

109/15
P. 305
18 JAN 1939

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY

VOL. XII

JANUARY, 1939

PART III

DUAL KINGSHIP IN ANCIENT INDIA,

Dr. P. SREENIVASACHAR, M. A., PH. D. (Lond).

Dual kingship may roughly be taken to be the conjoint constitutional exercise of the sovereign power by two persons in a State. We have such examples in the ancient States of the West. But in India we have only a single example of this in the little known history of the Haihayas of Kōna-maṇḍala.

The Kōna-sīma or Kōna-maṇḍala is the deltaic country at the mouth of the Godavari River. The Naḍupur grant¹ states that Kōna-sthala was situated in the Godavari delta. At present the term Kōna-sīma is applied to a portion of the Amalapuram taluk of the Godavari district, which being watered by several branches of the Godavari river is as fertile as a Kōna or valley. In this unique and more or less insular part ruled a branch of the Haihaya family from about the middle of the 11th century till the 14th century A. D. They were originally the feudatories of the Cōlas and were later on conquered by the Kākatiyas in the time of Gaṇapati.

They claimed descent from Kārtavīrya of the Yadu-vamśa and called themselves "the lords of Mahiṣmatīpura." Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* mentions it as the capital of Pratīpa, a descendant of Kārtavīrya, and locates it on the banks of the river (Rēva) Rewa. Cunningham identified it with Mandla on the Narmada. In any case it was a town which was outside the Telugu country and outside the rule of the Kōna chiefs. The title was hence merely hereditary.

The emblems of the Kōna chiefs were the drum, the peacock's tail, the spear, and the single conch. A few details of their political history are necessary to understand the nature of their succession to the throne.

1 *Ep. Ind.*, III, pp. 286—92.

The first ruler of this dynasty is Mummaḍi-Bhīma I who claims to have been appointed 'the lord of Vengi' by Rājādhirāja Rājendra Cōḍa, who is obviously Kulōttunga Cōḷa I. We need not discuss here the truth of this statement. But we may note that there is ample evidence to show that the Kōṇa chiefs were merely the subordinates of the Velanāṇḍu chiefs, and that even after the Velanāṇḍu chiefs were overthrown, the Pithapuram inscription of the joint rulers Malli-dēva and Manma-Satya II contains a *śloka* praising Jayammbā, wife of Manma-Gonka of Velanāṇḍu and the mother of Pṛthvīśvara.

The wife of Mummaḍi-Bhīma I was called Chhādvi-dēvī, and they had two sons, Venna and Rājaparēṇḍu I. We have no evidence of Venna's rule. Rājaparēṇḍu left three sons at the time of his death, two of them, namely Mummaḍi-Bhīma II and Rājendra-Cōḍa, by his first wife Lakṣmī, and Satya I, or Satyāśraya by his second wife Toṇḍamāmbikā or Toṇḍamāmbā. Although the eldest son was alive the second son Rājendra Cōḷa succeeded his father on the throne. He claims to have ruled the country of Vengi and to have assumed the insignia of sovereignty which had been conferred on his grandfather Mummaḍi-Bhīma I by Kulōttunga Cōḷa I. This is surprising since his own father Rājaparēṇḍu I is spoken of only as the "the Lord of Kōṇa-maṇḍala." Though it is unlikely that Rājendra-Cōḍa ruled any territory apart from his Kōṇa country, his very accession superseding his elder brother, suggests that he had some special claim on the favour of the Cōḷas.

From now on begins the joint rule which goes on for four generations.

After Rājendra Cōḷa, his two brothers Mummaḍi-Bhīma II and Satya I both came to the throne. They are both mentioned in an inscription dated A. D. 1135-36. Rājādēvī, wife of Mummaḍi-Bhīma II is mentioned in an inscription dated Śaka 1057 (A.D. 1135), while another inscription of the same year commemorates the gift of land by Satya or Satti-rāja, the son of Kōṇa Rājaparēṇḍu and Toṇḍi-dēvī, the younger brother of Rājendra-Cōḷa and the lord of the Kōṇa country. This shows that there was the actual rule of both the kings at one and the same time, in the same territory.

After the joint rule of Mummaḍi-Bhīma II and Satya I, came the joint rule of Lōka-mahīpāla or Lōka-bhūpālaka and Bhīma III, their respective sons. These were the vassals of Rājarāja mentioned in the two Pithapuram inscriptions. In an inscription dated in Śaka 1075 and the 9th regnal year of Rājarāja-dēva, corresponding to A.D. 1153, Bhīma III calls himself *Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* Bhīmarāja.

Lōka-bhūpalaka or Lōka-mahīpala is called Rājendra-Kōṇa-Lōka-Rāja, in an inscription dated Śaka 1072 (A. D. 1150).

After these two, Malli-dēva, the son of Rājendra-Chōlā I came into his own and shared it with Vallabha the son of Rājendra and grand son of Satya I. He had a pretty long rule and when Vallabha died he continued to rule now with Vallabha's son Manma-Satya II or Manma-Satti, who obtained his father's position. An inscription in Pithapuram records the grant of Oddiyur (near Drakṣārāma) in Śaka 1117 by these two kings Malli-dēva, and Manma-Satya II. This inscription is the bed-rock of the history of this family.

There are a number of other records of this dynasty, not yet published, mentioning various other rulers. But it is not necessary to go into the details of the political history of this dynasty, since the existence of Dual Kingship is clear from the evidence so far cited, particularly from the unimpeachable testimony of the Pithapuram inscription of Mallidēva and Manma-Satya.

Of course there are many cases in Indian History of joint rule in more or less a limited sense. The custom of the heir-apparent being associated with the end of the king's reign is quite common. This was largely due to the anxiety on the part of the reigning king to ensure the succession of his chosen person. When the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati decided on making his daughter Rudrama his successor he took this precaution. He practically treated her as his son and made her the ruler during his last years, without at the same time renouncing his throne. The famous Vijayanagara king Kṛṣṇadēvarāya did the same when he grew doubtful whether his boy-son Tirumalayyadēva-maharaya could succeed him on the throne of Vijayanagara, when the older and more fitted Acyutadēvarāya was still alive. We have a number of inscriptions of this boy king in the year A.D. 1524, under the royal name of Virapratāpa Tirumala-dēva-maharaya. It is said that Kṛṣṇadēvarāya conferred full power on this young boy of six, himself renouncing the throne and assuming the duties of the Prime Minister. Śaḷuva Timmarusu became the adviser. It is well known that this state of affairs did not last long because the young boy fell ill and died even before the coronation festivities had come to an end.²

2. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya tells me that he has got a copper plate grant which proves that Dēva-ṛaya I and Vijaya were ruling simultaneously. I dare say this is another instance of a Yuvarāja being invested with the authority to administer a kingdom by the reigning king.

It is needless to multiply instances, and we may pass on to a different set of cases where there are two rulers, one *de facto* and the other *de jure*. The rule of Allāḍa-reḍḍi of Rajahmundry is a clear case in point. The rightful heir was Anitalli, and the only other person who had some right to interest himself in the government was her husband Vīrabhadra. But we find actually Virabhadra's father Allāḍa-reḍḍi ruling and his elder brother Allaya-Vēma issuing grants in his own name. R ma-r ja occupying the silver throne of Vijayanagara, while Sad śiva continued to be acknowledged as the master—at least once a year—is another such case. Sad śiva however, had no choice in the matter.

To a slightly different category belongs the case of Harihara I and Bukka I. These two brothers of the Sangama family were the chief founders of Vijayanagara. All the four younger brothers acknowledged their eldest brother Harihara as their master, although they were practically independent in their provinces. But the inscriptions of Bukka I are found even in the country of Harihara I, and the relations between these two brothers are much more intimate. However, no question of Dual Kingship arises in this case. Bukka I was the right hand man of Harihara I in the supreme task they had undertaken of creating a formidable bulwark against the onslaughts of the Muslims. There was no time to think of settling down to a happy and peaceful rule and concern themselves with formal questions of prestige, authority, etc. Bukka I showed the necessary respect and honour due to his elder brother, but beyond that, it was impossible under the circumstances to act the courtier and merely wait for orders from him, when matters of life and death were pressing hard on their attention.

We have instances of two sons dividing a kingdom after their father's death. The kingdom of Rācakonḍa was thus divided in the reign of Ana-Pōta, who retained Racakonḍa and the surrounding territory for himself, giving the other half to his brother Māda, with the capital city at Dēvarakonḍa. Ana-Pōta was succeeded by his son Singama II and Mada by his son Pedda-Vēdagiri. This is quite different from what happened in Kōna-maṇḍala. We have an instance of even the gift of a kingdom in the foundation of the independent kingdom of Rajahmundry by Kaṭaya-Vēma, through the generosity of his brother-in-law Kumaragiri. But another instance of two kings ruling at the same time with equal status and power, as in Kōna-sīma is not seen in India.

Such a conception was unthinkable to the ancient Hindus, and neither literary men nor philosophers have conceived of such a thing. We have instances of the Republican form of government, and perhaps even of democracy of a sort. But kingship denoted something quite specific to the Hindu mind. It was too sacred and divine to be subjected to any artificial restraints.

Kingship was instituted by an act of Brahma. The Mahābhārata (*Śāntiparvan*, 59) strongly asserts this divine sanction and the legend of Pṛthu-manyu of the Holy order of the Kṣatriyas makes the king a veritable *nara-dēva*; a human god to be worshipped. The same idea is expressed in Manu. Nārada says, "The king has purchased his subjects by his austerity. And so he must be obeyed. Even their livelihood depends upon him. The king must be worshipped by his subjects even though wicked."

The theory of the divinity of the king was put into practice by the Hindu kings on their coins and in inscriptions. A Greek king was called Theos, and Agathocles called himself a God. The Kuṣāṇas were called *dēva-putras*. Then there was the nimbus or the halo over the heads of the kings suggesting their divine status. The Guptas also had the nimbus and Samudragupta is called *lōka-dhāmnō dēvasya*. He was equal to the other gods Kubēra, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama.

We cannot go into the origin and development of this idea of absolute monarchy. But we may note in passing that even as early as the Brahmanas, there had been a conflict between the Brāhminas and the Kṣatriyas as regards ownership of land. The Kṣatriyas claimed ownership of all land and a gift of land by a king never included ownership of land in the strict sense of the term. Some Brahmins, however, held that the king had no authority over land, since Earth was common to all men. Hence, they argued, the king could only give the use of the land. Śābara expands the idea underlying the Brahmanic point of view. According to him there is no difference between a monarch and a man. The king's duty is only to protect the soil. Although a portion can be given as a gift, a *mahā-bhūmi* cannot be given.

However, the Brahmins finally had to acquiesce in the Kṣatriya view of land. The *Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa* speaks of the Kṣatriya as the Norm of Society and compares the others with reference to him.

By the time we come to the Epics we find such terms as *pṛthivī-pati* or Lord of the Earth. The king was filled with the

spirit of Viṣṇu and since Mother Earth is one of the wives of Viṣṇu, the king is the husband of *bhūmi* or the Earth. The Brahmins consoled themselves by arguing that the Brahmin is the owner of the whole world, but the Kṣatriya can be the Lord of it, just as a woman takes a brother-in-law as her husband when the husband goes to war. Thus the Brahmins conceded the ownership of the Kṣatriyas in practice, though they kept up the theory wedging it in much argument. The divinity of the king thus increased in emphasis as their power advanced till we get the conception of absolute monarchy. Śukra says, "The king is made out of the permanent elements of Indra, V. yu, Yama, the Sun, Fire, Varuṇa, the moon and Kubēra, and is the lord of both the immovable and the movable worlds. In another place he says, "The sovereign must possess the attributes of Father, Mother, Preceptor, Brother, Friend, Vaiśvānara, or Kubēra and Yama, the god of Death." According to Śukra, the king is the quintessence of divinity. He is the source of the prosperity of the world. He safeguards the whole fabric of Society. It is from him that all social and political usage flows. He is altogether in an unusually high position, and is the most important factor in the body politic.

It is true that the king was ordained to go in accordance with the laws embodied in the *śāstras*. But in practice and even in theory the king was the originator of the law. Hieun Tsiang tells us a story of Bimbisāra passing a law that any man in whose house a fire broke out should be banished out of the realm. When a fire broke out in his own palace he was prepared to leave the realm. In Aśōka we have an instance of a king who made sweeping changes in the administration of the country,—changes that were almost revolutionary in character. The Brahmins might have disliked it but they could not put forth any great fight against it. Kauṭilya pertly remarks, "The king is the *Dharma-pravartaka* (the person who keeps the law going)".

In times of emergency the king could overlook the *śāstras* and do almost anything he liked. The conception of *āpat-dharma* was a safe excuse for ambitious kings. The welfare of the State was the only consideration to be looked to according to the *śāstras*. The state was to be emancipated from the rules of morality. It was a sort of *super-man*. These ideas are fairly well-known through Kauṭilya. But Kauṭilya was no inventor of Machiavellinism. It is already set forth in the Mahābhārata with great eloquence and force. In a passage in *Vana-Parvan*, it is stated, that whatever a king might

do for his kingdom can be expiated by sacrifices and gifts. In times of *āpat* or emergency the king could suspend all common laws and morality. Even Brahmins could be put to death if sinful, and the Mahābhārata, Manu and Śukra allow even the enlistment of Brahmins as soldiers.

Such a conception of kingship is totally inconsistent and incompatible with Dual Kingship. In addition to this there was the ideal placed before the Hindu king that he should become a *sārva-bhauma*, universally acknowledged to be supreme, and perform the Horse-sacrifice as a proof of it. This would make it quite impossible to conceive of two kings with equal power, each having the right to question and modify the actions of the others.

In the case of Sparta the idea of an elective monarchy suggests a high state of political development of the community at large and a realization by the people that they were the State, and that they handed over the sovereign power to the two elected kings. The element of contract appears in the election of the two kings and the insistence on their mutual agreement in all their important activities.

Unlike this, the Hindu idea of a sovereign made him the sole repository of sovereignty, which was, therefore, indivisible and divine in origin.

What then is the explanation of this strange institution in one corner of the Telugu country? We cannot brush aside the clear evidence of the Pithapuram inscription issued by two kings ruling together in the same territory, especially when the inscription contains a detailed account of four generations of Dual Rule. We may note here the exact wording of the passage. It runs:—"His elder brother (*i. e.*, Rājendra-cōḍa's elder brother) and younger brother, the glorious lord Mummaḍi-Bhīma (II) and prince Satyāśraya, whose prowess was famed in the world, (and) who burnt by (the fire of) their valour crowds of hostile lords of provinces—again (?) divides this earth, (?) and ruled (it) conjointly." The phrase 'divide this earth' which is followed by a question mark in Hultzsch's translation is significant. The actual reading is *vibhajyē-mām (cuvam) cūyah*, which has been corrected into *vibhaj=ēmām bhuvam bhūyah*. Both from the context as well as the actual wording of the statement it is impossible to interpret this to mean that they divided the kingdom between themselves. Besides, if such a division had taken place, two different dynasties would have been founded and the descendants of Mummaḍi-

Bhīma II and Satya I would have continued ruling their respective portions of the kingdom separately. Although the sons of these two rulers actually succeeded to the throne in the next generation, the succession after that does not allow us to conclude that two distinct dynasties had been founded.

The other verses relating to the succession and the details of the gift make this point clear.

(V. 23) After (the death of his) father that glorious Lōka-mahīpāla ruled the earth, seated on his throne.

(V. 24) And like Acyuta (Viṣṇu) himself, the glorious prince Bhīma (III) embraced the fortune of (his) father, prince Satya (I) together with the earth.

(V. 26) After these two, prince Mallideva and the Lord Vallabha ruled the earth undisturbed.

(ll. 96 f.) That prince Mallidēva and this lord Manma-Satya II, the son of the lord Vallabha, having both conjointly called together the *rās, rakūṭas* and all other ryots of the district of Guḷḍav ḍi issue the following command:—

(l. 99) Be it known to you that *We* have given.....

A word about the origin of the Haihayas in the Telugu country is necessary to account for some of their peculiar features. There are several feudatories in the Telugu country who claim to be of the Haihaya family, and trace their descent from K rtavīrya. They call themselves “lords of Mahīśmatīpura”.

Since the Kalacuris of Central India call themselves the Haihayas and claim descent from K rtavīrya of the thousand arms, we must assume that all these individuals and families which claim to be Haihayas, were probably connected with them. The most important family of these later Haihayas, namely the Kalacuris of Kalyāṇ were connected with the Kalacuris of the Cēdi family. The Kalacuris rose to power about A. D. 249 and held sway over a part of the Deccan including the western coast up to the country of Lāṭa.

It is largely due to the influence of this family that many rulers of later times began to call themselves the Haihayas, especially when they migrated into a different region and there laid claims to great antiquity and nobility of birth after attaining a position of some influence.

A famous Telugu work called *Palnāṭi-vira-caritamū* (The History of the Heroes of Palnāḍ) deals with another Haihaya family

in the Telugu country. It gives an account of their migration into the Telugu country; and this perhaps applies to the other Haihayas in that region. According to this account Anugurja or Aluguraja had to leave his ancestral kingdom of Ayōdhya on a tour of pilgrimage with his family, friends and army, to seek relief from the innumerable sins of his ancestor, Kṛtavīrya, which beset him. A close examination of the Haihaya history has shown that they had nothing to do with Ayōdhya (the modern Oudh.) They were the Cēdis already referred to, who ruled the extensive region to the south of Bundelkhand. The long Haihaya inscription at Bilvari and the Karambel inscription give the genealogy and many historical details about the Haihayas, and definitely show that they ruled the region on the banks of the Narmada, the traditional territory of Kṛtavīrya.

The reason for their migration has been suggested to be the Muslim onslaught. Smith says, "there is reason to believe that they were supplanted by the 'Bhagels of Rewa'. This does not however, explain the migration of Anugu since the Palnāḍ War must have taken place between A. D. 1176 and 1182; and consequently the Haihayas must have settled down in the Telugu country long before this date. Besides, it is difficult to imagine that the Haihayas who had been supplanted at home could have marched with their army right across the Western Chālukya kingdom and the rising Kākatīya kingdom in order to settle down in a small territory under the suzerainty of the Velanāḍu chiefs. Anugu could not have had much importance on the banks of the Narmada, though, after acquiring a position of authority in the partly secluded and somewhat inaccessible region of Palnāḍu he claimed to have been a Haihaya king of importance. The only point of interest is that these traditional accounts suggest that there was a migration of people in one or more groups from the North in search of homes.

The Haihayas were not very particular of caste regulations and intermarried freely with the Sindas, although they claimed to be Kṣatriyas. In fact they were touchy on the question of the origin of "Heroes"; and several features of their Social Life are unconventional and objectionable when compared with Aryan ideas. Can it not be correct, therefore, if we deduce from the above that these Haihayas were really the descendants of some non-Aryan tribe with pre-Aryan or non-Aryan customs which persisted in spite of long contact with Aryans and Aryan culture? The tradition

about Anugu-r-ja migrating with family, friends and army suggests a nomadic society, and it was probably this state of comparative insecurity that developed in them a necessity for *Dual Kingship*. We see something almost approaching this during the early stages of Vijayanagara history, when, for all practical purposes there were two rulers in the same territory, namely Harihara I and Bukka I. Such a tendency arising out of emergency is likely to become permanent and assume the character of an institution in a state of society different from that under Vijayanagara. There is no evidence to show that the Indian Aryans ever developed such an institution. So we must seek for its origin in pre-Aryan political institutions of India.

BATTLE OF TOPUR—SOME INACCURACIES.

Prof. K. SITRAMAIIYA, M.A., NIZAM COLLEGE.

Prof. Rao Saheb C. S. Srinivasachariar has contributed an interesting paper entitled "*A Great Maharatta Service to South in Pre-Sivaji Epoch*", to the SARDESAI MEMORIAL VOLUME, 1938. Therein the learned professor refers to the services rendered to the kingdoms of South India by Shaji father of Sivaji at the bidding of his master and overlord, the Sultan of Bijapur and expresses the opinion that battle of Topur was the cause of the internal disputes and civil wars among the kingdoms of South India. Thus he writes:

"In the civil war that followed the death of Venkata, Yachama Naick who championed the cause of the legitimate heir Ranga and was supported only by Achuta Naick of Tanjore and his son Raghunatha, against Jaggaraya and almost all the feudatories of the Empire, the former or the legitimate party was defeated in a great battle at Topur near the Grand anicut on the Coleroon. In this battle the Nayaka of Jinjee and Madura fell on the field and the Portuguese contingent is said to have taken the side of Jaggaraya according to the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*" (p. 74)

In the above statement all the facts are incorrect except the one that the Portuguese rendered assistance to Jaggaraya.¹ These events have been discussed by me in my *Tanjāvūri-Andhranāyakarāia-charitra*. (pp. 209-210).² Prof. Srinivasachariar's views on the battle of Topur, may be summarised thus: (1) That Ranga was the legitimate or rightful heir to the throne of the Vijayanagra Empire and that the battle of Topur was fought for the purpose of placing him on the throne; (2) that the rightist party was defeated in the battle and (3) that the Nayakas of Jinjee and Madura fell on the battlefield.

The purpose of this short paper is to point out that the above three conclusions are utterly incorrect. Prof. Srinivasachariar tells us that the authority for his information is the work *Raghunāthābhyudayam*. Let us examine the source from which he draws the information. There are two works of the name *Raghunāthābhyudayam*: one is a drama (*Nāṭaka*) in Telugu written by Ragunātha's son

1. *History of the Nayaks of Madura*. p. 124.

2. *History of the Andhra nayak kings of Tanjore* (Telugu).

Vijaya-Raghava and the other is a *kāvya* in Sanskrit, composed by Rāmabhadrambā, a poetess of the court of Raghunātha. Prof. Srinivasachair has not stated from which of these two works that he has obtained the information. Let us however examine both the authorities and see if these works support the conclusions so deliberately put forward by the learned Professor.

The *Raghunāthābhyudaya* (*nāṭaka*) describes the setting out for the battle of Topur thus:—

“భేరులు మ్రోయించి పెండ్లికిఁ బోవు
తీరున తగిన ముస్తీబుఁ గావించి
ఎదుట పాళెంబున కెరుక నేయించి

* * *

రాజులు మన్నీలు రాతులు దొరలు
తేజ్జీపై నెక్కి ధీరులై కొలువ,
చేరువ నొక గంధసింధురం బెక్కి,
ఆరామ దేవరాయలు చను దేర”

“Having sounded the kettle-drums, and in the manner of going out for the wedding, and having informed the *pālems* (hamlets) ahead, of his approach.”

“Surrounded by vassal kings, tributaries, captains and loads of realms on their horses, and having mounted royal elephant, that prince R. madēvarāya arrived.”

From the above passage it is clear that the name of the rightful heir to the Vijayanagar Empire was R. madēvarāya. It was to reinstate him on the throne that the battle of Topur was fought by Achyuta and his son Raghunātha of Tanjore. This is not all. There was no prince named Ranga alive at that time statement Prof. Srinivasachariar. that the battle of Topur was fought to reinstate him is also incorrect statement. Rangarāya was actually slain at night treacherously in cold blood with all his family in his own palace by Jaggarāya, and his younger son was saved by a clever device and protected by Yachama Nayaka. The young prince that escaped brutal death at the hands of Jaggarāya was R. madēva mentioned above. This is what the *Raghunāthābhyudaya-kāvya* of Rāmabhadrambā states.

विष्णोः पदं श्रयति वैकटदेवराये सर्वे तदियसचिवा युवराजसूनुम्

भद्रासने तदनु भुमरगायतूर्ण श्रीरंगरायनृपशेखरमभ्याषिचन् ।

* * * * *

सानुजो निशि स जगमहीशः पार्यिवस्यभवनं परिवेष्ट्य
 भूपतिं तदनु पुत्रकळत्रैः निर्वृणो निहत सातनुतेस्म ॥
 तनयेषु नृपालकस्य कंचित् शिशुमप्तो रजकस्समेत्यशीघ्रम् ।
 अनयन्नगराद्वह्निर्निशायां अति चैर्यात् द्विषतामनक्षिलक्ष्यम् ॥

Sarga VIII, Slokas 26—32.

These facts are also clearly mentioned by the author of the *Sāhityaratnakāra*:

स्वामिद्रोही जगगराजस्समित्रैः कैश्चन्द्रूपैः प्राप्यकर्णाटभूयम् ।
 सेवाव्याजेनाशु सेनासनाथः सुप्तं रात्रौः सोऽवधीवंधुमित्रैः ॥
 * * * *

हतेपि कर्णाट नृपेसहात्मजैः ततोवशिष्टं पृथुकं तदात्मजम् ।
 कमथ्युपाया दपहत्य यत्नतः कथंचिदायाति स याचभूपतिः ॥

Sarga VIII Slokas 74—77.

From the above it is obvious that after the death of the Emperor Venkatapati, Ranga was crowned and that the latter was killed in cold blood at night by Jaggarāya and that the younger son of Ranga was rescued by a washerman. Rangarāya therefore was not alive on the date of the battle of Topur and he was not also the legitimate heir who was to be reinstated, but his young son whom the *Raghunāthābhyudaya-nāka* calls by the name Rāma-dēvarāya.

Prof. Srinivasachariar also states that the legitimate party was defeated. It was not the rightful heir's party that was defeated; on the contrary it was the opposing party led by Jaggarāya that was defeated in the battle. The third conclusion of the Professor that the Nayaks of Jinjee and Madura who fought on the side of the traitor Jaggaraya fell on the battlefield in a way contradicts the Professor's assertion that the legitimate party was either destroyed or defeated. It is not stated by the learned writer what became of Jaggarāya and his other confederates, after the battle. The following extracts show that the Nayaks of Jinjee and Madura were not slain on the field but that Jaggaraya alone was killed.

अग्रे योधै रच्युतक्ष्माप सूनोः क्रोधावेशाद्भुम्भितः कुंतजालैः ।
 भ्रश्यत्प्राणो बन्धुवर्गेणसाकं जन्यक्षोण्यां जगगरजः पपात ॥

Raghunāthābhyudaya (Kāvya) Sarga X, Sloka 28.

బ్రమసిన పడమటి పా శేంబుమీద

దుమికి.....

కత్తులచే చీకాకు చేయింప

పోరిలో సమసె గొబ్బురి జగ్గరాజు

Again,

“మధురవారిని గూర్చి మమ్మింతచేసె
విధియంచు తనపాలి విధి దూరుకొనుచు
దొర లెల్ల నవ్వంగ తుండీరవిభుడు
పరువెత్తె తన జింజిపట్టణంబునకు.
“తనవద్ది దొరలెల్ల తనుడించి పార
ఇంతుల నెడబాసి యిలుచూడ యిచ్చి
సంతరించిన బొక్కు సము వీడబుచ్చి
తురగంబు డిగ్గి కైదువ పారవైచి
విరిగి పారదొడంగె వీరపనేండు”

Raghunāthābhyudayan—Nāṭaka

‘स्कंधावारे गन्धनागाश्च िघान् योषारत्नद्रव्यभूषाविशेषान् ।

पाण्ड्यस्यक्त्वा प्राणभीत्यासमित्यां धीमान् क्रोरं प्राद्रवीद्दीनदीनः ॥

“तुण्डीराणामीशिता दुर्ग्येन प्रापय्यैनं पाण्ड्यमत्यंतभंगम् ।

सद्योधावत्तेन साकं रणोर्व्या अप्रेसैन्यं हास्यमानोस्तलज्जम् ॥

Raghunāthābhyudaya-kavya Sarga X Slokas 35—36.

The above extracts show that the lords of Paṇḍya (Madura) and Tuṇḍīra (Jinjee) fled from the battlefield. It was Jaggaraya or Gobburi Jaggaraju that died on the battlefield. The Nayaks of Madura and Jinjee were the allies of Jaggaraya and the cause espoused by Jaggaraya was not that of the rightful heir Rāmadēvaraya but that of another scion who was sought to be placed on the imperial throne as a protege by Jaggaraya. It is therefore clear that Jaggaraya and his allies were defeated and that Achyuta and Raghunatha the supporters of the rightful heir were the victors in that decisive battle.

I give two more extracts to show that the Nayaks of Madura and Jinjee did not perish on the battle-field. The *Raghunāthābhyu-*

daya (*kāvya*) states that Raghunātha pardoned the lord of Pāṇḍya kingdom. The Nayak of Madura at this period was Muthu Virappa.

धीरोदात्तो दीनरक्षाधुरीणः सद्योभूपस्यह्यकन्यातटाग्रे

प्रौढाङ्कीर्तिं प्राप्तुकामो व्यातानीत् पांड्यक्षोणीपालक प्राणदानम् ॥

Raghunāthābhyudaya-kāvya, Sarga X, ślōka 61.

Another Telugu *kāvya* of the period claims for Yachama Nayak the glory of slaying Jaggarāya and the overpowering of the Nayaks of Madura and Jinjee.

మున్నె తోపూరం జగ్గరాణ్యులు నొంచి

మధురదొర, జెంజిమన్నీని మదమడంచి

తిరుచినాపలిదొరం దోలు తేజముగల

మేటి వెలుగోటి యాచని సాటిగలదె!

Bahulāśvacharitam.

I have shown that Prof. Srinivasachariar's assertions about the battle of Topur are utterly incorrect from the authorities which are unimpeachable. It seems to me that the Professor has drawn his conclusions basing his authority on a book which he never apparently read or consulted.

In the same Memorial Volume appears an article "Ramarya and Vijayanagar" written by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyengar (p.205). All the points brought out by me in the preceding paragraphs are supported by that learned writer. I make no apology to quote below from him.

"When Viceroy Rama the elder brother of Venkata died, Venkata sent the elder of the two sons to succeed his father and kept the younger called Ranga or Sriranga to succeed him. * * * It is a massacre of the royal family that precipitated the war, Jaggaraya having ordered the wholesale murder in cold blood of Ranga and all his family. Before the day appointed for the purpose Yachama Naika managed cleverly to secure the possession of one of the sons of Ranga, his second son by name Rama who was about ten or twelve ... as the arrangement was for a washerman to smuggle the boy out of the fort ... After a number of skirmishes, the war was ultimately decided by the battle of Topur, the village now being called Tohur, quite close to the Grand Anicut on the southeren banks of of the Cauveri. The battle went against the allies, Jagga fell in battle....." (pp. 204-205).

AN INSCRIPTION OF VIRACHODA AT MUKHALINGAM

B. V. KRISHNARAO, M.A., B.L.

This important inscription in Telugu characters is to be found on a pillar to the left of the entrance into the central shrine in the temple of Mukhalingēśvara (Madhukēśvara) temple at Mukhalingam, Parlakimedi taluk, Ganjam district and has been published as No. 1005 in Vol. 5 of the *South Indian Inscriptions* (Texts).

TEXT

- 1 Svasti [||*] Śakavarṣa 10(2)4 nēṇṭi Śrīm-A
- 2 nantavarmacēva(ra) pravardhamā-
- 3 na vijayaīājya saṁvatsa (3)8 nēm-(nē)-
- 4 nṭi Viṣu saṁkrānti-nāṇḍu Śrī Ma-
- 5 dhukēśvaracēvaraku (Vī)rachō
- 6 ḍadēvara Nakarapuvāḍa
- 7 pura (ūri)vākili uttaramunan(cā)-
- 8 chandrākka-sihāyigam beṭṭina naivēdya-
- 9 bhūmi puṭlu 8 ||

TRANSLATION

“Hail! In the Śaka year 10(2)4, augmenting and victorious the (3)8th year of the glorious king Anantavarmadēva, at the time of *Vishu Samkrānti*, king Virachōḍadēva registered a gift of 8 puṭties of land, at the city of Nakara, on the northern side, near the city-gate for the daily *naivēdya* (offering) to the deity Madhukēśvara, which was to last as long as the sun, moon and stars endure.”

The date of the record is read by the epigraphist Rao Bahadur H. Krishnasastri incorrectly. If the Saka year was 1024 it could not be the 38th year of Anantavarman-Chōḍaganga. The king's accession would seem to have taken place in S. 997. So both the Śaka year and the regnal year readings seem to be incorrect. There are no records to show that Virachōḍa lived till S. 1024 or beyond. The Śaka year doubtless reads as 1014 and that year was the 18th year of Anantavarman. Krishna Sastri's reading of the regnal year as (3)8 is not supported by the writing on the stone. What is actually (1)8 had been incorrectly read as (3)8. From this inscription, therefore, it appears that Virachōḍa was in Kalinganagara at the time of *Vishu* (i. e., Tula) Samkrānti, S. 1014 corresponding to about September 26, 1092 A.D.

PALLAVA NANDIVARMAN I AND DRISHTIYISHA

N. VENKATARAMANAYYA, M.A., PH.D.,
University of Madras.

Very little is known about the reign of Nandivarman I with whom the first dynasty of the Pallava kings that ruled in Kāñchī came to an end. The Udayēndiram Plates, the only record of his reign that has come down to posterity, give an account of his lineage. He was the great-grandson of Skandavarman, the grandson of Simhavarman, and the son of Skandavarman; and he ruled subsequent to them at Kāñchī, his ancestral capital.¹ As the inscription is dated in the first year of Nandivarman's reign, it has, naturally, very little to tell us about his achievements. The late Dr. Kielhorn who re-edited these plates in *Epigraphia Indica* expresses the opinion that they are not genuine. Though he assigns them on palaeographical grounds to a later period than the Uruvupalli grant, he declares that they are spurious: "I, myself, am of opinion," says he, "that the present inscription must, on palaeographical grounds, be assigned to a later period than the Uruvupalli grant; and, considering it suspicious that, at different periods, there should have been two Pallava princes, whose fathers and great grandfathers were called Skandavarman and that, moreover, two sets of four consecutive princes should have been described in almost identical terms, and taking also into account the extreme slovenliness of the wording of Nandivarman's grant, I cannot suppress the belief that this grant may be a spurious document, the writer of which took for his model either the Uruvupalli grant of Yuva-mahārāja Vishṇugōpavarman itself or some other *praśasti* of the same prince".² Dr. Fleet has accepted this opinion without comment.³ The objections brought forward by Dr. Kielhorn are not valid. Had he taken into consideration the Hindu practice of naming the children after their grand-parents and the existence of family *praśastis* in the royal archives on which each prince modelled his charters, Kielhorn would not have regarded the identity of the names of parents and grand-parents and the similarity of the phraseology as serious objections against the genuineness of the

1 I. A., VIII, p. 168.

2 E. I. III, p. 144.

3 I. A., XXX, p. 215.

record. Slovenliness on the part of the engraver, and the negligence of the writer are not necessarily the hall-marks of spuriousness. The similarity of the phraseology between the Udayēndiram and the Uruvupalli records noticed by Kielhorn points out, on the contrary, that Nandivarman I and Y.M. Vishṇugōpavarman belonged to the same family; and that the alphabet of the Udayēndiram plates, which, notwithstanding their close affinity to those of the Uruvupalli grant, exhibit characteristics of greater development, show that Nandivarman lived later than the time of Y. M. Vishṇugōpavarman, though they could not have been very far removed from each other. Dr. Fleet places the Uruvupalli grant in the fifth century A.D., and, therefore, the Udayēndiram plates must be assigned to the beginning of the next century.

Apart from the general grounds indicated above, there is ample evidence to show that the information conveyed by the Udayēndiram plates is quite genuine and that the kings mentioned in the inscription did actually rule at Kāñchī during the fifth century of the Christian era. The Penugoṇḍa plates of Mādhava II which Dr. Fleet assigns to the latter half of the fifth century A.D., mention two consecutive Pallava monarchs, Siṃhavarman and Skandavarman, who ruled, in all probability, at Kāñchī in the fifth century.⁴ According to the *Lōkavibhāga*, an early Jaina work which was translated into Sanskrit by Sarvanandin about the middle of the fifth century A. D., the twenty-second regnal year of a Pallava king of Kāñchī called Siṃhavarman corresponds to Śaka 380, i. e. 458 A. D.⁵ The Uruvupalle grant of *Yuvamahārāja* Vishṇugōpavarman, the affinity of which to the Udayēndiram plates has already been noticed, is dated in the 11th regnal year of a king called Siṃhavarman. Since Y. M. Vishṇugōpavarman held the office of *Yuvamahārāja* at the time of the grant, the Siṃhavarman in whose 11th regnal year it was dated must have been the king of the Pallavas and he must have been related to Viṣṇugōpa as father or elder brother. As it is known from the Uruvupalli grant that Vishṇugōpavarman was the son of Skandavarman, Siṃhavarman could not have been his father. It follows from this that Siṃhavarman under whom Y. M. Vishṇugōpavarman held the office of *Yuvārāja* must have been the latter's elder brother. This is corroborated by the evidence of the Western Gaṅga inscriptions of the period. Aryavarman, the son of Mādhava who flourished during the

4 E. I., XIV, p. 336; JRAS., 1915, p. 472.

5 Ibid., p. 476.

first half of the fifth century A. D., had two sons, Mādhava II *alias* Simhavarman, and Vishṇugōpavarman.⁶ The Penugonḍa Plates explicitly state that Āryavarman was installed on his throne by the Pallava king Simhavarman; and he gave to his two sons the names of Simhavarman and Vishṇugōpavarman in honour of his Pallava overlord and his younger brother respectively. Therefore, the rule of the kings called Simhavarman and Skandavarman, the son and grandson respectively of Skandavarman is borne out by the testimony of contemporary records. Now, the Vēlūrpālaiyam plates of Nandivarman III refer to Nandivarman I as one of the immediate predecessors of Simhavishṇu.⁷ The Vāyalūr Pillar inscription of the time of Rājasimha refers to the four kings, Skandavarman, Simhavarman, Skandavarman and Nandivarman, mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates in the same order.⁸ There is therefore no reason for entertaining doubts regarding the genuineness of the Udayēndiram plates or the authenticity of the information furnished by them.

The information that has come down to posterity about the reign of Nandivarman is indeed scanty; nothing is said of him in the inscriptions of his successors. The Vēlūrpālaiyam plates, however, allude to an incident which is said to have taken place during his reign. Nandivarman, according to this record, caused a *Phanindra* (Nāga king) called Dṛishṭivisha to dance before him by the grace of the God Pinākapāṇi (i. e., Siva).⁹ Although Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, the editor of this inscription, translates the term Dṛishṭivishah as a 'powerful snake whose poison was in its eyes',¹⁰ he draws attention to the historical significance of the allusion in a footnote. He points out that the influence of the Nāgas, who were the original rulers of Southern India, continued down to the time of Nandivarman. "In later times", he adds, "the Sindas of Yelburga and Chhindas of Bastar traced their origin to the serpents (Nāgas)"¹¹ It must be noted here that besides the families mentioned by Krishna Sastri, the Sindas of Sindavādi also derived the origin of

6 I follow the genealogy adopted by Rao Bahadur C.R. Krishnamacharlu in his recent article on the Sasankoḷa Plates of the Ganga king Madhavavarman (*E.I.*, XXIV, p. 237), as it appears to be correct and reasonable.

7 *S.I.I.*, II, Part iv, p. 510.

8 Jouveau-Dubreuil: *The Pallavas*, p. 20.

9 *S.I.I.*, II, p. 508.

"*Anugrahād=yēna Pinākapāṇēḥ pranartitō Dṛishṭivishah=Phanindrah*"

10 *Ibid.*, p. 510.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 503, n. 5.

their family to the snakes or the Nāgas. The reference to the Sindas in this connection is, indeed, very helpful, as it indicates the direction in which we have to seek for further information about Dṛishṭivisha. A late fragmentary record of the 12th or 13th century of a Sinda prince whose name is unfortunately lost mentions a chief called Dṛishṭivisha as the progenitor of his family.¹² As no serpent of the name of Dṛishṭivisha is known to mythology, it is not unlikely that the ancestor of the Sinda prince under consideration was not a denizen of the *Nāgalōka* or the serpent-world but a historical person, perhaps identical with the Nāga chief Dṛishṭivisha whom Nandivarman I is said to have brought under his control.

If the identification suggested above is not contrary to reason, an attempt may now be made to envisage the circumstances in which Nandivarman I came into conflict with Dṛishṭivisha, who was evidently the ruler of Sindavāḍi, a district which was situated on the frontier between the Pallava and the Kadamba dominions at this time.¹³ The conflict between Nandivarman I and Dṛishṭivisha was very probably an offshoot of the frequent Pallava-Kadamba wars that seem to have been a characteristic feature of the political life of South India during the fifth and the sixth centuries of the Christian era. The Kadamba territories originally formed an integral part of the Pallava kingdom. They were bestowed by one of the early Pallava kings of Kañchī during the fourth century A. D. on the Brāhman general Mayūraśarman as an appanage for services rendered in the field.¹⁴ Kṛishṇavarman I one of the descendants of Mayūraśarman declared his independence, and made an unsuccessful attempt to shake off the Pallava yoke about the middle of the fifth century A. D.; but he suffered defeat and his army was destroyed by the Pallava chief Nanakkāsa.¹⁵ The Pallavas did not however annex the Kadamba territories owing probably to considerations of policy. The Kadamba dominions which were situated in the extreme north-west of Pallava kingdom could not be easily controlled from Kañchī in the remote south-east.

12 *A.R.E.*, 198 of 1913. The existence of the Sindas in the Cuddapah district is borne out by the testimony of an early epigraph which has on palaeographical grounds to be assigned to the 7th or 8th century A. D. (*M. Mss.* 15-3-37.)

13 The Sindavaḍi Thousand lay in the north-west of the Pallava kingdom and extended perhaps, from Gutti in the Anantapur district to Raichur in the Nizam's dominions. It compromised during the 9th and 10th centuries the Alur and Adoni taluks, and some portions of the Anantapur and Raichur districts (*cf. Fleet, I.A.*, XXX, pp. 257 f.)

14 *E.I.*, VIII, p. 35.

15 *E.C.*, XI, D.G. 161.

Moreover, Vishṇuvarman, son of Kṛishṇavarman, who was perhaps discontented with his father fled from his court, and entered the service of the Pallava *Yuvamahārāja* Vishṇugōpavarman.¹⁶ He was naturally desirous to be recognised as his father's successor. Therefore, it was decided that Vishṇuvarman should be placed on the throne of his father; in accordance with this decision the Pallava Mahārāja Śāntivara or Śāntivara-Varman, accompanied him, and with the help probably of the Western Ganga king Āryavarman subdued the Kadamba territories and crowned Vishṇuvarman as the king of his ancestral dominions.¹⁷ Vishṇuvarman seems to have ruled for five years in peace, when his authority was challenged by Mṛigēśavarman, the son of Kadamba Śāntivarman and the grandson of Kākūsthavarman. In the inscriptions dated in the 4th and 7th regnal years of Mṛigēśavarman's reign, it is said that he obtained sovereignty by the strength of his own arm in the great stress of war.¹⁸ Evidently Mṛigēśa had little or no power at the beginning of his reign; and he had to fight hard to establish his sovereignty. The enemies whom he overcame in the war are mentioned in an inscription of his eighth year. In the Halsi plates dated in that year, it is stated that he uprooted the family of the powerful Gangas and was a fire of destruction of the Pallavas;¹⁹ It is obvious that Mṛigēśa had to contend against the forces of the Pallavas and the Gangas who appear to have joined together to oppose him. Though he claims victory over them, he did not completely succeed in his attempt to overthrow Vishṇuvarman and put an end to the Pallava domination; and it is not unlikely that during the last years of his reign, he even lost his hold on Vaijayanti; for, his son and successor Ravivarman was ruling from Palāsika in the early years of his reign, and Vaijayanti is not mentioned in the inscriptions dated before his fifth year.²⁰ Though Mṛigēśa died while the struggle with the Pallavas was still raging, the latter did not gain

16 He figures in the Uruvupalli grant as the builder of the *devakula* god Vishṇuhara at Kandukura in Muṇḍarashīra (*I.A.*, V, p. 52) for conducting services in which Vishṇugopavarman granted 200 *nivartanas* of land.

17 *MAR*, 1925, p. 98; *JMU.*, XI, p. 254.

18 *I.A.*, VI, p. 37.

'*Sumahati-samara-saṅkaṭē sva-bhuja bala-parākram=āvāpta vipul=aīsvaryaḥ.*' cf. *E.C.*, IV, prat I Hs. 18, p. 136.

19 *I.A.*, VI, p. 25.

Tuṅga.Gaṅga-kul=ōtsādi Pallava-praḷay=ānalah.

20 The two undated Halsi grants state that Ravivarman was ruling from Palāsika (*I.A.*, VI, pp. 25, 27); and the Nilambur plates dated in his fifth year are) the earliest of his records issued from his capital Vijaya-Vaijayanti (*EI*, viii, p 146.

any decisive advantage thereby. Ravivarman defeated the Pallava king Chaṇḍadaṇḍa, and put to death his cousin Viṣṇuvarman within a few years of his accession, and established his supremacy over the entire Kadamba kingdom.²¹ Chaṇḍadaṇḍa has been identified by Sewell with Skandavarman, son of Siṃhavarman I.²² This, however, cannot be accepted, as there are valid grounds for believing that Viṣṇuvarman lived a generation before Skandavarman's rule; for, in the first place, he is mentioned in the Uruvupalli grant dated in the 11th year of Siṃhavarman's reign, as an officer in the service of *Yuvamahārāja* Viṣṇugōpavarman;²³ and secondly, like the Western Ganga king Āryavarman, he had a son called Siṃhavarman whom he very probably named after his Pallava overlord as a mark of his loyalty. It is therefore likely that Chaṇḍadaṇḍa, the ally of Viṣṇuvarman, was identical with Siṃhavarman himself rather than with his son. If this identification commends itself to reason, the defeat of Chaṇḍadaṇḍa and the death of Viṣṇuvarman must be placed about 460 A. D.²⁴ Ravivarman had a long and prosperous

21 *I.A.*, VI, p. 29.

Śrī Viṣṇuvarma-prabhṛit n=narēndrān^s
 nihatya jītvā prithivī-samastām=
 utsādyā Kāñch=īśvara-Chaṇḍadaṇḍam
 Palāsikāyām sam=avasthitas=sah.

22 *Historical Inscriptions*, p. 19.

23 *I.A.*, V, p. 50.

24 Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, in his article on the Sangoli Plates expresses the opinion that Harivarman, the son of Ravivarman, ascended the throne in 538 A.D. (*E.I.*, XVI, pp. 165-66), thereby suggesting that his father who preceded him in the government of the kingdom, and who, according to the Sirsi plates ruled, if Sukthankar's reading of the date is correct, for 35 years commenced his reign in 503 A. D. He attempts to strengthen his position by pressing into service the Madhavavarman-Krishnavarman synchronism mentioned in the Western Ganga copper-plates. He identifies Madhavavarman who was, according to the Ganga copper-plates mentioned above, a sister's husband of the Kadamba king Kṛishnavarman with Madhava II *alias* Siṃhavarman of the Penukoṇḍa plates which Dr. Fleet assigns to 475 A. D., and draws therefrom the inference that Kadamba Kṛishnavarman, the first king of that name, lived also at this time. He assigns Śantivarman whom he takes to have been Kṛishnavarman's elder brother to 470 A. D.; and Harivarman, a great-grandson of the former, to 545 A. D.; which, according to him, coincides with the latest of the three dates (A. D. 507, 526, 545) suggested by the astronomical details furnished in the Sangoli plates.

The date assigned by Mr. Dikshit to the Sangoli plates, it must be pointed out, depends on two assumptions: (i) that Harivarman ruled in the sixth century A.D., and (ii) that Madhava II of the Penukoṇḍa plates was a contemporary of Kṛishnavarman I. Both these assumptions are arbitrary. In the first place, there is no

reign; and after the death of Vishṇuvarman and the defeat of Chaṇḍaṇḍa he seems to have met with little or no opposition. Siṃhavarman, son of Vishṇuvarman, does not seem to have done anything to restore the fortunes of his family; and the Pallavas showed no disposition to interfere in the affairs of the Kadambas. On the death of Ravivarman, he was succeeded by his son Hari-varman who ruled for a period of eight years. His authority was then overthrown by Kṛishṇavarman II, the son of Siṃhavarman mentioned above; probably with the help of the Gangas and the Pallavas. He was holding the district of Vallavi (Tumkur) at the beginning of his reign;²⁵ but some time after his seventh regnal year, he set out on an expedition to conquer the kingdom of Vaijayanti;²⁶ and granted to a Brahman a village in the Sēndraka Vishaya. It is interesting to note that Bh nuśakti, the chief of the Sēndrakas, figures as a subordinate of Harivarman in the Halsi plates II dated in his fifth regnal year.²⁷ The presence of Kṛishṇavarman in the Sēndraka-Vishaya during the course of his expedition against Vaijayanti, and the granting of a village included in the district to a Brahman points unmistakably to its subjugation by him. The Sirsi plates dated in the 19th regnal year of Kṛishṇavarman II clearly show that he succeeded in capturing Vaijayanti.²⁸

The circumstances in which Kṛishṇavarman managed to overthrow the authority of Harivarman who until his fifth year appears to have been the master of his territories are not known. Though Kṛishṇavarman had very little power at the commencement of his reign, he had valuable allies. The Gaṅga-Pallava combination which helped his grandfather was still ready to take up his cause. He was related

(Footnote continued from previous page.)

evidence to show that Harivarman ruled in the 6th century A.D. The evidence palaeography by which alone the date of this inscription has to be decided is no conclusive. The characters of the Sangolī plates resemble those of the inscriptions of Mrigēsa and Ravi; and it is not possible to fix the date of Harivarman definitely with the help of palaeography. Secondly, Madhava who married the sister Kadamba-Kṛishṇavarman was different from Madhava II of the Penukoṇḍa plates. He was the son of Vishṇugopavarman, and grandson of Harivarman and he belonged to a generation later than Madhava II of the Penukoṇḍa plates. The Kadamba prince Kṛishṇavarman whose sister he married must be identified with Kṛishṇavarman II, who overthrew the authority of Harivarman and occupied Vaijayanti, and not with his great-grandfather, Kṛishṇavarman I.

25 E.I., VI, p. 17.

26 E.C., V, Bl. 245. "*Vaijayanti-vijaya-yâtrâm abhiprasthitah*", which Rice wrongly renders into English as 'setting out on an expedition from Vaijayanti'.

27 I.A., VI, pp. 31-32.

28 E.I., XVI, pp. 216-f.

to the Ganga royal family, his sister having married Vishṇugōpa the younger brother of Madhava II-Sinhavarman of the Penukoṇḍa plates. Nandivarman I who succeeded Skandavarman at Kañchī by this time was not perhaps unwilling to offer his help, and re-establish the Pallava supremacy over the Kadamba country. A Pallava expedition was very probably despatched against Vaijayanti to assist Kṛishṇavarman II to re-establish his family in the ancestral capital; and it must have been on this occasion that Nandivarman subdued the frontier district of Sindavāḍi; and reduced its ruler Drishivisha to subjection.

THE YOGAVASISTHA QUOTATIONS IN THE JIVANMUKTIVIVEKA OF VIDYARANYA

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

One of the few well-known Vēdāntic works which make extensive use of the Yogavāsiṣṭha is the *Jīvanmuktivivēka* of Vidyāranya. Quotations of Vāsiṣṭha are not many in the Pañcadaśī; they are mostly anonymous citations as in XII. 83. IX, 3 and XIII, 83, but in some cases (XIII, 21—28), Vasiṣṭha is mentioned. Owing to the perplexing condition of the textual materials pertaining to Yogavāsiṣṭha literature, it is necessary to examine the large number of the Vāsiṣṭha citations in the *JMV*. Vidyāranya makes both long and short quotations, and he sometimes intersperses the verses with his comments. An examination of the quotations show that, except in a few cases, the *JMV* quotes all through from the *Laghuyōga Vāsiṣṭha* of Abhinanda. The following is a table of the quotations with their identifications. The editions referred to are the Ānandāśrama edition of the *JMV* and the Nirnayasāgar Press edition of the *LYV* of 1937.

JMV pp.	LYV	JMV pp.	LYV
147-160	II, 1. 1-17	252	IV. 5. 21, 22, 23
167-176	III. 1. 88-100	256-7	V. 1. 39, 41, 42, 49
202	V. 10. 116, 115, 117	266-7	V. 1. 90-100
233-4	V. 10. 118, 119, 113, 106 <i>a-b</i> 110 <i>c-d</i>	267	V. 10. 107 <i>c-d</i> ; 108 <i>a-b</i> ; V. 10. 10 <i>1c-d</i> ; 102 <i>a</i> and 102 <i>d</i>
205	V. 10. 111, 112	270	V. 3. 50, 52
207	II. 1. 107	272	?
„	V. 10. 114	„	III. 1. 92
209	III. 2. 108, 111, 110, 112	„	V. 2. 36
221	III. 1. 98	„	IV. 5. 26-29
235	V. 10. 48-51	„	V. 6. 70
236	I. 1. 10, 11, 12	„	?
248	V. 2. 42.	273	IV. 2. 14, 15
250	?	„	IV. 5. 42
251	V. 6. 17, 19, 18, 20, 21	„	IV. 5. 43-45 first line. (second line ab- sent in <i>YV</i> & <i>LYV</i>)
„	IV. 5. 20		

JMV	LYV	JMV	LYV
pp.		pp.	
273-4	V. 1. 60-64	298	V. 10. 6
280	V. 1. 53-55	299-300	V. 6. 29, 35-32, 109-115
„	IV. 4. 1-5		
„	IV. 2. 23, 22	305	V. 3. 36-38
281	IV. 2. 18-20	309	V. 9. 72
„	V. 5. 92	„	V. 1. 60
282	V. 10. 126, 127 (first half only), 128-131	318	IV. 5. 37-40, 35
		319	VI. 9. 447-450
283	V. 10. 38, 40 (first half) 41 (second half)	„	V. 4. 92-93, 106-107
284	?	321	V. 10. 15, 16, 18, 19c and 22d, 20-22 (23a-b left out), 23-24, 24-25, (25b left out) 26, 27, 32.
„	V. 10. 53		
284-85	V. 10. 65, 64		
285	V. 10. 122, 123, 121	322	III. 9. 126
„	V. 10. 57, 54, 55	326-7	I. 3. 17-18, 43-46, 47-53
„	VI. 2. 18	345-6	III. 9. 13-23
288	?	346-7	VI. 15. 70-71 b, 73-75, 76, 77, 79
291	VI. 1. 211, 216		
297	V. 10. 1	349-50	VI. 15. 57-61
„	V. 10. 6 b	354	VI. 16. 34
298	V. 10. 2 (second half only) 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	358	V. 1. 9-11; V. 2. 36; II. 1. 62, 66
„	IV. 5. 34	360	V. 7. 5-9, 24, 10-11
„	V. 9. 66, 67	363	VI. 14. 1-6

It can be seen that I could not identify just five quotations. The identifications disclose these facts:

1. Vidyāranya's quotations do not have the verses in the same order as in the *LYV* in some cases; earlier verses occur later and distant verses are put together, the interlying verses being left out.

2. A single unit of quotation contain verses belonging to different chapters.

3. Verses are made by joining halves and quarters of different verses: on p. 267, the *JMV* (in the last quotation) makes two verses out of *LYV* V. 10. 7 second half and 8 first half and *LYV* V. 10. 101 second half and 102 first quarter and 102 last quarter. On p. 297 of *JMV*, *LYV* V. 10. 1 is first quoted, it is followed by the first line of V. 10. 2 to which is added a second

line the former part of which is not found in the LYV or the YV and the latter part of which is the second quarter of V. 10. 6. Similarly on p. 32; here the quotation is made out of LYV V. 10. 15, 16 (17 left out), 18 a-o, 19 a with the last quarter made out of 19c and 21d.

This analysis would dispose one to think that Vidyāranya is citing from a text which is a further condensation of Abhinanda's LYV. But this conclusion does not seem necessary. For, in some of his quotations Vidyāranya brings together on one idea verses found in different places; in such cases an 'Iti' marks off each set of quotations, as for instance on pp. 272, 298, 309. Some of the quotations in which we see long jumps may be due to scribes' omission of these 'Iti's. That such 'Iti's are sometimes omitted by the scribe is clear from a quotation on p. 359 of the JMV where two texts are quoted in a bloc from two different sources, with only one 'Iti' at the end, a circumstance which will mislead one to suppose that there are missing verses in the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Such 'Iti's are possible on pp. 248, 358. Other cases of jump, short or long, are explainable by the possibility of Vidyāranya himself deliberately making the passages shorter for quotation purposes. If Vidyāranya did attempt at such brevity for quotation purposes, we can understand why he made also verses out of distant *Pādas* and *Ardhas* of different verses. The change in verse-order may also have been done to suit his needs. The above explanations are resorted to because in all the cases except those noted above, the quotations agree completely with the LYV regarding the verses and their order.

In his remark on the very first Vāsiṣṭha quotation in the JMV, Acyutarāya Moḍaka says that Vidyāranya is quoting from the *Madhyavāsiṣṭha*. According to Acyutarāya the YV is *Brhad Vāsiṣṭha*, Abhinanda's condensation is *Madhya Vāsiṣṭha* and perhaps the *Laghu Vāsiṣṭha* will be the condensation in ten chapters on which Mahīdhara has commented. The second quotation (p. 167) is also identified by Moḍaka as from the *Madhya Vāsiṣṭha*. The third instalment of quotation on p. 202 has this introductory remark of Vidyāranya "अतएव वा रा अवसाने." These verses however occur not at the end of the *Vāsiṣṭha*, but at the end of the *Upasama prakarna* of the *Vāsiṣṭha*. The editor points out that two Mss. read "वा रा उपशमे प्रकरणस्य अवसाने" In view of the quotations in the JMY from the VI, the *Nirvāṇa prakarna*, it is not possible to imagine that Vidyāranya's YV stopped with *Upasama prakarna*.

On p. 250 Vidyāranya quotes a line बाध्यबाध्यकता यान्ति कल्लोला इव सागरे with reference to the three *gunas*. Acyutarāya remarks that this is a quotation from the *Brhad* YV, but I am not able to verify this information.

The quotations on p. 282 are clumsy, as Acyutarāya also points out. An explanation which strikes me is that the portion from मनो विलयेहेतुनाम् to मनस्तेन विलीयते must be part of the *JMV* forming a metrical *Avatārika* for the quotation from the *LYV*. The prose *Avatārika* now found here अत एव वसिष्ठ आह will have to be removed. वसिष्ठेन कृतं etc. in the midst of the passage is otherwise not explainable and these lines occur neither in the *LYV* nor in the *YV*.

The question of these quotations in the *JMV* is further complicated by examples of interpolated additional quotations, which the editor has noted on pp. 298, 822, 346 and 354.

As I have mentioned, I am unable to locate in the *LYV* or in any of the likely places in the *YV* five quotations in the *JMV*, the first of which is from the *YV* according to Acyutarāya. These five quotations are on pp. 250, 272, 288 and 346. Instead of assuming that Vidyāranya quotes from the *Brhad* Y. V. also, one can justifiably assume that there are omissions in the N.S. Press text of the *LYV*. Certainly the N. S. Press text is defective in many respects.

READINGS

The N. S. Press text of the *LYV*, like that of *YV* of the same press, has many mistakes. In some cases, we can correct the *YV* with the aid of the *LYV*. And in both the *YV* and the *LYV* correct readings are found in the commentaries though the editors have not seen this fact. A work like the *JMV* which quotes profusely can also be used for collation purposes. The *JMV* offers a number of different readings. I note here the readings according to the N. S. Press edition of the *LYV* and the *JMV*.

LYV

JMV

II	1 सर्वदा सर्वमेवह	सर्वमेव हि सदा
"	4 तथैव तिष्ठामि मुने	मुने तथैव तिष्ठामि
"	7 तत्क्रमेण शुभेनैव	तत्क्रमेणाशु तेनैव (besides the other reading which is found in one Ms.)
"	10 अवतारयेत्	अवतारय

LYV

JMV

II	13	प्रागभ्यासात्	द्रागभ्यासात्
			(Ātmasukha notes both readings).
		„ वासनोदयः	वासना उदयम् (P. 157)
	16	निरोधिना	निराधिना (P. 160)
	17	बुद्ध्या	शुद्धाया (f.n. Buddhya also p.160)
III	1	89 शास्त्रगया	शास्त्रजया (P. 167)
	96	शान्तसंसारकलोलः	शान्तसंसारकलनः (P. 173)
	„	„ सचिन्तः -निश्चिन्तः	सचित्तः -निश्चितः (P- 173)
	99	वेतरः	नेतरः (P. 175)
V	10	116 समभ्यस्ताः	चिराभ्यस्ताः (P. 202)
	„	„ फलदा मुनेः	फलदायिनः } („) फलदा इमे }
	115	तत्त्वसंप्राप्तिः	पदसंप्राप्तिः („)
	117	चिरमप्यलम्	चिरमप्यलम् } („) चिरयत्नतः }
	„	„ संकीर्तिता इव	संकलिता इव („)
	113	स्थितान्यतः	स्थितानि हि (P. 204)
	111	न तावच्चित्तसंक्षयः	तावच्चित्तशमः कुतः (P. 205)
	114	विवेकतः	विवेकिना (P. 207)
	„	„ कृत्वा	त्यक्त्वा (P. 208)
III	2	108 तदभ्यासम्	ज्ञानाभ्यासम् (P. 209)
	111	विदुः परे	विदुः परम् („)
	110	ते ब्रह्माभ्यासिनः स्थिराः	तेऽप्यात्राभ्यासिनः स्थिताः (P. 209)
	112	बलोदिता	घनोदिता } (P. 209) नवोदिता }
V	10	48 दृढभावनया	दृढभावनया } (P. 235) दृढवासनया } (The Second reading must be rejected).
I	1	10 जन्मनो हेतुः	जन्महेतुस्यात् (P. 236)
	11	पुनर्जन्मकरी	Same and } („) जन्ममृत्युकरी }
IV	5	17 श्रमांसेनेव पुक्कसी	सश्रमांसेव पुक्कसी (P. 248)
V	6	17 देहमात्रास्थया धिया	देहभावनया तथा (P. 251)

„	6	21 आश्वासनेन	आस्थादानेन (P. 251) (The metaphor of snake makes this reading wrong).
IV	5	20 वासनाम्	वासनाः (P. 251)
„	„	21 विषयवासिताः *1	विषयवासनाः (P. 252)
„	„	23 अथ परित्यज्य *1	अन्तः परित्यज्य („)
IV	5	23 स्थिरसमाधानः	स्थिरसमासीनः (P. 252)
V	1	41 मम	तव (P. 256)
„	„	49 सन्ति	नष्टाः (P. 257)
I	2	91 विलोचनम्	विलोचने (P. 266)
„	„	94 नरान्	नरम् („)
„	„	97 -रज्जौ	-रज्जुः („)
V	10	107 वासनानां संपरित्यागे	वासनानां परित्यागे (P. 267)
„	„	„ करोषि वा	करोष्यलम् („)
„	„	„ तत्ते	तत्ते and तास्ते („)
„	„	102 तत्त्वज्ञ	चेत्तर्हि („)
V	3	50 अस्ति कियन्मात्रम्	अस्तीह किमात्रम् (P. 270)
„	„	„ किमयमेव वा	किमयमेव च („)
„	„	„ कोटहं कस्त्वं किमेते वा	कस्त्वं कोटहं क एते वा („)
„	„	52 अस्ति हि	अस्तहि („)
„	1	53 -शाखात्म	शाखाग्र (P. 280)
„	„	54 -उपशमेन तु	उपशमे न तत् („)
„	„	55 मनो नामेह हन्मि	मना नाम निहन्मि („)
VI	4	1 सर्वोपद्रवकारिणः	सर्वोपद्रवदायिनः („)
„	2	20 आगत मुदितं [चित्तम्]	अगमच्चन्द्रवदुदितम् (P. 281)
V	5	92 किलास्येह	किलास्येदम् (P. 281)
V	10	53 दृढभ्यासम्	दृढाभ्यास- (P. 284)
„	„	123 निस्सङ्ग-	असङ्ग- (P. 285)
VI	2	18 न शास्त्राणि	न मित्राणि („)
VI	1	211 अपानेऽस्तं गते	अपाने स्तंभितः (P. 291)
V	10	3 आत्मदृक् स्वयम्	आत्ममात्रदृक् (P. 298)
V	10	9 मग्नचित्ते न	मग्नचित्तेन („)
V	9	66 सुतप्ते	सुतीक्ष्णे („)
V	6	29 त्यक्तमनने	मुक्तमनने (P. 299)
„	„	35 वने	बलात् („)

* 1. Some mss have the same readings as are found in the N.S.LYV.

LYV			JMV	
V	6	35 पुनस्तुपविश्य	पुनरुपविश्य	(P. 299)
„	„	109 अगच्छतः	आगच्छतः	(„)
„	„	110 परे लूने	समालीने	(„)
„	„	„ हृदयान्तेर	हृदयाम्वरे	(„)
„	„	111 तदापि	तमपि	(„)
„	„	„ स्वान्तर्विवस्वता	ज्ञानविवस्वता	(„)
„	„	„ कान्तम्	स्वान्ते	(„)
V	3	36 सत्क्रमे	सङ्क्रमः	(P. 305)
„	„	37 भोगैः प्रपूरयेत्	भोगेन पूरयेत्	(„)
V	9	72 चित्तनाशाय	चित्तनाशस्य	(P. 309)
VI	1	60 परमः शिवः	परमेश्वरः	(„)
IV	5	37 प्रतिमानसः	शान्तमानसः	(P. 318)
„	„	38 विश्वम्	सर्वम्	(„)
„	„	39 अपि	हि	(„)
„	„	„ त्वत्तश्चात्मा	तथेहात्मा	(„)
„	„	„ क्वचित्	जगत्	(„)
„	„	40 स्थितम्	ततः or ततम्	(„)
VI	9	450 नृपः	बुधः	(P. 319)
V	4	106 उदाहरन्	उदाहरत्	(P. 319)
„	„	„ प्रद्वमानः	प्रद्वमा च	(„)
„	„	107 स प्रबुद्धात्मा	संप्रबुद्धात्मा	(„)
„	10	15 मुनेः	मुने	(P. 321)
„	„	16 स्वरूपः	सरूपः	(„)
„	„	26 विदेहमुक्तः	विदेहमुक्तौ	(„)
„	„	27 विदेहमुक्ते विमले	विदेहमुक्तावमले	(P. 322)
„	„	32 एकसुप्तम्	एकरूपम्	(„)
III	9	126 अर्थकार्येण	अर्थकारेण	(„)
I	3	18 अन्तः	अत्र	(P. 326)
„	„	„ ज्ञातज्ञेये	ज्ञातज्ञेया	(„)
„	„	46 भ्रमता	भ्रामितम्	(P. 327)
„	„	49 तेन	मुने	(„)
„	„	„ यस्य	स्वस्य	(„)
VI	15	58 मेरुपर्वतकुञ्जेषु	मेरुपर्वतकुञ्जेषु	(P. 349)
„	„	59 ततः	मुक्ते	(„)

		LYV		JMV
VI	15	59 पुरा कृते	पराकृते	(P. 349)
„	„	61 अभ्यस्तं	अभ्यस्त	(P. 350)
„	„	„ भूमिक्रमं	भूमित्रयम्	(„)
„	„	„ दृष्ट्वा	स्पृष्ट्वा	(„)
„	„	„ उपरि पतन्ति	परि पतन्ति	(„)
„	16	34 सलिलैः	सलिले	(P. 354)
„	„	„ कृतं सहस्रम्	सहस्रमिष्टम्	(„)
V	1	9 तस्य चैव	तमाश्चैव	(P. 358)
„	2	36 स्थितम्	स्थितः	(„)
„	„	„ तेन	येन	(„)
„	„	„ कलान्वितः	फलान्वितः	(„)
V	7	8 मम न	न मम	(P. 360)
„	„	„ व्यवहारेस्थितः कश्चित्	कश्चित्संव्यवहारस्थः	(„)
„	„	„ ध्यानव्यवस्थितः	ध्यान परायणः	(„)
„	„	10 यत्	तु	(„)
VI	14	1 हि	अपि	(P. 363)
„	„	5 एषः	एकः	(„)

A few very minor differences and patent mistakes in the *JMV* are omitted and even in the above list there are a few variants of the *JMY* which are obviously wrong.

Of the variants noted above, the *JMV* readings representing the following numbers agree with readings available in the N. S. Press edition of the full *Yōgavāsistha*: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 30, 32, 33, 40, 41, 47, 51-53, 60, 66, 68, 69, 84, 85, 92, 96, 99, 102, 105, 107, 110. See N. S. Press edition of the *YV* pp. 81, 92, 93, 93, 93, 147, 147, 147, 764, 764, 764, 185, 537, 665, 538, 47, 47, 606, 370, 370, 488, 753, 679, 674, 637, 637, 73, 1053, 1053, 1053, 531, 585, 685 respectively.

In the remaining cases, some show agreement between the readings in the *LYV* and the full *YV* in the N. S. Press edition; and some cases there are in which neither the *LYV* readings nor the *JMV* readings correspond to the *YV* readings. A strange phenomenon to be noted is that with respect to a single verse, the *YV* text agrees on one word with *LYV*, and on another with the *JMV* citation.

THE SORAS AND THEIR COUNTRY

Chapter II

G. V. SITAPATI, B.A.,L.T.

In this and the subsequent articles, I shall enter into a detailed discussion of the topics relating to the Ethnography of the Soras.

THE SORA SUB-DIVISIONS

The following is a tentative or provisional list of sub divisions among the Soras—not an accurate classification. A thorough investigation is yet to be made to ascertain the origin, nature and extent of the sub divisions.

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Ar'sid-Sōr' | 10. Jur'āi-Sōr' | 18. Mā'la-Sōr' |
| 2. Basēd'-Sōr' | 11. Kām'pu-Sōr' | 19. Mā'ra-Sōr' |
| (or Baseng'-Sōr) | 12. Kindāl'-Sōr' | 30. Mon'i-Sūr |
| 3. Bim'ma-Sōr | 13. Kimsēd'-Sōr | 21. Mū li-Sōr |
| 4. Bō'bibbilli-Sōr | (or Kisser'-Sōr | 22. Mut'ta-Sōr |
| 5. Don'diya- | 14. Kud umba-Sōr | 23. Sar'da-Sōr |
| 6. Gon'tora Sōr | 15. Kum'bi-Sōr | 24. Sud'dā-Sōr |
| 7. Jad'u-Sōr | 16. Lam'ba lanjia-Sōr | 25. Tekkali-Sōr |
| 8. Jāro-Sōr | 17. Luang-Sōr | |
| 9. Jā'ti-Sōr | (or Luara-Sōr) | |

Of these sub divisions the most extensive and numerically strong one is that of the Jāti Sōras. They are very proud of their name because it implies *Savara par excellence*. Jāti is not a word of the Sōra language. It is apparently a Sanskrit word which the Sōras must have borrowed at a stage when they had to distinguish themselves from other classes or sub divisions of Sōras to whom they claimed to be superior in having maintained the purity of their race, language, religion, customs and manners. Contact with their Hindu neighbours in the plains—prominently the Telugus—must have inspired their minds to notions of racial superiority among castes and tribes. The Telugu Brahman, for example, who is a strict vegetarian regards himself as superior to the Oriya or the North Indian Brahman who eats fish and flesh. Among the Oriyas themselves there are some castes, the members of which, though they eat fish and flesh, do not eat egg or fowl; and they regard themselves superior to those that eat them. Those that eat the flesh of the jungle fowl and the wild hog look down

upon those that eat the flesh of the domesticated fowl and the swine. With such notions of racial superiority, the Jāti Sōras who though they eat the flesh of the buffalo and the pig do not eat the flesh of the ox or the cow regard themselves as superior to those that eat them.

The Based (or Baseng), Bimma, Bobilli, K mpu, Kudumba, Tekkali and some among the Sudda Soras are, in varying degrees, Hinduised Soras and they have to some extent adopted the customs of the Hindus of the plains. The Sudda Soras have been partly Oriyaised and the rest Teluguised. These Soras have as a result of their intimate contact with the Hindus of the plains, given up eating the flesh of the cow or the buffalo and have been in touch with the civilisation of the plains. They, therefore, regard themselves as superior to the Soras of the hills, superior even to the Jāti Sōras (*Sōra par excellence*). But the Sōras of the hills—the Jāti Soras as well as the others, far from admitting their racial superiority look down upon them as Soras that have lost their racial and linguistic purity and surrendered their religious principles, customs and manners.

Arsi(d) Soras:—*Arsi-n* is a Sora word, meaning baboon. Since there is no trace of totemism among the Soras, this cannot be regarded as a totemic appellation. How the name came to be applied to these Soras is not clear. They could not offer any clear explanation for the name. Some Jāti Soras told me that the *Arsi(d)* Soras so called because they freely ate baboons and when I said that I noticed some Jāti Soras also eating baboons they remarked that it was really an “*ersi*” meaning taboo and sin and if some of their community ate them it was part of the recent relaxation of old customs. There is also another and more probable explanation for the origin of this appellation. The Oriyas call them *Lambu-lanjiya* (long-tailed Soras referring to the two ends of the waist cloth which the men of this community wear. The waist cloth about six inches wide and three to four yards long is so passed over the genitals and between the buttocks and wound round the waist twice or thrice, that the two ends, each a cubit long, hang from the waist, one in front serving as an additional cover to the genitals and the other behind the buttocks. As the ends of the waist cloth—especially the latter look like the tails of a baboon—the Oriyas and the other neighbours might have called them *Lamba-lanjiya* Soras. The same fact might have given rise to the name, *Arsi(d)* meaning a baboon.

Among the designs and other drawings on the walls of the huts of the Soras, we find pictures of the long-tailed baboons more profusely in the villages of the Arsid Soras than elsewhere in the Sora country. This shows that the Arsid Soras, far from feeling in any way insulted by this appellation, take delight in it. I once visited an Arsid Sora village near Gunupur and enquired into the origin of their name. The Soras there said in the usual way "who knows?" An old man, however, said in a humourous vein, "baboons are our elder cousins, nearest and dearest to us; we live in the same forests". "Do you worship them?" I said. "Yes", he said in the same humourous vein, "by eating them". Of all the Sora sub divisions this is the only tribe that has taken to weaving cotton cloth. They get the yarn from the plains.

Jadu Soras:—*Jadu* is a Sora word used to denote the inaccessible interior of the Sora country beyond Kollakōt and Puitasing.

The *Jadu Soras* have the typical Mongoloid features more prominently than the *Jati Soras* and the racial purity is really much stronger in them than among the *Jati Soras* but the *Jati Soras* regard themselves as higher because they abstain from eating the flesh of the cow while the *Jadu Soras* eat it.

Kindal Soras are basket makers. (*Kindal* is a Sora word meaning basket.)

Kumbi Soras are pot makers. (The word *Kumbi* comes through the Oriyas from the Sanskrit word *kumbha*, meaning pot.)

Luang or *Luara Soras* and *Gontara Soras* are workers in metals; the former in iron and the latter in brass and bell metal. *Luang* or *Luara* comes from Sanskrit *loha*, literally metal and derivatively meaning iron and *Gontara* from Sanskrit *ghanta*, meaning literally bell and derivatively bell metal.

The origin of the names of some of the partly Hinduised Soras is very interesting. *Based* (variants—*Basud*, *Basid*) is a Sora word meaning salt. *Baseng* is a compound word (*Based*=salt and *aseng*=side) meaning south. The idea of the Soras is that the salt country, the coastal strip where salt is produced lies to the south of the Sora country. It is really to the south-east but not exactly to the south of the Sora country. As the Telugus and others of the plains live here, the Soras living on the border land of the Sora country towards the coastal strip are known as *Based Soras* or *Baseng Soras* and the implication is that they are partly Hinduised Soras. *Kmpu* represents the older pronunciation of the modern Telugu word *Kāpu* which now denotes a *Sūdra* Telugu caste but,

formerly meant a cultivation. K mpu were the earliest Telugus with whom the Soras came into contact for the first time and consequently K mpu in Sora language denotes Telugu and though the pronunciation of Kāmpu has gradually changed into Kāpu (with a half nasal ā) and kāpu in the Telugu country, the older pronunciation is maintained by the Soras who borrowed the word.* This pronunciation shows that the Soras came into contact with the Telugus when the pronunciation to the Telugu language was K mpu. The Soras that live in the vicinity of the Telugus are known as Kāmpa Soras. Bobilli add Bimma seem to be the names of a few sub divisions of Based or Baseng and Kāmpu class of Soras. Tekkali Soras are, as the name clearly indicates, the Soras that have been long settled in Tekkali taluk. Sudda Soras are in the vicinity of Mahēndragiri; they are partly Oriyaised; some of them have adopted the Oriya methods of worship though they have not entirely given up their own religious practices. Since Kudumba Soras are also pot makers like Kumbi Soras, I am led to suppose that Kumbi and Kudumba are cognate words, the latter having an influx *ad* changing into *ud* for the sake of vowel harmony. (*Vide* under Kumbi).

Some of these partly Hinduised Soras have given up eating the flesh of the pig also. As observed above, the superiority of a class is measured with reference to the abstinence from eating the flesh of the ape, the cow, the ox, the buffalo and the pig. Arsid Soras eat the flesh of all these animals. The other (except the Jāti and the partly Hinduised Soras) eat the flesh of the cow, the ox, the buffalo and the pig; J ti Soras eat the flesh of the buffalo and the pig; most of the partly Hinduised Soras eat the flesh of the pig and some have given up eating the flesh of even the pig. A Sora who is proud of his superiority refuses to eat the food or to drink the water touched by a Sora of a class considered as inferior to his.

A more careful investigation of these tribes is not possible unless the investigator makes an exclusive tour in the Sora country and spends considerable time in it because some of the tribes are scattered and live in places which are not easily accessible.

Since the Jāti Soras belong to the most extensive and numerically strong sub division, my investigation has been mostly

* Cf. This pronunciation of Company (*i.e.*, the East India Company) as Kumpani still heard in India it represents the pronunciation of the Elizabethan age in England when the Indians heard the word for the first time.

confined to a study of the Soras of this sub division. The ethnographic accounts which I present in my articles will, therefore, generally refer to the Jati Soras. I shall, however, refer to the life of the Soras of the other sub divisions wherever it is necessary and possible for me to do so.

DRESS

The typical dress of a Sora man consists of three pieces of cloth (1) a waist cloth (2) a turban cloth and (3) an upper cloth. The waist cloth is five to six inches wide and six to nine feet long. It has coloured borders at the two ends and red coloured and clus-tened fringes of cotton thread at the front end. While the Arsid Soras let hang both the ends one before and the other behind, the Soras of other classes tuck up the end behind their buttocks and allow the front end to hang though not so far down as the Arsid Soras do. Old men and poor people wear only a smaller piece enough to pass between the legs and round the waist once. The turban cloth varies in quality and size with the social status and economic condition of the man, also with the occasion. A poor man's head dress ordinarily consists of any piece of their cloth which is at least six inches wide and four feet long—enough to pass round the head in coils and cover up the middle tuft of hair. A man of well-to-do circumstances has a bigger turban with a red or grey or yellow coloured cloth. The Soras are generally fond of having their turbans conical in shape, and they do so by keeping the middle tuft of hair stand straight on the head with the aid of a hair pin and by passing the cloth round the head in coils and round the tuft in spiral windings up to the top of the tuft. Some Soras like to have big turbans similar to those worn by the Telugu officials of the previous generation*; (3) an upper cloth consisting of a large sheet of cloth or two sheets joined and stitched together. This is intended to serve as a cover over the body. When the weather is fine, the Sora does not care to put it on but when he has to go to a distant place, he does invariably carry it on his shoulders as a provision against cold winds or to use it as a bed sheet. On festive occasions, the man appears in his picturesque chequered gala dress with waving tufts of feathers tucked in at the top of his turban.

The typical dress of a Sora woman consists of two pieces of cloth—(1) a thick skirt (loin cloth) about two feet broad and four feet long, which is passed round the waist, buttocks and the thighs,

* (Vide under Clothing my previous article)

leaving quite bare, the upper part of the body above the waist and the lower part of the legs below the thighs; (2) an upper cloth as in the case of men. The woman has an additional use for this upper cloth when she has to carry her baby. She passes the cloth over her shoulders and through her arm pits and making up a fold into a sling, keeps her baby in it and bundles it upon her back. She never takes any care to see if her breasts are covered or exposed to the public gaze. The idea of covering up the breasts is of very recent origin among the Soras who frequently visit the plains and even now they are very indifferent. In her village, the Sora woman rarely puts on the upper garment. On festive occasions, she takes special care to see that her loin cloth and upper garment are neat and tidy and her hair is well dressed. The travelling kit of a Sora woman consists of an upper garment and a pumpkin bowl or a calabash.

ORNAMENTS AND DECORATION

The Sora woman wears no head dress but the dressing of the hair is picturesque. She applies to her hair Karanja oil (oil of the seeds of the gloomy tree —*authocymus pictorius*) or the gingelly oil (oil of the seeds of *sesamum indicum*) and combs the hair neatly; collects all the hair into a big knot and tucks it up so that it bulges into a round ball to the left side at the back of the head. The hair pin (usually that made of brass) is passed through the braid to keep it intact. The forelocks are then dressed up towards the crown of the head and a headband that passes round the forehead prevents forelocks from falling upon and covering up the forehead. The head-bands used vary with the taste of the individual. Some head-bands consist merely of strong black fibres; some others are pieces of cloth, coloured black, on which several strings of tiny black glass beads are laid flat; some others are made of strips of the Indian date leaf, twisted and plaited dexterously. The woman's head is next loaded with several ornaments such as brass chains and brass flowers. Two brass chains, one on either side of the parting line of hair, pass along the head and are held up by the hooked ends, fastened into the hair; each looks like the crescent of the moon. The brass flowers are of various sizes; each has, on the upper side, a floral design and on the inner side a small coiled wire which when turned down on the head gets into the hair and keeps the flower intact.

Each of the two ears of a Sora woman is pierced with fifteen to twenty holes all along the helix and through each of

these holes an ear-ring is passed. In the case of some women even the tragus (a small cartilaginous eminence at the entrance of the external ear) is pierced with a hole and an ear-ring is passed through it. The holes of the ears are perforated and the aperture is gradually elongated very often to such an enormous degree that the weaver's wrist can easily pass through it. The methods adopted to increase the size of the aperture show the amount of care, attention and patience of the Sora belle, to enhance her beauty according to the notions of the Soras. A very fine and thin piece of broom-stick of the size of a pin if inserted on the first day of the aperture and the number of such pieces is gradually increased. I noticed a woman inserting in the aperture a small bundle of about one hundred such pieces and the woman told me that she would further increase the size of the aperture until she could insert a wooden disc which she then brought from her house and showed me; it was nearly two inches in diameter and half an inch thick and looked like a piece on the carroms board. As an alternative to the wooden disc a brass spiral ring attached to a brass pin that stands along the rim of the helix is inserted into the distended aperture so that the outer rim of the lobe looks like an expanded and polished rubber strap and touches the shoulders. There are the instances of the lobes hanging loose on the shoulders and marring the beauty of the woman.

The depressed portions of both the alae and the septum of the nose are each pierced with a hole and adorned with a thick brass ring. There is slight difference between the rings of the alae and the ring of the septum; while the former are flat and round, the latter is a little thick and heart shaped.

The neck of a Sora belle is often and especially on festive occasions very heavily burdened with various neeklaces and rosaries of beads. She wears brass chains which are patterned on bunches of small berries and rosaries of red beads and glass pearls far more profusely than the Sora youth; in fact a mass of these necklaces and rosaries comes up to the neck and the chest and covers a large part of the breasts. What appears to be a number of rosaries is, after all, only one long rosary wound round the neck a number of times so that each succeeding coil gets smaller and fits into the previous coil and the last coil is just large enough to pass through the head.

The waist band is artistically decorated with rows of tiny black glass beads laid flat one below the other, the number of rows varying from thirty to fifty.

On each hand, the Sora woman wears a pair of brass or aluminium armlets in the middle part of the arm, three or four pairs of wristlets and finger rings on each of the four fingers. The armlets are inlaid with beautiful designs.

On each leg she has a bronze or nickel or aluminium anklet and on each of the small toes, a toe ring; the ring of the middle toe has a curved top. The wife of the Gamang (the village chief) has the privilege of wearing conspicuously large anklet as a mark of distinction.

The brass ornaments are made by the Gontara Soras but the nickel and aluminium ornaments are purchased in the markets either in those that have been opened in the Sora country or in the markets of the plains. A few Soras have just recently learnt to make rings (ear, nose and finger rings) of silver. I saw one Sora who was making silver rings. He is a Luara-Sora living in a village near Serung. He makes the rings to order and with the silver of the silver coin that is given him by those who give him the order. He charges for his labour at the rate of two annas per rupee.

The Sora youth also pays some attention to his dress, ornaments and decoration. On festive occasions where he is expected to take part in a group dance, he takes special care to see that his dress, ornaments and decoration attract the attention of the party—especially of the belles that attend it. In addition to the dress, described above he has a large bunch of white feathers of the jungle birds, a peacock's feather and a few tail feathers of the jungle cock generally stuck in the knot of the hair and rising above the tapering head dress, waving up and down and presenting a very graceful appearance as he walks along his way. A flat piece of brass or wood of about eight inches in length with a flat button shaped disc of about two inches in diameter on the top is also used, not primarily as a head ornament but mainly to make the hair knot stiff and firm. At the time of dancing, the Sora youth wears the waist cloth like the Arsid Sora so that the back end also is allowed to hang; but the hanging pieces are short and not so long as those of the Arsid Soras.

Each of the two ears of the Sora youth is pierced with one hole at the top most part of the helix and one hole in the lobe and ear-rings made of brass are worn, one in each of these holes and from one of these ear rings of each ear hangs a pendant which generally consists of a small chain of about two inches in length. The chain consists of 8 to 10 tiny brass rings. The place of these

pendants varies with the taste of the individual. Some men have their pendants on both sides hanging from the top-most part of the helix; some others have them hanging from the lobes on either side; some others have the pendant of one ear from the helix and that of the other ear from the lobe. The ear-rings to which pendants are attached are small; practically they form part of the pendants. The ear-rings to which pendants are not attached are larger in size. Those of the lobes are generally thicker in the lower part than those of the helix.

A small brass nose-ring is passed through the alae of the right nostril.

Round the neck are generally a nickel or aluminium neck-ring, necklaces and rosaries of small beads. The number of brass necklaces varies from one to five but the rosaries of beads are sometimes as many as thirty or one large rosary passed round the neck thirty times in graded coils.

On each hand, there are one or two pairs of wristlets and two or three finger rings which are made of brass or nickel or aluminium.

Soras generally use for the waist band a thick plaited wire made of brass and recently some are using wires made of silver.

A Sora beau intending to go for a dance and eager to exhibit his full set of necklaces and beads does not care for the upper garment which may also hinder the easy movements at the dance. He wears all the ornaments he has and carries with him a sword or battle axe in his right hand and bow and arrows in his left hand. Sometimes he holds up open the modern umbrella which he has learnt to use now and moves it gracefully in conformity with the rhythmic paces of dancing.

There is marked difference between the Hill Soras and the partly Hinduised Soras both in dress and ornaments and decoration. The latter put on a larger piece of cloth, a part of which passing round the loins, covers the thighs and buttocks up to the knees and the other passing over the shoulders covers the breasts; some of the Oriyaised Sora women lift up the cloth over the shoulders so as to cover the back of the head also. The partly Hinduised Sora men wear a larger piece of cloth which covers the thighs and buttocks from the waist to the knees; the front end is folded four or five times and allowed to hang from the waist to the knees and the back end is drawn up between the thighs and tucked in at the back. They put on a small upper garment and do not generally wear the headdress or put on any feathers on the top knot of the

hair. When they wear a head dress, it is in the way in which the low caste Hindus do on ordinary occasions.

As regards ornaments, neither the men nor the women of the partly Hinduised Soras wear the rosaries of beads of which the Hill Soras are so fond. The men wear a few brass necklaces or chains and the women have, round their neck, a black string with a few red coral like beads. The ears of the women are pierced with one or two holes on the helix and one hole in the lobe and are adorned with the ear rings or studs. The women have nose ornaments similar to those worn by the Hill Sora women; but the men have only one hole through the left nostril and a small brass or aluminium ring passing through it. When asked if the men of his community have a nose ring to the right nostril, a Kāpu Sora said "Never; we are not Hill Soras to have a ring on our right nostril" and further volunteered to remark "nor do our women wear rings all along the helix of their ears". While the Hill Sora women have two to four brass wristlets and nothing else, the partly Hinduised Sora women put on just one brass wristlet and a number of glass bangles; women who have their husbands alive put on red, green, blue or yellow bangles while the widows put on black bangles.

I shall, in another article, refer to certain interesting points in Sora customs and conventions as well as in Sora folk-lore that throw light on the origin of dress and ornaments.

TATTOOING

The Soras, both men and women are, no doubt, fond of tattooing but they do not tattoo their bodies so profusely as the Porojas of the Jeypore Agency tracts or some other kindred tribes of the Kol-Munda race. Girls must have tattoo marks on their face, chest, arms, upper side of their hands, legs and the upper side of their feet. The exact place of the tattoo marks and the patterns vary with the taste of the individual. The tattooed lines on the forehead are horizontal in the case of some girls and vertical in the case of some others; they are evenly distributed on either side of the forehead and are noticed above the eye-brows. In either case, there is an additional vertical line in the centre. Some have only a dot which looks like a caste mark. There is among many women a line along the ridge of the nose. I have also noticed tattooed dots on the chin and the cheeks. Elaborate tattoo marks are made on the chest, the inner side of the fore-armss and the legs backside of the legs and the patterns used vary with the taste of the individual taste. Floral designs seem to be very common and popular. I have also noticed pictures of birds like peacock and

dove and pictures of animals like monkey and tiger also tattooed on the inner side of the fore-arm; some small floral designs or geometrical figures tattooed on the upper part of the hands and the feet; some dots or small circles or short lines tattooed on the upper side of the fingers and the toes. The pricking is made with thorns or needles and the pigment used is a vegetable dye mixed with charcoal powder dissolved in oil.

The tattoo marks in the case of the Sora men are generally very scanty—just a dot or a short vertical line in the centre of the forehead, and an elaborate design on the chest or the innerside of the fore-arm.

No special significance is attached to tattooing. In response to my frequent enquiries I could only get the usual reply “This is our *ukka*, meaning custom. Some Soras have however said that tattooing protects the body from some evil spirits and the diseases caused by them. It is generally regarded as a mode of decorating the body.

SOCIAL GRADES AMONG THE SORAS

Among the Soras of the Parlakimedi Hill tracts most of whom are Jāti Soras, there are three social — (1) Gamangs, (2) Buyyas and (3) Parjās. At public assemblies sometimes held to decide questions of common interest, the speaker addresses the audience as *ē gamangji!* *ē buyyāji!* *ē parajāji!* (O Gamangs! O Buyyas! O Parajas!)

The official village-head is called Gamang, —a Sora word which literally means a great man; and his colleague in the internal administration of the village is the Buyya, who in addition to his work of helping the Gamang stands as the High Priest of the village. Both of them are recognised by the Government. I shall describe their rights and privilege under Political Organisation in another article.

There are besides the official Gamang, many other Soras in the village known as Gamangs. To distinguish between the officially recognised Gamang and the Gamangs in general, the Soras refer to the former as Sadi Gamang to indicate that he receives as ingignia a pair of clothes from the hands of the District Collector who, as Agent to the Governor of the Province, holds an annual Durbar at an important centre in the Sora country and presents insignia to the local officials of the Sora country. The Sādi Gamang and other Gamangs of the same village seem to be members of one any the same Gamang family. They have their houses together in a row in the same street or section of the village known as Gamang street or Gamang section.

There is likewise besides the official Buyya, many other Soras in the village known as Buyyas. To distinguish between the

officially recognised Buyya and the Buyyas in general, the Soras refer to the former as S di Buyya. Both the Sādi Buyya and other Buyyas of the same village seem to be members of one and the same family. They have their houses together in a row in the same street or section of the village known as Buyya street or Buyya section.

Unlike Gamang the word Buyya is not a common Sora word. It refers to the class of Buyyas, besides the officially recognised S di Buyya. Both the Gamang and the Buyya officers are hereditary and the rule of primogeniture regulates the succession to them subject, of course, to the principle that members who are physically disabled or are of unsound mind should be excluded. Besides physical fitness and mental soundness, the Buyya expected to possess the technical knowledge of a High Priest but since knowledge is not inherited the Buyyas of several villages get the work done by another among the Buyyas who has acquired the necessary knowledge. To distinguish between the officially recognised Buyya and the Buyya who actually officiates at the ceremonies the Soras call the former Sādi Bayya and the latter Purpur Buyya.. The word *Pur-pur* refers to worship and all other religious ceremonies involving invocation of spirits. The officiating priest comes invariably from the class of Buyyas who seem to be the exclusive custodians of the Sora religion and "*Pur-pur*" (religious worship, religious ceremonies etc.). Whether the Sora Buyyas are in any way related to the Bhuiyas widely scattered in other parts of India such as the Orissa States, Orissa Division, Man bhum, Patna Division, Bhagalpur Division is yet to be ascertained by further and more extensive investigation.

The word *paraja* is evidently from Sanskrit *praja* meaning subject people in a kingdom. It does not indicate any racial distinction. Thus is, however, marked difference in social status between the Gamangs and the Buyyas on the one hand and the Parajas on the other. The Gamangs and the Buyyas regard one another as equals in social status and intermarry but both of them treat the Parajas as inferior to them and while they accept the Paraja girls in marriage, they do not allow their girls to marry Paraja youths,

Each of these three classes in the village has its own cremation ground as well as the place for setting up stone slabs in memory of the dead.

Further reference to the differences in customs and manners among these three classes will be made under other topics in my articles.

TYPES & LEGENDS OF HAIHAYA COINS OF MAHAKOSALA

L. P. PANDEYA SARMA

The Haihaya coins of Mahākōsala have been described as coins of Eastern Chēdi by former Numismatists. I doubt, whether the Mahākōsala kingdom was ever called "Eastern Chēdi", by its own rulers who called themselves "Lord of *Sakala Kōsala*"¹ about the 12th century A. D. Although two different branches of the same family of the Haihayas, ruled over Chēdi and Kōsala (Mahākōsala), they never named their kingdoms as Western or Eastern Chēdi. No inscriptional evidence to this effect has yet been found. In fact, Chēdi (Tripurī, Ḍāhala² or Jubbalpur) and Kōsala (Ratnapura) were two different kingdoms from the 10th century A.D. to the 17th century A.D., having their ancient histories. It would, therefore, be more appropriate to classify the rulers of these two kingdoms as Lords of Chēdi and as Lords of Kōsala (Mahākōsala) respectively.

In this paper I propose to describe the gold and copper coins issued by the Haihaya rulers, who had their capitals first at Tummāna (in the Bilaspur district) and later on at Ratnapura (present day Ratnapur) 16 miles to the north of the present town of Bilaspur. These princes continued to govern the Kosala kingdom uninterruptedly for about 800 years. The Haihaya rule was replaced in 1747 by the Maratha general Bhaskar Pandit, on his way to Orissa on "Bengal Expedition".

Materials to determine the appropriate extent of the Kingdom of Mahākōsala prior to the advent of the Haihayas are meagre. Mahākōsala or South Kōsala was no doubt an important province during the 7th century A.D. and the famous Chinese pilgrim describes it in the following words:

"This country, more than 6,000 *li*³ in circuit, was surrounded by mountains and was a succession of woods and marshes, its capital being about 40 *li* in circuit. The soil of the country was rich and fertile, the towns and villages were close together; the people were prosperous, tall of stature and black in colour; the king

1 Amoda plates of Prithividēva I

4 अस्ति विश्वम्भएसारः कमलाकुलमन्दिरमभागरिथिनिर्मदयमध्याडहन मण्डकम् ॥

3 A *li* is equal to about 1/5th of a mile. See Watter's *Yuan Chwang*, II, p.200.

was a Kshatriya by birth, a Buddhist in religion and of noted benevolence. There were about 100 Buddhist monasteries, and about 10,000 brethren, all Mahayanists. Near the south of the city (that is apparently the capital) was an old monastery with an Asoka tope where Buddha had vanquished Tirthankars by the exhibition of supernormal powers, and in which Nāgārjuna Pu'sa had afterwards lodged."

As Yuan Chwang does not mention the name of the king⁴ or the capital, we are unable to identify either of the two with any certainty. The omission of any reference to the famous river of Mahākōsala—the Mahānadi, adds to our difficulty. Rai Bahadur Dr. Hiralal took the present day town of Bhandak in the Chanda district, C. P. to be the probable representative of the capital of Mahākōsala, which the Chinese pilgrim visited. Some other scholars suggest the name of Sripura (present Sirpur on the bank of the Mah nadi in the Raipur District, C. P.) for that honour and go to identify Mahāśiva Gupta (Bālārjuna) with the Kshatriya king in question. Mahāśiva Gupta Bālārjuna was the son of Harshadēva or Harshagupta and his grand-uncle was Mahā Śiva Tīvaradēva, supreme Lord of Kōsala, *Kōsalādhipati*, whose capital was Śrīpura.

No coins of either of the three kings have yet come to light, although stone inscriptions and copper charters of their time have been found in the Raipur and Bilaspur District.

The kingdom of Mahakōsala during the Haihaya rule from about 11th to 14th centuries A.D. was a comparatively condensed territory, when compared with its vastness under the *Sōma* or *Pāṇdu-vamśa* rulers who had their capital at Śrīpura on the Mahānadi.

The Haihayas in ancient days were very powerful. They were well known throughout India. They had their own era called *Kalachuri* or *Chēdi* era which began on the 5th September 248 A.D. What great event this commemorates or how the era originated is not clearly known. There is no doubt that the family is an ancient one and finds mention in the *Mahābhārata*. They trace their origin to Sahasrārjuna or Kārtavīrya who had a thousand arms. The word "*Haihaya*" is a combination of two Sanskrit words *ahi* + *hayameaning* 'Snake and Horse'.⁵ To me it appears to be expressive of the meaning that the original founder was born of parents

⁴ Yuan Chwang also omits to give the name of the dynasty to which the then King of South Kosala belonged. *Ed.*

⁵ अहिहय नृपवंशे शम्भुभक्तोऽवतीर्णः कलचुरिरिति शाखां प्राप्य तद्विप्रतापः

Khalarī Stone Inscriptions of Haribrahmadeva. *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 228.

hailing from an *Ahi* or *Nāga* family and an *Aśvapati* or *Hayapati* (Lord of Horses) family. The Haihayas were known as Kalchuris and their original kingdom was the Chēdi country extending along the south bank of the Yaman². An authoritative account of them is given by Captain C. E. Luard, M.A., (Oxon) I.A., Superintendent of Gazetteer on Central India.

“This region (Rewah State) has been from very early days connected with the Haihayas, Kalachuris or Chōdis, who were apparently branches of the same tribe. The *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyana*, *Purānas* and early Buddhist books, all refer to their sovereignty over this tract. It would appear that in the Buddha’s day the Magadhas held the country up to the Sōṇ Valley, and the Chēdis (Chētis) Mahā Kōsala, lying to the north-west of it. They appear to have been a branch of the great Haihaya tribe. The Haihayas early acquired the Narmadā Valley, their first capital being at Māhishmati.

As to the origin of the Haihaya tribe, I have come across an account published in the Hindi journal *Sanātana Dharma Patākā*, under the heading “Jaganmatā Lakshmī” (Vol. 38 No. 3 Moradabād-June 1937.) I give below in brief the substance of that article.

Once Rēvantā the son of god Sun went to Vaikuṇṭha riding on his famous and beautiful steed named Uchchaiśravā. Lakshmī began to watch the movement and gestures of the noble horse with undivided attention, and forgot herself for a time. Just at that moment abruptly appeared god Vishṇu before her and enquired as to what she was looking at so devotedly. Lakshmi was quite beside herself and she could not know of the arrival of, and the subsequent question of her Lord.

Vishṇu got annoyed and cursed his wife to go down to *Bhūloka* or ‘the Earth’ and take birth as a mare because of her so lovingly watching the particular horse.

At this, Lakshmi to trembled with fear and insult and implored her husband to take pity on her. Vishnu was however firm; but he said that her birth as a mare would cease to continue as soon as she begets a son.

Lakshmi accordingly had to come down to the Earth, from *Vaikuntha dhāma* and to take birth as a mare. She then began her penances at the holy junction of rivers Kālindi (Yamunā) and *Tamasā* in the sacred name of god Śiva. In due course Śiva along with his consort Parvati appeared before Lakshmī, who was in the form of a mare and enquired why she had been put to such a trial. On hearing from her all about the curse and its termination, god Śiva assured her of his hearty help to move god Vishnu, who as was known to Lakshmi was different from Śiva only in name .

and form, to end the curse at once. Vishnu, thereupon, had to assume the form of a horse; and the union with the mare form of Lakshmi, his beloved consort resulted in the birth of a son named *Vira* or *Ēka Vira*. From this *Vira* the Haihaya dynasty took or derived its name.

This legendary account is not referred to in the inscriptions of the Haihayas. But both goddess Lakshmi and god Siva were the main tutelary deities of the Haihaya kings. We find Gaja-Lakshmi figure on their seals and god Siva as their family god *Kula-deva*.

To return to the main string of our investigations, the Haihayas claimed Yādava descent and trace their origin to a mythical ancestor called Kṛtavīrya-Arjuna of a thousand arms.

The connection with Mahishmati was always carefully preserved, and we find Haihaya officers in the 11th century serving under the Western Chalukyas of Kalyāna who described themselves as "Lords of Mahishmati, the best of towns." The Haihaya main branch appears to have gradually extended its sway eastward towards the source of the Narmada, where it remained for many centuries. We don't find any reference to them in any inscription from 1st century A. D. upto the time of Samudragupta. Dāhala is mentioned in one of the records of this time. A king is stated to have sought to give prosperity to the kingdom of Dāhala, which had come to him by inheritance and the 18 Forest Kingdoms. In the Allahabad pillar inscription (350 A. D.) it is mentioned that a conquest of the Forest Kingdoms was made by him. This possibly refers to the Dāhala kingdom.

As stated elsewhere the Chēdi era of which the initial year corresponds to 249 A. D. goes to show that by that time the Haihayas had become a tribe of importance. Their era was in use for over 1000 years. Traditionally the establishment of their position is connected with the capture of the fort Kālanjar, where one Krishna Chēdi slew an evil-minded king who practised cannibalism. By the end of the 6th century, they became so powerful as to engage in a contest with Mangaliśa, the Chalukya King of Badami, who in his Mahākūta (Bijapur) inscription of A. D. 598 records a victory over Buddhavarman Kalatsuri (Kalachuri) son of Śāṅkargaṇa of Chēdi, during a campaign in the Northern region.

The *Vṛihat Samhitā* written during the 6th century, mentions the Chaidyas as a people of the Madhya-Dēsa or "middle region" of India. In the Abhona (Dist. Naisik) plate of Śāṅkargaṇa - Chedi era 347 (=595 A. D) we find that the donor Śāṅkargaṇa is described as पूर्वपरसमुद्रान्तादिदेश स्वामी मातृपितृपादनुध्यपरभमाहेश्वर श्रीशङ्करगणः

These plates were issued from the victorious camp Ujjainī now known as Ujjain in Central India.⁶

Some coins of Śaṅkaragaṇa's father Krishnaraja have come to light. (*Progress Report Arch.Sur. Western India* for 1914-15 p. 60). The son of Śaṅkaragaṇa was Buddharāja who had his second capital at Viḍiṣ, the modern Besanagar near Bhilsa (vide Vadner plates) his main capital being Māhishmati.

The "Ancient History of the Deccan" has the following:—The inscription of Mahākūṭa which is dated in the 5th year of the reign of Mangaleśa i. e. 601-602 A.D. says (*Ind. Ant.* vol XIX, p. 7) that this King vanquished Buddha and the Nerur plates (*Ind. Ant.* vol. VII p. 166) say that he put to flight Śaṅkargagaṇa's son Buddharāja and killed Svāmīrāja of the Chālukya family (see also *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI p. 363).

Further it states :— The Aihole inscription (*Ep. Ind.* vol. VI No. I, p. 8.) says that Mangaleśa took in marriage the fortune of the Kaachchuris and seized upon the isle of Rēvatī, it was perhaps in this island that Svamiraja reigned". The location of isle of Revati can be known from a reference to the family of Batpura which lived probably not far from Goa at Rewatidvipa (Goa plates-*J.B.Br.R.A.S.* vol X, p. 348). For about 200 or 300 years from *circa* 600 to 900 A. D. history is silent about the Kalachuris or the Haihayas, till we come to one Kokalla, Lord of Tripurī (present day Tewar) in the Jubbalpur Dist., near Bēhḍāghāt a few miles from the Jubbalpur town. One of the Kalchuri kings became very powerful, and was able to win for his family imperial fame. Dr. Hiralal has dealt with this branch of the Haihaya dynasty in detail. Here I refer to the coins of Gāṅgeyadeva of this family.

This family won a victory over *Trikalinga* and *Andhra* and assumed the high sounding title, *Trikalingādhipati*. Their another proud title was *Kālāñjarapuravarādhīsvora* or Lords of Kālāñjar, best of cities.⁷ With Kālāñjar as the base the family had extended their sway, the tract becoming known as Chedi-Desa after them. The Kalachuris were also called *Traikūṭaka* because of their connection with *Trikūṭa* kingdom. Many inscriptions of them attribute their home-land to *Tritasaurya*. The genealogy of the Kalachuris begins with Kokalla, apparently Kokalla (the First) who ruled about 875 A. D. This Kōkalla had 18 sons. The eldest of these was who had

⁶ विजय स्वन्धावारादुज्जयनीवासकात् ।

Abhona Plates.

⁷ *Arch. Sur. of West Ind.*, No. 10,

capital at Tripurī. The rest of the brothers became the lords of various Mandalas. To one of Kokalla's sons, the Haihaya Rulers of Tummaṇa and Ratanpur trace their origin. The doors of all the temples built by the Kalchuris in Dāhala, contain the *Gajalakshmi* figure. (vide *Jabalapur Jyoti* by Dr. Hiralal). The C. P. inscription has on p. 230 the following:

"Coins of Kalachuri dynasty of Dāhala or Western Chedi. These are the coins of the real sovereign of the C. Ps. who ruled at Tripurī or Tewar, six miles from Jubbalpur. They bear the figure of their tutelary goddess Lakshmi in a sitting posture, with a slight deviation from the Gupta devices in that the Goddess has four instead of two arms. The reverse contains the name of King Gaṅgādēva.

1. COPPER COINS

The last king of Haihaya Dynasty of Mahākōsala whose copper coins have come to light was Pratāpamalladeva (Pratāpa Singh of the C. P. Gazetteer.)

(a) LION AND SWORD TYPE

Obverse: Legend in Devanagari script in three lines:—

*Śrīmat-Pra-
tāpa-ma-
lladēva*

Reverse: Figure of a sword and that of a lion.

These coins were discovered at (Bālpur) a little village on the left bank of the Mahānadi in the Bilasapur Dist.,⁸ I identified these coins as Haihaya ones on the strength of the characters used in the legend and looking to the great distance of their find-spots from Nepal:⁹ No silver or gold coins of this king have yet come to light. These copper coins are either round or hexagonal (six-sided.) The round ones are of three different sizes: (1) large size, (2) middle size and (3) small size.

The device on these is a lion accompanied by the figure of a sword or a dagger. This sword or dagger figure finds a place on the Gaja-Lakshmi seal of king Pratāpamalladeva, just below his name. This seal was found with the copper plates of the same

8 In 1927 I published with plates a paper entitled "Bālpur Copper Coins of Pratāpamalla-Dēva"—A new discovery—in the March issue of the *I.H.Q.*, of Calcutta, Vol. III, No. 1, March 1927.

9 The late R. D. Banerjee, to whom the coins were sent by me for examination, expressed an opinion that they might belong to Prince Jayapratāpamalla of Nepal.

king found at Pendrābandh village in the Balōd, Bazār Tahsil, Dist. Raipur in 1934. The plates are dated in the Chedi era 965=1214 A. D. This first known record of Pratāpamalladeva confirms my identification of his coins. Aa genealogy of Pratāpamalla is given in the plates, from which we learn that he was the son and successor of Ratnadeva III the Haihaya prince of Ratnapura. Our Mahākosla Historical Society, is in possession of a number of all the four kinds of the copper coins of Pratāpamalladeva, all picked up in solitary bits of one or two, from year to year, during the rainy season on the very site of the present village of Balpur and in the adjoining grass fields along the left bank of the Mahānadi.¹⁰

Specimens of these coins have been supplied by our Society to:—(1) The British Museum, London. (2) Indian Museum, Calcutta. (3) Central Museum, Nagpur C. P. (4) Local Museum Raipur, C. P. (10—7—1929) (5) Archaeological Dept. Gwalior State (9—2—28) C. I.

(b) RAMPANT LION TYPE.

Coins of this type are all round. They belong to Ratnadeva III, Prithvideva III and Jājalladeva II. The legend unlike that of Sri Pratāpamalla-Deva's coins, is in two lines instead of three. It reads

[श्रमद्र]	OR	[श्रीमत्पृ]	OR	[श्रीगजा]
[नदेव]		[थीदेव]		[जल्लदे [व]]

These are comparatively thick. The copper coins of Pratāpamalladeva are thinner than those of the above princes.

(c) HANUMAN TYPE—FOUR ARMED OR TWO ARMED.

The coins belonging to these three kings are of gold and copper. They are available in the Nagpur Central Museum and Indian Museum, Calcutta. The Ratnapur princes were worshippers of god Siva. Kesari the father of Hanumana is described in Hindu religious books as an attendant or companion (Gaṇa) of god Siva; as such the adoption of the figure of Hanumana on their coins by the Haihaya Princes, is not extraordinary. The figure of Hanumana is shown on some coins with *four arms* and on some with *two arms*. A female figure is shown below one of his feet. Hanumana type coins are earlier than those of *Lion Type*. They belong to Ratna Deva I and Prithvideva I respectively. Hanumana type copper coins of Jājalladeva are very rare. Our society has got one or two specimens only.

¹⁰ Prof. V. V. Mirashi's paper "Pendrābandh Plates of Pratāpamalla: The (Kalachuri) year 965. *Ed. Ind.*, Vol. XXIII, No. 1.

(d) ARCHER TYPE.

I have come across a most interesting copper coin of Jājalladeva which bears a bow-man either a representation of Hanumāna or of the king himself. It was found at Bilpur on 2—8—1930.

In all probability this archer type of coin must have been struck by king Jājalladēva I, who was a great warrior and who had obtained victory over the kings of Jejēkabhukti, Kannauja and Chedi. This new device would have been adopted to commemorate his victory over the aforesaid princes. The weight of the two coins (copper) of this type in possession of our society is two *māṣās* and four *ratīs* each.

2. SILVER COINS

Silver coins of this Dynasty are very rare and they have not yet come to light. In the bed of the Mahanadi, a gold-dust-washer came across a round silver coin (small size) and produced it before me on 20—11—1934. This is the only silver coin of this dynasty yet come to light. On examination I found that it belonged to Prithivideva the Haihaya prince of Mahākosala (Ratnapura).

Museum Notes on Haihaya Coins

INDIAN MUSEUM, CALCUTTA

R. B. R. Chandra Esq. Superintendent Archaeological Section, Indian Museum writes under date 28th Oct. 1927 as follows:—

“We have in our cabinet the coins of the Haihaya Dynasty of Mahākōsala which is otherwise called Eastern Chēdi corresponding to the Chhattisgarh Division of the Central Provinces with Ratnapura (present Ratnapur town, 15 miles to the north of Bilaspur town) as the capital. Prithivideva, Jajalladēva and Ratnadēva are the kings of whom we possess *gold* coins.”

CENTRAL MUSEUM, NAGPUR

I give below an extract from a printed notice dated 8-9-1925. supplied to me by Mr. M. A. Saboor of the Nagpur Museum.

List of coins available for sale at the Central Museum, Nagpur, C.P.

Gold coins of Prithivideva, 1140—63 A.D. (E. Chēdi)

13 big coins Rs. 9 each.

5 small coins 3 „

Gold Coins of Jajalladēva 1160—75 A.D. (E. Chēdi)

9 big coins Rs. 2 each.

Gold coins of Ratnadēva 1175—90 A.D. (E. Chēdi)

11 big coins Rs. 9 each.

6 small coins 3 „

(Sd.) E. A. D. ABREU,
Curator, Central Museum.

Weights of the Coins

1. Copper coins of Pratāpamalladēva:
 - (a) (Round) Small size One māṣā four rattis ($1\frac{1}{2}$ māṣā)
 - (b) „ Middle „ Two māṣās, two rattis
 - (c) „ Large „ Three māṣās
 - (d) (Hexagonal) (Larger size (weight seven māṣās)
2. Copper coins of Prithvidēva (Hanumana type) 7 (seven) māṣās
3. Copper coins of Ratnadēva (Lion type) 7 (seven) māṣās
4. Coins of Jajjaladēva: Hanumāna type (middle size) 3 (three) māṣās

The coins issued by the Haihaya coins of Ratnapur (Mahakōsala) do not contain any date whatever. None of the coins yet examined by experts is found with a date either in Chēdi era or in Vikram Samvat. This absence of date on the coins of the Haihaya Princes is mostly responsible for the difficulty in classing which of the coins belongs to which Ratnadēva, Prithvidēva or Jajjaladēva as there were three kings of each of the aforesaid three names.

I have been engaged in the collection and preservation of coins since 1915. The largest find of copper coins was reported to me from Talōra,—a village in the Raigarh State E.S.A. This village is about 10 miles to the N. E. from my place Balpur on the Mahanadi and is owned by Messrs. Shiva Prasad and Manohar Prasad Mishra, sons of late Rai Sahib Pandit Kriparam Mishra, Ex-Dewan of that State. Mr. Trilochan Misra, their Mukhtar sent to me the coins in July 1934. According to his statement a lot of 43 coins of middle and small size were unearthed at Talōrā, put in old earthen pot and buried underground.

Almost all of them are awfully corroded except a few on which the letters *ma* or *dē* and *śrī* are seen. They are thin round bits. A few contain the legend in two lines as

Śrīmad-Ra

tnadēva

with lion symbol on the reverse.

The Largest find of the Gold Coins

This was reported from Sonsari, a village in the Tahsil and District of Bilaspur C. P. The total number of coins discovered was 600 (six hundred). They were found buried underground carefully put into a copper jar. A detailed description of the find is as follows:

1. Prithvidēva (1140-1160 A.D.)	405 coins	54 coins
	middle size	small size
	W. 59.3 ¹¹	W. 14
	S. 78	S. .52
2. Jajjaladēva (1160-1175 A.D.)	29 coins	7 coins
3. Ratnadēva (1175-1190 A.D.)	68 coins	28 coins

Other than Haihaya ones:

4. Govinda Chandra	2 coins
5. Unknown	2 coins
6. Unknown	5 coins

Total= 511 plus 89 = 600

I regret that I could not myself examine this hoard of 600 gold coins and am, therefore, unable to make further observation upon them. My cordial thanks are due to Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A., for kindly going through this paper and to Mr. M. A. Suboor for his courtesy in noting down the weights of the various gold and copper coins of the Haihaya Princes, available in the cabinet of the Central Museum, Nagpur, C. P. for many useful suggestions.

J. Allan Esq., M.A., was pleased to remark in his letter of 4-12-39, on the *archer type* of copper coins of *Jājjaladēva* as follows:

"Many thanks for your letter to Dr. Barnet. I am much interested to learn of the coin of J jjaladēva, the Haihaya. It seems to be quite new and I do not quite know what it should be compared with. The type goes back to a Gupta Archer type which survived upto the 7th century as the later Guptas or perhaps later on through their imitations, we get from Eastern Bengal.

The discovery shows how much can be discovered by a painstaking researcher devoting himself thoroughly to a particular era."

Sir H. Bomford K.C.T.E., I.C.S., lately Governor of Central Provinces, to whom my paper on Haihaya Coins was submitted in manuscript for perusal and opinion, was pleased to write under date 16—6—38:

"Many thanks for your note on the coins of Haihaya kings, which I have read with interest. I am not however in a position to offer my useful criticism or opinion. I have, however, not the least doubt that the idea that the coins of Pratāpamalla were of Napalese origin was erroneous. Coins of Nepal of that age would not, I think, be found in the C. P. So far as I know the Malla rulers of Nepal struck in silver only."

¹¹ These weights and sizes may slightly differ in coins of the same or different kings of this dynasty. Difference in weight is due to good or bad condition of the coins.

REVIEWS

The Rise and Fall of Muhammad Bin Tughluq

[By AGHA MAHDI HUSSAIN, Lecturer in History and Politics,
Agra College: Publishers LUZAC & Co. Pp. 262. Price sh. 15]

The book is an elaboration of the author's thesis for the Ph. D. Degree of the London University and is a good attempt at a better understanding of not only this much maligned monarch of the Sultanate period, but of other little understood problems of the times like the lot of the Hindus under Muslim rule.

That Muhammad Bin Tughluq has been "one of the most grossly misunderstood" is due to the fact that contemporary writers like Ibn-Batuta, Ziya-ud-din Barani, 'Iṣāmi' the author of the *Futuh us Salatin*, were all men who had suffered in some way or other at his hands, or who did not like him for his 'free thought and rationalism', especially his treatment of the Ulamas and Maulvis. The Qazis of the Empire had declared war on him and had approved of his assassination. Ibn-Batuta was an important Qazi. Disgusted with the Sultan he spent the later years of his stay in S. India at Madura in the land of Ma'bar, an important centre of discontent and rebellion during the reign. Ziya-ud-din Barani is specially responsible for portraying the Sultan as a mixture of opposites and he does it by "making use of hyperbolical and satirical expressions" and "by expressing repeatedly and in a peculiar manner his bewilderment at understanding him". 'Iṣāmi' again belonged to the ranks of the discontented and spent most of his years in the Deccan in the court of Hasan Bahmini, another successful rebel against the Sultan. He is largely responsible for the story about Baha-ud-din being skinned alive and the skin being stuffed with straw and paraded in the streets. He is also responsible for the highly coloured account of the transfer of the capital. As against these accounts of partisan writers, it is an irony of fate that no official records of the reign exist and the one good source of information discovered by the author, namely, the Sultan's Autobiography is meagre and insufficient. In spite of these handicaps the author has done well to present to us an yet another and more charitable interpretation of this great Sultan than the ones we have had so far. He has been able to do this largely by evolving his own chronological order for the events of

the reign, in place of the one given by Barani and usually followed by most modern historians of the reign. The author has put the crux of the problem thus. (See p. 136) "Barani's history is not a chronological account of the reign. He gives an event precedence not because it happened first but because it struck his imagination most. Evidently, by putting the enhancement of revenue in the Doab at the head of the Emperor's projects he does not mean to say that it was the first of all those formed, and that it was followed by others, namely, the transfer of the capital to Deogir, the introduction of the token currency and the Khurasan and Qarochil expeditions. It would be absurd to take these events in the order described by Barani. Yet Mr. Moreland assumes Barani's order of events as correct. "At the outset of his reign", says he, "Muhammad decided to enhance the revenue of the river country. Not long afterwards the king carried out his plan of transferring the capital etc." By putting down an event which took place much later, practically at end of his period of projects as having taken place at the beginning, 'the Sultan is made to appear like one who did things in a purely obstinate senseless manner. Therefore one chief aid to a better understanding of the Sultan is to arrange the events of the reign on a more reasonable basis of the sequence and the author has succeeded very well in this.

We will now take one or two episodes of the reign where the author tried to read the Sultan's career better. As regards the Mongol invasion of Tarmāshīrīn and the alleged cowardice of the Sultan in buying off the Mongol chieftain, the author says that there is no evidence for this. Even Barani does not refer to it. In the early years of the reign, the Sultan's administrative organisation was very efficient—even distant provinces like Dwarasamudra, Ma'bar, Kampila, Warangal etc. were held well from the centre. It is not likely that a strong king of his calibre would have surrendered in this weak manner to the foreigner. If Muhammad Bin Tughlaq welcomed him here and lavished much wealth on these Mongols, it was not because he was afraid to face them in fight but because he was already planning an expedition against Khurasan and he wanted information and help later in this cause, from Tarmashirin. Ibn Batuta had stopped at Bukhara and spent two months with Tarmashirin on his way to India and he does not mention about any such invasion by him.

As regards the transfer of the capital to Deogir, Dr. Hussain cites Barani for his view that it was only the upper class Muslims

that were asked to transfer their residence to the new capital and not the masses who were largely composed of Hindus. The Sultan's idea was to establish a colony of Muslim culture in the South, especially with a view to convert the Hindus there. There was no occasion for a war of conquest there. It was therefore only with a view to establish a centre of Muslim culture there. Delhi was therefore not deserted completely. Dr. Hussain derives further support for his view from the Sanskrit inscription belonging to the years 1327—28 which attests to the prosperous condition of the Hindu peasants in the neighbourhood of Delhi immediately after the time of the so-called transfer of the population. The story of Shaikh Fakhr-ud-din Zarradi related in the *Siyar ul Auluja* further supports this view. Further, none of the eleven contemporary travellers whose observations are contained in the *Masalik-ul-Absar*, a work compiled some ten years after the so called destruction of Delhi, has made any such reference to Delhi. No doubt the forcing of the 'ulama' and the mashaikh to move to Deogir caused much displeasure to the gentry and it remained a sore point with them for the rest of the reign. On the other hand there can be no doubt that the action of the Sultan contributed much to strengthen the Muslim elements in the Deccan, and when disruption began within the Empire, if a great Muslim kingdom known as Bahmini kingdom arose there, it was largely a result of this exodus of Muslim culture earlier in the reign.

However, as regards the question whether the rebellion in the Punjab in 1335 was or was not due to the enhanced taxes in the Punjab, we are afraid the author is overshooting the mark when he says that there was no general increase of taxes ordered by the Sultan and that the rebellion was due to the failure of the rains coupled with the disbanding of the large army (of 3,50,000) got ready for the Khurasan expedition. So long as these Rajput clans were on the roll, their lands had not to pay the usual amount of tax. When disbanded, not only their pay was stopped, but they had to pay full tax. They would not do this and would not work on their lands. On the other hand, they tried to intimidate the Government, depending on their fighting capacity. No government worth the name could keep quiet in the face of such resort to force. So the Sultan had to fight them. But after putting down their rebellion, he was prepared to be generous, and so made large remission of taxes and advanced loans for agriculture. All this appears to be special pleading, unsupported by evidence of any sort.

We can however join with him in his summing up the character and achievements of Muhammad when he says that "he was neither visionary nor impractical, nor inherently unsound, nor his grandiose schemes beyond the range of human possibility. He was far in advance of his age, and could not, like a modern government, exploit religion, which he should have left to itself, if he wanted to rule successfully. He roused the opposition of the 'ulama' and in his attempt to reform them he not only paralysed the right arm of the State but raked up hostilities, before which he succumbed and his imperialism perished."

The book discloses the author's lack of adequate knowledge of the contemporary history of the Deccan, particularly of the great Kakatiya Empire, as well as of the topography of the Andhra country which occupies the entire south-eastern portion of the Deccan. An instance of this kind is his reference to Rajamahendry and its situation, Dr. Hussain thinks that its principal Hindu temple was not destroyed by Ulugh Khan and that it lay in the kingdom of Orissa at that time (p. 61). It was the provincial capital, the seat of the Kakatiya viceroy and was second city of importance in the great Kakatiya Empire of Pratāpa Rudra. Here there was a famous temple of Vishṇu (Vēṇu Gōpāla) which was demolished by Ulugh Khan and converted into a mosque. The architecture of the mosque is purely Eastern Chālukyan, and its origin can be clearly traced even today. It is on the main doorway of this mosque that the inscription referred to by the author is to be found.

S. VENKATACHARI

Humayun Badsha

[By S. K. BENERJEE, Reader in Indian History, Lucknow University: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS. Pp. 256. Price Rs. 8.]

The book is an amplification of the author's thesis for the Ph. D. Degree of the London University submitted in the year 1925, modified in the light of later knowledge and experience. The present volume brings the story of that "gifted but unfortunate monarch" down to his defeat at the hands of Sher Khan in 1540 and the rest of the story is to be continued in another volume. In writing this account the author has made use of all available sources for the reign including the local histories of kingdoms like Guzerat, Bengal etc. In the opinion of Vincent Smith "Humayun, although a cultivated gentleman, not lacking in ability, was deficient in the energetic promptitude of his versatile father". In the

author's opinion, though these observations contain some truth they do not sufficiently express the greatness of his character nor explain the reasons for his failure, and he has therefore, set before himself the task of striking a better balance between his virtues and defects.

He naturally stresses on his scholarship and his humane instincts as seen throughout his career, for instance, in his treatment of the Khalifa who plotted to place his aunt's husband, Mahdi Khwaja, on the throne immediately after the death of his father, his treatment of the Mirzas in spite of their repeated treachery, and of his brothers who were always causing him some trouble or other. Babur's last advice to Humayun was "Do naught against your brothers, even though they may deserve it". But he seems to have shown the same amount of kindness to other relations also like the Mirzas, and also a desire not to beat his enemies too much, enemies like Bahadur Shah and Sher Khan. This ought to be considered culpable weakness on the part of a king set to rule a country newly conquered and not yet brought under any efficient system of control and administration. The author himself admits, while speaking about Humayun's leniency towards Md. Zaman Mirza after the latter's rebellion in 1537 that "Md. Zaman Mirza should not have been leniently dealt with.....He should have foreseen the difficulties which Md. Zaman Mirza would create for the State by his pretensions to high lineage and his irresponsible conduct. In fact, Humayun betrayed a softness which has always been incompatible with the stern duties of a ruler. Perhaps he excused himself on the score of his father's dying advice etc." (p. 174.)

"Kingship knows no Kinship" should have been the guiding maxim of the king in his relation to the Mirzas. If he should be secure on the throne, his first task was to break the close alliance between Bahadur Shah of Gujerat and Sher Khan of Bihar. Still he was not for beating either of them too much. At the time of his attack on Mandasor, Humayun had timely information of Bahadur's flight from the besieged town with only five followers but he would not order an attack on the town that night nor attack the army afterwards as it was proceeding to Mandu under the command of Sadr Khan. The author asks "What was Humayun's hesitation due to? Was it that Humayun took pity on Bahadur and did not desire to add to his distress?" Again after the conquests of Gujerat which was not really over, when Humayun was returning to Agra on account of his brother Askari's hostile movements there, he did not make proper arrangements to convey the wealth

got at Champanir to Agra or Delhi with the result that Bahadur Shaw was able to recover it, nor did he settle affairs with Bahadur by arriving at some workable proposition with him that would wean him permanently from his alliance with Sher Khan. So that Dr. Benerjee himself admits that "in short, Humayun was a poor reader of the future. He betrayed lack of statesmanship and allowed his enemies an opportunity of queering the pitch for his cause in Gujerat. He could have averted his doom by a proper and skilful co-ordination of his moves. Not only thereby could he have broken up the secret alliance between Bahadur and Sher Khan, but he could have also befriended Bahadur and hoist Sherkhan with his own petard by exploiting against him Bahadur's friendship so far coveted by Sher Khan. But he let the grass grow under his feet not only in this manner through his diplomatic shortcomings but in a more direct manner by idling away time at certain very critical moments. "After his first campaign against the Afghans he lingered in Delhi to found his capital Din-panah though conscious of the danger from Gujerat. After a strenuous campaign in Gujerat, he let time drift at Mandu during February—May 1536, and again after his return to Agra, he did not move out for a year from August 1536—July 1537 though he knew of Sher Khan's menace in the east.

Probably while at Mandu in the previous year, he had increased his daily dose of opium and become a confirmed opium-eater. Later on we find during his Bengal campaign that he dawdled away nearly a year at Gaur though his men and animals were dying in large numbers on account of the unhealthy climate there, and thus allowed his foe Sher Khan to come in between himself and Delhi, besides encouraging the ambitious spirits in Delhi to rise up against him under the leadership of his vain brother Hindal. So that Dr. Banerjee himself admits that Humayun's defeat at Chausa in June 1539 was the direct result of his prolonged stay in Malarious Bengal and his indifference to administration. In spite of all this admission the author's explanation of Humayun's fate as a matter of "a painful struggle between his head and heart, in which the latter almost always triumphed" fails to convince us, and his attempt to strike a better balance between his virtues and defects cannot be put down as a great success radically altering the generally accepted reading of Humayun's personality and achievements as a ruler.

The Successors of the Satavahanas in Lower Deccan.

[By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, M.A., PH.D. 6" × 9½".
Pp. xv + 417. With one map. Published by the CALCUTTA
UNIVERSITY, 1939. Stiff bound. Price not stated.]

The early political history of southern and western India is beset with considerable difficulties. Pioneer workers like the late Drs. Fleet, Bhandarkar, Hultzsch, Rapson, Rice, Venkayya, Krishna Sastri and Narasimhacharya, have no doubt cleared the ground and shown us the right path. But the extremely complicated nature of the domestic and foreign relations of the rulers, and the different scripts in which the early records are engraved are some of the pitfalls across which students are likely to stumble, even when these latter are gifted with industry, patience, and an analytical spirit. But every attempt, like the one before us, which helps us to elucidate the complex post-S'atavāhana period, based on the sober evidence of palaeography and epigraphy deserves praise and careful perusal.

Dr. Dines Chandra Sirkar's object in the work under review has been to "bridge the gulf between the Ś'atavāhanas and the Calukya periods". (Preface, p. vii.) He, therefore, attempts to deal "with the successors of the Ś'atavāhanas, who held sway in the vast region of the Deccan, mainly inhabited by the Telugu and Kanarese peoples, before the foundation of the Calukya empire". (*Ibid*). And in doing so, he describes the rulers of the following dynasties:—The Ikṣv'kus, the B'ṛhatphal'yanas, the Ānandas, the Ś'lankāyanas, the Viṣṇukundins, and the Pallavas, all of whom, according to the learned author, (belonged to? and) reigned in the Eastern districts; and the early Kadambas of the lines of Mayūraśarman, Kṛṣṇavarman and others, and the Kekayas, all of whom reigned in the Western districts of the Deccan. Dr. Sirkar then deals with the question of the Yavanas and the P'rasikas, the Alluru inscription, the grants of Nandavarman II, M'dhavavarman I and Jayasimha I, the *aśvamedha* sacrifice and its importance, the problem of the *divyas*, the V'yalar list of the early Pallavas, the *kāvya* style in the inscriptions, and finally, brings these ten appendices to an end with a set of useful chronological tables. In the *addenda et corrigenda* (pp. 395—404) he rectifies in some places minor sins of omission and commission that have crept in the work.

Two of the most noticeable features of this interesting book are, firstly, the definite stand which the learned author rightly

takes by epigraphic records, and, secondly, the occasional confirmation by linguistic or palaeographic evidence which is brought to bear upon the subject. Moreover there is the marked endeavour to give a connected account of the annals of the various dynasties, at least as much as is allowed under the circumstances. This makes perhaps speculation inevitable, and that is the fourth feature of the work.

It may be remarked here that, on the whole, Dr. Sirkar is a close follower of Prof. Dr. J. Dubreuil in matters of chronology, although he sometimes does not hesitate to rectify the errors of that French scholar (*e. g.*, p. 65). Of the six dynasties that ruled in the Eastern districts of the Deccan— the Ikṣvaku, the Br̥hatphalīyanas, the Ānandas, the S lankāyanas, the Viṣṇukundins, and the Pallavas, it may be said that their early records admit, among other factors, of palaeographic discussion based on some sort of linguistic data. But these records do not possess any definite chronological evidence, and hence all chronological assertions concerning the rulers of these dynasties can be only speculative in nature. This is evident when we see how Dr. Sirkar tentatively assigns the rulers to approximate periods. (Pp. 23, 73, 81, 89, 110-122, et cet.) The same chronological uncertainty marks the learned author's remarks on Kadamba history (pp. 232 seq.)

In order to be convinced about the unacceptable nature of Dr. Sirkar's chronology, we may see how he fixes the reigns of the early Kadamba kings, who seem to have succeeded the later Sāta-vāhanas in the Deccan. Dr. Sirkar rejects the evidence of later traditions concerning the Kadamba rulers as "of little historical value." (P. 233). And yet when occasion arises, he does not hesitate to utilize later traditions, as can be seen from the rather summary manner in which he locates the Kuntala country (P. 215 seq.), or when he makes Mayūravarman a Brahman (P. 228 seq.) Incidentally we may observe that some of his explanations, *e. g.* that relating to the term Brahma-Kṣatriya (P. 229), seem to be somewhat novel. Supposing we accept Dr. Sirkar's statements concerning the disputed question of the historicity of the persons preceding Mayūravarman (or Mayūraśarman), we reach the dates 320—350 A. D. as the probable dates of that monarch's accession (P. 233). It would be better to give *verbatim* the speculative statements of the author concerning Mayūravarman. "Supposing that Mayūraśarman's reign began about the middle of the fourth century and that the reign-periods of the four predecessors of Kākusthavarman (*viz.* Mayūraśarman, Kaṅavarman, Bhagīratha, and Raghu)

together covered about a century we arrive at about the middle of the fifth century for the period of K kusta." (P. 233). And Dr. Sirkar then would place K kusta in the middle of the fifth century A. D. (*Ibid*, p. 233). If we accept this age given to Kākustha, we cannot understand how it can be made to square with the date, between 415—503 A. D. which the same scholar gives to the reign of Kakustha's grand-son Mrgeśavarman (Pp. 234—5)! Certainly it cannot be that the reign of K kusthavarman and that of his grand-son coincided with each other!

The reason why Dr. Sirkar arrives at the age 450 A. D. for K kusta is because he follows the late Dr. Fleet in this detail. Fleet gave an ingenious explanation of a statement occurring in the Halsi grant of K kusthavarman, and relating to the issuing of that record in the eightieth year (*Indian Antiquary*, VI, p. 23; Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 291; Sirkar, *ibid*, p. 233-34). Fleet opined that the eightieth year was to be counted from the *paṭṭabandha* of Mayūravarman. But it would have been better if equal credence had been given to the more rational explanation given by Rice long ago in the following words:—"The victory in the eightieth year of which Kākustha was *yuvarāja* might (if it is correct) perhaps refer to the events by which Mayūravarmma (to give his name in the form of that of a king) gained his throne, which would thus be at the beginning of the fourth century. But if he had predecessors going back to four or five generations, the rise of the Kadambas may safely be placed early in the third century, the time at which the Śātavāhana power came to an end." (Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 24). We have chosen the early Kadambas out of the other dynasties mentioned by Dr. Sirkar simply because the records of the early Kadambas afford many clues to the proper settlement of the chronological and historical difficulties of the period. And when once we argue on the strength of an earlier date for king Mayūravarman the historicity of a number of dynasties connected directly or indirectly with that famous monarch, we find that we have little to accept from Dr. Sirkar's assertions concerning Kadamba and non-Kadamba chronology.

However it would be doing injustice to the learned author if, because of his unstable chronology, we were to dispense with the very many valuable facts with which his work abounds. When all things are said, it may be opined that no historian of the Deccan can fail to profit by this assiduous attempt of Dr. Sirkar, who has diligently unravelled the intricate political problems of the Deccan during the centuries that followed the collapse of the great Śāta-

vāhana Empire and the rise to power of the famous Cālukya dominions.

B. A. SALETORÉ.

Kausambi in Ancient Literature

Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 60.)

[By DR. BIMALACHURN LAW, M.A., B.L., PH.D., Honorary Correspondent, Archaeological Survey of India: Published by the Manager of Publications, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, Delhi, 1939. Pp, 22. Price Rs. 1—10—0 or 2 sh. 6 d.]

The interesting monograph under review deals with one of the most important cities of ancient India. It is divided into six sections, viz., (1) antiquity and origin of the name of Kauśāmbi, (2) its general description and topography, (3) the Vaśas or Vatsas and their land, (4) political history of Vatsa with its capital at Kauśāmbi, (5) the Vatsa king Udayana, his parents, queens and children, and (6) Vatsa and Kauśāmbi in religious history. There are a useful index, and three illustrations of the site of Kauśāmbi, the modern village of Kosam (Kosamba Kauśāmba, or bī) in the Allahabad District, U. P. There is also a good sketch map of the Allahabad District showing all important ancient sites.

The treatment of the subject is quite satisfactory as in the other similar works from Dr. Law's pen. We may however draw the attention of the learned author to an interesting inscription which has escaped his notice. At p. 13 of the work, Dr. Law refers to the inscription in the Kara fort, which is dated in V. S. 1093=1036 A.D. in the reign of Pratīhāra Yaśapāla and records the grant of a village in the Kauśāmba-maṇḍala. He observes, "The history of Vatsa or the country of Kanśāmbi as a political unit ended with the rule of Yaśapāla of Kanauj." There is however another inscription in a ruined temple at Meohar, seven miles from Kosam. This record (*J. R. A. S.*, 1927, p. 695 f.) is dated in V. S. 1245=1189 A. D. in the reign of Gāhaḍavāla Govindachandra (c. 1170-93 A. D.) and records the construction of a temple of Sidhēśvara (Mahadeva) at Mehavaḍa in the Kauśāmba-pattalā. This record therefore proves the existence of Kauśāmbi as a political unit during the time of the later Gāhaḍavālas, immediately after whom the country passed to the Muslim conquerors. It is possibly at the time of the Muslim rulers that Kauśāmbi was made a part of the political unit of Prayaga or Allahabad. Dr. Law's work will certainly prove to be a useful book of reference to the students of ancient Indian history and geography.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR,

THE XVII ANNUAL REPORT OF THE WORKING OF
THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY,
RAJAHMUNDRY, FOR THE YEAR 1938-39.

Presented to the General Body at its 17th Annual Meeting
held on Sunday 2—4—1939.

At the last annual general body meeting held on 1—5—1938,
after having been adjourned twice previously, the following Office-
bearers for the year 1938—39 were elected:

President:

K. N. Anantaraman Esq., M.A., I.C.S.

Vice-President:

Sri Nyapati Kameswara Rao Pantulu, B.A., B.L.

Hon. Secretary:

Sri B. V. Krishna Rao, M.A., B.L.

Hon. Treasurer:

Sri K. S. Gopala Rao Pantulu, B.A., B.L.

Hon. Librarian & Curator:

Sri V. S. Ramachandramurti, M.A., B.Ed.

(resigned on 17-7-39 and in his vacancy was elected)

Sri B. Viswanatha Sastri, M.A., B.Ed.,

Ordinary Members of the Managing Council:

Sri Rallabandi Subba Rao, M.A., L.T.

Sri Rajah K. S. Jagannadha Rao Bahadur.

Sri M. Sambasiva Rao.

Sri Mallidi Anna Reddi, M.A., LL.B.

The year under report is another land mark in the history
and progress of the Society, and we have great pleasure in stating
that the Society had shown during the year definite signs of progress.

Ordinary Members:

During the year on the whole there had been encouraging
increase in the membership of the Society. Last year the number
on the rolls of ordinary membership was 141 and this year it had
increased by an addition of as many as nine new members. Further
it was due to the interest which the President took in the affairs
of the Society that the Society received great encouragement from

several gentlemen who otherwise would have neglected the care of the Society. There is good deal more to be accomplished in this direction and it is hoped the Managing Council in the coming year will take up the threads and complete the task.

Life Members and Honorary Members:

In this year there had not been any additions to the number of *Life* and *Honorary Members*. It is the desire of the Council to confer the Honorary Membership upon distinguished scholars in the country as a mark of appreciation of their valuable work in the cause of literary and historical research. The most notable of such scholars is Sri Veturi Prabhakara Sastri, who is well known for his great erudition and literary output. With this year the terms of the Honorary Membership of Sri Chilukuri Veerabhadra Rao and Sri Mallampalli Somasekhara Sarma will expire. Considering the services rendered by Sri Somasekhara Sarma in the cause of the Society and his connection with it as well, it is but meet that we should re-elect him in this general body for another term of Honorary Membership, according to our Rules. During this year were elected two highly respected and reputed scholars of Andhra, viz., Dr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, M.A., (Cantab) D.Litt., M.L.C., the distinguished Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University and Rao Saheb Mahopadhyaya G. V. Ramamurti Pantulu, B.A., K.H.G., *Kala Prapurna*, Honorary Correspondent of the Department of the Archaeological Survey of India, as Hon. Presidents of the Society. These two gentlemen will hold the dignity for three years, till the end of 1941—42. The Society did not elect any gentlemen during the year as Honorary Vice-Presidents.

Managing Council.

There were during the year eleven meetings of the Managing Council at which the business of the Society was transacted. There were also two occasions when owing to the urgency of the matters involved, resolutions were adopted unanimously by circulation of the agenda among the members of the Council. It is a matter of pleasure to record that all the members of the Council took a keen and vigorous interest in the management of the Society. Though Mr. Vaddadi Appa Rao was not a member of the Council, he was always co-opted to the Council meetings to give the benefit of his views on matters concerning the *Reddi Sanchika* and Reddi Empire Day celebrations as he happened to be the Editor of the *Reddi Sanchika*.

Library and Reading Room.

The most important event of the year is the shifting of the Library, Museum and the Free Reading Room of the Society, from the Theosophical Society at the southern end of the town into the present premises near the Government Training College, in the heart of the town. The rent for these premises which consist of a suite of rooms (a hall and a room) is Rs. 12 per mensem excluding the cost of electric lighting etc. which comes up to Rs. 2 per mensem. This is important because the Managing Council had been trying its best to bring back the Society into the town for the last three years but in vain. We shifted into these new premises on the 9th November 1938, and the formal opening took place five days later on the 14th November. The Managing Council lost no time in intimating the fact of the shifting of the Society into the town to all the local educational institutions, and that had the desired result. The new premises, being centrally situated in the convenient and prominent neighbourhood of the Government Training and Arts Colleges and other schools, the Society's Library and Free Reading Room have become more attractive than before and the daily attendance of the public and the members has been satisfactorily increasing.

Library

Towards the close of the year, the Managing Council on the suggestion of Mr. R. Subba Rao appointed a clerk on Rs. 15/- per mensem to take stock of all the publications both Telugu and English up to date and prepare a Revised Catalogue to substitute the old one which had become out of date. This had been necessary owing to the expansion and growth of the Library. Moreover, the revision of the catalogue was undertaken to make it up-to-date and useful. The stock taking of the publication was also felt to be necessary as year after year the Auditor had been pointing out the desirability of keeping a stock register. The work was done satisfactorily by the clerk.

There have been many additions to the Library and to the Museum as well. Most important among the additions may be mentioned the latest Archaeological publication under the authority of the Government of India, *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-daro* by Dr. Earnest Mackay, in two volumes. In this connection the Society takes the opportunity to offer its most grateful thanks to the Director-General of Archaeology in India for his

sympathy in every matter connected with the furtherance of the objects of the Society. Among the additions to the Museum are the following: Mr. R. Subba Rao has presented another C. P. grant of the Eastern Ganga king Anantavarma-Chodaganga, dated S. S. 1005 and Mr. B. V. Krishnarao has presented to the Society an Eastern Chalukya C. P. grant of Sarvalokasraya Maharaja of the seventh century and also three fragments of Reddi Copper-Plate Charters. These copper-plate charters are by a curious accident happened to be shared equally by the local Gautami Library and ourselves. But all these charters have been published in full in the *Journal* of the Society, Vol. XI, Parts 3 and 4 under the joint editorship of Messrs B. V. Krishnarao and R. Subba Rao. The other two sets also were edited by their respective donors in the latest issue of the *JAHR*S (Vol. XII, Part 1) with plates. These copper-plates are very valuable ones. The Society is indeed proud in publishing in the pages of its *Journal* the only copper-plate grant of the time of the Reddi king Kumaragiri of Kondavidu. Mr. B. V. Krishnarao has also presented a few coins of the Ikshvāku kings to the Museum. The coins are very important and their acquisition by the Society is a matter for rejoicing, and very soon a paper on them which is being prepared by Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao will appear in the *Journal* of the Society. The Council places on record its thankfulness to these donors.

Activities of the Society

During the year the Society deputed three of its members, viz., Mr. R. Subba Rao, M.A., L.T., Mr. C. Atmaram, B.A., B.L., and Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao, M.A., B.L., as delegates to attend the Second Indian History Congress held at Allahabad under the presidency of Prof. Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar, M.A., Carmichael Professor of Indian History and Culture (Calcutta University, Retired), during October, last year. Mr. R. Subbarao contributed a paper on "The Commencement of the Ganga Era" and Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao "On the date of Malavalli Stone Pillar Inscription of the Kadamba king Sivakhandavamma and the rise of the Pallavas of Kanchi". Mr. R. Subba Rao alone, of the three gentlemen, was, able to attend the Congress. An encouraging feature of this was that the Session of the Second History Congress was good enough to appreciate the large volume of important and original contributions of the Society and its *Journal* to the cause of Indian History. As a result of this, the Session elected Mr. B. V. Krishnarao, Hon. Editor of the *Journal* and Hon. Secretary, to the Committee of

Scholars who were appointed to explore the possibility and desirability of writing a comprehensive scientific History of India.

During the year the Society published Vol. XI of the *Journal*, Parts 1 & 2 in April and 3 & 4 in October 1938 and part 1 of Vol. XII in March this year. It has not been possible to publish the remaining parts Vol. XII. which is the Volume for the year 1938-39.

Reddi Empire Day and Reddi Samchika.

It is gratifying to record that in this year substantial progress has been made with regard to the Reddi Empire Day Celebrations and the *Reddi Sanchika*. About the beginning of this year, it was resolved at a meeting of the Managing Council held on 12—6—1938 to celebrate the Reddi Empire Day in September last year, and to purchase printing paper of about 30 reams of D/C size for the *Reddi Sanchika*, out of the sum donated by the Patron-President, the Maharani Saheba of GADWAL, and to commence the printing of the *Sanchika* immediately. For that purpose the Reddi Sanchika Editorial Board was strengthened by the addition of Mr. M. Anna Reddi. Again at the next meeting of the Managing Council, it was resolved that the Hon. Secretary and Mr. V. Appa Rao, Editor of the *Reddi Samchika* should prepare a programme for the Reddi Empire Day Celebration and that the celebration should be held on two consecutive days in the third week of October instead of in September 1938. At the next meeting of the Managing Council Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D. of Guntur and Mr. S. Pratapa Reddi, B.A., B.L., Editor of the *Golkonda Patrika*, Secunderabad (Dn.) were elected to the Editorial Board to assist the Society in bringing out a good volume of the *Reddi Sanchika*. For reasons over which the Council had no control the celebration could not be held in October. But they were able to purchase paper in December 1938 for the printing work, about 33 reams, and commence the printing work of the *Reddi Sanchika* with the funds placed at their disposal by Dr. C.R. Reddy from out of the sum donated by the Patron-President, the Maharani of Gadwal. At the same time Mr. Vaddadi Appa Rao and Mr. Anna Reddi were deputed to go to all places between Madras and Vizagapatam and collect donations for the *Reddi Samchika* as quickly as possible. It was resolved in that meeting of the 18th December to celebrate the Reddi Empire Day in the Easter of 1939. Mr. Appa Rao could not accompany Mr. Anna Reddi as originally planned to collect funds for the *Reddi Sanchika* in the Christmas holidays. After hearing the statement made by Mr.

Anna Reddi regarding the matter of collections etc., the Council at its meeting on 21—1—1939 resolved to request Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao to co-operate with Mr. M. A. Reddi in the matter of collections of donations in the place of Mr. V. Appa Rao who could not go out. At the same meeting a committee consisting of Messrs R. Subba Rao, V. Appa Rao and B. V. Krishnarao the latter as Convener was appointed to draft a programme for the celebrations. The draft programme prepared by the Secretary and Mr. R. Subba Rao was adopted and the celebrations were fixed for the 7th, 8th and 9th April 1939 at a meeting of the Council held on 12—2—39. Also the Council resolved after due consideration and discussion of all the matters connected with the question of the *Reddi Sanchika* and Reddi Empire Day Celebration, to appoint Mr. Anna Reddi as Joint Editor of the *Reddi Sanchika* in order that he might assist Mr. Appa Rao in the work of expediting the publication of the *Reddi Samchika* and the collection of funds by way of donations. We are glad to announce here that during the last week of the last month Mr. B. V. Krishnarao and Mr. M. A. Reddi toured the villages in Ramachandrapuram taluk which have a predominant Reddi population and collected a sum of Rs. 400 by way of donations for the publication of the *Reddi Samchika* and the celebration of the Reddi Empire Day. This is indeed very gratifying. In this connection the Society's thanks are due in no small measure to the enthusiastic support rendered by Mr. Dwarampudi Rama Reddi of Anaparti and Mr. Mallidi Sattireddi, Editor, *Reddi Rani*, Rayavaram, but for whose help and co-operation the Council could not have been able to accomplish anything. It is hoped that M. Anna Reddi, Mr. S. Pratapa Reddi and other members of the *Reddi Sanchika* Editorial Board will tour villages in the West Godavari and other districts and also Hyderabad State and other cities in the Telingana, for the purpose of collecting donations for the *Reddi Sanchika* etc. in the coming year, and bring out a publication which would be a monumental work. The names of the donors and their donations appear at the end in Appendix A.

In this connection mention may be made of the services rendered Mr. B. V. Krishnarao and Mr. M. A. Reddi at Madras by attending the 11th Reddi Conference held on the 26th Feb. 1939 at Madras. There Mr. Krishnarao made an announcement regarding the Reddi Empire Day Celebration and the *Reddi Sanchika* and earnestly appealed for financial help.

The Reddi Empire Day Celebrations will come off, God-willing, on the 7th, 8th and 9th instant and it is hoped that the new

Managing Council will faithfully carry out the commitments and make the occasion a really memorable one.

In this connection the Society takes the opportunity to express its thanks to the Director-General of Archaeology for granting readily permission to the assistants of the Department at Madras to contribute articles to the *Reddi Sanchika* at the request of the Hon. Secretary and also to the Superintendent for Archaeology, Southern Circle, Madras for specially lending exhibits to the Historical Exhibition to be arranged on the occasion.

Distinguished Visitor to the Society

Shortly after the removal of the Society's Library into the new premises, the Society was honoured by the visit of Rao KASINATH NARAYAN DIKSHIT Bahadur, M.A., F.R.A.S.B., *Director-General of Archaeology in India*, New Delhi. The *Director-General* visited Rajahmundry on the 9th January 1939. Accompanied by the Hon. Secretary, he visited some interesting localities of archaeological importance situated in the neighbourhood of Rajahmundry. Among them mention may be made of the site of ancient Buddhist monasteries, temples and rock cut caves on the hills near Korukonda and Rampa-Yerrampalem. It will be a proper thing if the Government took steps for protecting these monuments under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act. The people of Yerrampalem are needlessly interfering with the ruins and other antiquities of their place and this work which is fraught with serious consequences must be promptly stopped. Likewise, the caves of Korukonda and other antiquities are fast decaying and require immediate protection.

In the evening on the 9th January last, the Council entertained the distinguished visitor at a Tea Party. Rao Bahadur K. N. DIKSHIT inspected the Library and Museum and the Free Reading Room and left a record of his impressions of the working of the Society in the Distinguished Visitors Book. It runs as follows-

"I am glad to visit the premises of the Andhra Historical Research Society. While deeply appreciative of the work done by the Society, which is indeed credible, I would suggest that future work be organised on these lines:— 1. Funds should be collected throughout Andhradesa for a Museum which should be considered as the nucleus of the ANDHRA PROVINCIAL MUSEUM. 2. Members should be vigorously enlisted in all Andhra districts, with a local organising member in each centre, who will actively collect information and historical material, which is fast in danger of being destroyed by the vandal and ignorant cultivator. I commend

the Society as highly deserving of the encouragement and support of the enlightened sons of Andhra Desa”.

K. N. DIKSHIT, M.A., F.R.A.S.B.,

Director-General of Archaeology in India.

9—1—39.

Finances of the Society

It is gratifying to inform the house that the District Board of Rajahmundry granted a sum of Rs. 200/- for the year when an application was made for an annual grant of Rs. 200. Soon after the recommendation went to the Government the Rajahmundry District Board was amalgamated with the Cocanada Board and the old District Board came into existence once more. Then the Director of Public Instruction, Madras requested the District Board to approve of the grant once more in order to give necessary sanction to it. It is now understood that the East Godavari District Board had sanctioned it and orders are being awaited for the sanction of payment from the Government. The Society takes this opportunity of tendering its grateful thanks to the President and members of the old Rajahmundry Board and the present District Board for sanctioning the grant of Rs. 200 to it. The Council earnestly appeals to all the members of the Board and its President to make this donation an yearly grant. The Society has been as usual obtaining the annual Municipal grant of Rs. 100/- from the Rajahmundry Municipality, and once more the Council publicly acknowledges its gratitude to the Municipality for the great help they have been rendering to the Society.

It is a well known fact that the Society's income is very limited, and the only sources are the subscriptions from the members and the institutions and a solitary donation. The income is utterly inadequate to the needs of the Society.

The Society makes an earnest appeal to the enlightened public of Andhra once more in the name of our dear country to come to our aid in time. It needs a permanent habitation of its own with facilities for expansion. In a word, for want of adequate financial help the Society is struggling to exist.

APPENDIX A

Donors for the Reddi Empire Day Celebrations.

1.	H. H. The Maharani Saheba of Gadval (Received so far for expenses to wit purchase of paper and advance for to the printer Rs. 397—5—0).	Rs. 500
2.	Sri Tatavarti Seetarama Shresthi	Rs. 50
3.	„ P. H. Rama Reddi, Director of Agriculture, Madras.	25
4.	„ Dwarampudi Venkanna, son of Seshayya, Tossipudi	25
5.	Srimati Dwarampudi Buchayamma wife of Venkatra- yudu, Tossipudi.	25
6.	The Reddi Mahajanas of Pasalapudi through their representative Dr. K. B. Reddy of Pasalapudi.	116
7.	Sri Kovvuri Satyanarayana Reddy, President Pan- chayat Board, Balabhadrapuram ...	25
8.	„ Satti China Venkata Reddi, Vedurupaka-Savaram	25
9.	„ Satti Sattiraju of Vedurupaka-Savaram. ...	25
10.	„ Satti Subbanna & Gangireddi of Vedurupaka Savaram	25
11.	„ Gudimetla Munireddi do. ...	5
12.	„ Malireddi Subbireddi son of Veeraswami of Pan- dalapaka.	40
13.	„ Mallidi Abbayi, son of Seshayya of Pandalapaka.	30
14.	„ Mallidi Choudarayya, son of Nagayya, Pandala- paka.	15
15.	„ Padala Subbanna son of Pullayya, Pandalapaka.	5
16.	„ Padala Ramayya, son of Adinarayana of Pandala- paka.	10
17.	„ Padala Sattiraju, son of Venkatanarayana, Pan- dalapaka.	5
18.	K. N. Anantaraman Esq. M. A., I. C. S. ...	5
19.	Sri Dwarampudi Venkayya, Savaram ...	25
20.	„ Kovvuri Appanna Tata of Vedurupaka. ...	5
21.	„ Kovvuri Abbayi Reddi of Balabhadrapuram	25

B. V. KRISHNA RAO, M.A.,B.L.,

Hon. Secretary,

THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL

Receipts and payments Account for the period

DR.		RS.	AS.	P.	RS.	AS.	P.
	<i>To Opening Balance of Cash</i>			...	269—	7—	9
	On hand.	165—	3—	7		
	In S. B. A/c.	104—	4—	2		
	„ <i>Subscriptions.</i>	686—	12—	0
	Individuals.						
	Arrears.	375—	4—	0		
	Current.	68—	0—	0		
	Institutions						
	Arrears.	108—	8—	0		
	Current.	135—	0—	0		
	„ <i>Library Fund</i>	125—	0—	0
	„ <i>Sales</i>	104—	1—	0
	Kakatiya Sanchika	6—	0—	0		
	Raja Raja Sanchika	3—	0—	0		
	Journal Volumes	95—	1—	0		
	„ <i>Donations</i>	850	—5—	0
	Reddy Sanchika and Reddy Empire day Cele- brations						
	„ <i>Miscellaneous.</i>	3—	8—	2
	Bank Commission.	0—	8—	0		
	Interest on S. B. A/c.	1—	15—	11		
	Sundries.	1—	0—	3		
	„ <i>Fines.</i>	0—	10—	0
	„ <i>Borrowings.</i>	94—	14—	0
	„ <i>Advances.</i>	4—	1—	3
					Rs. 2138—	11—	2

Rajahmundry,)
12—10—1939.)

RESEARCH SOCIETY, RAJAHMUNDRY

commencing from 1—4—1938 to 31—3—1939.

	RS.	AS.	P.	RS.	AS.	P.
By Journal	610—	11—	3
„ Reddy Sanchika	223—	7—	0
„ „ Embire Day.	100—	8—	0
„ Postage.	164—	1—	0
„ Binding.	48—	0—	0
„ Peon's Salary.	94—	12—	6
„ Sundry Expenses.	34—	0—	6
„ Railway Charges for journal.	2—	8—	0
„ Stationery and Printing.	18—	9—	0
„ Sweeper.	1—	14—	0
„ Library Sorting.	15—	0—	0
„ Rent.	56—	12—	9
„ Lighting Charges.	19—	9—	3
„ Purchase of Books.	12—	12—	0
„ Honorium.	10—	0—	0
„ Bank Commission.	1—	12—	0
„ Revenue Stamps.	0—	5—	0
„ Contingencies.	2—	2—	0
„ Loans repaid.	194—	14—	0
„ Closing Balance of Cash.	527—	0—	11
On hand. ...	103—	12—	10			
In S. B. Account. ...	423—	4—	1			

Rs. 2138—11—2

Checked and found correct subject to separate report.

D. KAMESWARA RAO,
Registered Accountant.

THE 17TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HON. LIBRARIAN FOR THE YEAR 1938—1939.

I took charge of the office from Sri V. S. Ramachandramurthy, my predecessor on 13—9—38 but I propose to deal in this report with the working of the Library for the whole year, as no separate report is being submitted by Sri Ramachandramurthy.

LOCATION.

The Library was located till 9—11—38 in the premises of the Theosophical Lodge when it was shifted to the present premises as the latter were considered to be centrally and conveniently located and within the reach of a greater number of the reading public. The effect of this shifting is best seen in the increased number of people making use of the Library, as the average number of daily visitors after the change increased to thrice the number before.

ADDITIONS.

During the year there are about 365 additions including periodicals and books for review, the number of books being about 30. Among them the most notable are: "Further Excavations at Mohenjodaro" by Dr. Ernest Mackay. Epigraphia Indica, Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India, Annual Reports of the Archæological Department, Annual Reports of the South Indian Epigraphy, Annual Bibliography of Indian Archæology etc. Among the new exchanges, mention may be made of the Twentieth Century. There are altogether 70 periodicals on our exchange list. About a dozen of the periodicals which we had been previously getting in exchange for our Journal have now been discontinued. Attempts have been made to complete the incomplete volumes and the Secretary's efforts in this direction are bearing fruit as the missing parts are arriving, set after set. About 170 volumes have been got bound during the current year.

MUSEUM.

There have been a few useful additions to the Museum during the year. Mr. R. Subbarao has presented a C. P. Grant of Eastern Ganga king Anantavarma Chodaganga dated S. S. 1005. Mr. B. V. Krishnarao has presented one complete set of an Eastern Chalukya grant of Maharaja Sarvalokasraya of the 7th century and also 3 fragments of Reddi copperplate charters. Mr. B. V. Krishnarao

ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY

OBJECTS

The objects of the Society shall be:—

1. To promote Historical Research in Andhradesa, and record the results of such research.
2. To organise meetings for imparting historical knowledge to the people.
3. To celebrate historical occasions and hold exhibitions.
4. To publish a journal of historical research and special books if any.
5. To co-operate with other learned Societies engaged in similar work as well as with individual scholars.

All those who are in sympathy with the above may become members of the society.

All members are entitled

1. To get a copy of the Journal of the Society published quarterly, free of cost, and
2. To make use of the Library at Rajahmundry.

FOR SALE

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY

Back Volumes 1 to 9 at Rs. 6 and 10 onwards
at Rs. 8 per each volume (*Postage Extra*)

TELUGU PUBLICATIONS

RAJARAJANARENDRA PATTABHISHEKA SANCHIKA:

Edited by Sri B. V. Krishnarao, M.A., B.L. Rs. 5 (only a few copies left).

KALINGADESA CHARITRA: Edited by Sri R. Subbarao, M.A., L.T.

Original price Rs. 7—8—0. Reduced to Rs. 5/-

KAKATIYA SAMCHIKA: Edited by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., PH.D. Rs. 4

REDDI SANCHIKA: Edited by Sri V. Appa Rao, B.A., B.L. (*in the Press*)

All correspondence should be addressed to:—

THE SECRETARY,
ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY,
RAJAHMUNDY (Madras Presy.)

CONTENTS

Pages

1. Duel Kingship in India 125—134
DR. P. SREENIVASACHAR, M.A.,PH.D. (London)
2. Battle of Topur—Some inaccuracies 135—139
PROF. K. SITARAMAIIYA, M.A.
3. An Inscription of Vira-Chōḍa at Mukhalingam 140
B. V. KRISHNARAO, M.A.,B.L.
4. Pallava Nandivarman I and Drishṭivisha 141—148
DR. N. VENKATARAMANAYYA, M.A.,PH.D.
5. The Yōgavāsiṣṭha Quotations in the Jīvanmuktivivēka of Vidyāranya 149—156
DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A.,PH.D.
6. The Soras and their Country 157—168
G. V. SITAPATI, B.A.,L.T.
7. Types and Legends of Haihaya Coins of Mahākōsala 169—178
L. P. PANDEYA SARMA
8. Reviews 180—184

Annual Report and Treasurer's Statement