even as late as the sixth century the
THE VISHNUKUNDINS

latter is known as Dhanyaakaṭaka—Chezarla Inscription. No one has pitched upon Pallava wars with the Western Cāḷukyas and Ikṣvāku matrimonial connections with the house of Ujjain as evidence of their northern origin. Kielhorn looks upon Vinukonda as the survival of the dynastic name¹ and this looks quite probable. Visṇukundin > Visṇukondin > Vinukonda. Kundi really means ‘one who comes from the fire-pit.’ But the fact that their family deity was the Śrīparvatasvāmi, may go some way to prove their southern or Andhra origin. But even this piece of evidence should not be pressed too far. Visṇukundin used in the plural is, like Vakataka end Iksvaku, a family name. Some writers look upon it as a gotra name. They say that the Vākāṭakas with whom the Viṣṇukundins had matrimonial connections belonged to the Viṣṇuvṛddha gotra. Viṣṇu also is a recognised gotra. But they admit that the Viṣṇukundin is not to be traced in the gotra and pravara kāṇḍas. Moreover we have the plural and not the singular.

It is, however, possible to build some history on the name. The kings of the line though devoted to the God at Śrīparvata (Mallikārjuna) would, as their family name indicates, have been worshippers of Viṣṇu, and the names borne by these kings also lends support to this view. Not one king in the line among those known till now bears a Śaivite name. One wonders if the Śrīparvatasvāmi of the Viṣṇukundins was a Viṣṇavaite deity, otherwise as yet unknown, of the Śrīparvata of the Nāgarjunikoṇḍa inscriptions.² Current local tradition, it may be noted, associates the hill with the Rāma cycle of stories. Mādhavavarman and Govindavarman, names which occur in the lists, the latter twice, are indications of the Viṣṇu worship in the family, before, if not after, they rose to power. The first king of the line so far known is not called a Śrīparvatasvāmi-padānudh-vāta. Did the dynasty begin a Viṣṇavaite revival? According to Dr. Hultzsch the seal of Ḫūr I “is divided by a cross-line into

¹. EI, Vol. IV, pp. 194-95; “The name Vishnukundin has not, so far as I know, been met with in other epigraphical records. Considering the locality where these plates come from, as well as the facts that the writer’s vernacular was Telugu and that, the donor worshipped the lord of Śrīparvata, which I take to be the sacred Śrīśaila in the Karnūl district, I believe that the word survives in Vinukonda, the name of a hill-fort and town in the Kistna district, about 60 miles east of Śrīśaila and 50 miles south of the river Kṛishṇā, and that this Vinukonda, which is reported to be a place of great antiquity, was really the capital of the Vishnukundins.”

². See Ch. VII.
two sections. The lower bears in relief the legend Mādhava-
varma in two lines. Above the line seems to be a
figure of Lakshmī or a Svastika on a pedestal, flanked
by two lamp-stands, and surmounted by the sun(?) and the
crescent of the moon."3 Says Sircar:4 "As on the seals attached
to Chikkulla and the Rāmatirītham plates, the figure of a lion is
clearly visible, it may not be impossible that the obliterated part
above the line contained the figure of a lion which was possibly
the crest of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins." But the symbol is not the svastika
as the arms are not equal in length, nor is there any trace of a lion
or Lakshmī. It is a symbol much like that found on the
coins of the Cuṭus in the Anantapur District. True, the seal
of the Chikkulla plates bears in relief on a slightly counter-struck
surface a well-executed lion, which stands to the proper right
raises the right fore-paw, opens the mouth and apparently has a
double tail.5 The Rāmatirītham plates seal "shows the faint figure
of an advancing lion or tiger (facing the proper right). with its
fore-paw raised, neck erect, mouth wide-open and the tail raised
above the back, so as to end in a loop."6 The lion device was per-
haps Buddhist in origin. The lion motif at Amarāvatī is sufficient
evidence.

Viṣṇukūṇḍin Genealogy

The genealogy of the dynasty was a mess before Sircar came
in to point out a patent error made by Dr. Hultzsch and Mr. K. V.
Lakshmana Rao. Identifying Mādhavavarman of Ipūr I with the
Mādhavavarmans of the Rāmatirītham and the Chikkulla plates
Hultzsch constructed the following genealogy:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Ipūr} & \text{Rāmatirītham} & \text{Chikkulla} \\
\text{Govindavarman} & & \\
\text{Mādhavavarman} & \text{Mādhavavarman} & \text{Mādhavavarman} \\
& \text{Vikramendra} & \text{Vikramendravarman} \\
& \text{Indravarman} & \text{Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman} \\
& & \text{Vikramendravarman II}
\end{array}
\]

But Hultzsch went wrong in making the Māḍhavavarman of Īpūr II the grandfather of Māḍhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates. Accepting Hultzsch’s view regarding the position Māḍhavavarman of Īpūr II in Viṣṇukundin genealogy, and obsessed by the theory that Māḍhavavarman of Polamūru plates whose grant is renewed by the Eastern Cālukya king Jayasiṁha I must be late in the series, and also by the theory that succession was in one line, Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others have built up a fantastic genealogy.

Hultzsch’s genealogy is vitiated by one mistake. When he stopped with Īpūr I his genealogy was correct. When he came to Īpūr II he was confronted by the palaeographical difficulty. “The inscription records the grant of a village, the name of which is doubtful, by Māḍhavavarman (II) . . . . His father was Devavarman (1.5), and his grandfather the Mahārāja Māḍhavavarman (I) . . . . As the alphabet of this inscription seems to be of an earlier type than that of the preceding one, and as grandsons are frequently named after their grandfather, I consider it not impossible that Māḍhavavarman II was the grandfather of Govindavarman’s son Māḍhavavarman, who would then have to be designated Māḍhavavarman III. Hultzsch’s theory has been exploded by the Polamūru grant which mentions a Vikramahendra and not Māḍhavavarman as the grandfather of Māḍhavavarman and father of Govindavarman.

Sircar has pointed out, Hultzsch and others have made three Mādhavavarmanas out of two. Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla, Rāmatirtham and Ipūr I and Polamūru plates is one Mādhavavarman. In the Ipūr I plates he is called ‘Trivaranaagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati-hṛdaya-nandanaḥ,’ ‘agniṣṭoma sahasra-yaśi,’ and ‘Hiraṇya- 
garbhaprasūtaḥ,’ and in the Polamūru plates ‘Trivaranaagara-bhava-
vana-gata-yuvati-jana-viharaṇa-ratih,’ ‘kratu-sahasra-yaśi’ and 
‘Hiraṇyagarbhaprasūtaḥ.’ In both he is also called ‘ekādaś-Āśva-
medhāvabhrta-snāna-vigata-jagad-enaskah’ (Polamūru) and ‘ekā-
das-Āśvamedhāvabhrta-vidhūta-jagatkalmaṣaḥ’ (Ipūr I). So 
the Mādhavarman of the Polamūru plates is identical with the 
Mādhavavarman of Ipūr I. Mādhavavarman of the Rāmatirtham 
and Chikkulla and Ipūr I plates is identical, as Hultzsch himself 
had admitted. 8 If Mādhavavarman, father of Devavarman of Ipūr 
II, is Mādhavavarman Janāśraya, son of Govindavarman, the genea-
logy falls in to the following mould:

```
Vikramahendra
   |               |
    Govindavarman
    |                | Mādhavavarman Janāśraya (I)
   |  Maṇcyāṇa-
    bhaṭṭāraka   |  Devavarman  | Vikramendravarman I
   |                | Mādhavavarman II  Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman
   |            |                | Vikramendravarman II
```

Vikramendravarman I would seem to have had another son as 
Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman is called the eldest son of the former. 
Maṇcyāṇabhaṭṭāraka, associated with his father Mādhavavarman 
as ājīnā of Ipūr I, dated in the 37th year of Mādhavavarman, would 
seem to have been the eldest son of the latter.

It now behoves us to remove the palaeographical difficulty. It 
is highly improbable that that Mādhavavarman issued the Ipūr II 
plates as king. In the plates he is not called a Mahārāja or Rāja. 9

8. EI, XVII, p. 335. Contra ibid, p. 338. See also Sircar op. cit. pp. 84-8.
9. In the Chikkulla plates Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman is called Mahārāja and 
in the Rāmatirtham plates Rāja.
In all the other plates of the Visnukundins the reigning king is called Rāja or Mahārāja. In Ṛpūr II Devavarman, the father of Mādhavavarman, is also not known by regal titles. True, in our records the predecessors of the reigning king are sometimes mentioned without regal titles. Devavarman is also known as one who displayed matchless and well-known valour in attacking warriors. It is therefore probable that he fell in battle in one of the ceaseless wars waged by his father. Ṛpūr II was issued at the command of Viṣṇukūṇḍ (d) yadhirāja. We know from the Godāvari plates of Prthivimūla that adhirāja means overlord. The inscription is dated in the 47th year. We know from the Polamūru plates that Mādhavavarman reigned for forty years. Such a long reign as forty-seven years for Mādhavavarman, son of Devavarman, is improbable in view of the fact that he was succeeded by his uncle, himself having died childless. It is therefore very probable that the edict was issued by Mādhavavarman the younger, who had been put in charge of the kingdom by his grandfather when the latter was away busy with his wars with Kāliṅga. The Polamūru plates show that in the 40th year of his reign Mādhavavarman Janāśraya crossed the Godāvari with a view to conquer the eastern region. Ṛpūr I plates of the 37th year of Mādhavavarman Janāśraya record the grant of the village of Vilembali in the district of Guddādi to the Brahman Agniśarman of the Vatsa gotra. Ṛpūr II refers to the two donees Agniśarman and Indraśarman. The words preceding Agniśarmendra (śarma) bhy (ā) m are obliterated, and Hultzsch has not read them. One donee seems thus to be common

10. 'Śri-Vikramendravarmanāḥ', Chikkulla plates, t. l. 10. 'Śri-Vikramahendrasya', Polamūru plates, l. 4. Śri-Govindavarmanāḥ', ibid., l. 6.
11. Kṣatriyāvaskandapravart (t) ita apratimavik (yā) taparākramasya.
12. Viṣṇukūṇ (d) yadhirājadhyānodaṭṭa.
13. The numerical symbols were read as (4)7 by Hultzsch. Says he: "The first figure of the year in the date portion of the . . inscription (l. 13), is injured and uncertain" (p. 338). Sircar reads it as 10. But as the upper part of the symbol is clearly the upper part of the symbol for four Hultzsch's conjectural reading is correct
The curves considered by Sircar are merely scratches far below the line.
14. Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others read the symbol as 48. But as in Ṛpūr II even the symbols for 47 are the symbols for 4 and 7, and not one symbol, and as there is not a single instance of the combination of two symbols in one, such a reading has to be abandoned. What is taken as a ligature for 8 is only the flourish of the lower part of the vertical of the symbol for 40.
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to both the grants. It would therefore seem that Ípùr II is also
dated in the reign Mādhavavarman Janāşraya of eleven Āsva-
medhas fame. In that case Ípùr I is prior to Ípùr II only by ten
years. And there are not insuperable palaeographical ob-
jections to placing Ípùr II ten years after Ípùr I. Firstly though both the
records were found in the possession of Brindāvanam Gopālācharlu
at the village of Ípùr in the Tenali Taluq of the Guntur district,
they do not seem to have belonged to the same locality. The first
set records the grant of the village of Vilembali in the Guddadi
visāya, by the king from his camp at Kuḍāvāḍa. Guddādi viṣaya is
the Guddavādi viṣaya to which Drāksārāma and Chellūr in the
Godāvari district belonged. The name of the viṣaya which contain-
ed the second grant is obliterated.

The alphabet of II has those thick dots and that bold writing
which characterise the grant of Dāmodaravarman and of some of
the kings of Kalinga.15 Hultzsch says that the alphabet of Ípùr II
reminds us of the British Museum plates of Cārudevi. But the com-
parison between the carelessly written Cārudevi grant and this
grant is not happy. While speaking of Ípùr I Hultzsch said that
"The alphabet is of an earlier southern type than that of the two
other published grants of the Viṣṇukunḍin family. The secondary
forms of i and ī are not always clearly distinguished; in "kuṇḍīnāṁ—(1. 1) ī looks like ī, and in bhagavacchṛ-
paruvata (1. 1), śrī Govinda (1. 3), and—mahī—(1. 4), ī
looks like ī." But in Ípùr II the distinction between
i and ī is clear e.g., i in agniśṭoma (1. 2), priyaputraḥ (1. 5),
and ī in Śrī-Devavarmanāḥ and Śrīparvutasvāmi (ll. 5 and 6); the
o sign is as developed as that in I grant-agniśṭoma (1.2). The tail
of Ípùr II la is as developed as that of I la. Ípùr II ṣa is in no
way more developed than the Ípùr I ṣa. On the other hand na of
the former has a larger bottom than that of the latter and in this
respect it resembles the Maṭṭepāḍ na. Ji in 1.2 Ípùr II is more
developed than ji in I 1.7. Ta without the loop occurs in I also
(1.13). Pa-s in both have looped bottoms. II ta and ṇa resemble
the Maṭṭepāḍ ones. No doubt the reascent of the vertical of ra
and ka is not as pronounced in II as in I. But the subscript in kra
has a better flourish in II than I; e.g., parākramasya I, l.1; II,
1.5. Much of the difference between the two alphabets is due to
the fact that Ípùr II alphabet is of an angular and bolder type
while the alphabet of I is slanting and small. Moreover the affil-

15. EI, Vol. XII, pp. 4 ff., pp. 2 ff.
ations of the alphabets of II are with the Maṭṭepāḍ grant whilst the alphabet of I is closely related to the grants found in the northern parts (e.g., the grant of Nandaprabhaṇijanavarman).

The foregoing arguments, some of them positive and others negative, prove that there are no insuperable difficulties in putting Ṫpūr II as later than Ṫpūr I. And the arguments adduced above also show that Ṫpūr II belongs to the reign to which Ṫpūr I belongs and that the interval between the two is only ten years. Ṫpūr II, in other words, is a grant of the grandson dated in the reign of his grandfather.

We may in passing note the patent objections to the genealogical scheme built by Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others. They have identified the Vikramahendra of the Polamuru plates with the Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. It may be pointed out that Vikramahendra of the Polamuru plates is not even as names go the same as the Vikramendra of the Chikkulla grant. Vikramendravarman II's grandfather is also known as Vikramendra. To place the Ṫpūr and Polamuru grants after the Chikkulla and Rāmatīrtham grants is palaeographically impossible. Since two Mādhavavarmans have been made three K. V. Lakshmana Rao wonders why Aśvamedhas should have been the monopoly of Mādhavavarmans!

The chronology of the Viṣṇukanḍin dynasty can now be settled within reasonable limits. While editing the Polamuru plates, Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao pointed out that the grant recorded in these plates was renewed by Jayasiṁha I whose date is known. Both grants were found buried in the same village, one by the side of the other. The Polamuru plates say that when Mādhavavarman had set out on an eastern expedition and crossed the Godāvari, he made an agrahāra of the village of Pulombūra on the Daḷiya-vāyi river and of four nivartanas of land at the southern extremity of Mayindavāṭaki, and granted it to Śivaśarman of the Gautama gotra resident of Kunṟūra in the Karivarāṭra. The grant of Jayasiṁha I who began to rule from 633 A.D., records that in his fifth year (638) he granted the village of Pulombūra in the Guddavaḍi viṣaya to Rudraśarman son of Śivaśarman and grandson of Dāmaśarman. In Mādhavavarman's grant it is Śivaśarman son of Dāmaśarman that gets the same village. So it is clear that the Polamuru grant of Mādhavavarman is separated from the grant of

Jayasimha by at least one generation. The Polamūru grant of Mādhavavarman is dated in the 40th year of Mādhavavarman. If, as is stated in the grant of Jayasimha, Rudrāśarman was the owner of the agrahāra before he was dispossessed of it, the interval may be greater, say 35 to 45 years. So Mādhavavarman's reign falls between 553-593, the period of Dāmodaravārman and Attivārman (Kandarā). The day on which the grant was made was Phalguni Pūrṇimā on which lunar eclipse occurred. And the chronology worked out in this chapter makes 593 a possible date for the Polamūru grant.

Mādhavavarman's period is then between 553-593 or more. Vikramendravarman, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, Vikramendravarman II might each be assigned a period of 25 years, and the end of the dynasty brought to the latter part of the seventh century A.D., a generation after the advent of the Eastern Cāḷukyas.
In a monograph entitled ‘Reconstruction of Andhra Chronology’ in the pages of the *J.A.S.B.* Mr. G. Bose has drawn revolutionary conclusions from equally revolutionary assumptions and interpretations. He has handled the Purānic material shrewdly. But his reconstructed chronology breaks down at every step.

To him the Purānic evidence is everything and the epigraphic one is utterly futile. The Purānic chronological data if properly assessed would give 3101 (Kali)—2700 = 401 B.C. as the date of Nanda’s coronation. The Purāṇas place the end of the Andhra dynasty 838 years after the advent of the Nandas. The lower limit is therefore 437 A.D. The dynastic total gives us 21 B.C. as the starting point. This is corroborated by the legend that the first Śālivāhana killed Vikramādiṭya who is supposed by Mr. G. Bose to be the author of the Vikrama Era. A Kanheri inscription and the Girnār inscription prove that Puḷumāvi was the son-in-law of Rudradāman. Puḷumāvi’s date is near 150 A.D.; Gautamīputra is known from Nāsik records to be his father. As the starting-point is 21 B.C., Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi must be Nos. 6 and 7 in the Purānic lists, and not Nos. 23 and 24 as supposed till now, for 21 B.C.+ the regnal years of the first five kings would take us to 74 A.D. and Nos. 6 and 7 reigned for 74 years up to 148 A.D. Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi of the records have been identified so far with Nos. 23 and 24 on the *slender* and often *false* guide of identity of names. ‘The name Gautamīputra is not an exclusive one and might be applied in conjunction with siri-Sātakaṇi to more than one Andhra king. It is on such a weak foundation that the whole structure of modern Andhra chronology has been built up.’ No. 7 is called Lambodara, but it is a sobriquet and there is nothing against the supposition that his personal name was Puḷumāvi. ‘Of course the regnal periods of Lambodara (18 years) and Puḷumāvi (24 years) do not tally.’ The same is the case with Sirī-Yaṇa who is assigned in the Purāṇas 19 years while the inscriptions show that he reigned for at least 27 years.

2. Lüders’ List, No. 994.
3. Some Purāṇas assign him 29 years.
of Kiapili of 408 A.D. identified by Wilson with Siri-Yaña supports these conclusions. All these Mr. G. Bose calls a four-fold point of contact.

What is claimed to be a four-fold point of contact is really the Purānic evidence with other pieces of evidence twisted to fall in line with it. It has been shown in an earlier chapter that Pulumāvi could not have been the son-in-law of Rudradāman and that the Sātakaṇi of the Girnār record also cannot be the son-in-law of Rudradāman, but a later king.

The early Sātavāhanas do not bear metronymics. Even the Bhilsa inscription of the time of an early Sātakaṇi gives only the metronymic of the avesāṇi Ānanda. Kings after No. 22 almost invariably bear metronymics.

Pulumāvi is a peculiar name and has been given on all the coins and inscriptions of the kings bearing it. Even when the title Navanarasāmi is given4 the personal name is not omitted. The name Pulumāvi occurs thrice in the Purānic lists. It is hard to believe that the great Gautamiputra is not mentioned in the Purāṇas by his only non-surname while the only Gautamiputra is an insignificant Gautamiputra Viḷivāyakura. Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi are juxtaposed only lower in the list. The Āpilaka coin, and the coins of Vijaya and Skanda belonging to the Akola hoard, make an attack on Purānic names extremely dangerous.

Epigraphic evidence of the weightiest kind shatters Mr. Bose's conclusions. The interval between Gautamiputra and Siri-Yaña of 320 years and that between Pulumāvi and Siri-Yaña of 265 years are too long. That between Gautamiputra and Kanha of 53 years is too short. Fortunately we have at Nāsik a stream of inscriptions belonging to different reigns—of Kanha's time, of Hakusiri's grand-daughter, of Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi, and of Siri-Yaña's time. Nāsik palaeography is therefore a weighty and accurate evidence. The inscription of Kanha's time5 with its da open to the left, rounded va, ka with a short vertical, narrow-bottomed ha; angular ta and short strokes and curves for u and i signs, is very early in the series. It is more related to the Aṣokan inscriptions. Fifty-three years are not sufficient for the development of these early forms into a, ka and ra with long verticals curved ornamen-

5. No. 2 in the Purānic lists. El, Vol. VIII, Pl. VI.
tally at the lower end, va with angular bottom and very ornamental i and u signs. Hakusiri’s grand-daughter’s inscription, conclusively proves that even two generations after Kanha had not changed materially the da open to the left and the rounded bottom of ya and pa; la and ha and i and u signs are still primitive. Only sa, ka and ra are slightly developed. The development is so slight and the older forms are so pronounced, that the wonder is not that there is change, but it is so slight. Nāsik Nos. 2 (Puḷumāvi) and 24 (Siri-Yaṇa) are palaeographically so closely related that we cannot postulate more than a two-generation interval without committing a great error. The treatment of the verticals of āa, ra and ka, and the angular pa are the same in both. The close resemblance of the a-s sa-s, da-s, ha-s and the i signs of the two inscriptions deserve notice. Palaeography though not a safe guide in fixing narrow margins, is a safe and sure criterion in fixing or disproving long intervals, and it will not do to brush it aside as Bose does.

Mr. Bose’s scheme makes meaningless Gotamī Balasiri’s remark that her son inherited ‘from a long line of ancestors the privilege of kingly music.’ His suggestion that it refers to the predecessors of Simuka as governors under the Kāṇvas is a desperate guess. Therefore the orthodox theory rests on a much securer basis than mere identity of names, on the rock of epigraphic evidence.

Other conclusions of Mr. Bose are that Gautamīputra was the founder of the Śaka era, that Siri-Yaṇa is the king of the Nāṇeghat record and that Puḷumāvi was a viceroy under his father. To him Balasiri’s inscription when considered along with the Purāṇic account and the Śālivāhana tradition ‘throws unexpected light on the origin of the Śaka era’. Khakharāta is perhaps the Prākrit form of Śakarāṭ. Tradition points to Śalivāhana the enemy of Vikramāditya as Śakendra, Śakāditya and Śaka. If we suppose a confusion between Nos. 1 and 6, we can look upon the victories recorded in No. 2 as the starting point of an era. Once this theory is admitted ‘it will be seen that there is no alternative but to recognise that the Western Satraps, who dated in the Śaka era, were tributaries to the Andhras’ and the ‘evidence in favour of the Andhra origin of the Śaka era is fairly conclusive.’

6. Nāsik Nos. 4 and 5, El, Vol. VIII, Pl. II.
This is only the revival of an old theory. If the Junnar inscription of Ayama, minister of Nahapāṇa, is dated in the Śaka era we are led to the absurd suggestion that Nahapāṇa died long before \( 78+46=124 \) A.D., (that is in 78 A.D., the year of hostilities between Gautamiputra and Nahapāṇa as worked out by Mr. Bose), but that a person called himself his minister even long after his death. In Western Kṣatrapa inscriptions the words are \( \text{vasa} \) or \( \text{varṣa} \) and the name of the month, whereas in the Śatavāhana inscriptions they are \( \text{savachara} \) and \( \text{pakha} \). It is also curious that an era started by Gautamiputra is not used either by himself or what is more important by his son and successors. Would the Western Kṣatrapas have continued with religious fervour to use on their coins and in their inscriptions an era which started with their defeat—a constant reminder of their fall and chains? And that too, long after the Śatavāhana glories had passed away like a forgotten dream? Mr. Bose’s theory narrows down to nothing the interval between the Prākrit records of Nahapāṇa’s line (years 45 and 46) and the Sanskrit record of year 52. It is all the more significant that the daughter of Rudradāman and a Śatavāhana queen uses Sanskrit. The more plausible suggestion is that it started with a revival of Śaka power after the crushing blow it had received at the hands of Gautamiputra. In cognate records \( \text{kha} \) is the Prākritic form for \( \text{kṣa} \) or \( \text{ṣa} \) or \( \text{sa} \) in Sanskrit, e.g. Khandapālita, Khatiya. The question of the Śaka era is a knotty one, but Mr. Bose’s conjecture based on his interpretation of tradition will certainly not fit into known historical facts.

The Girnār record says that Rudradāman was the lord (\( \text{pati} \)) of Ākara, Avanti, Anūpa, Ānarta, Surāśṭra, Svabhra, Maru, Kaccha, Kukura, Aparāṁta, etc. In No. 2 Kukura, Surāṭha, Aparāṁta, Anūpa, Ākara and Avanti of which Gautamiputra was the lord (\( \text{rājā} \)) are mentioned just before Śaka-Yavana-Pahlava nisūdanasa and Khakharaṇavasā niravasesa karasa. These leave no doubt about the contest between the two powers and all theory of the appointment of Rudradāman and Caṣṭana by Gautamiputra is shattered by the words ‘and other territories gained by his own valour’.

The view that Uśavadāta was governor under Gautamiputra is blasted by the Nāsik and Kārlā records. The mention of the Veja-
yatī army, the non-mention of the purchase from Uṣavadāta of the land granted, though he is mentioned as the previous owner of the land⁸ and the official nature of the records⁹ make the theory of conquest, transfer and utter destruction of Khakharāta power doubly certain. The Kārlā inscriptions Nos. 13 and 19 record the grant of the same village of Karajaka by Uṣavadāta and a Sātavāhana king, almost certainly Gautamīputra, and the entry of it in the state archives. What else can this signify except a change of government?

The author’s remarks about Siri-Yaṇa are the most startling. He looks upon Gautamīputra Śrī-Yajña as the restricker of Nahapāṇa’s coins long after they were issued.¹⁰ The comparison with the Viḷivāyakura practice is unhappy as in the latter case no conquest is involved. If his theory is correct, we should find the personal name ‘Yaṇa’ which we find invariably on his numerous coins and his inscriptions. On the restruck coins, on the other hand, we have only Gotamiputasa Śrī-Sātakanisa.

The Nāneghāṭ record is ascribed to Siri-Yaṇa.¹¹ The argument is as follows: the names Satisiri (which he Sanskritizes as Śuktaśrī on the supposition that Prakṛtic form is a corruption) and Vedisiri of the princess of the Nāneghāṭ record are in conformity with the name Siri-Yaṇa; the worn out name of the king in the inscription ends with ‘siri,’ wherefore it must be Yaṇasiri. Vedic rites in the place of Buddhistic ceremonies were likely to have been inaugurated by the royal personages on the re-establishment on the throne of the Sātavāhana sub-clan, which occurred at the time of Siri-Yaṇa. The placing of the relievo figure of Sisuka, the first Sātavāhana, the founder of the dynasty, along with those of the other members of Siri-Yaṇa’s family was to emphasize the fact that the Sātavāhana sub-clan was re-established; Vedasiri is to be identified with Cada Sāti read as Vada Sāti on coins, and Vada Sāti or Cada Sāti is next to Siri-Yaṇa in the Purāṇic lists. The conservatism of State engravers as also the presence of other inscriptions near at hand, which served as epigraphic models to them, would

⁸. Nāsik, No. 4.
⁹. Ibid., Nos. 4, 10 and 12.
¹⁰. P. 111 §. 191.
¹¹. P. 111, §. 190.
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explain the old form of the Nāneghāṭ script'. The author of the remark that mere names are false guides in identifications hangs all his conclusions on the slender name Yaña, which could have been borne by any king as sacrifices were not the monopoly of one king. ‘Sati’ is a variant of ‘Sata’ which is a contraction for Sātakaṇi. If every Vedisiri must be the son of Siri-Yaṇa then all Skanda Sātakaṇis must be looked upon as sons of Puraṇic Sivasiri. On Siri-Yaṇa’s coins and inscriptions ‘siri’ is only a prefix. It is only the Purāṇas which give Yajiiasri. ‘Siri’ as a name ending does not occur in any of the later inscriptions and coins or in the so-called early inscriptions of Gautamiputra and Pulumiavi. If Vedic rites were performed by one who revived the glories of the dynasty, there is greater reason to believe that an early member of the dynasty performed them to announce and assert the new glories. The author has obviously misunderstood the purport of the Nāsik and Kārlā grants. They do not show Buddhist leanings of the kings, but were mere political acts intended to win the support of or at least reconcile the Buddhist monks to the new regime. The inscription of Caḍa Sāti disposes of any attempt to read the name as Vada Sāti which again cannot be equated with Vedisiri. The identification of the 29th king with Vedisiri is more than fantastic. The utter flouting of palaeographic evidence is thoroughly unscientific. Wherefrom Bose gets his idea of the conservatism of state engravers of our period, we do not know. There are no other inscriptions at Nāneghāṭ to serve as models other than the long sacrificial record and the relievo inscriptions. The Nāneghāṭ record of a later king Catarapana Sātakaṇi shows later forms only. It is a far cry from the Nāneghāṭ script which is a little more developed than the Aśokan to the Siri-Yaṇa alphabets which are as developed as those of the Ikṣvākus.

It remains to speak of the theory of viceroyalty of Pulumiavi of Nāsik, Nos. 2 and 3 under Gautamiputra. ‘The epithets and titles (in Nāsik No. 2) leave no room for the doubt that Gautamiputra was the paramount lord and Vāsiṣṭhiputra had a subordinate position. Under these circumstances one would naturally expect the inscription to be dated in the regnal years of the paramount

12. P. 107, §. 181.
13. EI, Vol. XVI.
14. JBBRAS, Vol. XIII.
king but it is not so. The most plausible explanation is that Bala-
sri had been living with her grandson who was a provincial ruler
under his father." It is Bhandarkar's theory of conjoint rule
walking in new clothes. The expressions, pitupatiyo applied to
father and mahādeviya ayakāya sevakāmo piyakāmo ca, leaves no
doubt that the grand-mother was living and the father was not
when the inscription was incised. Nāsik No. 3 is issued in the
same way as No. 4. Nava
ranarasāmi reminds us of Benākaṭaka-
sāmi. The amaca at Govadhana is addressed in both; both have
the prefix siri; in both the regnal years of the kings concerned are
given. In what way No. 3 can be construed to be the order of
a Viceroy and the other that of a King of Kings one fails to un-
derstand. Moreover, if Govadhana was in Puḻumāvi's province
one would expect Gautamīputra in No. 4 to issue the order through
Puḻumāvi. The regnal years of Puḻumāvi given in Nos. 2 and 3
are enough to shatter Mr. Bose's theory though he glosses over
this fact. In all cognate records the year of the reigning king is
given. The epithets lavished upon Gautamīputra are explained
by the motherly feelings towards the dead son and by his grand
exploits ('the funeral oration of a disconsolate mother'). Nothing
can be made out of rāja applied to Puḻumāvi and rājarāja applied
to his father as both are called mahārājas towards the end.
Moreover Puḻumāvi is also styled [Dakhina] pathesaro, a title which
is not viceregal. Gautamīputra is also called rāja in No. 4 and 5.

One minor conclusion may also be studied. Nāsik No. 5
is said to be a joint order of Gautamīputra and his queen Jīvasutā.
As according to Indian custom as long as the mother-in-law is
living the daughter-in-law would not find any prominent mention
anywhere, Gotamī Balasirī must have died between 97 and 100 A.D.

Since No. 2 is the record of Puḻumāvi's reign Gotamī Balasirī
outlived her glorious son. The theory of the viceroyalty of Puḻu-
māvi having been disproved, how can the so-called Jīvasutā call
herself rājamatā; as Puḻumāvi is a Vāsiṭhīputa one would expect to
find the gotra name of the queen. To Mr. Bose the translation ' one
whose son is living' is absurd, because it is a joint-order of Gautamī-
putra and a mahādevi. But the association of a lady in the govern-

15. EI, Vol. VIII.
16. According to Senart Dakhīna is 'a conjecture although more than a
probable one.' Between the two creases there are traces of a letter. It can-
not however be read as da though it is tempting to do so.
ment shows the failing health or more probably the illness of the king and under such circumstances, 'kings's mother whose son is living' is neither absurd nor superfluous. Nasik No. 2 speaks of him as aviparamātu susūsaka.17

Mr. G. Bose's monograph in short contains nothing new, and must be considered unsatisfactory in every way as an attempt to reinterpret the familiar data.
INDEX

A

Abhidhamma, 146.
Abhidhamcintāmani, 41.
Abhidhāna Rājendra, 16.
Absārah, 127.
Adavi-Cāntisiri, 129, 140.
Adhapanakheta, 115.
Agityana, 37, 101n.
Agniśarman, 205.
Agniwijaya, 37, 101n.
Agniwijaya, 37.
Ahdra, 23n, 81, 84, 86, 87; 146-47.
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 1, 2, 76, 77n.
Ajalakā, 57.
Akalikāyam, 57.
Aittiyapadasana, 169n.
Akara, 49, 53, 63.
Akhayanlvi, 114n.
Aksapatalika, 88.
Alexander, 92.
Allōgsyne, 104, 105, 150.
Allūra inscription, 88 ff., 130.
Amaca (Sans. Amdtya), 73, 81, 86, 87n, 88.
Amaraṇa, 200.
Andhāpata (mistake of the scribe for Andhāpatha), 86, 157.
Andhāpatha (Andhrāpatha), 1, 2, 22.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhāpatha gotra (avesani), 29n., 210.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhrāpatha, 86.
Andhrāpatha, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhāpatha gotra (avesani), 29n., 210.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhāpatha gotra (avesani), 29n., 210.
Andhāpatha gotra, 185.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
Andhrāśrama, 86.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE ANDHRA COUNTRY

Benakataka, 74n., 165n.
Benakatatasami, 17, 64, 68n.
Benapangara, 165.
Bhada, 141.
Bhadanta, 120.
Bhadayaniya, sect., 87n., 102n., 118, 119.
Bhaghvada Kasiputa, 45.
Bhadanta, 120.
Bhadgavata Purana, 78.
Bhanda, 165.
Bhikuhala, 161.
Bhogapati, 85n.
Bhogika, 85n.
Bhaya (Kumara), 15, 33, 38.
Bhajanacatusala, 121.
Bhajanamatapa, 121.
Bhajana, 76.
Bhajika, 98.
Bhumika, 71n.
Bhuvanabhajana, 185.
Bina, 10.
Bisuyakondapattana, (Motupalle), 105n.
Bodhagothi, 115n.
Bodhisiri, 125n., 141n.
Bhaktiprolu, 13n., 99, 129.
Bhagbahadra Kasiputa, 45.
Bhagavata Purana, 78.
Bhadanta, 120.
Bhaya (Kumara), 15, 33, 38.
Bhajanacatusala, 121.
Bhajanamatapa, 121.
Bhajana, 76.
Bhajika, 98.
Bhumika, 71n.
Bhuvanabhajana, 185.
Bina, 10.
Bisuyakondapattana, (Motupalle), 105n.
Bodhagothi, 115n.
Bodhisiri, 125n., 141n.
Bhaktiprolu, 13n., 99, 129.
Bhagbahadra Kasiputa, 45.
Bhagavata Purana, 78.
Bhadanta, 120.

C

Cadaka, 110.
Cada Satja (=Vada Sati?), 213.
Cada Sati (Satakani), 3, 12n., 14, 44n., 68n., 71, 84, 86n., 113, 214.
Caitika (see Caityavardha and Caityavarman), 119.
Caityavardha (see Caitika and Caityavarman), 119.
Cakora Satakarni, 34.
Calliene (see Kaliana and Kalyan), 108.
Cannimakara, 113.
Caityisiri, 131n., 134, 138, 145.
Caityisirinikà, 136, 147n.
Candada, 25, 187.
Candavarman (Kalindadhipati), 164n., 177, 178, 180.
Candavarman (Valngeyaka), 175, 177ff.
Candragupta II, 153n.
Candragupta (Maurya), 19, 28n.
Carakas, 95, 123.
Caratha, 89, 104.
Caruvedi grant, 154ff., 164n., 171, 175, 187.
Casana, 13, 29n., 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 64, 65, 68n., 75, 135.
Catarapana Satakani, 11n., 18n., 66, 67, 69, 72, 214.
Cecimma, 102.
Ceficeruva, 179.
Cetikya (see Caitika and Caityavarman), 118.
Cetikya-gharga (=Sela-ghара=Cetikya-kodhi), 118, 121, 140n., 141.
Cetikya-kodhi, 121, 122.
Ceylon, 146.
 Chadaka, 104.
Chadakapavata, 104.
Chadakapavatica, 140150.
Chakalepa, 102.
Chathisiri, 136, 138, 140.
Chezarla, 193ff.
Chryse, 105.
Cikambari, 68n.
Cithrarathasvami, 183, 184.
Cittapura, 176.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 109.
Cula-Camtisirinika, 131n., 138, 140.
Cula-Dhammagiri, 125n., 127n., 142n.
Cula-Kanha, 147n.
Cutch, 52, 53.
Cutukaθana, 75.

D

Dachinabades, 20, 106.
Dahanu, 101.
Dahanukâ, 101.
Dahanukâgara, 101.
Darihâpapathapati, 20, 36.
Daksamitra, 57n., 95.
Daksiâsala, 125n., 126n., 152n.
Daksinâpâtha (Darihîpâtha), 20, 26, 170.
Dalyavâyi river, 207.
Damaicika, 95n.
Damaśârman, 207.
Damilla-Kanha, 129, 147n.
Damirica, 20.
Dâmôdârana, 123.
Dâmodaravarman, 24, 189ff., 196, 206, 208.
Daśapura, 102, 103.
Daśanapura, 176, 187.
Daśarûpaka, 43.
Daśamitrâ, 94n.
Demetrius I, 37.
INDEX 219

Denarius, 135n.
Deśādhịpati, 181.
Deśikosa, 87n., 157n.
Deśināmamālā, 41, 42n.
Devagiri, 142.
Devagupta, 128.
Devaparavana, 103.
Devavarman (Vaiśegyaka), 163, 164, 166, 168ff., 174, 175, 178.
Devendravarman Gariga, 166.
Devi-vihara, 143.
Dhambhikagama, 101.
Dhaihma (Yavana), 93n.
Dhammacakka, 116.
Dhammakathika, 120.
Dharmarajara inscription, 193.
Dhenukakata, 57n., 94.
Dīgha Nikāya, 139n., 146.
Dimita, 37.
Dīnārī-ṃghaka, 112n., 135.
Dīnika, 94.
Dīpanavīnsa, 141n.
Draśsarama, 43, 206.
Dūtaka, 84n., 88.

E

Eastern Cālukyas, 1, 2, 157n., 195n., 208.
Ehuvula Cāṃtāmūla, 128, 129, 131, 132n., 142.

G

Gadhika, 113.
Gāgliputa, 45.
Gahapati, 88n., 111.
Gahata, 111.
Gahini, 98.
Gāndhāras, 1, 92.
Gāmika, 85n., 87.
Gaṇādhṛipati, 123.
Gaṇḍavyūha, 126n.
Gaṅgaridai, 165.
Gani Ātukūru, 194.
Gardabhillas, 127.
Gāṭhāsaptātī, 41, 42.
Gimhānapakha, 173.
Gīmār prakṛti, 53n., 56, 154.
Gokarnaśāmin, 183, 184.
Golden Chryse, 105.
Golīka, 93.
Goranta inscription, 193.
Goliputa (Maḥāraṇī), 44n., 45.
Govadhanā (Govardhana), 24, 101, 102, 103, 109, 110, 114, 123, 215.
Govadhanāhāra, 24, 74, 101, 102n., 157n.
Govagāma, 141, 146n., 215.
Go-Vallabhas, 181.
Govindavarman (Viṣṇuṅkūṇḍīn), 202, 203, 204.
Great Dhammagiri, 142.
Guddāḍi viṣaya, 206.
Guddavāḍi viṣaya, 206.
Gudrahāra (= Gudrāra), 157n.
Gudrāvāra viṣaya (= Kūḍūrahāra), 181n.
Gumika, 84n., 87n.
Gunapadeya grant, 153.

H

Hagāna, 55.
Hagāmāsa, 55.
Hakusiri (see Maha-Hakusiri), 33, 37, 38, 122n.
Hāla (= Satākāri), 5, 13, 14, 33, 35, 41ff., 87, 122.
Hālaka (Hālīka), 91.
Hālakīya, 111.
Harināmaruddhā, 136.
Harināmaruddhikā, 134.
Harisena, 2.
Harivaniṣa, 59.
Harivaniṣa Purāṇa, 16.
Harsacarita 40n., 43n., 62n., 70.
Hastimalla (see Athimallan), 191n.
Hastin, Mahārājā, 84.
Hāṭhigumpha inscription, 7, 9, 28, 37, 75n., 76, 104, 158n., 159n.
Hemacandra, 19n., 23n., 30n., 41, 87n.
Hemantānapakha, 173.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE ANDHRA COUNTRY

Heranifco, 87, 88n.  
Hinayana, 145.  
Hippokura, 60, 61, 109.  
Hiralura, 103.  
Hiramapinda, 133.  
Hiranyagarbhaprasita, 192.  
Hiru-Hatakani (= Siri-Satakan) 13, 14, 33, 54.  
Hirumthuva, 142.  
Hiuen-Tsang, 70, 125n., 142n., 144n., 197.  
Iksvakus, 15, 82, 125ff., 170.  
Indrabhattarakavarman, 202, 203, 204.  
Indragnidatta, 94n., 95, 96.  
Indrasarman, 205.  
Indravarman Gahga, 166.  
Ipur plates I, 200ff.  
Ipur plates II, 200ff.  
Isanavarman, 2.  
Isvarasena Abhira, 45, 69, 93n.  
Isvaravarman, 2.  
Janapada, 84n.  
Jana&raya (Madhavavarman I), 204, 205, 206.  
Jatadhara, 181.  
Jatikarna, 35.  
Jayadaman, 52, 53.  
Jayasihha, 207, 208.  
Jayavarman of Brhatphalayana gotra, 86n., 151, 164, 166, 168n., 170, 184, 197.  
Jinsprabhasuri, 30, 31.  
Jinasena, 16.  
Jogalthemi hoard, 5, 49 57.  
Jouveau-Dubreuil 105, 157n., 158, 175.  
Kadhicaka, 113.  
Kahapana, 89.  
Kailasanatha inscriptions, 193.  
Kakusthavarman, 22n., 35n., 197.  
Kalaka, 16, 49.  
Kalakacaryakathä, 16, 49.  
Kaliana (See Calliennca), 108.  
Kalingattupparani, 130n.  
Kalpasutra, 148.  
Kalyan (=Kalianna, Kalyana), 6n., 50, 69, 107n., 108, 109, 121.  
Kanyakra, 113.  
Kamasutra, 35.  
Kambodjas, 1, 76, 92.  
Kandasiri, 127n., 147.  
Kamgura, 189n.  
Kammakara, 113.  
Kammakarata, 103, 146n.  
Kanabhoa, 77.  
Kanda or Kandan, 186.  
Kandaras, 185ff.  
Kandara (meaning), 185.  
Kandara (King), 24, 186.  
Kandarapura, 24, 188, 189.  
Kandara-Vallabha, 185.  
Kandhara, Kandhra, 185.  
Kandharapura, 189n.  
Kanduluru, 189n.  
Kanha (Satavahana), 6, 14, 19, 20, 28, 30, 32ff, 37, 73, 210, 211.  
Kanhabenä, 37.  
Kanhara, Kanhara, 185, 186.  
Kantakasela (Sans. Kantakasailla), 8, 104, 142, 150.  
Kantakossyla, 8, 104, 135n., 142n., 150.  
Kanva, 19.  
Kansas, 21, 25, 29n., 211.  
Kapal tila, 123.  
Kapanakas, 101n.  
Kapicit, 103.  
Kapura, 101.  
Kapurahara, 101.  
Karahaka, 109.  
Karajaka, 57, 161n., 213.  
Karandavyaha, 145n.  
Karikala, 26.  
Karnarasta, 3, 207.  
Karṣapana, 97, 112, 113, 114.  
Karumbudhinaka, 128.  
Karumburāñceru, 179.  
Kāśākāras, 113.  
Kāśākārasena, 114.  
Kāśīkā, 159.  
Kātañkakasa (see Kantañkasela, Kantañkossyla, 142n.  
Kathāsatoritsagara, 30.  
Kathāvatthu, 119, 120, 144.  
Kātyāyana, 132.  
Kauṭilya, 48.  
Kāvyaprakāśa, 43.  
Kekāpura, 101.  
Kekāpurahara, 101.  
Kevurura, 103, 110.  
Khadi, 97.  
Kakhārāta (Kṣaharāta race), 53, 56, 163n., 211.  
Khainidacaikiremanaka, 127n., 147.  
Khainidana, 71.  
Khainidana-siri, 157n.  
Khainidasagaramnaka, 147n.  
Khainidasiri Vasithiputa, 134n.  
Khāravela, 2, 7, 8, 9, 28, 37, 75n., 76, 104.
INDEX

Khubiraka, 7, 10.
Kilakila Kings, 128.
Kociputa, 45.
Kodabalisiri, 137, 142, 143.
Koddura (Küdūra), 8, 86, 104, 135n.
Kođhi, 118, 121.
Kolanu, 173n.
Kolikas, 113.
Kollitippa, 105.
Koñačika, 103.
Koñḍamāna Haritiputa, 48n.
Koñḍamutfi plates, 84, 86n., 151ff., 170, 197.
Kopparam plates of Pulakesin II, 157n., 188n.
Kosasthall, 129.
Kosiklputa, 45, 60.
Kothagdrika (Sansk. Kosthagarika), 141, 147.
Kotivarsa visaya, 159.
Kottisarman, 195.
Krsnavarman I, 187.
Ksaharata, 16.
Kṣatrapa t, 29n., 50ff., 67, 68n., 70, 112n., 126n., 135n., 136n., 137, 186n., 178n.
Kuberanāga, 32n.
Kuñjiva, 200.
Kuddhakapāta, 22n.
Kudrāhāra visaya, 23n.
Kudrāhāra, 23n., 24, 86, 156n., 157n., 167.
Kujula Kadphises, 59.
Kukura, 49, 53, 62.
Kulahaka family, 131n.
Kularikaseni, 114.
Kumaradatta, 71.
Kumaravisnu, 164, 187.
Kumbhakarna, 35.
Kunala, 173n.
Kunrura, 207.
Kuram plates, 193.
Kuravaka agrahāra, 179.
Kuravata, 176.
Kuśa, 129.
Kusāna, 49, 59.
Kuśāna, 59.
Kuśānamūla, 118.
Kūta, 102, 183.
Kūti, 118.
Kuśumbika (= Kuṭhubika), 111.
Kuśumbini, 98, 111.

L
Lakumari, 176.
Lambodara, 35, 41, 209.
Lekhaka, 83, 113, 160.
Lenḍulūra (=Dendraḷūra), 200.
Liññavati, 5, 41, 43.
Liññavati, 43.
Limyrike, 20.
Lohavānīyas, 113.
Lokavibhāga, 190.

M
Madavi, 89, 100.
Mādhavavarman I (Viṣṇukundin), 47, 171, 201ff.
Mādhavavarman II (Viṣṇukundin), 188, 204, 205.
Mahākukēvara, 137n.
Madhumathana, 123.
Magila Vachiputa, 14, 46.
Maha–Hakusiri (= Hakusiri), 37, 38, 47n.
Maha–āryaka, 87.
Mahaḥbhrata, 1, 76, 123n.
Mahahbogika, 85n.
Mahābhhoja, 75ff., 82, 85, 113, 117, 148, 160.
Mahābhhoji, 78, 80, 98.
Mahacetiya, 136.
Mahādeva, 197.
Mahā-Hakusiri, 37, 38, 47n.
Mahādeva, 197.
Mahā-Hakusiri, 37, 38, 47n.
Mahākushyapa, 103.
Mahākṣata, 113.
Mahāmāta (Mahamātra), 32, 87, 88.
Mahānadi, 165.
Mahānavačakrama, 120.
Mahāpratiharā, 78n., 84, 149.
Mahārakśita, 92.
Mahārāṭhi, 9, 27, 46ff., 60, 61, 73n., 75ff., 80, 81, 82, 85, 117, 131; 148, 160.
Mahārāṭhi Cutūs, 131.
Mahārāṭhini, 80, 81n., 82, 85, 98.
Mahāsāmanta, 75, 78, 84, 85.
Mahāsāṃghikas, 118, 119, 144.
Mahāśāṅghikā, 84.
Mahāśena, 134, 166.
Mahāśēnapati, 15, 24, 71, 75, 78n., 81n., 83ff., 85, 104, 131, 134n., 147, 160.
Mahāśāvānīras, 120.
Mahātalavaras, 15, 46, 61, 82, 89, 127, 130, 131, 134n., 147, 148ff.
Mahātaraka, 87.
Mahāsvānisa, 22n., 77, 92, 108, 117, 141n.
EARLY HISTORY OF THE ANDHRA COUNTRY

Mahāvāstu, 145.
Mahāveja, 103.
Mahāvihāra, 142.
Mahāvināsela, 103, 119, 144n.
Mahāvināseliya, 145.
Mahāvinayamāhāra, 144.
Mahāyānism, 145
Mahemkhanaja, 103.
Mahendravadi inscription, 194.
Mahendra II, 186n.
Mahendra I, 186, 195n.
Mahinda, 141n.
Mahisasaka (Mahisasaka), sect, 118, 143, 144.
Maisolia, 2, 17n, 104, 105, 159.
Maisolos, 8, 20.
Majjhima Nikāya, 139n., 146.
Malakaras, 113.
Mdlavikagñimitra, 39.
Mama4a (Mamala), 100, 103.
Mamalahara, 86, 94, 100, 103.
Mambanes (=Nahapana), 16n., 50, 58.
Mamdagora, 109.
Manamuka^a, 103.
Mandasor, 103.
Mahgalagiri, 177.
Mahglur grant, 2n., 163n., 190, 193.
Manikaras, 113.
Manjusri, 126n.
Mantaraja, 173.
Mādhyakāyana (acarya), 197.
Mayurasarman, 187.
Medinikofa, 165.
Megasthenes, 22.
Meghasvati, 11.
Melizagara, 109.
Menander, 92.
Metronymics, 44ff.
Mihivreśvara, 183.
Milda, 94n.
Mitadevanaka, 57n.
Mithikas, 113.
Moda, 96.
Mōtupalle, 105.
Mrṣendra Sātakarni, 34.
Mrgeśvarman, 187.
Mudānanda Rājan, 75.
Mudukutala (Senāgopa), 104.
Mugudāsa, 113n.
Mulaka, 53, 62, 129.
Mūlakura bhojakā, 178.
Mūṇḍa, 182.
Mundarāstrā, 23n., 181, 190.
Mundūra, 179.
Mūrdhaka, 91.
Mūsika, 37.
Mutalik, 182.
Mutalpaṭṭa, 182.
Mutṭha, 182.
Mutuda (Prākṛt Muduḍa), 182.
Myakadoni (or Jangli Gundu inscription), 7, 23n., 24n., 44n., 71, 72; 79n., 84, 85, 87, 126, 153n.

N
Nagadatta Kosikiputa, 48n.
Nāgānīkā (=Nāyanikā), 32n.
Nāgārjuna, 62n., 70, 71, 117, 125n., 126n., 146.
Nāgārjunikonda, 125ff.
Nahapāna (= Nahavāna), 12n., 16, 17, 22n., 49, 50, 51ff, 53, 55, 56, 57ff., 59, 64, 68n., 94, 95, 96, 103, 112; 168n., 212.
Namban (Nambanes), 50, 58.
Nandaprabhaśijaśvarman, 164n., 177, 180, 207.
Nandivarman I, 154n., 157n., 166n., 169, 174, 175, 177.
Nandivarman II, 168n., 170, 171n., 174, 178, 179, 184n.
Nārasala (sela?), 103, 110.
Navakaṁma, 120.
Navakaṁmam, 139n.
Navanarasāmi, 210, 215.
Nāyakamisa, 113.
Nāyanikā, 6, 9, 15n., 32, 33, 36, 77, 111.
Negama, 110, 114n.
Nībandhakara (Nībandhakāra), 88.
Nīgarasasāhā, 110n., 114.
Nīyogas, 181.
Nīyuñktas, 181.
Nīyukti, 16.
Nūrṇuvār Kannar, 35.

O
Odayantrikas, 113.
Odayantrikasesi, 114.

P
Paethan (=Paithān), 107, 108.
Pāgūnavara viṣaya, 181n.
Pahlava, 95.
Paithān, 4, 16, 17, 20, 22, 27, 47, 50, 60, 62n., 64, 107n., 109, 117, 121, 157n.
Paithāna, 24, 86, 87.
Paithānapathā, 24, 118.
Palaepatmae, 109.
Palakṣaḍa, 187.
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Sagarapaloganas, 108.
Saghdrama, 121.
Saka era, 211.
Saka-girl, 96.
Sakurukaro, 81n.
Sakurt, 211.
Sakas, 94ff., 109.
Sakasena Matfhariputa, 10n., 12, 68ff., 109, 113.
Sakha, 102.
Salakenoi, 164, 165.
Salahkayana gotra, 151, 154, 163ff.
Samalipada, 87n.
Samanta, 85n.
Samdpita, 120n.
Sanambhu, 184n.
Sammhivigrahika, 84.
Samrt, 132, 133.
Samudrasena Mahdsdmanta Mahd-rdja, 183.
Sanapodhis, 121.
Sangha, 11n.
Sapa, 10ln.
Sapila, 10ln.
Saptasatakam, 1, 5, 41, 87, 111, 116n., 122, 123, 124.
Sarasipurl, 173n.
Sarasri, 43.
Sarasvatt KantKabKarana, 43.
Sarvanatha Maharaja, 183.
Sarvarman Maukhari, 166.
Sdtnasamcdrin, 181.
Satahani-rattha, 23, 71n.
Satakani Siri I, 6, 9, 12n., 20, 28, 29n., 31, 32ff., 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40n., 41, 64, 73n., 77, 91, 96, 111, 130, 132, 133.
Satakani II, 37, 38, 41.
Satakani (Satakarni) Siva Siri, 14, 54, 55, 66 69, 135n.
Satakani Vasithiputa, 13n., 45, 54, 66, 75, 78, 89, 93n.
Satakarna, 34.
Satakarni (meaning), 34ff.
Satanuru, 25.
Satapatha Brhadmana, 132.
Sattavahana, 30ff., 170.
Sattavahanapura, 24.
Sattavahanihara, 23, 24, 71, 85, 86.
Sathavaha, 110.
Sathavahini, 110.
Satisiri, 33, 38, 213.
Sattabhama, 188.
Sattan, 31, 35.
Sela-ghara, 140n.
Sela-mandava, 139n.
Selavadhakini, 113.
Seleucus, 92.
Sendgopa, 104.
Senguttuvan, 85n.
Sethim, 110, 114.
Sethipamukha, 110.
Seuraka, 103.
Sha-to-p’s-ha, 70.
Siddhathikas, 144.
Sihoôchi, 115.
Siha-la-vihara, 142, 146.
Silamegha, 43.
Silappadikaram, 31, 35.
Simhavarman Pallava, 190.
Simhavarman II, 164, 190.
Simhaviisnu, 26.
Simuka, 6, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29ff., 35, 48n., 73, 133, 211.
Simylla, 109.
Siripavata, 127n.
Siuku (=Simuka), 30n., 213.
Sivalakura Madhariputa, 60, 61.
Sivamaka Sada (Satakani), 30n., 34, 44n., 54, 55, 67ff., 131n., 157n.
Siva-saran, 207.
Sivaskanda (Sivamaka Sada), 28n., 54, 67.
Siyamaâgalam, 194.
Skandasvâti, 71.
Skandastambhi, 38.
Skandavarman, 166n., 171, 179.
Sodasa, 55, 56.
Sodranga, 81n.
Sopara (=Soupara, Sopâraga), 108, 117, 118.
Soparaga (Sopâraga), 79n., 101, 102, 103, 108, 123.
Soparahâra, 86.
Soparikara, 81n.
Sothikapatas, 116.
Sri-Kâkulem, 5, 18.
Sringala dvipa, 43.
Sriparvata, 125, 126n.
Sripurutavam, 184, 201.
Sripuratiya, 125, 126n., 128.
Sriyangain plates, 3.
Srisâllam, 125, 126n.
Sthaviras, 120.
Sthaviravâdas, 144.
Subodhikâ, 148.
Sudisana, 102.
Suppara (Sopâra, Supâra), 26, 117.
Surâstra, 58, 92.
Surala (Surâstra), 49, 53, 63.
Sutta-Pitaka, 146.
Suvarnakâra, 88n., 113.
Suvarna, 59, 112n.
Suvarnamukha, 102, 104, 123.
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T
Talaydri, 148.
Talavara, 148.
Talavarium, 149.
Talavatuka, 149.
Talavay, 148.
Talaydrikaih, 148n.
Tanthikontha (Tanrikonra), 194.
Taranatha, 125n., 126n.
Tarauara, 149.
Telingana, 2.
Ter (=Thair), 107.
Tesakaras, 113.
Tesakdraseni, 114.
Teuijos, 120.
Thanaka, 121.
Tiastanes, 53, 136.
Tilapisakas, 113.
Tilapi?akaseni, 114.
Tiranhu (Trirasmi), 95, 102, 189.
Tiranhupavata, 102n.
Tissa Moggaliputta, 141n.
Todatura, 103.
Tompuki district, 104.
To-na-kie-tse-kia, 24, 126n., 142n., 147, 149, 150.
Tondaimandalarii, 187.
Trariakayiro Maharathi, 9, 32, 33, 38, 77.
TrikandaSesa, 165.
Trikuta (^Trirasmi), 200.
Trikutaparvata (Trirasmi), 189.
Trilingdnudsanam, 18.
TripitaJca, 120.
Tripatam, 159.
Udayipabhahis, 120.
Uttarfipatha, 7.
Umapatam, 159.
Umapata, 159.
Upanikara, 2.
Upanikara, 149.
Upanikara, 2.
Upanikara, 149.
Uparikara, 81n.
Upatdnasald, 118, 121.
Usabhanaka, 57n., 111.
Usavadata, 11, 17, 22n., 42, 49n., 51, 55, 56, 57, 58n., 59, 64, 65, 88, 91; 94; 95; 101; 102; 107n., 110n., 112, 114, 119, 123, 130n., 153n., 212, 213.
Utayipabhahis, 120.
Utartapatha, 7.

U
Umavarman, 180.
Uparkara, 81n.
Upadhanasala, 118, 121.
Usabhanaka, 57n., 111.
Usavadata, 11, 17, 22n., 42, 49n., 51, 55, 56, 57, 58n., 59, 64, 65, 88, 91; 94; 95; 101; 102; 107n., 110n., 112, 114, 119, 123, 130n., 153n., 212, 213.
Utayipabhahis, 120.
Utartapatha, 7.

V
Vacaspatya, 113n.
Vaälikâ, 103.
Vaähakti, 113.
Vaäugur, 2.
Vaäugaveja, 2.
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Vaijayanti, 61, 62, 75, 107n., 137n., 138.
Vaijayantipura, 168n.
Vaiügeyakas, 163ff.
Vallabhás, 181.
Vâlimiki Sütras, 19.
Vâluraka, 103, 109.
Vanâvâsaka Mahârajâ, 137.
Vanâvâsi (=Vanavâsa), 137n.
Vanîjaka (=Vanija), 91, 110n.
Vanîjini, 98, 110.
Vâpata, 159.
Vârâhputra, 48n.
Vassa, 117, 118, 121.
Vâtsipûra, 45, 46.
Vâyu Purâna, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30n., 32, 38, 127, 129.
Vedasiri, 213.
Vedasiri, 15, 33, 36, 122, 213, 214.
Vejayanti, 62, 109, 118.
Vêlûmita Vâsîthipûra, 45.
Vêlagiri, 103.
Vêngideša, 2, 177, 181n., 197.
Vênigâmanâla, 2, 173n., 177.
Vênigându, 2.
Vênigîpura, 163, 165, 167, 168n., 17.
Vênîrâstra, 177.
Vêngorâstra, 2, 176.
Vepuraka, 71.
Vetarakuda, 89.
Vîdarbha, 63, 126n.
Vide (de) tûrapallikâ, 178.
Vîhârâgaon, 103.
Vijayâ, 79n.
Vijayanikâ, 79n.
Vijayakhanîdâvîra, 157n.
Vijayanarînda, 43.
Vijayapûra, 110, 127n.
Vijayapurî, 127, 159.
Vikramadhitya, 49, 209.
Vikramahendrâ, 207.
Vikramendrâ, 207.
Vikramendrâvarman I, 179, 186n., 207.
Vikramendrâvarman II, 207, 208.
Vilambali, 205, 206.
Vîjivâyakura Gotamiîpûra, 60.
Vîjivâyakura Vâsîthipûra, 39, 60.
Vînayapistakâm, 120n., 134n.
Vîndhyâsâkî, 128.
Vinhusiri, 147.
Vinûkoça, 107n., 201.
Vîpparla (Virpara), 157n.
Vîramâna, 67, 128n., 135n.
Vîramâna, 67, 128n.
Vîrapûra, 103.
Vîrapûrasadâta Mahârîpûta, 8, 96, 128ff., 132n., 133n., 134, 135ff.
Vîravarman, 47, 174n.
Viripara, 163, 157n.
Virparu (=Viripara), 157n.
Virūpakhapati, 134.
Visayapati, 85n., 159, 181.
Viṣṇudattā, 32n., 95, 96, 97.
Viṣṇukaṇḍa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakarnī, 134n.
Viṣṇukūṇḍa Cutukulananda Sātakarnī, 163, 157n.
Viṣṇugopa varman Yuvamahārāja, 164, 179, 179.
Viṣṇugṛhasvarūmī, 179, 184n.
Viṣṇukundinīs, 188, 200ff.
Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 22, 23, 48n., 62n., 129.
Viyapata, 159, 160n.
Vudhika, 95, 102.

W

Wima Kadphises, 166.

X

Xathroi, 48.

Y

Yaśodharman, 166.
Yavana (Yona), 1, 76, 92ff., 94.
Yāsīmotika, 52.
Yue-gnai (Sīrī-Yaṇa), 209.
Yugapradhāna-svarūpa, 16.
ILLUSTRATIONS

Plates II, IV-2 and VIII-1 are reproduced with the kind permission of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director-General of Archaeology of India.
(1) A new inscription from the Caitya Cave—Kārlā

(2) A silver coin of Vāsithiputa Sūri-Sātakāni—enlarged $2^{1/2}$ times.
Remains of the reliefo figures and the inscriptions above them
—Nāneghāt cave
(1) Nagarjunikonda Valley

(2) Remains of the rihnra on the Naharallabodu mound
(1) Remains of the mandapa east of the Mahāvastu founded in the fifteenth year of Viramunisadāta.

(2) A coin of Siva Siri-Āpilaka
(1) Monastery on a mound (Great Dhammagiri) to the N W. of Nāharallābudu

(2) The Mahācetiya—Nāgarjunikonda.
Another view of the monastery on the moima N W of Naharlabódú.
PLATE VI

(1) Sculptured beams from Stūpa No 6—Nāgarjunikonda.

(2) Sculptured beams from Stūpa No. 6—Nāgarjunikonda
PLATE VI (bis.).

(3) Apsidal temple by the side of the Mahācetiya—Nāgarjunikonda

(4) Another view of same
Stūpa slabs from Stūpa No. 6—Nāgarjunikonda.

Fragment of a statue of the Buddha—Nāgarjunikonda.
(1) The Nāneghāt cave in which the long sacrificial inscription is incised.

(2) Kārlā Cetiya Cave, X marks the new inscription.
(1) Sinhastambha—Kārla Cetiya cave

(2) Sculptures at the entrance to the Cetiya cave—Kārla.
(1) Three-storeyed vihāra Kārlā

(2) Māhāvīraust sculptures in cave No 24 - Nasik
(1) Medals and medallions on a pillar in the Queen’s Cave—Nasik

(2) Queen’s Cave—Nasik
(1) Cave of the time of Kanha Sātavāhana—Nāsik

(2) Cetiya Cave—Nāsik