

No. 49.— KADABA PLATES OF PRABHUTAVARSHA ;
SAKA-SAMVAT 735.

By H. LÜDERS, Ph.D. ; OXFORD.

The copper-plates which contain this inscription, were found at Kadaba in the Tumkûr district of the Mysore State. They are now preserved in the Mysore Government Museum, Bangalore. The inscription has been previously published, with a photo-lithograph, by Mr. Rice in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XII. p. 11 ff. A reprint of this edition, with some corrections of obvious errors, will be found in the *Prâchînâlêkhamâlâ* of the *Kâvyamâlâ*, Vol. I. p. 47 ff. The impressions which I have used for this new edition, were supplied by Dr. Hultzsch, who obtained the original plates from Mr. J. Cameron, Superintendent, Mysore Government Museum, Bangalore, and were made over to me through Professor Kielhorn.

The plates are five in number, each measuring about $9\frac{1}{2}''$ long by about $5\frac{3}{8}''$ broad at the ends and about $4\frac{1}{2}''$ in the middle. They all have raised rims. The first and the last plate are engraved on one side only, the latter containing altogether only twelve *aksharas*. The ring on which the plates are strung, is now cut. Its diameter is $4''$ to $4\frac{1}{4}''$. It holds a circular seal, $1\frac{7}{8}''$ in diameter. The seal bears, in relief on a countersunk surface, a figure of Garuda, facing to the full front, and squatting on a lotus. The wings, which do not appear in the drawing in the *Indian Antiquary*, are, as Dr. Hultzsch states, distinctly visible in the original. The figure differs only in details from those on the seals of other Râshtrakûta grants.⁵ The average size of the letters is $\frac{1}{16}''$. In lines 76, 77 and 79 blanks were originally left by the engraver for the name of the founder of the grantee's *awaya*, and the names of the grantee's teacher's teacher and teacher. These were filled in afterwards by a second hand in a very rude manner.⁶ The words *pa[la]-punu[se] eva[r]ile ante pôyie*, in the description of the boundaries in l. 90, have been written by the same hand, the original text being effaced here. Other corrections have been occasionally made by the engraver himself. The characters belong to the southern class of alphabets. Details will be discussed below.—The language is Sanskrit, but the description of the boundaries and witnesses in ll. 88-98 is in Kanarese. The text and translation of the Kanarese portion have been contributed by Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, B.A. The Sanskrit portion of this inscription is of special interest on account of its form. Being mixed of prose and verse, in an exceedingly rich and flowery language, it belongs to that kind of literary composition which is styled *Champû*.—The orthography calls for a few remarks.

⁵ Compare e.g. above, Vol. III. p. 104 ; *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. pp. 112, 126, and 161, Plates.

⁶ L. 76, *Śrīkīrtiyā* for *Śrīkīrtiyā-ā(chāryy-āwayā)* ; l. 77, *Kālī-ā(chāryyā)* (Mr. Rice reads *Kāvīlā*, but the last *akshara* is distinctly *ā* ; for the second *akshara*, which I consider to be *lī*, compare the *lī* in *kālī* in a temple inscription at Paṭṭadakal, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. p. 125, Plate, l. 2) ; l. 79, *Vijayakīrti*, or, perhaps, originally *Vijayakīrti* for *Vijayakīrtir*.

The vowel *ri* is employed instead of *ri* in *namas-kriyamānam*, l. 30, whereas *ri* is written for *ri* in *visṛita*, *kṛita*, l. 1, *dhṛita*, l. 60, and *parama-rishi*, l. 9, where the usual spelling would be *parama-rṣi*. The sibilant *ś* is used for *s* in *avataṁśa*, l. 1, *pāṁśu*, l. 52, and *s* for *ś* in *viśeśha*, l. 3, *yasa(s)*, l. 16, and *aśeśha*, l. 74. Twice the sonant non-aspirate is found instead of the sonant aspirate, in *saṁgīta*, l. 17, and *stamba*, l. 16. The rules of *saṁdhi* have been frequently disregarded. Three times, in ll. 22, 71 and 75, the *upadhānīya* occurs before *p*. Consonants after *r* are doubled, with the exception of *k* (except in *arkka*, l. 13), *th*, *bh*, and the sibilants. The doubling of the first consonant of a group occurs only in *vikkrama*, l. 17. A double mute before a consonant, on the other hand, is represented by a single mute in *jagatrāya*, l. 19, and *ujjala*, l. 25.—As regards lexicography, it may be pointed out that *chārvi* in l. 3 and *sudhā* in l. 16 are used in meanings known hitherto from dictionaries only.¹ In l. 24 a denominative *bhāvayati* seems to be used in the sense of 'bhavishyati'; and *chaturākāra* occurs in l. 48, in a *pan*, in the meaning of 'square.' Regarding the word *pada* in l. 50, I refer to the note on that passage.

The inscription records that the king Prabhūtavarsha, (i.e. Gōvinda III.), residing in his victorious camp at Mayūrakhaṇḍi, on the application of Chākīrāja, in Śaka-Saṁvat 735 presented the village of Jālamāṅgala to the Jaina *muni* Arkakīrti, on behalf of the temple of Jinēdra at Śilāgrāma, in remuneration for his having warded off the evil influence of Saturn from Vimalāditya, the governor of the Kunuṅgī district.

Before giving a more detailed account of the contents, it will be expedient to determine, as far as can be done from external points of evidence, whether the inscription is a genuine one or a forgery. Doubts about its genuineness have been already expressed by Dr. Fleet,² and we shall see that his suspicion certainly cannot be called unjustified.

I shall begin with the paleography. In his examination of the paleography of the spurious copper-plates of the Western Gaṅgas,³ Dr. Fleet has used, as leading tests, the letters *kh* and *b*. Of these, *kh* in the present inscription appears generally in the later form; but in *sukha*, l. 15, *līkhita* (for *likhita*), l. 16, and, probably, in *mukha*, l. 7, and *vikhyāta*, l. 10, the old type is followed. For *b* the older form is used throughout. Dr. Fleet states that the later form of *kh* appears first in an inscription of Amōghavarsha I. at Mantrawāḍi near Baṅkapur, dated in A.D. 865,⁴ and that it does not seem at all possible that it can be carried back to before A.D. 804, as the Kanarese grant of Gōvinda III., dated in that year,⁵ and earlier inscriptions contain the older form only. Our inscription, being dated in A.D. 812, lies within these limits, and, accordingly, the occurrence of the later form cannot prove its spuriousness. Nevertheless, I consider it a little suspicious; for, though the later form actually is used in A.D. 865, the older form alone appears, according to Dr. Fleet, in the Śīrūr inscription of Amōghavarsha I., dated in A.D. 866,⁶ and it appears therefore that at that time the later form was not yet generally employed, but rather on the point of coming into use. Such, however, being the case, it does not seem likely that it was used altogether already more than fifty years before that time.

The remaining letters call for no remarks, with the exception of the dental *l*. For this two signs are used: the subscript sign in the stretched form, which appears already in older inscriptions, and the full sign in the later form, which seems to have been introduced into this alphabet in the second half of the eighth century A.D.; for, though in the Wokkalēri grant of Kīrtivarman II., dated in A.D. 757,⁷ the full sign appears still in the old form of the Cave-

¹ *Chdret 'dīptau' Śabdārthanāṁsilī in Śabdakalpadruma; sudhā, 'earth.'* in von Bohtlingk's *Dictionary*, quoted from a *Dictionary of Galanos*.

² *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, 2nd ed., p. 399.

³ Above. Vol. III. p. 161 ff.

⁴ It has not been published yet.

⁵ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. p. 126, Plate.

⁶ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XII. p. 215. A lithograph of this inscription has not been published yet.

⁷ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VIII. p. 23 ff., and lithograph.

characters, with the curve attached to the right vertical stroke ending at the base-line,¹ the later form is used throughout in Gōvinda's Kanarese grant of A.D. 804, mentioned above.² There is nothing remarkable, therefore, as to the forms of the *l* in the present inscription, but what is quite peculiar is the manner in which the two signs are employed. According to older inscriptions, we should expect to find the subscript sign in combination with *i*, *ē*, *ē*, *ā*, *ai* and *au* and as second letter of a ligature, and the full sign everywhere else. But this is not the case. Perfectly regular is only the use of the subscript sign as second letter of a ligature (12 times), and of the full sign in combination with the *vīrāma* (5 times in the Kanarese portion). Nearly regular is also the use of the full sign as first letter of a ligature (14 times), the subscript sign appearing here only once (l. 39), and of the subscript sign in *lō* (13 times), the full sign appearing here twice (ll. 69, 70). In *li* the subscript sign is employed 6 times, the full sign once, in *pulipadiya* (l. 91), which is a mistake for *pul-padiya*. In *lō* the subscript sign occurs 5 times, the full sign 5 times.³ In *lā* the full sign is used 13 times,⁴ the subscript sign 9 times. *La* is expressed by the full sign 33 times, by the subscript sign 28 times. The full sign is used in *lu*, and the subscript sign in *lō*; but this is irrelevant, as neither of them occurs more than once; *lū*, *lai* and *lau* do not occur at all. I have not been able to find an analogy to this almost indiscriminate use of the two signs in another inscription written in the same alphabet, but am inclined to look at it as a characteristic feature of the writing in the ninth century A.D. The Wokkalēri grant referred to above proves that, in the middle of the eighth century A.D., there was a tendency to generalize the use of the subscript sign; for in that inscription the subscript sign appears everywhere, except in combination with *ā*. That this tendency was only temporary, is shown by the later development of the alphabet; in inscriptions of the tenth century A.D. the full sign again is generally used, the subscript sign appearing only as second letter of a ligature. Secondly we have the curious fact that at the same time the same mixing of the two signs took place in that variety of the southern alphabet which was used in Gujarāt and the adjacent districts. In the Tōrkhōḍ copper-plates of Gōvindarāja,⁵ dated in A.D. 812, we find the full sign in *la* 13 times, *lā* 5 times, *li* twice, *lu* twice, *lō* twice, and the subscript sign in *la* twice, *lā* 3 times, *li* twice, *lō* once. Of ligatures only *lla* occurs; this is expressed by the combination of the full and the subscript sign 4 times, by two subscript signs twice.⁶

The next point that commands attention is the orthography. Badness of orthography is a common badge of almost all forged grants, and it cannot be denied that our inscription shows a want of accuracy in this respect. I do not attach too much importance to the misspellings quoted above, and the numerous minor slips, as they are either commonly found in records of this time, or may be due merely to the carelessness of the engraver. But there are some passages which seem to have been corrupt already in the original copy,⁷ and, in addition to this, we find twice (l. 19 ff. and l. 64) faulty constructions.

Nor is the form of the record much in favour of its genuineness. I have already stated above that the inscription is composed in the style of the *Champās*, and I have only to add here that it is quite original, and has not one line in common with any of the other Rāshṭrakūṭa grants. I admit, however, that this may be accounted for by assuming that it was not issued from

¹ Compare the *l* in *Idmēkhana*, ll. 4, 5, *paldyamānair*, l. 28, etc.

² Compare *vallabha*, l. 4, *kḍaladoi*, l. 6, *goḷai-bandalli*, ll. 7, 8, *iriyalbandall(ili)*, l. 10. The subscript sign appears in *modaloī*, l. 9, and *likhitaḥ* (for *likhitah*), l. 19. Both the older and the later form of the full sign appear in the temple inscription at Paṭṭadakal of the time of Dhruva (between A.D. 783 and 794; *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. p. 125 and lithograph), but the later form used here has a somewhat peculiar shape (compare *ballahan*, l. 2, *dēgulada*, ll. 3, 4, and *vallabha*, l. 1, *kali*, l. 2).

³ Of these, however, four cases are misspellings for *li*.

⁴ In three cases of these, *lā* is a misspelling for *la*.

⁶ Which form is used in *mudgala*, l. 39, I cannot decide.

⁵ Above, Vol. III. p. 53 ff.

⁷ Compare e.g. ll. 11, 12, 26, 50, 57.

the office of the Rāshtrakūṭa king directly, but that, the sanction of the sovereign having been obtained, it was drawn up by somebody in the service of the governor of the Kunuṅḡil district or of the viceroy of the Gaṅga province in whose territory the granted village was situated.

Finally we have to examine the date. It runs (line 83) : *Śakanripa-saṁvatsarēshu śara-sikhi-muniṣhu vyatītēshu J[y*]śēshṭhamāsa-śuklapakṣha-daśamyām Pushyanakṣatrē Ohandravdrē*. The year being taken as current,¹ the date would correspond, as pointed out by Professor Kielhorn,² to Monday, the 24th May A.D. 812, and this would be a perfectly possible date for Gōvinda III. Prabhūtavarsha, as we know from the stone inscription at Śīrūr that his successor Śarva or Amōghavarsha I. came to the throne in A.D. 814 or 815.³ But the date offers two difficulties which cannot be overlooked. Firstly, the *nakshatra* is wrong. On the 24th May A.D. 812 the moon was, as shown by Professor Kielhorn, in Hasta (No. 13) and Chitrā (No. 14), not in Pushya (No. 8). This, however, may perhaps be considered as being of little importance, as such and even graver mistakes will be found in doubtlessly genuine records. Of much greater consequence is the second point, the expressing of the Śaka year by numerical words. The earliest epigraphic instance of this in India proper is the stone inscription of Chanḍamahāśēna at Dhōlpur, dated in Vikrama-Saṁvat 898,⁴ and the earliest instance in Mysore is a stone inscription at Śravaṇa-Belgola, which gives Śaka 904 as the year of the death of the Rāshtrakūṭa Indra IV., and probably was engraved not much after that time.⁵ The present inscription would therefore furnish the earliest example of the use of numerical words not only in this part of the country, but in India altogether. Of course, even this does not prove with absolute certainty that the inscription is a forgery. It may be alleged that it precedes the Dhōlpur inscription only by thirty years, and that in Cambodia and Java numerical words appear already in

¹ That current years are called "expired" is not unusual; compare Professor Kielhorn's list, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXIII p. 127 ff.—(Without wishing to decide—what, indeed, at present I cannot do—whether the inscription is a forgery or not, I would, with Dr. Lüders' permission, offer the following additional remarks on the date:—1. The phrase *Śakanripa-saṁvatsarēshu . . . vyatītēshu* is foreign to the inscriptions of the Rāshtrakūṭas, in which the regular phrase is *Śakanripa-kāl-ātta-saṁvatsara*. On the other hand, we have the similar phrases *Śakanripa-ābdēshu . . . vyatītēshu* in the British Museum forged copper-plate inscription of the Western Chalukya Pulikēśin I. of Śaka-Saṁvat 411 (to be taken, like the year of the Kaḍaba plates, as a current year); *Śakanripa-saṁvatsara . . . atītēshu* in the Haiderābād plates of the Western Chalukya Pulikēśin II. of Śaka-Saṁvat 534; and *Śakanripa-saṁvatsarēshu . . . gatēshu* in the Nilgund inscription of the Western Chalukya Taila II. of Śaka-Saṁvat 904. Considering that these dates belong to Chālukya inscriptions, attention may be drawn to the fact that the family of the Vimalāditya of the present inscription claimed to belong to the Chālukyas.—2. Genuine dates with current years, before Śaka-Saṁvat 1000, are indeed very rare; but, supposing the date to be a forgery, one would expect the forger to have been anxious to give it some appearance of probability, while, in quoting the *nakshatra* Pushya with Jyēshṭha-sudi 10, he would have decidedly failed to do so. The *nakshatra* on Jyēshṭha-sudi 10 usually is Hasta, in whatever year, and this the writer of the date may reasonably be assumed to have known. Of 12 ordinary Hindu calendars for different years, which I have examined, no less than 10 give Hasta for Jyēshṭha-sudi 10.—3. It may also be argued that the circumstance of the inscription being a *kāvyā* of some sort, sufficiently accounts for the fact that the year of the date is expressed by numerical words, with the use of which the people of India proper undoubtedly were well acquainted in A.D. 812. The dates from Cambodia, in which numerical words are used as early as Śaka-Saṁvat 526 and 546, are in verse; and so is the date of Śaka-Saṁvat 654 from Java. The same is the case with all the Indian Śaka dates of the published inscriptions that give numerical words, down to at least Śaka-Saṁvat 1001 (of Ś. 867, 904, 944, 991, 999, and 1001), and with all the Vikrama dates down to at least Vikrama-Saṁvat 1240 (of V. 898, 978, 1009, 1010, and 1240).—F. Kielhorn.]

² *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXIV. p. 9.

³ *ibid.* Vol. XII. p. 219. The inscription is dated in Śaka 788 expired, Vyaya, while the fifty-second year of the reign of Amōghavarsha-Nripatūṅga was current.

⁴ *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morg. Ges.* Vol. XL. p. 38. The stone inscription of Dhavala of Hastikuṅḡi at Bijapur (*Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. LXII. Part I. p. 314) contains the date Vikrama-Saṁvat 973 in numerical words, but the inscription itself belongs to Vikrama-Saṁvat 1053. These and the following dates were kindly pointed out to me by Professor Kielhorn.

⁵ L. Rice, *Inscriptions at Śravaṇa-Belgola*, No. 57, p. 55.

Sanskrit inscriptions of the seventh and eighth century A.D.¹ But I should think that by the fact that the use of the numerical words is combined with a series of other suspicious circumstances: the mistake in the date, the unusual form of the record, the incorrectness of the orthography, and the doubts attaching to the palaeography, we are entitled to declare the genuineness of the present inscription as somewhat doubtful.

We shall now consider the contents. The first part of the inscription (ll. 1-64) consists of a eulogy of the Rāshtrakūṭa kings. The genealogy is given as follows: Gōvinda; his son Kakka; his son Inda; his son Vairamēgha; his paternal uncle Akālavarsha; his son Prabhūtavarsha; his younger brother Dhāravarsha Śrī-Prithiviallabha Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara, called also Vallabha; and his son Prabhūtavarsha Śrī-Prithiviallabha Rājādhirāja² Paramēśvara, afterwards (l. 82) called Vallabhendra. Six of these names can be identified at once: Gōvinda is Gōvinda I.; Kakka is Karka I. whose name appears in the present form also in the Sāmangaḍ and Bharōch grants;³ Inda is Indra II., the form of the name occurring here being either the Prakṛit form or a mere mistake of the engraver; and Akālavarsha, Dhāravarsha, and the second Prabhūtavarsha are, respectively, Kṛishṇa I., Dhruva, and Gōvinda III., called here by their *birudas* which are known also from other grants. Of the remaining two kings, therefore, Vairamēgha would correspond to Dantidurga or Dantivarman II., and the first Prabhūtavarsha to Gōvinda II. These *birudas*, however, do not occur in any other inscription. For Gōvinda II. we know no individual *biruda* at all, and Dantidurga is stated in the Sāmangaḍ grant to have been called Khaḍgāvalōka.⁴ But as almost all the Rāshtrakūṭa kings bore more than one *biruda*, it does not seem quite improbable that Dantidurga had a *biruda* Vairamēgha in addition to that of Khaḍgāvalōka; and as regards Prabhūtavarsha, a strong argument in favour of its correctness lies in the fact that in the Rāshtrakūṭa family certain *birudas* are constantly combined with the same name, and that Prabhūtavarsha was the *biruda* of Gōvinda III. and Gōvinda IV. of the main branch, and of Gōvinda I. of the second Gujarāt branch, and of these only.⁵ Unfortunately, there is another point to render it somewhat doubtful again whether the composer of the grant was sufficiently acquainted with the names of the dynasty to deserve credit for his statements in this respect. In line 34 Akālavarsha is said to have erected a temple which was styled after his own name Kannēśvara. As the combination of a dental and lingual *n* in the interior of a word is absolutely impossible, this must be a mistake for either Kannēśvara or Kannēśvara, and the name of the king would therefore be either Kanna or Kanna. As far as I know, neither of these forms can be considered as derived from Sanskrit Kṛishṇa, the common Prakṛit form being Kapha, and the Kanarese equivalent Kannara, whereas both Kanna and Kanna

¹ Barth, *Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge*, p. 36 ff. (Śaka 526, 546, etc.); *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXI. p. 48.

² *Rājādhirāja* is perhaps only a mistake of the engraver, who omitted *mahā*.

³ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. p. 111; Vol. XII. p. 182.

⁴ I have not overlooked the fact that Gōvinda II. is called Vallabha, and Dantidurga, besides Khaḍgāvalōka, Vallabharāja and Prithiviallabha. But these are the common titles borne by all the Rāshtrakūṭas, beginning from Dantidurga, and not individual *birudas* which here alone are the matter in question.

⁵ That the relations between the *birudas* and the names in the Rāshtrakūṭa family were constant, was first pointed out by Mr. Rice in his introduction to the present inscription. And though they are not constant in all cases (compare e.g. Amōghavarsha in combination with Sarva, Baddiga and Kakka II.), it is a fact that Prabhūtavarsha, Nirupama Dhāravarsha, and Śubhatuṅga Akālavarsha are found as the *birudas* of, respectively, Gōvinda, Dhruva, and Kṛishṇa only. But in using this fact for the identification of an Akālavarsha mentioned in the Merkara plates with a Kṛishṇa supposed to have lived in the fifth century A.D.,—the impossibility of which, for other reasons, has been shown by Dr. Fleet (above, Vol. III. p. 168),—Mr. Rice has overlooked the second fact that no *biruda* at all has turned up until now for the predecessors of Dantidurga. I do not consider this to be merely accidental, but infer from it that Dantidurga, the first king who acquired supreme sovereignty, was also the first who adopted the custom of *birudas*. It will be observed that also in the present inscription the predecessors of Dantidurga are called by their real names, whereas for all the following kings the *birudas* only are used. This too supports to a certain extent the assumption that the names, as given in the present inscription, are correct.

represent the Sanskrit Karpa. We have to assume, therefore, either that the real names of the king and of the temple were unknown to the author, and that the name he gives is a product of his own imagination, or that Kanpésvara is a misspelling or a clerical error for Kanhésvara or Kannarésvara. But even if the latter opinion should be the correct one, it would be still questionable whether the temple really had that name. In ll. 29-30 it is said that the sun, reflected in its jewel-paved floor, seemed to have descended from heaven to show reverence to Paramésvara. This and the form of the name¹ indicate that the temple was dedicated to Śiva. And it must have been an uncommonly magnificent building; for nearly the sixth part of the whole inscription is devoted to its description, and its erection is the only deed of the king which the author has thought worth mentioning. The temple spoken of here must therefore necessarily be that splendid Śiva temple which, according to the Baroda grant, was built by Kṛishṇa on the hill of Ēlápura, the modern Ēlurá.² None of the temples at Ēlurá, however, bears, as far as I can ascertain, the name of Kṛishṇésvara or a similar name, and, to reconcile the statement of the inscription with the facts, we have to assume again that either that temple itself has entirely disappeared, or, at least, that its original name was in course of time forgotten, and exchanged for another. But all these suppositions are very vague, and as long as the reality of that name is not established by other facts, it would be hardly advisable to rely on it.

The building of that temple is almost the only historical event related in this portion of the inscription. As was pointed out already by Mr. Rice, king Dhruva Dhāravarsha is mentioned in verse 7 as having fought some battle on the banks of some river; but no particulars are given, and the text, moreover, seems to be corrupt.³ I will add here, as it is a matter of some interest in connection with the Rāshtrakūṭas, that afterwards, in l. 81, Gōvinda III. is stated to have resided at the time of the grant in his victorious camp at Mayūrakhaṇḍi.⁴ This is the same place from which the Vaṇi-Diṇḍōri and Rādhanpur grants of Gōvinda III. are dated,⁵ and it has long ago been identified by Professor Bühler with the modern Mōrkhaṇḍ, a hill-fort in the Nāsik territory. But those two grants leave it doubtful whether Mayūrakhaṇḍi was the capital of the dynasty. Professor Bühler thought it not likely, because "Indian princes do not usually govern their dominions from lonely forts;"⁶ and as the statement of the present inscription that it was only a place of encampment coincides with his opinion, they may be considered as mutually supporting each other.

In ll. 65-75 the inscription gives the genealogy of Vimalāditya. His father was the *vājan* Yaśōvarman, and his grandfather the prince (*varanara*) Balavarman. The family claimed to belong to the Chālukyas; but to the present time we are unable to connect them in any way either with the earlier or the later dynasty of this name, and Professor Bhandarkar therefore considers them an independent branch.⁷ Vimalāditya apparently was a petty chief under the Rāshtrakūṭas; he governed, as mentioned above, the district (*deśa*) called Kunuṅgil.⁸ Mr. Rice has suggested that this might be the modern Kunigal, but he has added himself that this is only a conjecture, and that he has taken the same Kunigal to be the Kopikal-vishaya of the Hostr grant of Ambēra, which, though a palpable forgery, cannot on palaeographical grounds be placed later than the present inscription. Taking for granted that the second identification is

¹ Names ending in *śvara* always refer to buildings consecrated to Śiva. In the present case, it may be noted that Śiva is actually mentioned, under the name *Bhava*, in v. 4.

² *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XII. p. 159 and p. 228 ff. Professor Bhandarkar supposed the temple to be the famous Kailāsa.

³ That really a battle near some river is spoken of in that verse, is proved by the mentioning of elephants and boats, which is in accordance with Manu, vii. 192.

⁴ In the present inscription the name is written with a short *i*. But as *i* and *e* are often confounded, this may be only a clerical error.

⁵ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XI. p. 159; Vol. VI. p. 67.

⁶ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 64.

⁷ *History of the Dekkan*, 2nd ed., p. 79.

⁸ In line 98 the name is spelled with a lingual *g*.

correct,—and it seems to me much more probable,—it is hardly possible to connect Kuṇigal at the same time with Kanuṅgil.

Vimalāditya is stated to have been the sister's son of Chākīrāja who is called the ruler of the entire province of the Gaṅgas (*akēsha-Gaṅgamaṅḍal-ādhirāja*), and on whose application the grant was made. As for this prince, our knowledge is confined to what we learn of him from the present inscription. From his title and the fact that he applied to Gōvinda, we must infer that he was a vassal of the Rāshtrakūṭa king, and governed the Western Gaṅga kingdom in his name.¹ And this is indeed the state of things that we should expect for the time of our grant. All that can be ascertained with respect to the relations between the Rāshtrakūṭas and the Gaṅgas in the second half of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century A.D. is this. In the Paiṭhaṅ plates² the Gaṅga is mentioned among the princes who were called to assistance by Gōvinda II. against his brother Dhruva. The Vaṇi-Diṅḍōri and Rādhapur plates relate that Gaṅga—who is described as a powerful monarch—was imprisoned by Dhruva. He must therefore have been conquered and taken prisoner between A.D. 783, when Gōvinda II. was still on the throne,³ and A.D. 794, when Dhruva's son, Gōvinda III., was already reigning.⁴ We are further told, in the same plates, that Gōvinda III. released him from his long captivity; but as soon as Gaṅga had returned to his country, he revolted against his benefactor. Gōvinda then defeated and imprisoned him again. This must have taken place before A.D. 807, the two plates being dated in this year.⁵ It would therefore be quite natural to find a viceroxy appointed by the Rāshtrakūṭa king in A.D. 812.

Here the historical portion of the inscription ends. As far as I see, it does not contain anything that would decide the question of the genuineness of the record; for the incorrectness of the name of the temple—the only thing that can be proved to be actually wrong—may after all be accounted for as I have tried to show above. I can therefore only repeat here what I have said before, that this inscription, though there is not sufficient evidence to establish its spuriousness beyond all doubt, is subject to a slight suspicion of being a forgery. Such being the case, those statements which are not supported by other records must, of course, be taken for what they are worth.

In ll. 75-80 the inscription gives a detailed account of the grantee. He was called Arkakīrti, and was the disciple of Vijayakīrti, who again was the disciple of Kūli-āchārya.⁶ This person is said to have belonged to the family (*anvaya*) of Śrīkīrti-āchārya⁷ in the Punnāgavrikshamūlagana of the Nandisaṅgha of the venerable Yāpaniyas, and in l. 77 he is given the epithet *vrata-samiti-gupti-gupta-muni-vrinda-vanāṭa-charaṇaḥ*. Comparatively little is known hitherto about the Yāpaniyas. In the *Bhadrabhūcharita*⁸ we are told that king Bhūpāla of Karahāṭa, at the request of his wife Nṛikaladēvā, invited the Śvētāmbara monks of Valabhī to come to his city. But beholding them dressed in white garments, he

¹ Mr. Rice thinks it possible that Chākīrāja was a supreme king. But neither is *adhirāja* ever applied to an independent sovereign, nor *maṅḍala* to an independent state. I would remark that the term *Gaṅga-maṅḍala* is quite analogous to the term *Lāṭīvara-maṅḍala*, occurring in the Baroda, Tōrkhēḍ and Kāvī plates as the name of the province of Gujārāt.

² Above, Vol. III. p. 107.

³ Bhandarkar, *History of the Dekkan*, 2nd ed., p. 65.

⁴ The Paiṭhaṅ grant of Gōvinda III. was issued in this year.

⁵ The account of these facts given by Mr. Rice in his *Epigraphia Carnataca*, p. 3, is very inaccurate. Besides, he says that it must have been during the reign of Śivamāra that the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dhāravarsha or Nirupama is said to have defeated and imprisoned Gaṅga. For this Śivamāra he fixes (*ibid.*) A.D. 804 as the year of his accession to the throne. The dates given above show that these statements are incompatible.

⁶ See above, p. 332, note 6.

⁷ I consider *śrī* here to be a constituent of the name, partly on account of the analogy to Arkakīrti and Vijayakīrti, and partly because the person who inserted these names has not added a honorific prefix in any other case.

⁸ Chapter iv. verse 138 ff.; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morg. Ges.* Vol. XXXVIII. p. 39 ff.

turned away from them in disgust, and did not receive them before they had yielded to the queen's entreaties to cast off their clothes. This was the origin of the Yāpaniyasaṅgha, the members of which "had the appearance of Digambaras, but the observances of Śvētāmbaras" (verse 151). A similar account is given in the *Pañchamārgśūpatti*,¹ a work in Tamil mixed with Sanskrit, propounding the origin of the five unorthodox sects of the Jains. According to the statements of Mr. Taylor, it is related here that "out of them (the Śvētāmbaras) proceeded a class termed Yavaniyam, who were unclathed ascetics: they taught some opposite tenets, relative to prescribed fasts, and to prohibited periods of journeying." In a *Paṭṭāvalī* of the Digambaras, published by Dr. Hoernle,² it is stated, on the authority of the *Nītisāra*, that the Yāpaniyasaṅgha was one of the five false Jaina sects, and though no details are given, the passage is of some interest as probably containing a second name of the sect, the Yāpuliḡachchha or Yāpulyas.³ Epigraphical records show that the sect existed from about the fifth to the twelfth century A.D. in the western part of the Dekkan, from Kōlhāpur in the North to Mysore in the South.⁴ There are, as far as I know, four inscriptions, in addition to the present one, containing references to the Yāpaniyas. Three are copper charters of the early Kadamba kings, found in the districts of Belgaum and Dhārāvād. In a grant of Ravivarman,⁵ the revenues of a village are allotted to some Jaina *sūris* who are called *Yāpanīyās tapasvīnaḥ*. In a grant of Ravivarman's father Mrigēśa,⁶ the king is said to have presented some land to the Yāpaniyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrchakas. And in a grant of Kṛishṇavarman,⁷ the king is stated to have given a field to the Yāpaniyasaṅghas (*Yāpanīya[su]ñghēbhyaḥ*). To these we may add a stone inscription of Gaṇḍarādītya at Honūr in the Kōlhāpur State.⁸ For though it seems that the name of the Yāpaniyas does not actually occur here, and though the name of the *saṅgha* cannot be made out from the facsimile, there can be no doubt that the *gaṇa* referred to is the Punnāgavrikshamūlagāṇa, the very *gaṇa* that is found in the present inscription.

Lastly we have to consider the epithet given in full above. In his paper on *Bhadrabāhu, Chandragupta and Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa*,⁹ and again in his remarks on the Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa epitaph of Prabhāchandra,¹⁰ Dr. Fleet has called attention to this passage as containing the name of the Jaina teacher Guptigupta. Dr. Fleet quotes only the words *guptiguptamunivṛinda*, and translates them by 'the body of saints (i.e. community) of Guptigupta.' But the preceding words *vratasamiti* cannot possibly be taken separately, and the whole, from *vrata* to *charaṇaḥ*, must be taken as one compound: 'he whose feet were revered by crowds of *munis*, protected by observance of the rules, good conduct, and guard from sins.' The five *vratas*, the five *samitis* and the three *guptis* are the three requisites of a Jaina monk.¹¹ Though it must therefore be denied that the name of Guptigupta is found in the present inscription, I need hardly say that this is of very small importance as regards the question discussed by Dr. Fleet in his two articles.

As regards the formal part of the inscription (ll. 80-98), the main points have been mentioned already above, and I have to add only a few remarks on some details. The Jaina temple at Śilāgrāma— which I cannot identify— is said to have adorned the western side of the excellent Mānyapura. Mr. Rice remarks that this would naturally suggest Mānyakhēṭa, the modern Mālkhēḍ in the Nizam's territory. The identification of these places, if correct, would imply

¹ Taylor, *Catalogue Raisonné*, Vol. III. pp. 78, 79. See also *Ind. Stud.* Vol. XVII. p. 133.

² *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXI. p. 67 ff., §§ 16, 17.

³ As was pointed out by Dr. Hoernle, these paragraphs seem to be a little confused.

⁴ This may be considered as to a certain extent confirming the tradition on the origin of the sect at Karahāṭa, the modern Karhād in the Sātāra district.

⁵ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 26.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 24.

⁷ *Ibid.* Vol. VII. p. 34; compare Dr. Fleet's note.

⁸ Major Graham's *Statistical Report on the Principality of Kolhapoor*, p. 466; No. 22, Facsimile.

⁹ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXI. p. 159, note.

¹⁰ Above, p. 24, note.

¹¹ Compare the *Uttarādhyayanśūtra*, translated by Professor Jacobi, p. 50, and Professor Bhandarkar's *Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. for 1893-84*, p. 98, notes, and p. 100, note.

that the inscription is considerably later than it pretends to be; for we know from the Dêôlî plates that Mányakhêta was founded by Gôvinda's successor, Nripatunga Amôghavarsha I., and therefore did not exist at all or, at any rate, was not a city deserving the predicate *pura-vara* in 812 A.D. But in addition to the fact pointed out by Mr. Rice himself that it does not appear that Mányakhêta is ever described as Mányapura,¹ I cannot see any reason whatever for that identification, and Mr. Rice's second suggestion that it might be the old Mányapura, "situated near Châmrajnagar in the south of Mysore, the site of which is known on the spot as Manipura," seems to me far preferable. According to ll. 82, 83, 85-88, Jâlamangala, the granted village, was situated in the Idigûr-*vishaya*, and surrounded by the villages Svastimangala on the east, Bejjinda on the south, Guççanûr on the west, and Taripâli on the north, and a more detailed description of the boundaries is added in ll. 88-96. I am not able to identify any of these localities. The inscription concludes with the names of the witnesses (ll. 97-98), and four of the usual imprecatory verses (ll. 99-103).

TEXT.²

First Plate.

- 1 Ôrî³ svasti [||*] Vistri(stri)ta-visada-yaśô-vitâna-visâdikri(kri)t-âśâ-chakravâla[h*]
karayâla-prav[â*]-âvatamśa(sa)-virâjî(ji)ta-Jayalakshmi-samâli[m] (liî)⁴
- 2 gita-daksha-dakshîpa-bhûri-bhuj-ârggala⁵ galita-sâra-śauryya-rasa-visara-vi[sa*]-
kha|kpit-ôgr-â-
- 3 ri-vargga⁶ varga-traya-vargga-aika-nipunô=chal-âchâra-chârvi(rvvi)-visê(sê)sha-
nirjîit-ôrvvi(rvvi)-maṇḍal-ôtsav-ôtpâdana-para[h*]
- 4 para-bhûpâla-mauli-mâlâ-liḍh-âmghri-dvandv-âravindô Gôvindarâjah [||*] Tasya sū-
5 nuḥ sutarṇa-bhâv-ôdaya-dayâ-dâna-dinêtara-guṇa-gaṇa-samarppita-⁶bandhu-janaḥ saka-
6 la-kal-âgama-jaladhi-Kalaśayoniḥ Manu-darsita-mârgg-ânuḡami Râshtrakûta-kul-â-
7 mala-gagana-mṛgalâmchhanaḥ budha-jana-mukha-kamal-â[rh]sumâli manôha-
8 ra-guṇa-gaṇ-âlamkâra-bhârah Kakkarâja-nâmadhêyah [||*] Tasya putraḥ sva-
vañś-ânêka-nri-
- 9 pa-saṅghâta-parampar-âbhuyudaya-kâraṇaḥ parama-rishi-⁷brâhmaṇa-bhakti-tâtparyya-
- 10 kuśalaḥ samasta-guṇa-gaṇ-âdhivônô⁸ vikhyâta-sarvva-lôka-nirupama-sthira-bhâva-
ni(vi)jîit-â-
- 11 ri-maṇḍalaḥ yasy-aimam⁹=âsit || ¹⁰Jitvâ bhûp-âri-vargga-naya-kuśalatayâ yêna râ-
- 12 jyañ kṛitam yah kashṭê Manm(nv)¹¹-âdi-mârggê stuta-dhava-la-yaśâ na
kvachid-yâga-pûrvvaḥ¹² [||*] saṅgr[â]mê yasya sêśhâ

¹ The Mânapura mentioned in a grant of some Râshtrakûta prince Abhimanyu (*Journ. Bo. Br. As. Soc.* Vol. XVI. p. 91) stands certainly in no connection with Mányakhêta, as the editor thinks. The name rather seems to indicate that it was founded by Mânâka, one of the ancestors of Abhimanyu, as it is a common custom to form the name of a town by compounding the first element of the founder's name with *pura*.

² From impressions supplied by Dr. Hultsch.

³ Expressed by a symbol.

⁴ Instead of *sa* two *aksharas*, the first of which was *nî*, were originally engraved.

⁵ Here and in other places below, the rules of *sandhi* have not been observed.

⁶ Read *-santarppita-*.

⁷ Read *parama-rishi-*.

⁸ Mr. Rice reads *-gaṇ-âdhi-dhvdnô*, but this is impossible. There can be only a doubt whether the last but one *akshara* is *vêô* or *dhvêô*. The editors of the *Kavyamâlâ* read *-gaṇ-âdhi-dhvdnô*, the meaning of which I fail to see. As the signs for *vêô* and *sthêô* do not differ very much (compare *sthêô*, l. 63), I propose to read *-gaṇ-âdhi-dhvdnô*.

⁹ This passage is corrupt. I cannot suggest any satisfactory correction.

¹⁰ Metre: Sragdharâ.

¹¹ Perhaps this correction was made by the engraver himself.

¹² This *pâda* seems to be corrupt: perhaps we have to read *yâta-pûrvvêô*. For this suggestion and the right interpretation of vv. 4 and 6 my thanks are due to Professor Kielhorn.

- 13 sva-bhñja¹-kara-bala-pr[ā*]pitā yā Jayaśrī[r=*]yasmin=²jātē sva-vañśō=bhyudaya-
dhavañatām yātavan=arkka-tējāh [|| 1*] ā(a).
14 sāv-Indarāja-nāmadhēyah [||*] Tasya putraḥ sva-kula-lalāmāyamanō māna-
dhanō dñ-ānā-

Second Plate ; First Side.

- 15 tha-jan-āhlādanakara-dāna-nirata-manō-vṛittih hima-kara iva sukhakara-karaḥ kul-
āchala-samu-
16 dāya iva sudh-ādhāra-guṇa-nipuṇaḥ Himasaila-kūṭa-taṭa-sthāpita-
yasa(śa)stambāñ(mbha)-lī(li)khī(khi)t-ā-
17 nō(nō)ka-vikkrama-guṇa[h*] [1*] ⁴Agha-saṅgā(ghā)ta-vināsaka-surāpagā yasya⁵ sad-
yaso viśadañ⁶ [1*] gāyant-iva tarāṅga-prabhava-
18 ravair-vvabati jana-mahitā l(ḥ) [2*] asau Vairamēgha-nāmadhēyah [||*] Tasya
pitṛivyaḥ hṛidaya-padma-ā-
19 sanēstha-Paramēśvara-siraś-śīśirakara-[kara-*]nikara-nirākṛita-tamō-vṛittih
saviśēshasya⁸ jaga[t*]-traya.⁹
20 sār-ōchchayēñ¹⁰=ēva virachitasya chaturtha-lōk-ōdaya-samānasya Kṛitayuga-śatair-
iva nirmmi-
21 tasya yasya yaśasaḥ puñjam=iva virājamānaḥ¹¹ || ¹²Pradagdha-kāḷgaru-dhūpa-
22 dhūmañ pravarddhamān-ōpachayāḥ=payōdāḥ [1*] yasy=ājirañ svachchha-
sugandha-tōyai[h*]
23 siñchanti Siddh-ōdita-kūṭa-bhāgāḥ || [3*] Na ch-ēdṛisāñ prāpyam=iti pralōbhāt
Bhav-ōdbhavō¹³ bhāvi-[yu]g-ā-
24 vatārē [1*] avaimi yasya sthitayē svayan=tat kalp-āntarañ n=aiva cha
bhāvyat=iti || [4*] Tārā-ga-
25 ṇēsh-ūnnata-kūṭa-kōṭi-taṭ-ārpitās-ō[1*]jvala-dīpikāsu [1*] mōmuhyatē rātri-vi[bhēda-
bhā]-
26 vah¹⁴ niś-ātyayaḥ paura-janair=nniśāyām¹⁵ || [5*] Ādhāra-bhūt=āham=idam vyatttya
mā[m] varddhatē
27 ch-āyam=atiprasaṅgaḥ [1*] yasy=āvakāśārtham=it=iva pṛithvī pṛithv=iva¹⁶ bhūt=ēti
cha mē vi(vi)-
28 tarkaḥ || [6*] vichitra-patākā-sahasra-samchhāditañ upari-paricharāṇa-bhayaṭ
lōk-ai-
29 ka-chūdāmañāñ māñi-kuṭṭima-sa[m]krānta-pratibimba-vyājēna svayam=avatīryya

Second Plate ; Second Side.

- 30 Paramēśvara-bhakti-yuktēna namaskṛi(skri)yamāṇam=iva vī(vi)rājamānañ prahata-
pushkara-mandra-ni(ni)nād-ā-

¹ It would seem that originally *kara* was engraved instead of *ōhuja*.

² Read *yasmiñ*.

³ -*gaṇaḥ* would be a preferable reading.

⁴ Metre : Āryā.

⁵ Originally *yasyā* was engraved, but it seems to have been corrected to *yasya* by effacing the *d*-stroke.

⁶ Originally *ō* was engraved, but the engraver corrected the error by beating it down and engraving *ōi* a little more to the right.

⁷ Originally another *akṣhara* was engraved before *iva*, but it has been struck out.

⁸ From here to line 21 the construction is faulty. Instead of the genitives *saviśēshasya*, *virachitasya*, *-samānasya*, *-nirmmitasya* the respective nominatives *saviśēsham* etc. are required.

⁹ Perhaps *-traya* was engraved.

¹⁰ The first *ō* looks like *o*.

¹¹ Read *puñja iva virājamānaḥ*.

¹² Metre : Upajāti ; also of the next three verses.

¹³ Read *pralōbhāt=Bhav-ōdbhavō*.

¹⁴ Read *-bhēvō*.

¹⁵ I consider the second half of the verse to be corrupt, without being able to offer a plausible conjecture.

¹⁶ *pṛithv=ēva* would be a preferable reading.

- 31 karṇṇan-ōdit-ānurāgaḥ prāvṛṣṭi-ārambha-kāla-janit-ōtsav-ārambhaiḥ¹ mayūraiḥ
prārabdha-vṛitta-nṛi-
- 32 tātāntaḥ² dhūma-velā-lilā-gata-vilāsini-janānām kara-tala-kisalaya-rasa-bhāva-sad-
bhāva-praka-
- 33 ṭana-kuśala-śaśivadan-āṅganā-naritan-āhṛita-paura-yuvati-jana-chitt-āntaram samasta-
siddhānta-sāga-
- 34 ra³-pāraga-muni-śata-saṅkulam dēvakulam-āsīt Kanṇē(ṇṇē)śvaran-nāma
sva-nāmadhēy-āmkita[ṛṇ*] aśā-
- 35 v=Akālavarsha iti vikhyātāḥ [||*] Tasya sūnuḥ ānata-nṛipa-makuṭa-mapi-gaṇa-
kirāṇa-jāla-raṅjita-
- 36 pada-yugala-nakha-mayūkha-prabhā-bhāsita-siṅhāsan-ōhā(pā)ntāḥ kāntā-jana-kaṭaka-
khachi-
- 37 ta-padmarāga-di(dī)dhiti-visara-śumbhat-kusumbha-rasa-raṅjita-nija-dhava|a-
vi(vi)jyamāna-chāru-chā-
- 38 mara-nichaya-vikhyātān(ta)-prājya-rājya-ābhishēk-āntar-aikaisvaryya-sukha-samanubhava-
sthi-
- 39 tiḥ nija-tuka(ram)gam-aika-vijay-ānita-rājalakshmi-sanāthō mahi-nāthō yaḥ
kalpāṅghmi(ghri)paḥ sakhavaḥ⁴
- 40 chintāmapir-iti dhruvaṅ yam vadanty-arthina[h]⁵ nī(ni)tya[ṛṇ] prītyā prāpt-
ārtha-sāmpad-asau Prabhūtavarsha iti vi-
- 41 khyātō bhūpa-chakra-chūdāmaṇiḥ [||*] Tasy-ānujaḥ Dhāravarsha-
Śri-Prithuvi(thvi)vallabha-mahārājādhi-
- 42 rāja-paramēśvaraḥ khaṇḍit-āri-maṇḍal-āsi-bhāsita-dōr-dpaḍaḥ Puṇḍarika⁶ iva bali-
ripu-marddan-ā-
- 43 krānta-sakala-bhuvana-talaḥ sukṛit-ānēka-rājya-bhāra-bhār-ōdvahana-samarthaḥ
Himaśaila-vi-
- 44 śāl-ōra-sthalēna rājalakshmi-viharāṇa-mapi-kuṭṭimēna chatur-āṅgan-āliṅgana-tuṅga-
kucha-

Third Plate; First Side.

- 45 sa[ṛṇ]ga⁷-sukh-ōdrēk-ōdita-rōmānūcha-yōjitēna sva-bhuḥ-āsi-dhārā-dalita-samasta-⁸gaḷita-
muktāphala-vi-
- 46 sara-virājit-āri-bala-hasti-hast-āsphālana-danta-kōṭi-ghaṭṭita-ghanikṛitēna virājamāṇaḥ
Tripura-
- 47 hara-vṛishabha-kakud-ākār-ōnnata-vikaṭ-āmsa-taṭa-nikaṭa-dōdhūyamāna-chāru-chām a ra-
chayaḥ phēna-piṇḍa-
- 48 pāṇḍara-prabhāv-ōdita-chchhavinā vṛittēn-āpi chatur-ākārēṇa sit-ātapatrēṇ-
āchchhādita-samasta-dig-viva-

¹ After this we should expect *iva*.

² Read *vṛitta-vṛittāntam*, as suggested in the *Kāvyamālā*.

³ Originally another *akṣara* seems to have been engraved instead of *ra*.

⁴ The second *akṣara* of this word, which I have read *kha*, is very uncertain; it is apparently a later correction. Mr. Rice reads *saśā*, but the *visarga* at the end of the line is distinctly visible in the impression. I fail to see which word was meant by the author. The editors of the *Kāvyamālā* suggest *satyam-śā*.

⁵ Evidently the author has endeavoured here, in imitation of a well-known practice of writers of artificial prose works, to impart a certain rhythmical flow to the words. The sentence ends like a *pāda* of the Śraṅgīṣṭ metre: *-ti dhruvaṅ yam vadanty arthinaḥ*. Similarly we find twice periods ending like Nandana: *ma evandmadhdyāntitam* (l. 34) and *bhūpachakrachūdāmaṇiḥ* (l. 41).

⁶ Read *Puṇḍarikākṣha*.

⁷ It is possible that before this another *akṣara*, perhaps *saḥ*, was engraved. But it is entirely effaced.

⁸ Read *-dalita-masta*.

- 49 rô ripu-jana-hridaya-vidāraṇa-dāruṇēna sakala-bhū-tal-ādhipatyā-lakshmi-līlām-
utpādayatā pra-
- 50 hata-pada¹-dḥak[k*]ā-gambhīra-dhvānēna ghanāghana-garjjan-ānukārīṇā asyāchitō.²
vinōda-nirggamaḥ sva-
- 51 [k]lyā[n] sañchalatām para-nṛpa-chētō-vṛttishu dātum=iv-ōchchair-āvilōla-
prakaṭita-rājya-chi-
- 52 hnaḥ turāṅgama-khara-khur-ōtthita-pāṇsu(su)-paṭala-masṛiṇita-jalada-saṅchaya[h*]
53 anēka-matta-dvipa-karata-taṭa-gajita-dāna-dhārā-p r a t ā n a - p r a s a m i t a - m a h i -
54 pa-rāgaḥ || ³Yasya śrī[s=*]chapaḥ-ōdayā ⁴khura-taraṅg-ālt-sama(mā)sphālanāt
nirbhinna-⁵dvipa-yānapā-
- 55 tragatayō yē sañchalach-chētasaḥ⁶ [I*] tasminn-ēva samētya sāra-vibhavaṁ
sa[n*]tyajya rājyaṁ rapē
- 56 bhagnā mōha-vaśāt svayaṁ khalu diśām-antaṁ bhajantē-rayaḥ || [7*] ⁷Idaṁ
kiyad=bhū-talam=atra
- 57 samyak sthātum=mahat-saṅkaṭam=ity-udagraṁ [I*] svasy-āvakāśam na⁸ karōti
yasya yaśō
- 58 diśāṁ bhitti-vibhēdanāni || [8*] anavarata-dāna-dhāravarsh-āgamēna trīpta-
janatāyāḥ Dhā-
- 59 rāvarsha iti jagati vikhyātas=sarvva-lōka-vallabhatayā Vallabha iti || Tasy-
ātma-jā(jō) nija-bhu-

Third Plate; Second Side.

- 60 ja-bala-samānta-para-nṛpa-lakshmi-kara-dhri(dhri)ta-dhavaḥ-ātapatra-nāja[h*] pratikūla-
ripu-kū(ku)la-charaṇa-nibaddha-
- 61 khaḷakhaḷāyamāna-dhava[ā]-śrīṅkhaḷa-ra-va-badhīrīkṛita-[pa]ryyanta-janō nirupama-
gupa-gaṇ-ākarpṇana-samā-
- 62 hlādita-manasā sādhu-janēna sadā sann[ī]ngīyamāna-śasi-viśada-yaśō-rāsik(r)=śś-
āvashṭabdhā-ja-
- 63 na-manah-parikalpana-triguṅikṛita-svakīy-ānushṭhānō nishṭhita-karttavayāḥ(vyaḥ)
Prabhūtavarsha-Śrī-Prī-
- 64 thuvi(thvi)vallabha-rājadhīrāja-paramēśvarasya⁹ pravarddhamāna-śrī-rājyā-¹⁰vijaya-
samvatsarēshu vaha-
- 65 tsu | chāru-Chāluky-ānvaya-gagana-tala-hariṇalā[n]chhanāyī(ya)māna-¹¹śrī-
Balavarmma-narēndra-

¹ The editors of the *Kāvyamālā* have corrected this word to *paṭaha*; but, though this would be correct Sanskrit, I would retain the word as it stands, as it occurs in the same form in the inscription of Kirtivarman I I (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. VIII, p. 23 ff., Plate, l. 27 : *pada-dhakkā*). *Paṭaha* and *dhakkā* are mentioned together also in the *Svayambhūtipurāṇa*, p. 297; compare *Amarakōśa*, i. 7, 6.

² This passage is corrupt. Something like *krīti-dri-chētō* seems to be intended.

³ Metre: Śārdūlavikrīḍita.

⁴ I would read *khara*; but it is possible that *Khura* is the name of some river, though, in this case, we should expect to find a feminine form.

⁵ Read *-samstaphālanān=nirbhinna-*.

⁶ The text is here apparently corrupt. Considering that *tasmin ranḥ* in the second half of the verse implies a relative pronoun in the first half, we have perhaps to read *nirbhinnadvipayānapātrakatayā yasmīnś-chalach-
chētasaḥ*. This, at least, yields a tolerable meaning.

⁷ Metre: Upajāti.

⁸ I would read: *svasy-āvakāśēna*, though the dative *avakāśāya* would be preferable.

⁹ The construction is here confused. The correct reading would be *-paramēśvaraḥ ś tasya*.

¹⁰ Read *-rājya-*. Perhaps the sign for the long vowel has been struck out again by the engraver.

¹¹ This word seems to have been corrected.

- 66 *sva* su(sû)nu sva-vikram-âva[r]jjita-sakala-ripu-nripa-sîras-âkhar-â[r*]chchita-
charapa-yuga-
- 67 *lô* Yasôvarmma-nâmadhêyô râjâ vyarâjata' [l*] Tasya putras-suputraḥ kula-
dîpaka
- 68 *iti* purâpa-vachanam-avitatham=iha kurvann-atitarâḥ virâjamânô Manôjâta iva
mânini-
- 69 *jana*-mana-sthalî-[sa]ñcharapa²-chaturag(s)=chatura-jan-âsrayaḥ sri-samâlîn(lin)gita-
visâlâ(la)-vaksha-sthalô ni-
- 70 tarâm-asôbhata asau mahâtma || ³Kamal-ôchita-sad-bhujântara sri-
Vimalâdityâ(tya) i-
- 71 *ti* pratita-nâmâ [t*] kamanîya-vapur-vvilâsininâ[m] bhramad-akshi-bhramar-âli-
vaktra-padmaḥ [(l) [9*] yaḥ=pra-
- 72 chaṇḍata-karavâlâ(la)-dalîta-ripu-nripa⁴-kari-ghaṭâ-kumbha-mukta-m u k [t] â p h a | a-
vira[ch]jita-ruchi-
- 73 ra-kaṇṭhik-âtiruchira⁵-parîta-nî(ni)ja-kaṭra⁶-kaṇṭhaḥ Śî(Śî)tikaṇṭha iva ma[h]jita-
ma[hi]m[â] pra]thya[mâ]na⁷-ruchira-

Fourth Plate ; First Side.

- 74 ⁸kirttir-asé(sé)sha-Gaṅga-maṇḍal-âdhirâja-sri-Châkirâjasya bhâginîyaḥ bhuvi
pr[â*]kâsata [t*] yas[m]i(smin) Ku-
- 75 nuṅgil-nâma dêsam-ayaśaḥ-parâmu(âmu)khê Manu-mârggêṇa pâlâ(la)yati sati
© sri-Yâpanîya-
- 76 Nandi(ndi)saṅgha-Punnâgavrikshamûlaganê Śrîkirty-⁹âchâryy-ânvayê bahushv-
âchâryyô(ryyê)shv=stikrâ-
- 77 ntêshu vrata-samitî¹⁰-gupti-gupta-muni-vrinda-vandita-charapa[h*] Kûli-âchâryyô
nâm=âsi(sit)ê [l*]
- 78 tasy=ântêvâsi samupanata-jana-parîsrama-haraḥ sva-dâna-santarppita-samasta-vidvaj-
janô
- 79 janita-mah-ôdayaḥ Vijayakirtî¹¹ nâma muni-prabhur-abhâvan¹² || ¹³Arkakirttir=iti
khyâtîm=âtanva-
- 80 n=muni-sattama[h] [l*] tasya sishyatvam=âyâtô na yâtô vaśam=ênasâ[m*] ||
[10*] tasmê(smai) muni-varâya
- 81 tasya Vima[lâ]dityâ(tya)sya Śanaishchara-piḍ-âpanôdâya Mayûrakhaṇḍi(nḍi)m-
adhivasati
- 82 vijaya-skandhâvarê Châkirâjêna vijñâpitô Vallabhêndraḥ Iḍigûr-vvishaya-
madhya-varṭti-
- 83 na[m] Jâlama[m]gala-nâmadhêya-grâma[m] Śaka-nripa-sainvatsarêshu śara-
śikhi-munishu vyatitê-

¹ *ja* seems to have been omitted first and inserted afterwards.

² *sa* is very indistinct, and apparently inserted afterwards.

³ Metre : Anupachhaudasika.

⁴ In the *Kâvyandî* this is corrected to *-nripa-*; perhaps we have to read *-nripa-para-*.

⁵ The aksharas *tiruchira* are engraved below the line.

⁶ Between *ka* and *la* another *la* was originally engraved, but it appears to have been effaced.

⁷ The reading of this word is rather uncertain. Mr. Rice reads *-mahim-âmôdyamâna-*.

⁸ Originally *-t-a-* was engraved for *-r-a-*.

⁹ Read *Śrîkirtty-*.

¹⁰ *sa* of *samitî* has evidently been inserted afterwards.

¹¹ Read *Vijayakirttir-*; perhaps *Vijayi* was originally engraved.

¹² Read *abhavat*; the *s* is indistinct.

¹³ Metre : Anushubh.

- 84 shu J[y*]ēshṭha-māsa-sukla-paksha-daśamyām Pushya-nakshatrē Chandravārē
Mānya-puravar-āpara.¹
- 85 dig-vibhāg-ālamkāra-bhūta-Śilāgrāma-Ja(Ji)nēdra-bhavanāya dattavān [||*] tasya
pūrvva-dakshi-
- 86 n-āpar-ōttara-dig-vibhāgēshu Svasti(sti)maṅgala-Bellinda-Guḍḍanūr-Ttaripā=iti
prasi(si)ddhā grā-
- 87 mā[h [*] ēvaṁ chaturṇām grāmānām=madhyē vyavasthitasya Jālamāṅgalasya-
āyaṁ chatur-āghā-

Fourth Plate ; Second Side.

- 88 ṭi-kramah [||*] punas=tasya sīmā-vibhāgah [||*] Íśánataḥ mukūḍal dakṣhiṇa-dig-
vibhāgam=avalōkya E|taga-
- 89 kodala² mūḍa gareyi[m*] bandu irpeya³ komade paḷlad-oḷagaṇa uli aḷariye
kodeyā[|]i be-
- 90 lane saykane bandu ⁴po[la]-puṇu[se] eva[r]ile ante pōyie⁵ Bi-
- 91 dirūr=geṛe mukuḍal⁶ [I*] Tataḥ=paśchimataḥ pulipadiya⁷ temkaṇa
pēr-o|beyi[m*] pé[r-bi]like e|a-
- 92 gala⁸ koṇaṇḍ-āle mukuḍal⁹ [I*] Ante saykane pōgi Gāymani-geṛeya tāy-gaṇḍi
mukūḍal [I*]
- 93 Tataḥ uttarataḥ Baṭṭi-geṛeya paḍuva gaḍe goda paḷambe puṇuseye Ánedale-
geṛee¹⁰
- 94 pul-[p]adiye ¹¹e|a-galle Pulli(H)[v]ārada geṛe mukūḍal [I*] Tataḥ pūrvvataḥ
niduvilinkke
- 95 kadavi[na] pul-pādiye¹² ka[n̄cha]gāra-galle pola-elle-puṇuse¹³ baṭṭa-puṇu-
- 96 seye belane bandu íśánada ¹⁴mukuḍalo[|]=k[ū]ḍi nindattu ◎ ◎
- 97 Rāvamalla-Gāmuṇḍanuṁ Śīraṇuṁ Gaṁga-Gāmuṇḍanuṁ Māreyanuṁ Be[|]geṛey=
Oḍeyō-
- 98 ruṁ modal=āge E|padimbaruṁ Kuṇṇiṅgil=Aynūrbaruṁ sākshiy=āge koṭṭattu ◎
namaḥ ◎
- 99 ¹⁵Adbhir=datta[m] tribhir=bhuk[t]am shaḍbhiś=cha pariḥ(pā)litam [I*] étāni na
nivartantē pūrvva-rāja-kṛitāni cha ||
- 100 Svan=dātu[m] suma[ha*]ch=chhakyam duḥkham=anyasya pālā(la)nam [I*]
dānēn(nam) vā pālanam chētti¹⁶ dānāch=chhrēyō=
- 101 nupālanam || Sva-datt[ā*]m para-datt[ā*]m vā yō harēti(ta) vasundharām [I*]
shashṭhin(shṭim) varsha-sahasraṇi vi-
- 102 shṭhāyam jāyatē krimi[h] || Dēva-svam [hi*] visham ghōram kākūṭa-sama-
prabham [I*] visham=ēkā-

Fifth Plate.

- 103 kinam hanti dēva-svam putra-pautri(tra)kam ||

¹ Properly this should be *Mānyapura-puravar-āpara*, but *pura* is frequently omitted in this case; compare the title of Kriṣṇa-Kandhāra, *Kandhārapuravar-dāśvāra*, *Ind. Ant. Vol. XII. p. 220*, etc.

² Read *kolada* (?).

³ Read *irpeya*.

⁴ The words from *pola-* to *pōyie* are written on an erasure and in a larger hand.

⁵ Read *pōyie*.

⁶ Read *mukūḍal*.

⁷ Read *pul-padiya*.

⁸ Read *elle-galle*.

⁹ Read *mukūḍal*.

¹⁰ Read *-geṛeye*.

¹¹ Read *elle*.

¹² Read *-padiye*.

¹³ Read *-puṇuseye*.

¹⁴ Read *mukūḍa*.

¹⁵ Metre: Anuṣṭubh; also of the following verses.

¹⁶ Read *v=ā*; *chē* is indistinct.

TRANSLATION.

(Line 1.) *Om*. Hail ! (*A king*) who brightened the circle of the quarters by the expansion of his profuse brilliant fame ; whose strong, bar-like right arm was accustomed to the embraces¹ of the goddess of victory, shining with a garland of sprout-like swords ; the crushed host of whose formidable enemies resembled lotus-fibres, the abundant juice of which had lost its flavour, as (*out of fear of him*) their great valour had lost its strength ; who was skilled only in multiplying the three objects of life ; who was intent upon causing jubilation on the globe of the earth, conquered by the excellent splendour of his firm conduct ; (*and*) whose two lotus-feet were touched by rows of crowns of hostile princes,— was *Gōvindarāja*.

(L. 4.) His son, who rejoiced his relatives by the multitude of his virtues, (*viz.*) his tenderness, prosperity, clemency, liberality and high spirits ; a real *Agastya*² to the ocean of all arts and sciences ; following the way pointed out by *Manu* ; the moon in the spotless firmament of the race of the *Rāshṭrakūṭas* ; the sun to the lotus-faces of the learned ; wearing as ornament the multitude of his captivating virtues,— was called *Kakkarāja*.

(L. 8.) His son, who caused the prosperity of an uninterrupted series of numerous kings of his own lineage ; who was filled with deepest devotion to great sages and *Brāhmaṇas* ; who was an abode of the multitude of all virtues ; who by his famous firmness, unequalled in all the world, conquered the circle of his enemies ; to whom the following stanza refers (?)³ :—

(Verse 1.) Who, having conquered the host of hostile kings with experience in policy, exercised the government ; who, his bright fame being praised, (*walked*) in the difficult path (*pointed out*) by *Manu* and others, which had never been followed before ;⁴ whose garland was the goddess of victory, gained in battle by the strength of the hand of his arm ;⁵ at whose birth his sun-like race assumed the brightness of the rising sun,—

he was called *Iṅdarāja*.

(L. 14.) His son, the ornament of his family ; endowed with pride ; whose thoughts incessantly were occupied with gifts that gladdened the poor and helpless ; who, causing joy with his (*lavish*) hands, was like the moon that causes pleasure by its beams ; who, being skilled in protecting the earth, was like the group of the principal mountains that are accustomed to support the earth ; who engraved his many heroic virtues⁶ on the memorial pillars set up on the slopes of the summit of the *Himālaya* ;—

(V. 2.) Singing, as it were, his excellent pure fame with the murmur of its waves, the *Gaṅgā* is running along, annihilating the multitude of sins and extolled by men ;—

he was called *Vairamēgha*.

(L. 18.) His paternal uncle, who dispelled the darkness by the cluster of the rays of the moon on the head of *Paramēśvara*⁷ who dwelt in the lotus of his heart ; whose bright fame was embodied, as it were, in the excellent temple⁸ which seemed to have been constructed by accumulating the quintessence of the three worlds, which resembled the rising of a fourth world, which seemed to have been created during hundreds of *Kṛitayugas* ;—

(V. 3.) The clouds, their masses increasing by the smoke of the burnt aloe incense, and their summits being mounted by the *Siddhas*, besprinkle its court with their pure, fragrant waters.

¹ I take *samlingita* in the sense of *samlingana*.

² In the text *Kalāsayōni*,— ‘born in a water-jar.’

³ The text is corrupt here.

⁴ I have translated *yāta-pūrve* instead of *yāga-pūrve*.

⁵ This seems to mean that the goddess of victory, embracing his chest, clung to him like a garland of flowers. For *śēśā* in the sense of ‘garland’ see the *Sūbhāshītāvalī*, verse 2556.

⁶ Or, reading *-gaṇaḥ* for *-gṇaḥ* : ‘the series of his numerous exploits.’

⁷ i.e. *Siva*.

⁸ Literally : ‘shining like a cluster of whose fame, a temple,’ etc.

(V. 4.) Bhava¹ will not be allured to be born again in a future age by the prospect of getting such (a temple);² nay, in order that this (temple) may be permanent, that new period, I fancy, will not come (at all).³

(V. 5.) When at night the blazing lamps have been fixed on the outsides of the pinnacles and battlements that touch the groups of the stars, the division of the night is in great disorder, the citizens thinking that the morning has come (?).⁴

(V. 6.) 'I am (its) seat, and it is growing beyond me; this is an *atiprasaṅga*;⁵ with such and similar thoughts, in order to make room for it, the earth has grown wide I suppose.—

(This temple) which, covered with thousands of coloured banners, shone honoured, as it were, through devotion to Paraméśvara, by the one crest-jewel of the world (the sun) which, out of fear of moving above (in the sky), had descended of its own accord, in the guise of its image that was reflected in the jewel-paved floor; where the peacocks, their passion being roused by hearing the deep sounds of the beaten drums, commenced to perform their dances, as if the beginning of the rainy season had caused their exultation; where the minds of the citizens' young women were enchanted by the dances of moon-faced girls that were skilled in manifesting by (the gestures of) their sprout-like hands the true state of the sentiments and affections of lovely maidens engaged in wanton sport at the time of the smoke;⁶ which was filled by hundreds of sages who had crossed the ocean of all Siddhāntas; which, being marked with his own name, bore the name of Kāṇṇéśvara,— he was renowned as Akālavārsha.

(L. 35.) His son, the neighbourhood of whose throne was illuminated by the splendour of the rays of his foot-nails that were coloured by clusters of beams from the jewel-groups in the diadems of kings bowing down (before him); who, at his numerous royal inaugurations, by the multitude of the beautiful, white fanning *chauris*, coloured with safflower-juice and irradiated by thick flashes from the rubies sparkling in the bracelets of the (fanning) women, showed that he permanently enjoyed the pleasure of supreme sovereignty;⁷ who possessed the goddess of regal fortune, won by a single victory of his horse; the lord of the earth; whom supplicants in truth called the tree of desires,⁸ the gem of wishes; who only by peaceable means had acquired a store of riches,— he was known as Prabhūtarsha, the crest-jewel of the circle of kings.

(L. 41.) His younger brother, Dhāravarsha Śrī-Prithivialabha Mahārājādhirāja Paraméśvara, whose strong arm shone with his sword that had cut into pieces the hosts of his enemies; who, having conquered the whole earth by destroying his mighty foes, was like Puṇḍarikāksha⁹ who stepped over the whole world to defeat the hostile demon Bali; who was able to bear the heavy burden of (the government of) numerous well-ruled kingdoms; who was adorned by a chest as broad as the Himālaya mountain,— a jewelled floor for the promenades of the royal Lakshmi,— the hair on which, in the embraces of lovely women, used to thrill with ecstasy from the contact with their high bosoms, (and) which had grown hard by the strokes

¹ i.e. Śiva.

² The meaning is that there will never be again a temple of Śiva like this one.

³ Before the beginning of a new *Kalpa* the world is destroyed. The rise of a new *Kalpa* would therefore imply the destruction of the temple.

⁴ This seems to be the meaning of the second half of the verse, which apparently is corrupt.

⁵ *Atiprasaṅga* is a grammatical term. It takes place in case of a rule exceeding its sphere, that is, if it should be applicable beyond its proper sphere. *Avakāśa* also, in the second half of the verse, is apparently used with an allusion to the special meaning attached to the word in grammatical literature, 'the opportunity for the taking effect of some rule.'

⁶ *Dhūmasāñā* may have a special meaning unknown to me. Mr. Rice seems to render it by 'south-east.' Can it mean 'the time when the smoke of the evening-fires arises, the evening-time'?

⁷ I think that this is what the author intended to say, though it implies the supposition that the words *prājya-rājya-abhiśāntara* are not in their proper place in the compound.

⁸ Regarding this blank see p. 342, note 4.

⁹ i.e. Viṣṇu.

with the trunks and the blows with the points of the tusks of the violent hostile elephants that were covered with clusters of pearls which had dropped out of their skulls cleft by the edge of the sword of his arm; who had groups of beautiful *chauris* fanned near his shoulders which, being high and broad, resembled the hump of the bull of the destroyer of Tripura! who overshadowed all the quarters by his white parasol, the lustre of which rose like the white splendour of a ball of foam, and which, though being round, yet offered a charming aspect;³ who, by the deep sounds of the beaten *paṭaha*³ and *dhakkā* drums, which imitated the rumbling of thick rainy clouds, made his enemies give up their diversions⁴— for, cruelly they pierced the hearts of his foes and caused sport to his own Lakshmi that held the supremacy over the whole of the earth;— who displayed his royal emblems waving aloft, intent, as it were, to confer their vacillation upon the hearts of the hostile kings; who by the dust rising under the hard hoofs of his steeds made round the banks of clouds; who cooled the rage of (*foreign*) princes by the streams of juice running down from the temples of his numerous rutting elephants;—

(V. 7.) When once in battle his fortune was fickle, his heart trembling on account of the destruction of his elephants and ships by the crushing of the rough waves,⁵— even then his enemies, though united, and their power being unshaken, forsook the kingdom, and, bewildered by delusion, fled themselves to the remotest regions.

(V. 8.) 'How small this earth is! The space is much too confined to rest here comfortably!' Having thus reflected, his lofty fame, in order to get room, breaks down the walls of the quarters.

Being used to gladden people by incessant showers of gifts, he was known in the world by the name of Dhārāvarsha, and, being everybody's favourite, by that of Vallabha.

(L. 59.) His son, who had the rod of his white parasol carried by the hands of the Lakshmis of hostile kings, gathered by the valour of his arm; who, by the noise of the rattling polished chains bound to the feet of hosts of hostile kings, deafened the people that were near; whose clustering fame, as white as the moon, was continually sung by the good whose hearts were delighted with hearing of his unequalled numerous virtues; who trebled his incumbencies by accomplishing even the thoughts of those who were hoping (*for the fulfilment of their desires*);⁶ who performed his duties,— was Prabhūtarsha Śrī-Prithvīvallabha Rājādhirāja Paramēvara.

(L. 64.) While the years of his glorious and victorious reign were running on:—

(L. 65.) There was ruling a king called Yaśōvarman, the son of the glorious king Balavarman, the moon in the sky of the excellent race of the Chālukyas, whose feet were revered by the crest-diadems of all the hostile kings that were humbled by his valour. His son, making true here the old saying "a good son is a light to his family," exceedingly brilliant, like Manōjāta⁷ accustomed to abide in the hearts of enamoured women, the support of clever people, having his broad chest embraced by Śrī,— he shone bright with his lofty mind.

(V. 9.) His excellent chest being cherished by Kamalā,⁸ his face, on account of his charming beauty, being sought for by the embarrassed glances of the fair, as the lotus is sought for by swarms of bustling bees, he was renowned by the name of glorious Vimalāditya.

¹ i.e. Śiva.

² Or 'appeared square.' There can be no doubt that *chatur-śkara*, to work out the pun, is used here in the sense of *chatur-śra*, though this is hardly admissible.

³ The form used in the text is *paṭa*; see p. 343, note 1.

⁴ I have followed the conjectural reading in translating this passage; see p. 343, note 2.

⁵ See p. 343, note 6.

⁶ I am not sure that my translation is correct. Perhaps the author intended to say that the king used to grant thrice as much as was expected by the supplicants.

⁷ i.e. Kāma.

⁸ i.e. Lakshmi.

(L. 71.) The necks of his wives being beautifully adorned with beautiful collars composed of pearls that were scattered from the frontal globes of the war-elephants of hostile kings, cleft by his terrible sword, his majesty being praised like that of Śitikanṭha,¹ his splendid fame spreading afar, the sister's son of the glorious Chākīrāja, the Adhirāja of the entire province of the Gaṅgas, was flourishing on earth.

(L. 74.) While he, averse from all that is not honourable, was ruling the district called Kunuṅgil in accordance with the Law of Manu :—

(L. 75.) When many *āchāryas* in the family of Śrīkīrti-āchārya in the Punnāga-*vṛikshamūlagāṇa* of the Nandisaṅgha of the venerable Yāpaniyas had passed away, there was a man whose feet were revered by crowds of *munis* protected by observance of the rules, good conduct, and guard from sins, called Kūli-āchārya. His disciple, relieving the misery of people devoted (*to him*), rejoicing all learned men by his gifts, and causing great prosperity, was the lord of *munis* called Vijayakīrti.

(V. 10.) The best of *munis*, who spread his famous name Arkakīrti, having become his pupil, was no more subject to sin.

(L. 80.) To him, the best of the *munis*, on removing the evil influence of Saturn from that Vimalāditya,—Vallabhendra, residing in his victorious camp at Mayūrakhāṇḍi, on the application of Chākīrāja, gave the village named Jālamaṅgala, situated within the district of Iḍigūr, when 735 years (of the era) of the Śaka king had elapsed, on the tenth of the bright fortnight of the month Jyēshṭha, in the constellation Pushya, on Monday, on behalf of the temple of Jinendra at Śilāgrāma which adorned the western side of the excellent city of Mānyapura.

(L. 85.) On its east, south, west and north are (*respectively*) the well-known villages Svastimaṅgala, Beḷḷinda, Guḍḍanūr and Taripāl. This is the order of the four boundaries of Jālamaṅgala, which is situated in the middle of those four villages. Again the details of its boundaries :— Looking towards the south from the north-eastern angle,² the eastern bank of the Elṭaga pond ; coming thence, of an olive tree ; a *pīpal* tree³ in a pit ; coming straight (*thence*), a tamarind tree in a field ; going further, the tank of Bidirūr (*forms*) the (*south-eastern*) angle. Thence towards the west, on the south of a grass ridge ; thence a boundary stone ; the stump of a banyan tree (*forms*) the (*southern*) angle. Going straight on, the head-slucice (?) of the Gāymaṇi tank (*forms*) the (*south-western*) angle. Thence towards the north, on the western side of the Baṭṭi tank a tamarind tree ; the Ānedale tank ; a grass ridge ; a boundary stone ; the tank of Puli[v]āra (*forms*) the (*north-western*) angle. Thence towards the east, a grass ridge at the door ; the stone (*i.e.* anvil ?) of a brazier ; a tamarind tree at the boundary of a field ; a circular tamarind tree ; coming (*thence, the boundary*) joins the north-eastern angle.

(L. 97.) Given while Rāvamalla-Gāmuṇḍa, Śīra, Gaṅga-Gāmuṇḍa, Māreya, Be[]geṅe Oḍeyōru and others of the 'Seventy,' and the 'Five-hundred' of Kunuṅgil were witnesses. Obeisance !

[Ll. 99-103 contain the usual imprecations.]

¹ *i.e.* Śīva.

² With *mukūḍal* compare *mayyanikūṭṭu*, above, p. 96, note 4, and *muechhandī*, p. 237 f.

³ *Ajari* is probably the same as *araji*.