

A.—Vira-Pāṇḍya (November 11, A.D. 1252—July 13, A.D. 1253).

No. 32. 7th year : July 13, A.D. 1259.

No. 31. 15th year : November 10, A.D. 1267.

B.—Māraṅvarman Parākrama-Pāṇḍya (December 1, A.D. 1334—November 1, A.D. 1335).

No. 33. 6th year (Śaka 1262) : November 1, A.D. 1340.

No. 34. 8th [for 18th] year : November 30, A.D. 1352.

C.—Jaṭavarman Parākrama-Pāṇḍya (January 10, A.D. 1357—January 9, A.D. 1358).No. 35. Year 10 opp. to 5 (*i.e.* 15th year ; Śaka 1293) : January 9, A.D. 1372.**D.—Jaṭilavarman Parākrama-Pāṇḍya Arikēsarideva (June 18—July 19, A.D. 1422).**No. 37. [Year] opp. to 31 (*i.e.* 32nd year) : July 19, A.D. 1453.No. 36. Year 2 opp. to 31 (*i.e.* 33rd year ; Śaka 1377) : March 24, A.D. 1455.No. 38. Year 4 opp. to 31 (*i.e.* 35th year) : March 16, A.D. 1457.No. 39. Year 8 opp. to 31 (*i.e.* 39th year ; Śaka 1381 [for 1383]) : June 17, A.D. 1461.**E.—Jaṭilavarman Parākrama-Pāṇḍya Kulaśekhara (November 15, A.D. 1479—November 14, A.D. 1480).**

No. 40. 20th year (Śaka 1421) : November 14, A.D. 1499.

F.—Jaṭilavarman Śrīvallabha (November 29, A.D. 1534—November 28, A.D. 1535).

No. 41. 3rd year (Śaka 1459) : November 28, A.D. 1537.

G.—Māraṅvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya (June 2, A.D. 1531—June 1, A.D. 1532).No. 42. Year 22 opp. to 2 (*i.e.* 24th year ; Śaka 1477) : June 1, A.D. 1555.**H.—Jaṭilavarman Śrīvallabha Ativirarāma (August 23, A.D. 1562—August 22, A.D. 1563).**

No. 43. 5th year (Śaka 1489) : August 22, A.D. 1567.

**No. 3.—AMARAVATI INSCRIPTION OF KRISHNARAYA
OF VIJAYANAGARA ; SAKA-SAMVAT 1437.**

BY H. LÜDERS, PH.D. ; GÖTTINGEN.

This inscription,¹ which I edit from inked estampages supplied by Dr. Hultzsch, is engraved on a slab in the *Saṁnyāsīn's* room in the Amareśvara temple at Amarāvati in the Kistna district.

It contains 53 lines of writing. The average size of the letters is $\frac{5}{8}$ ". The alphabet is Telugu of the type described in Vol. VI. p. 108 f. *Ka* shows here everywhere the advanced form. *La* appears twice (ll. 10 and 14) in the older form of the Bīṭraguṇṭa and Vānapalli plates, but in l. 49 it shows a form which comes nearer to that of the Maṅgalagiri inscription. The *ottu* appears in *ḍha* (l. 35) ; in the case of *dha* and *bha* it occurs only in a few cases, and it is never

¹ No. 266 of the Government Epigraphist's collection for the year 1897.

found in *kha* and *tha*. As first letter of a group, *r* is represented by the full sign in *ryô* in l. 15 and *rvâ* in l. 46. In all other cases the secondary sign has been used. The language is Sanskrit, and, with the exception of the introductory phrase *śubham=astu* in l. 1 and the concluding words *śrī śrī śrī* in l. 53, the whole text is in verse. As regards orthography, it may be noticed that a consonant is doubled after *r* in *dévair=mmathyamānān* (l. 7), *kurvvan* (l. 22), *sārththā* (l. 24), *-audāryyas* (l. 43), *arththi-sārththa* (l. 48), *kīrtti-dharmmau* (l. 50), after *anusvāra* in *tumgga* (l. 1), *Vinikoṃḍḍaṃ* (l. 32), *Bellakoṃḍḍaṃ* (l. 32), *-ānttād* (l. 48), and as first letter of a group in *jāta-ppratishṭhān* (l. 28) and *Amarēsa-pprasādatah* (l. 52). The groups *tth* and *ddh* are written *tthh* and *dddh*; compare, in addition to the cases cited above, *tadh-dhāma* (l. 4) and *samīnddhē* (l. 49).

The inscription is one of king **Kṛishṇarāya** of **Vijayanagara**. The greater portion of it consists of verses already known to us from other records.¹ New are only the verses 7, 9, 10 and 12. Verse 7 states that "from him (i.e. king Narasa) was born by **Nāgamāmbā** king **Kṛishṇarāya**, who causes pleasure to the world, as the moon, who causes the fragranciness of the water-lilies, was born from the milk-ocean." **Kṛishṇarāya**'s mother is generally called **Nāgalā**. However, the variant **Nāgāmbikā** is found also in the prose portion of the Hampe and Saṅkalāpura inscriptions.²

Of greater interest is verse 9, which praises **Kṛishṇarāya** as him "who, having taken by a forcible attack **Śivanasamudra**, **Udayādri**, **Vinikoṇḍa** and **Bellakoṇḍa**, and having captured alive on the battle-field **Virabhadra**, the son of the **Gajapati** king, took **Koṇḍaviḍu**." This account, although rather meagre, is of considerable importance as being the first epigraphical record of **Kṛishṇarāya**'s warlike exploits up to the conquest of **Koṇḍaviḍu**. The enumeration of the events seems to follow the chronological order. The taking of **Śivanasamudra**, at any rate, appears to have been the first military success in **Kṛishṇarāya**'s career. The ancient city of **Śivanasamudra** is situated on an island between the two great falls of the **Kāvēri**, 9 miles north-east of the modern **Kollēgāl** in the **Coimbatore** district. It belonged at that time to the **Ummatūr** chiefs, who regarded **Somēsvarasvāmin**, whose magnificent temple may still be seen at **Śivanasamudra**, as their family god.³ The **Ummatūr** chiefs were subject to the kings of **Vijayanagara**. The then lord of **Ummatūr** must have revolted against his sovereign; for, quite in accordance with the inscription, a native chronicle relates that, after having first settled the **Drāviḍa** country about **Conjeeveram**, **Kṛishṇarāya** crushed a refractory **Rāja** in the **Maisūr** country, the **Gaṅga Rāja** of **Ummatūr**. In the war against the latter **Kṛishṇarāya** captured the strong fort of **Śivanasamudra** and the city of **Śrīraṅgapattana**, after which all **Maisūr** submitted to him.⁴ We can even determine, with great probability, the cause which led to this war, by combining the facts ascertained hitherto with the statements of a Portuguese author. In his *Commentaries of the Great Afonso Dalboquerque*⁵ the son of the great conqueror gives us an abstract of a letter written by a certain **Luiz**, a **Franciscan** friar, who, after the disaster at **Calicut** in **January 1510**, was sent by **Albuquerque** to the court of **Vijayanagara** with the view of securing **Kṛishṇarāya**'s assistance against the **Zamorin**. The letter was delivered by the

¹ See e.g. **Kuppēlūr** plates of **Kṛishṇarāya**, *J. Bo. Br. R.A.S.*, Vol. XII, p. 331 ff.; **Hampe** inscription of the same, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 361 ff.; **Ūṇamāñjēri** plates of **Achyutarāya**, *ibid.* Vol. III, p. 147 ff., etc. Verse 5 of the present inscription is formed by combining the first halves of two *ślōkas* of those inscriptions (vv. 6 and 9 of the **Hampe** inscription, vv. 7 and 8 of the **Ūṇamāñjēri** plates).

² *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 365, and Vol. IV, p. 267.

³ *Ep. Carn.* Vol. IV, p. 60 of the text; compare for the **Ummatūr** chiefs **Mr. Rice**'s account, *ibid.* Introduction, p. 27.

⁴ **R. Sewell**, *Sketch of the Dynasties of Southern India*, p. 109. **Mr. Sewell** quotes as his authorities **Mr. Foulkes** in the *Salem District Manual*, p. 45, and the summary of a manuscript in the *Madras Journal*, Vol. XIV, (I.), p. 39. I regret that these two books are not accessible to me at present.

⁵ Translated by **Walter de Gray Birch** (**Hakluyt** edit.), Vol. III, p. 35.

ambassadors whom Kṛishnarāya sent to Goa immediately after having received the news of the recapture of that place by the Portuguese in November 1510. In this letter Fr. Luiz informed Albuquerque "that the king of Narsinga was getting himself ready with five thousand men on foot and two thousand on horse, for an expedition against one of his vassals who had risen up in rebellion and seized the city of Pergunda, (the rebel) declaring that to himself belonged the kingdom itself by right; and that directly he had taken the rebel the king would proceed with all this force of men to his places situated on the edge of the sea." There can be little doubt, I think, that the rebel spoken of in the letter is the Rāja of Ummatūr. Pergunda has already been correctly identified by Mr. Sewell¹ with Penakoṇḍa in the Anantapur district, situated about half-way between Vijayanagara and Śivanasamudra, and the war would thus appear to have arisen from a dispute about this hill-fort. This view is further strengthened by an inscription at Hōṇakanahalli in the Guṇḍlupēte tāluka,² where Chikkarāja-Oḍeyar, the lord of Ummatūr, is given the *biruda Penugoṇḍa-chakrēśvara*. As this inscription is dated in Śaka-Saṁvat 1426, the Krōdhana *saṁvatsara*, during the reign of Narasa, it would seem that the Rājas of Ummatūr had taken possession of Penakoṇḍa already under Kṛishnarāya's predecessor, and that it was not until Kṛishnarāya's accession to the throne that their claims were seriously disputed.

The taking of the forts of Udayādri, Vinikoṇḍa, Bellakoṇḍa and Koṇḍaviḍu formed part of Kṛishnarāya's campaign on the eastern coast against the Gajapati of Orissa. Fernão Nunes³ tells us that Kṛishnarāya had a special desire of acquiring Udayagiri, because king Narsymga (Narasimha) in his testament had enjoined on his successors the necessity of taking the fortresses of Rracholl (Raichūr), Medegulla (Mudkal), and Odigair (Udayagiri).⁴ He therefore collected 34,000 foot-soldiers and 800 elephants and arrived with this army at Digary (Udayagiri), which, although its garrison numbered only 10,000 foot-soldiers and 400 horse, was nevertheless a very strong place on account of its natural position. The king laid siege to it for a year and a half, cutting roads through the surrounding hills in order to gain access to the towers of the fortress, and finally took it by force of arms. On this occasion an aunt of the king of Orissa fell into his hands.

The capture of Vinikoṇḍa, the modern Vinukoṇḍa, and of Bellakoṇḍa, generally called Bellamkoṇḍa, is not mentioned by Nunes, probably because these places were only of secondary importance. He proceeds at once to the account of the siege of Koṇḍaviḍu, which I have discussed above, Vol. VI. p. 109 ff. According to inscriptions at Maṅgalagiri, Kāzâ and Koṇḍaviḍu the fortress surrendered on Saturday, the *Harivāsara* of the bright half of the month Āshāḍha in Śaka-Saṁvat 1437, which, for Śaka-Saṁvat 1437 expired, corresponds to Saturday, the 23rd June A.D. 1515.

There remains the statement that the king took alive on the battle-field Virabhadra, the son of the Gajapati. This fact is mentioned by Nunes as well as by Domingos Paes. The latter has only the short notice that, in the war against the king of Orissa, Kṛishnarāya took captive his enemy's son and kept him for a long time in the city of Bisnaga (Vijayanagara), where he died.⁵ Nunes' account is more detailed.⁶ He tells us that, after the capture of Koṇḍaviḍu, Kṛishnarāya continued his march northward until he arrived at Comdepallyr (Koṇḍapalle). After a siege of three months he took it; among the prisoners he made was a wife of the king of Orissa, and one of his sons who was a prince, and seven principal captains of the kingdom, all of whom he sent to Bisnaga (Vijayanagara). When Kṛishnarāya himself had returned to Bisnaga, he summoned

¹ *A Forgotten Empire (Vijayanagar)*, p. 126. Mr. Sewell was also the first to draw attention to the importance of this letter for the history of the first years of Kṛishnarāya's reign.

² *Ep. Carn.* Vol. IV. p. 77 of the text.

³ *Chronica dos Reis de Bisnaga*, p. 19 f.; Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 316 f.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 13; by Sewell, *loc. cit.* p. 308, their names are given as Rachol, Odegany, and Conadolgi.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 89; Sewell, *loc. cit.* p. 247.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 21 f.; Sewell, *loc. cit.* p. 318 ff.

the son of the king of Orissa, who was renowned as being a good swordsman, to show his skill. The prince consented, but seeing that the antagonist whom the king had chosen for him was a man of low birth, he felt greatly offended and, unable to bear such an insult, he killed himself. The news of the death of this prince induced the King of Orissa to open fresh negotiations with Kṛishṇarāya, which in the end led to a conclusion of peace.

Nunes generally shows himself so well informed that there is no reason to doubt that this story also is substantially correct. The only discrepancy between the chronicle and the inscription is with respect to the date when the prince was taken captive. Whereas the Portuguese author asserts that it took place more than three months after the capture of Koṇḍaviḍu, it would follow from the inscription that it was before that event. This is implied not only by the words of the text, which admit of no other interpretation, but also by the date of the inscription in verse 10, which states that 'in the Śaka year marked by the Munis (7), the towns (3), the oceans (4), and the moon (1), (i.e. Śaka-Saṁvat 1437), in the year Yuvan, on the twelfth day in the month Āshāḍha, (the king) duly performed the gift called *tulāpūruṣa* and gave away many incomparable *agrahāras* in the presence of the god Śūlapāni, who is renowned in the world as **Amarēśa**, on the bank of the Kṛishṇavēni, which destroys darkness.' This date, although it is incomplete and cannot be verified, is without doubt identical with the date given above as that of the capture of Koṇḍaviḍu, the *Harivāsara* mentioned there being only another term for the twelfth day of the bright half of the month Āshāḍha.¹ Whether the chronicle or the inscription is to be trusted in this case, I do not venture to decide at present. It is quite possible that the text of the inscription was composed and engraved some months after the event which it is intended to commemorate, and that the author inadvertently referred to things which had happened in the meantime. But it is equally possible that Nunes has made a slight mistake, and that Vīrabhadra was taken captive on an earlier occasion.

The inscription concludes with a verse (12) invoking the blessing of **Amarēśa** on Kṛishṇarāya. The **Amarēśa** mentioned here and in verse 10 is, of course, the god of the temple where the inscription is found.

TEXT.²

- 1 शुभमस्तु ॥ नम[स्तु]ग[शि]रञ्चुवि-
- 2 चंद्रचामरचारवे । त्रैलोक्य-
- 3 नगरारंभमूलस्तंभाय शं-
- 4 भवे ॥ [१*] कल्याणायस्तु तध्वाम³ प्रत्यु-
- 5 हतिमिरापहं । यद्गजोप्य[ग]जोद्ग-
- 6 तं हरिणापि [च] पूज्यते ।[। २*] अस्ति क्षीरम-
- 7 [य]ाद्देवैर्मथ्यमानान्महांबुधेः । नवनी-
- 8 तमिवोद्भूत[मप]नीततमो महः ।[। ३*] तत्⁴
- 9 वं[शि] देवको]जानिर्दिदीपे तिम्रभूपतिः ।[।
- 10 यशस्वो तुर्वेदेषु यदोः क-
- 11 षा [इवा]न्वये ।[। ४*] ततो[भ्र]डुकमाजा-

¹ See above, Vol. VI. p. 111, note 4.

² From inked estampages supplied to me by Dr. Hultsch.

³ Read तद्वाम.

⁴ Read तदंशे.

- 12 निरीश्वरक्षितिपालकः । सर-
 13 सादुदभृत्सम्भारसावनिपा-
 14 लकः । [१ ५*] चेरं चोळं च पांड्यं तमपि
 15 च मधुरावल्लभं मानभूषं वीर्यो-
 16 द[ग्रं] तुरुष्कं गजपतिनृपतिं चा-
 17 पि जित्वा तदन्यान् । आगंगातीरलंका-
 18 प्रथमचरमभूत्तटांतं नि-
 19 तांतं ।^१ ख्यातः क्षीणीपतीनां स्रजमि-
 20 व शिर[सां शा]सनं यो व्यतानीत् ॥ [६*] त-
 21 तोभून्नागमांबायां कृष्णराय-
 22 महीपतिः । कुर्वन् कुवलयामोदं
 23 क्षीराब्धेरिव चंद्रमाः । [१ ७*] महत्तामर्थि-
 24 सादर्थ्या^२ श्रियमिह सुचिरं भुंजता-
 25 मित्यवेत्य प्रायः प्रत्यूहहेतोस्त-
 26 पनरधगतेरालयां^३ देवतानां । त[त्त]-
 27 द्विगजैत्रवृत्त्यापि^४ च विरुदपदैरंकि-
 28 तांस्तत्र त[त्र] स्तंभान्^५ जातप्प्र-
 29 तिष्ठान् व्यतनुत भुवि यो भूभृ-
 30 दभ्रं कषायान् ॥ [८*] अपि शिवनसमु-
 31 द्रं यो बलाच्चोदयाद्रिं तद-
 32 पि च विनिकोडुं वेत्तकोडुं च
 33 धात्र्या [१*] गजपतिनृपसूनुं वी[र]-
 34 भद्रं गृहीत्वा समरभुवि सजीवं
 35 चाग्रहीत् कोडवीडुं ॥ [९*] आषाढे-
 36 न्दे युवाख्ये मुनिपुरजलधीं हं-
 37 क्ति यः शकाब्दे विख्यातस्यामरेश^६
 38 स्वयमिति भुवने सन्निधौ शूल-
 39 पाणेः । तीरे श्रीकृष्णवेष्टा हत-
 40 तमसि तुलापूरुषाख्यं च दा-
 41 नं द्वादश्यां सा[धु] कृत्वा व्य[तर]-

^१ This sign of punctuation is superfluous.

^२ Read सादर्थ्याः.

^३ Read पनरधगतेरालयान्.

^४ Read °वृत्त्यापि; between व्या and पि an original न has been effaced.

^५ Read स्तंभान्नात°.

^६ Read °शः.

- 42 दनुपमानग्रहा[र]ाननेकान् ॥ [१०*]
 43 [स्तु]त्यौदार्यस्सुधीभिस्स विजयन-
 44 गरे रत्नसिंघानस्थः¹ क्ष्मापालान्
 45 कृष्णरायचित्तिपतिरधरीकृत्य
 46 नीत्या नृगादीन् ॥² आ पूर्वाद्रे-
 47 ³रधास्तत्तिधरकटकादा [च]
 48 हेमाचलांत्तादा सेतोरर्थिसार्थ⁴
 49 श्रियमिह बह्मीकृत्य कीर्त्यास्समिंघे⁵ [॥ ११*]
 50 अस्य श्रीकृष्णरायस्य कीर्त्तिधर्मौ
 51 [स]होद्भवौ । आकल्पं तिष्ठतां लो-
 52 [के]ष्वमरेणप्रसादतः । [१ १२*]
 53 श्री श्री श्री [॥*]

No. 4.— THREE MEMORIAL STONES.

By E. HULTZSCH, Ph.D.

I.— BANGAVADI STONE OF NARASIMHAVIKRAMAVARMAN.

The stone which bears this inscription (No. 103 of 1899) was discovered by Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, B.A. It is set up near the Śiva temple at **Baṅgavâdi** in the Muḷubâgal tâluka of the Kôlâr district of the Mysore State and bears the representation of a warrior riding on a horse at full gallop.

The **alphabet** is archaic Tamil and resembles that of the published inscriptions of the same king.⁶ The only Grantha letter which occurs is *da* of *Daḍiya*^o (l. 2). The **language** is Tamil. An archaic form is *nâlgâvadu* (l. 2) for *nâṅgâvadu*. Instead of *kânga* and *Daḍiyargaḷ* we find the vulgar forms *kânga* (l. 5) and *Daḍiyâṅgaḷ* (l. 2 f.). *Mayindîramikkiruma* (l. 3) is a Prâkrit corruption of *Mahêndravikrama*. The word *tonru* (l. 4) is a variant of *toru*, 'cattle.'⁷

The inscription is dated in the 24th year of the reign of the (Gaṅga-Pallava) king **Vijaya-Narasimhavikramavarman**.⁸ It records the death of a hero, who was in the service of **Skanda**, the *adhîrâja* of the **Bâṅas**,⁹ and who fell in recovering cattle which had been seized by three persons. These were the **Daḍiya**,—evidently the chief of *Daḍigavâdi*,¹⁰—an unnamed **Bâṅa** chief, and a certain **Mahêndravikrama**. The usual imprecation at the end of the inscription is only partially preserved.

¹ Read °सिंहासनस्थः.

² Read °दीन् ।

³ Read रथात् ।

⁴ Read °रथिसार्थ-

⁵ Read कीर्त्या समिंघे.

⁶ Above, Vol. IV. No. 22, A. and No. 52.

⁷ See above, Vol. IV. p. 179, note 2, and Vol. VI. p. 163.

⁸ In two Kil-Muttugûr inscriptions (see note 6 above) the name of this king appears in the shorter form **Vijaya-Narasimhavarman**.

⁹ On the title *Bâṅâdhîrâja* see above, Vol. V. p. 50 and note 14.

¹⁰ See Dr. Fleet's remarks in *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXX. p. 109 f. and above, Vol. VI. p. 256, note 3.