

The Later Satavahanas and the Sakas

BY

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI

The Later Satavahanas and the Sakas

BY K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI

THE relations between the later Śātavāhana Kings and the "Western Satraps" have formed the subject of many discussions already. The matter is, however, still in an unsatisfactory state. Mr. Smith's *Early History of India* (4th ed.), for instance, says that Nahapāna "may be assigned approximately to the middle of the first century after Christ, or possibly earlier" (p. 221); but this may not be done if "it is possible that the Kshaharāta records are dated in the Śāka era (in the same way as those of the Castana line)" (p. 232); and yet we are told in the same place that all the data seem to harmonize admirably. They do nothing of the kind, and it seems to be still true that "the whole question of the history of Nahapāna and Castana, their relation to each other, and the relation of both to the Andhra power, requires careful re-examination in the light of the available inscriptions. Too much has hitherto been taken for granted" (Rapson, *JRAS.*, 1899, p. 376).

A little before the exhaustive and scholarly review of the subject written by Professor Rapson in his *Introduction to the British Museum Catalogue of Andhra, Ksatrapa, and Other Coins*, the large Nasik hoard of Nahapāna's coins came to light. This hoard of over 13,000 coins has been discussed by the Rev. H. R. Scott with great acuteness and lucidity in the *JBBRAS.* 1908, p. 223. Since then the Cutch inscriptions discovered by Professor D. R. Bhandarkar have been edited by Mr. R. D. Banerji in the *EI.*, vol. xvi, p. 19. Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, Mr. R. D. Banerji, and M. Jouveau-Dubreuil have also made important contributions to the general discussion of the subject of this paper.

There are three aspects of this intricate question, each of which might, for convenience of discussion, be treated separately, although in discussing any one of these the issues

involved in the others must also be remembered. (1) In what relation does Nahapāna stand to Castana and his line? (2) What is the relation between these two lines of foreign rulers and the Śātavāhanas? (3) Among the Śātavāhanas themselves what is the relation in which the reign of Gautamīputra Śātakarni stands to that of Vāsishtīputra Pulumavi? There is also the "vexed question of the origin of the Śāka era".

BHANDARKAR'S THEORY OF THE JOINT RULE OF ŚĀTAVĀHANA KINGS

It seems best to take up the last of the three questions put above for being answered first. Over forty years ago, the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar sought to reconcile the conflicting statements in the Purānas about the duration of the Andhra dynasty, one tradition giving them about 456 years and another giving them only 300 years. "Now," he said, "the manner in which the two traditions are to be reconciled is by supposing that the longer period is made up by putting together the reigns of all the princes belonging to the several branches of the Āndhrabhṛitya dynasty" (*EHD.*, p. 26). A much better reconciliation of the conflicting statements in the Purānas was suggested by Mr. V. A. Smith in his well-known paper on "Andhra History and Coinage" in the *ZDMG.* in 1902. He pointed out that the difference between the two reckonings in the Purānas, the period of about 156 years, is exactly made up by the total duration assigned by the same Purānas to the Śungas (112) and the Kānvas (45), and that the shorter reckoning must be taken to date from the close of the Kānva dynasty.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar also held that Dhanakataka was the chief capital of the Andhras and Paithan a subsidiary one ruled over by the younger princes of the family who succeeded to the throne in Dhanakataka when it fell vacant; and he thought that this supposition derived strong support from

the inscriptions at Nasik mentioning Gautamīputra Śātakarni and Vāsisthīputra Pulumavi, and a statement of Ptolemy about Pulumavi. This view of the reigns of these two princes has never been accepted by other scholars, but Professor D. R. Bhandarkar has recently restated it, and sought to strengthen it by fresh arguments based on materials accessible to his illustrious predecessor and on the new Andhau inscriptions.¹ The Andhau inscriptions and the arguments based on them may best be considered by themselves later ; for these arguments are valid only on the assumptions that the date 46 in the Junnār inscription of Nahapāna's minister Ayama is a date in the Śāka era, and that the statements of Ptolemy in his Geography are capable of only one interpretation—neither of which assumptions need be taken for granted, much less both of them together.

The other arguments adduced by Professor D. R. Bhandarkar are three, two of which are repeated in the form in which Sir R. G. Bhandarkar urged them, and the third drawn from the inscriptions in Nasik. It will be well at this stage to arrange the relevant inscriptions with the necessary particulars in the order in which M. Senart has edited them in the *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. viii :—

(a) No. 2—dated in the 19th year of Siri-Pulumavi—records exploits of Gautamīputra, gift of the Cave in the Tiranhupavata (Mount Trirasmi) by Gotamī Bālasirī to the Bhikhusamgha of the Bhadāyanīyas. A postscript records the gift of a village Pisājapadaka, evidently by the grandson of the great queen Gotamī, i.e. Pulumayi, the merit of the gift being made over to the father (*Pitupatiyō*).

(b) No. 3—a continuation of (a), dated in the 22nd year of Siri Pulumavi—records “ that the village of Sudasana given to the monks on the dates mentioned in the last inscription,

¹ See his note on “ Śatakarni of the Girnar inscription ” in the *JBBRAS.* xxiii, p. 66. This note has been discussed also by R. D. Banerji in his article on “ Nahapana and the Saka Era ” in *JRAS.*, 1917. Also D. R. Bhandarkar's “ Deccan of the Satavahana Period ”, *IA.*, 1918.

shall be exchanged for the village of Samalipada ” (Rapson). Contains the expression *Dhanakatasamanehi* in referring to the gift of Sudasana.

(c) No. 4—dated in the 18th year—records an order of Gautamīputra (described also as Govadhanasa Benakatasvāmī) transferring a field in the village of Aparakākhadi to the Tekirasi (? Trirasmi) ascetics.

(d) No. 5—a continuation of (c) with two dates in the year 24—records an order “in the name of King Gautamīputra and of the King’s queen-mother, whose son is living” giving another field to the monks of the last inscription in place of the one mentioned in (c).

It will be noticed that the dates in (c) and (d) are not connected with any particular king. The position taken up by Professor Bhandarkar is that Gautamīputra was “lord of Dhanakataka” in the east, that his son Pulumavi alone reigned in the west of the Dekkan, and that all the dates in the four inscriptions cited above must be referred to Pulumavi’s reign. The arguments on which these views are based may be briefly stated and reviewed.¹ (1) Gautamī Balasrī is called mother of the great king and grandmother of the great king in (a), and Gautamīputra is called Dhanakatasāmi in (b). We may hence infer that both the son and grandson were ruling at the same time, and that the former was ruling in the east (Dhanakataka). But neither of these inferences is secure. Attention may be drawn to the peculiar form of (d), in which the command is issued in the name of the King Gautamīputra and the queen-mother whose son the King is living (*Jīvasutayā*), and to the postscript of (a), in which the grandson (*nattā*) of the queen-mother makes a gift for the merit of his father (*pitupatīyō*); “such an application of merit,” M. Senart thought, “can be made only in favour of deceased persons” (*EI.*, vol. viii, p. 65). Now (d) is dated 24, (a) is dated 19 of Pulumavi; there seems little room for doubt that 24 refers to Gautamīputra’s reign,

¹ See also Dubreuil, *Anc. History of the Deccan*, pp. 38-9.

and that he died, as has generally been held, soon after. As for the phrase Dhanakatasamanehi in (b), this is what M. Senart has said : " Of course, I cannot venture to hold my own against those who worked from the stone itself ; I must own, however, that considering the general similarity of *b* and *dh*, it seems very tempting to suppose that our Dhanakata is not different from the Benakataka in the following epigraph. Of the two, the reading Benakataka seems to me to be the better secured one. I should incline to introduce it here . . . As to the hypothetical Dhanakataka, it could in no case be identified (as postulated by Bhandarkar) with the proper name (equivalent to Dharanikot or not) which we find again at Amarāvati, as it has there the form Dhañnakataka (Burgess' *Buddhist Stupas of Amarāvati*, No. 53, p. 90)." *EI.*, viii, p. 68.

(2) If Gautamīputra was dead for nineteen years by the date of inscription (a) and Pulumavi was alone reigning at that date, it is very strange that nothing should be said in it of Pulumavi's reign, while Gautamīputra's exploits should form the subject of a long eulogium. Therefore, though the inscription is dated in Pulumavi's reign, Gautamīputra must be taken to have been living at the time and reigning in a superior capacity. A very plausible explanation of the apparent anomaly has been suggested by M. Dubreuil that the excavation was begun under the orders of Gautamīputra and that this inscription " is the funeral oration on the great king delivered by an inconsolable mother ". In any case, the absence of a eulogy on Pulumavi in an inscription dated in his reign cannot by itself form the foundation of so far-reaching a theory as that of the simultaneous rule of these two princes, and, in general, of all " Andhra rulers ".¹

(3) Lastly, in the opinion of Professor Bhandarkar, the inscriptions in Nasik Cave No. 3 themselves strongly support his view. All these inscriptions have been briefly put together above and marked (a), (b), (c), and (d). The learned professor

¹ See also the remarks of Mr. R. D. Banerji, *JRAS.*, 1917, p. 281.

quotes a part of (*d*) in which Gautamīputra claims the cave as his gift in the year 24, points out that this same cave was made over to the monks by the queen-mother in the nineteenth year of Pulumavi's reign, and asks "is not the conclusion irresistible that Gautamīputra was living when the cave in question was made over to the Buddhist monks, i.e. in Pulumavi's nineteenth regnal year, and that the year 24 of the other inscription, although it records a donation of Gautamīputra, must be referred not to his, but to Pulumavi's reign?" Is not the conclusion irresistible? We venture to say it is not. But as the argument on this question is bound to be minutely archæological, and as it has been partly dealt with already by Mr. R. D. Banerji in the *JRAS.*,¹ it has been relegated to a note on Nasik Cave No. 3 at the end of this paper.

It thus seems clear that every link in the chain of argument that leads to the theory of the simultaneous rule of Gautamīputra Śātakarni and Vāsisthīputra Pulūmavi is very weak, and there need be no hesitation in rejecting this theory as improbable and unproven. At the time Sir R. G. Bhandarkar wrote and as one among the earliest attempts to reconstruct "Āndhra" history, the theory put forth in the *Early History of the Dekkan* was plausible. But now it cannot by any means be maintained. During the interval that has elapsed, there has been nothing to confirm Sir Bhandarkar's hypothesis and everything to make it more and more difficult to hold. The Nasik hoard containing Nahapana's coins, huge numbers of which are restructed by Gautamīputra, is by itself enough to shatter the supposition that Gautamīputra did not rule in the western part of the Dekkan. And we shall see that there is nothing in the Andhau inscriptions that can be taken to favour the hypothesis that we are rejecting.

One further point may be noted. The manner in which the four inscriptions and M. Senart's No. 1 in Nasik are dated seems to settle the question in a decisive manner. In (*a*) the date is in the beginning of the inscription, and reads: "In

¹ 1917, p. 281-4; also Jan., 1925.

the year 19 of Siri Pulumavi, etc.” The same is the case with M. Senart’s No. 1 Nasik dated “In the year 6 of Siri Pulumavi, etc.” In (b), (c), and (d) the dates are given separately at the end of the inscription without mentioning the kings in whose reigns the dates fall. If we turn to Karle inscriptions (*Epigraphia Indica*, vol. vii) there also we have two cases representing these two styles. In No. 19 Karle the date comes separately at the end, while in No. 20 the date is in the beginning, and runs “In the year 24 of Siri Pulumavi, etc.” It cannot possibly be a mere accident, that in *all* these cases in which the dates come at the end, and, as it were, quite in the manner of saying “This order was issued on such a date”, we find the inscription does record the order of the reigning king, introduced by the significant word *ānapayati* (commands). We indeed miss that word in (d); but there is another *rājānito* which Buhler did not explain satisfactorily, and Senart, after throwing a doubt on the reading amending it into *rājanati*, renders it into “a command of the king”, or “order of the king” (*EI.*, viii, p. 74).¹ On the other hand, in all cases in which the date is given at the beginning of the inscription, as e.g. “In the year 19 of Siri Pulumavi, etc.,” what follows is a record of private or non-official benefaction. I am not aware that this difference has been noticed before. If it had been, so much trouble would not have been experienced over the interpretation of *rājānito* (?) in (d). And I see also from an entry in Mr. V. A. Smith’s table of the Later Āndhrabhrtya kings in the *ZDMG.*, 1902, at p. 663, that the famous record of Gautamī, which I have marked (a) in this discussion, is described as an official grant; I should class it among private or non-official grants.

Now, if this interpretation is correct, and I am now almost sure that it is,² the dates in the records containing royal

¹ The slight departure from the ordinary form seems to be necessitated by the fact that the king reigns, but the queen-mother governs, and the message is to be delivered in the name of both.

² Cf. also Nasik No. 15 of the ninth year of Abhira Iswarasena; No. 24 of the year seven Sri Yajna; No. 25 of the year two of Siri Pulumavi.

orders—introduced by *ānapayati*, and in one special case “docketed” (as Senart has happily suggested) as a royal order (*rājanati*)—must be referred to the reigns of the princes issuing the order; and the dates 18 and 24 of (c) and (d) would thus come to belong to the reign of Gautamīputra, and could not by any means be transferred to Pulumavi. It is clear that Pulumavi succeeded Gautamīputra in due course, and that the latest date in the inscriptions of both these rulers happens to fall in the twenty-fourth regnal year in each case in the Nasik inscription marked (d) above for Gautamīputra, and in Karle No. 20 quoted above for Pulumavi.

NAHAPĀNA AND CASTANA

The chronological relation in which these two rulers stand to each other has always been a moot question. In 1890 Pandit Bhagavanlal Indraji¹ attributed the inauguration of the Saka era to Nahapāna, and said “his reign must have been a very long one. . . . Neither he nor his son-in-law, Ushavadata seems to have had a son. . . . This is borne out too, by the evidence supplied by the coins. Castana who succeeded to the power of Nahapāna, evidently belonged to a different family . . . but there is sufficient similarity in the style of their coins to show that they not only lived at about the same period, but also that they were probably satraps of the same overlord.” This was a remarkably shrewd set of deductions to make when only four coins of Nahapāna were known. When, some years afterwards, Cunningham proposed to assign the years found in the Nahapāna (Ushavadata) inscriptions, 41, 42, and 46 to the Vikrama Era, Professor Rapson objected, saying: “It is extremely

Also Karle No. 14 of the seventh year of Sri Pulumayi; as also the wording of Nasik No. 23 of the reign of Kanha (Krsna). See also Kanheri inscr. of the eighth year of Madhariputa Swami Sakasena (?) in *JBBRAS.*, xii, p. 407.

¹ *JRAS.*, 1890, p. 642.

improbable that Nahapāna and Castana were separated by any such interval as would be necessitated by this theory" (*JRAS.* 1899, p. 365).

Professor Rapson also quoted Professor Kielhorn's rule regarding the predominance of the use of *Varsha* for year in Śaka dates, and the extreme rarity of the use of *varsha* in dates in the other eras, which use *Smvatsara* instead, and said: "Professor Kielhorn's rule would show that Nahapāna's dates like those of the Western Ksatrapas are in the Śaka era." There is force in this argument, but it will be well to remember also that Kielhorn's rule is empirical and not without exceptions.

In 1904 Professor Rapson discovered the existence of an earlier member of Nahapāna's family, Bhūmaka, by name. In the course of a short note in the *JRAS.* for the year, the Professor made the following important statements: "The coins of Bhūmaka seem to supply an important link between the bronze coins of Nahapāna and those struck conjointly by Spalirises and the Śaka Azes. . . . The larger coins of Bhūmaka hold, as regards their size, an intermediate position; they are smaller than those of Spalirises and Azes, and larger than those of Nahapāna. As regards fabric and quality of metal, they resemble the coins of Spalirises and Azes rather than those of Nahapāna. On Bhūmaka's coins the Kharosti inscription holds a position of equal importance with the Brāhmi inscription." Professor Rapson in this note thus gave Bhūmaka a place chronologically near Azes, perhaps several years before Nahapāna, whose dates he still referred to the Śaka era.

But in 1908 Mr. R. D. Banerji emphasized a point made by Professor Bhandarkar, several years before, that the inscriptions of Nahapāna's son-in-law, Ushavadata are paleographically earlier than that of Śōdāsa of the year 72, and held that "this precludes any possibility of the use of the Śaka era in these inscriptions" (*IA.*, 1908, p. 63). He also held that "the characters of his inscriptions are earlier than

those of the inscriptions (of rulers ?) who are now held to be his contemporaries, and so much earlier than those of the Junāgadh inscription that it is impossible to place Rudradāman twenty-six years after Nahapāna" (ibid.). Buhler's remarks on this question at pp. 41-3 of his *Indian Palæography* may be cited here. He is quite emphatic that the Gīrnar *praśasti* agrees with the later southern alphabets in several characteristic points, and that in Ushavadata's inscriptions from Nasik "the traces of the southern peculiarities are faint or entirely wanting". On the other hand, unlike Mr. Banerji,¹ he thinks that the script of the Nasik inscriptions of the Andhra kings Gautamīputra Śatakarni and Siri Pulumavi is "very similar" to the script of Ushavadata's inscriptions from Nasik. Buhler rather doubtfully refers the dates in the inscriptions of Ushavadata to the Śaka era, and treats Gautamīputra as almost contemporary. But we seem justified on the strength of Buhler's own data in dating Ushavadata's inscriptions much earlier than twenty-six years before the Gīrnar *praśasti*, or 46 Śaka, and in bringing the dates 41, 42, 46 of the Ushavadata inscriptions into line with the Śodāsa record of 72; for the similarity between Gautamīputra's inscriptions and those of Ushavadata offers no difficulty in the way of our doing so. It is a similarity which is only to be expected if the area of their location had been ruled by the Khakarātas for some time before Gautamīputra recovered it for the Śātavāhanas.

The evidence of the Nasik (Jogelthembi) hoard may now be taken up. The Rev. H. R. Scott, when he discussed this hoard,² took it for granted that the inscriptions of Ushavadata are dated in the Śaka era.³ But the facts supplied by his invaluable discussion seem to support an earlier date for Nahapāna. He says that we learn from these coins that

¹ I am unable to see how Banerji claims Buhler's support for his view on this particular point. See *IA.*, 1908, p. 43.

² *JBBRAS.*, xxii, p. 223.

³ See esp. his note on p. 230 (ibid.).

Nahapāna's coins bore the symbols of the thunderbolt and arrow, and Mr. V. A. Smith has pointed out: "The arrow and thunderbolt of Nahapāna's coins connect him with the Parthians and the Northern Satraps, Hagāna and Hagamāsha."¹ Hagāna and Hagamāsha ruled immediately before Rajūvala,² the father of Śōdāsa of Mathura, whose inscription dated 72 has been noticed before. The legends in this hoard are in three scripts. (a) Greek transliteration of the legend in the other languages ranging from a very correct to a corrupt, almost unintelligible form. (b) Kharosthi, also found in two forms, one comparatively more accurate, and the other degenerate. "The worst specimens of the Kharosthi are found on the coins that have the most perfect Greek and vice versa." (c) Brāhmi: on the legends in this script, Mr. Scott says "Buhler's tables give specimens of Brāhmi ranging from 350 B.C. to A.D. 350. The characters on *our coins* belong to *near the middle of that period*" (italics mine). It would appear from these facts that the old numismatic objections to a considerable interval between Nahapāna and Castana fall to the ground. It may be noted that the Greek transliteration is not found in Bhūmaka's coins,³ and that it is not unlikely that Nahapāna employed some foreign workmen who did the Greek properly, managed the more important Indian script Brāhmi, and did not care to do the Kharosthi so well. This supposition will go some way to explain "the curious and decidedly puzzling fact" noted above under (b).⁴ But what is most important to note is that the state of Kharosthi in Nahapāna's silver coins—there is still only one specimen of his copper coins—seems now to secure for him a place distinctly earlier than Castana;⁵ and this cannot be

¹ *EHI.*, iv, p. 232.

² *EHI.*, iv, p. 241 n.

³ Cunningham surely made a mistake (see Rapson catalogue, p. 64, n. 2).

⁴ It may be noted that the Kharosthi legend is found in an abbreviated form only "on coins that preserve the most correct form of the Greek legend".

⁵ See *JRAS.*, 1899, p. 372, and 1904, p. 373.

given him if the dates in Ushavadata's inscriptions are referred to the Śaka era. Again, Mr. Scott's opinion quoted above on the Brāhmi legends in these coins, gives Nahapāna a place near the commencement of the Christian era, and goes against a date in the second century A.D. which would be required by the usual arrangement.

The Kutch (Andhau) inscriptions, lastly, render it almost impossible to refer the dates of the Ushavadata inscriptions to the Śaka era. Professor Bhandarkar has pointed this out very clearly in his note in the *JBBRAS.*, xxiii, and his arguments have been summed up by Mr. R. D. Banerji in the *JRAS.*, 1917. These new inscriptions are somewhat uncertain in import. They are dated in the year 52, most probably of the Śaka era. They furnish evidence that in 52 Śaka, Kutch was being ruled by Castana and Rudradāman or Rudradāman alone, according as we understand the wording of the inscription. I am unable to agree with Messrs. Banerji and Bhandarkar that because Kutch is one of the countries mentioned in the Gīrnar *praśasti* as having been conquered by Rudradāman, therefore all the countries mentioned in that *praśasti* must have been conquered by him before the date of the Kutch inscriptions.¹ There is an ample time of twenty years, if not more, between the two records for Rudradāman to complete his conquests. But there is this to be noted. If we refer the inscriptions of Ushavadata and Ayama to the Śaka era, we shall find Nahapāna in possession of Konkan and N. Maharastra so late as A.D. 124; it has been pointed out that Surāshtra, Anupa, Ākarāvanti, Kukura, and Aparānta are common to the Nasik inscription of Gautamī Bālasrī and the Gīrnar *praśasti*.² We have evidence already in A.D. 130 in the Andhau inscription of the commencement of

¹ With this exception I accept, like Mr. Banerji, Mr. Bhandarkar's demonstration of the utter impossibility of keeping to the present arrangement of the chronology of the age; but, while Mr. Bhandarkar gets over the difficulty by the theory of simultaneous rule of the two Śātavāhana rulers, others prefer the solution referring Nahapāna's dates to another era.

² Senart, *EI.*, viii, 62.

that movement of the Ksatrapas against the Śātavāhana power, the culmination of which is recorded at Gīrnar in or soon after A.D. 150. Six years (A.D. 124–30), and these probably years of failing health for Gautamīputra Śatakarni, are far too short a time for all the extensive conquests ascribed to him in the Nasik record to have been made; and the conquest would also be too short lived to be commemorated in such splendid phrases as are employed in the Nasik inscription, especially *Śātavāhanakulayaśapratithāpanakarasa* (restored the glory of the Śātavāhana race). It must also be noted that this record of his achievements is made nineteen years after the death of its hero. Thus Mr. R. D. Banerji is perfectly justified in saying: "The light thrown on this period by the discovery of the Andhau inscriptions shows clearly that, if the year 72 of the Girnar inscription of Rudradāman be a Śāka date, and if Gautamīputra Śatakarni and his son Vāsisthīputra Pulumayi did not reign simultaneously, it must be admitted that the dates in the inscriptions of Nahapāna's son-in-law Ushavadata at Nasik and Karle, and of his minister Ayama at Junnār, cannot be referred to the same era as that used on the inscriptions and coins of Castana's dynasty" (*JRAS.*, 1917, p. 285).

How, then, are we to interpret the dates in the Khakarāta records in Nasik, Karle and Junnār? Mr. R. D. Banerji suggests that they are the regnal years of Nahapāna. It seems better to accept the suggestion made by Cunningham long ago and refer them to the Vikrama era. We have seen reason to connect Nahapāna in some way with the Northern Satraps. And recently Professor Sten Konow found it necessary to refer the Śodāsa record of 72 to the Vikrama era.¹ Palæographically, there is every reason to bring the Nahapāna inscriptions into line with this record, so that, after all, Cunningham's guess turns out on the whole a happy one.

There is, indeed, the objection to this view from Kielhorn's rule noticed above. But the evidence from the general course

¹ *EI.*, xiv, p. 139.

of history as discovered by the Andhau inscriptions, and the palæography of the inscriptions of Ushavadata are strongly in favour of an earlier date for Nahapāna than has so far been usually assigned; and the evidence from the Jogelthembi hoard of coins also favours this. M. Dubreuil has argued that the style of Nahapāna's monuments also requires an early date for him.¹ In the face of so much evidence the empirical rule of Kielhorn may be overlooked, even if it applied here in all its force. But it must be noted that there are very few dates in these records, and even among these few, we are unable to trace any consistency in the manner of dating. An important inscription at Nasik is undated; only the year and month is mentioned in another, though the day of the month is also added elsewhere in the same inscription. The use of *varsha* for year does not seem to be so rare in early dates that are not in the Śaka era. I find three instances given by Sten Konow at pages 135-7 of the *Epigraphia Indica*, xiv. There seems to be consequently very little difficulty in assigning these dates tentatively to the Vikrama era. It will be shown below that this seems to accord best with all the evidence and to make an intelligible story of the relations between the Satavahanas and their foreign enemies.

THE KHAKARĀTAS, THE KŚATRAPAS, AND THE ŚĀTAVĀHANAS

Professor Rapson says: ² "Gautamiputra's conquest of Nahapāna seems undoubtedly to have taken place in the eighteenth year of his reign," and refers us to two inscriptions, Nasik No. 4 (*b* above) and Karle No. 19. The former transfers a field held by Ushavadata to the monks mentioned therein by an order to the minister in Govardhana. The latter, from which the King's name is missing, grants to some monks the village of Karajaka. This same village was granted to the same monks by Nahapāna's son-in-law, Ushavadata (Karle No. 13).

¹ *Anc. Hist. Deccan*, pp. 21-2.

² *Catalogue*, xxvii.

Now there is no doubt that the second reference of Professor Rapson is quite correct. But it is by no means clear that it proves that Gautamīputra conquered Ushavadata's father-in-law Nahapāna. A whole village granted in perpetuity to a corporation may have been held by it for a considerable period before some turn in politics necessitates a confirmation of the rights of the corporation by a new power. At one time the first reference given by Mr. Rapson was held to mean that a field till that day possessed by Ushavadata, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, was transferred by Gautamīputra to the monks. The phrase in the inscription is ¹ :—

Ajakālakiyam Usabhadatēna bhutam nivatanasatāni be 200.

M. Senart denied that *Ajakālakiyam* = *adyakālīkam*, meaning "till to-day", as held by Buhler and Bhagavanlal, and held that it is the name of the field. I deny that this "Ushabhadata", who held a single field in Govardhana, was the son-in-law of Nahapāna. In this case, as well as in dealing with Karle No. 11, one cannot help feeling with Professor Bhandarkar that too much has been presumed on the ground "that this name (Ushavadata) is not very common."² It is very unfortunate that all the considerations urged so far about the Ushavadata inscriptions should have the effect of throwing serious doubts on what appeared a rather secure foundation for "Andhra" chronology, viz. Professor Rapson's equation: Gautamīputra's year $18 = 46 \text{ Nahapāna} + x = \text{A.D. } 124 + x$ (Catalogue xxvii). We are left only with the ascertained dates of Western Ksatrapas and the statement of Ptolemy about the contemporaneity of Pulumavi and Castana; Nahapāna's dates can furnish no information for the period of the later Śātavāhanas. It may be noted that Mr. V. A. Smith recognized this when he wrote:³ "It is not necessary to believe that Gautamīputra Āndhra fought with Nahapāna personally. Study of the great Jogelthembi hoard

¹ *EI.*, viii, p. 71.

² Senart, *EI.*, vii, p. 56, and Bhandarkar, *IA.*, 1918, p. 73.

³ *EHI.*, iv, p. 232.

of more than 13,000 coins of Nahapāna proves that the coinage extended over many years, although always bearing the name of Nahapāna, who, I believe, was dead before Gautamīputra extirpated his family or clan.”

Two other matters need some consideration before a final reconstruction can be attempted. It is well known that Rudradāman claims to have been twice victorious over Śatakarni, lord of the Deccan, and to have spared him on account of his connexion with him being not remote (*Sambandhāvidura(ta)ya*). Messrs. Smith and Rapson make Pulumavi the son and successor of Gautamīputra, also the son-in-law of Rudradāman. The older archæologists Bhagavanlal and Buhler made a certain Vāsithīputra Catarapana the son-in-law of Rudradāman and his son Sri Yajna Śatakarni, the Satakarni of the Gīrnar inscription. Professor Rapson has since decidedly rejected this view.¹ But it has been pointed out that Ptolemy makes Castana and Pulumavi contemporaries, and that Pulumavi consequently could not have married Castana's grandson's daughter. It may be remarked that we have either to understand Ptolemy's statements very loosely,² as not implying strict contemporaneity or give up the attempt to make Pulumavi the Śatakarni of the Gīrnar inscription. It should also be observed that so long as the dates of Nahapāna were referred to the Śaka era, there was no escape from making Pulumavi the son-in-law and opponent of Rudradāman. For, according to that scheme, there is only an interval of twenty-six years (46 to 72) or a little more between the defeat of Nahapāna and the Gīrnar *praśasti*, and no other ruler than Pulumavi could have reigned in the Dekkan after Gautamīputra during that interval. But this limitation disappears when the dates of Nahapāna are referred to some other era, tentatively the Vikrama era, as suggested above. It should also be noted that Rudradāman only claims to have

¹ *Catalogue*, intro., § 50 and § 72.

² See *IA.*, xii, pp. 273-4.

spared his foe from destruction after having beaten him twice,¹ and that he distinctly claims to have annexed countries corresponding to Konkan and N. Maharashtra.² Now it does not seem from the provenance of the inscriptions and the coins of Siri Pulumavi that in his reign the empire suffered any serious disaster, or that the king came so near destruction as the Gīrnar inscription suggests. This consideration, taken along with the indications from Ptolemy's statements, should lead us to look for the Śatakarni of the Gīrnar inscription and "not remote" relation of Rudradāman later than the reign of Pulumavi. I can only suggest that this Satakarni *may* have been Śīva Śri Śatakarni, the successor of Pulumavi, and that the husband of the Kārdamaka queen, the daughter of Mahākshatrapa Rudra, *may* have been the brother or son of Śīva Śri Śatakarni and his successor, viz. Vāsisthīputra Śri Candra Śāti. It seems necessary to make the foe of Rudradāman, not his son-in-law, but only some connexion of his, "not remote."

Then there are the Andhau inscriptions. The crux of the difficulty here lies in the peculiar way in which all these four³ records mention both Castana and Rudradāman.

*Rājno Chastanasa Ysāmotika putrasa Rājno
Rudradāmasa Jayadāmaputrasa Varshe dvipan-
Chāse 50, 2.*

Mr. R. D. Banerji, in editing these inscriptions, accepted the suggestion made by Professor Bhandarkar to introduce the word *putrasa* before the second *Rājno*, and refer the inscriptions to Rudradāman's reign. Mr. Banerji also explained that the omission of this important "word or phrase indicating relationship between Castana and Rudradāman"

¹ *EI.*, viii, p. 47.

² I am unable to accept Mr. Rapson's summary of the history of N. Maharashtra and Aparanta in his introd. § 95. See Banerji in *JRAS.* 1917. The two doubtful Kanheri inscriptions of Sakasena seem to need careful reconsideration.

³ *EI.*, xvi, p. 23 ff. M. Dubreuil's treatment of these records, pp. 26-8 of his *Anc. Hist. Deccan*, is very unsatisfactory.

may have been due to "the ignorance of the people of Andhau". On this I can only remark that while our ignorance of the past is certain, the ignorance of contemporaries requires very strong proof to be established; and I do not consider the omission of the Kshtrapa title in these inscriptions such proof. "F. W. T."¹ remarked, apparently in justification of the introduction of the word here, that *pautrasya* is inserted in the Junāgadh inscription. Exactly, why is that word inserted in an inscription of year 72, but omitted from one of 52? There must be some reason. Moreover, the wording of the Junāgadh inscription in the genealogy part is not the same as that of the Andhau inscriptions, and it seems quite unsafe to make any textual inference from the one to the others. Professor Bhandarkar has given up his original suggestion and accepted another from Mr. R. C. Majumdar, that the Andhau inscriptions mean that both Castana and Rudradāman were ruling at the time.² As Professor Rapson pointed out long ago: "After the various satrapal houses had become established in the rule of their respective provinces, it is customary to find a Mahāksatrapa and a Ksatrapa ruling at the same time—the latter occupying the position of heir-apparent and regularly, in due course, succeeding to the higher dignity."³ The known facts about Castana, Jayadāman, and Rudradāman can be explained by using this rule in their case. Jayadāman is known only to have been Ksatrapa. He must have become that when his father was Mahāksatrapa, and predeceased him before the date of the Andhau inscriptions. Then Jayadāman's son, Rudradāman, would have become Ksatrapa in his place, and held that post till the death of Castana (sometime between 52 and 72), and then became Mahāksatrapa in his turn. There is nothing in the rhetorical passages of the Gīrnar *praśasti* to support

¹ *JRAS.*, 1917, p. 276 n.

² Mr. Banerji refuses to accept this on the score that "nobody ever thought or tried to prove conjoint reigns of two monarchs except Messrs. Bhandarkar". *EI.*, xvi, p. 22.

³ *Cat.*, intro., p. c.

Professor Bhandarkar's opinion that there was a break between Castana and Rudradāman.¹

The best view to take of the establishment of the Śaka era seems to be that put forward by Mr. Sten Konow (*EI.*, xiv, 293-4) that it was founded by the Kushan ruler Vima-Kadphises, who "again" conquered India by ousting the dynasty of Vikramāditya from Ujjain, and appointed a governor to rule the country. This governor may have been Castana.²

CONCLUSION

Mr. Smith remarked³ that much confusion resulted from the bad habit of mixing up under the common designation of "Western Satraps" the two distinct dynasties of Nahapāna and Castana. The conclusion that has been arrived at by this investigation is that we have to recognize two distinct periods of foreign advance against the Śātavāhana power, one about the beginning of the Christian era and another towards the end of the first quarter and the second quarter of the second century A.D., with an interval in between the two periods, marked by a decided recovery of Śātavāhana power, commemorated by the inscriptions of Gautamīputra Śatakarni and Vāsishtīputra Pulumavi. It will be noticed that the two periods of foreign advance against the Deccan sovereigns are more or less distant consequences of the Śaka Pahlava and the Kushān invasions in the North-West of India.

The story, then, as a whole seems to have been this. We find Nahapāna in possession of all N. Mahārastra, Konkan, Gujarat, and Mālwa at the end of the first century B.C.⁴ This was probably the result of a struggle, the beginning of which

¹ *IA.*, 1918, p. 154. Bhandarkar overlooks the reason stated in the inscription itself for the men of all castes choosing Rudradāman for their ruler. The reference is clearly to a formal investiture or coronation ceremony.

² Sten Konow thinks it was Yasāmotika = Bhūmaka.

³ *EHI.*, iv, p. 232.

⁴ If Nahapāna = Nambanus, the Periplus may be taken to support this view. Schoff's date for the Periplus is A.D. 60.

may perhaps be traced in the stories of Vikramāditya of Ujjain. Nahapāna and his successors retained possession of their conquests for nearly a century,¹ until at the end of the first century A.D., or very early in the second, Gautamīputra Śatakarni uprooted the race of the Khakarātas and restored the glory of the Śātavāhanakula. The territories so recovered continued under Gautamīputra and Pulumavi to belong to the Śātavāhanas. It may be noted that Kachacha, where we find the earliest evidence of Castana's rule, is not among the territories mentioned in the conquests of Gautamīputra. But there is no doubt that the advance of Śātavāhana power received a check and the ebb tide commenced probably late in the reign of Pulumavi, during the rule of Castana as Mahāksatrapa.² Castana was followed by a vigorous grandson, and Pulumavi's successors were unable to hold their own against Rudradāman, and they lost considerable territories in N. Maharashtra, Konkan, Gujarat, etc., to him (c. A.D. 150). Henceforth, but for some slight recovery under Yajna Śatakarni, the Śātavāhana power collapses in the west of the Dekkan, abandoning the northern districts to the Ksatrapas and the southern parts to the feudatories of the Cūtu dynasty, who now become prominent and find their power confined to the east for some time before its extinction by the rise of other powers like the Ikṣvākus and the Pallavas.

P.S.—I saw Mr. R. D. Banerji's second paper on Nahapāna and the Śaka era in the *JRAS.*, January, 1925, only after completing this paper and the following note on the Nasik Cave No. 3, and I see no reason to alter anything I have stated.

NOTE ON NASIK CAVE NO. 3

All the four inscriptions marked *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d* in the text of this paper are in this cave. Their positions as given by M. Senart may be noted :—

(a) "On the back wall of the veranda above the entrance."

¹ See H. R. Scott, *JBBRAS.*, xxii, p. 237.

² Rapson, *Catalogue*, introd., p. cxv.

(b) "Engraved in continuation of *a*, from which it is separated only by a Swastika followed by another symbol."

(c) "On the east wall of the veranda under the ceiling."

(d) "Engraved in continuation of *c*, from which it is separated only by a Swastika."

In *d* there occurs this statement, in the order to be communicated in the name of Gautamīputra and his mother (Mahādevī Jīvasutā): "We have here on Mount Tiranhu formerly given to the mendicant ascetics dwelling in the cave, which is a pious gift of ours, a field in the village of Kākhadi." The cave mentioned here must be the cave in which the epigraph is recorded—Cave No. 3, as it is known. This same cave, however, is dedicated by the queen-mother to the monks of the same mountain in the year 19 of Siri Pulumavi (*a*). How can a cave, dedicated in the year 19 of Pulumavi, be claimed as a gift of his by Gautamīputra (extract from *d* above) in the year 24, unless (i) the year 24 of *d* is later than the year 19 of Pulumavi, and (ii) Gautamīputra was alive at the time the gift was originally made, i.e. 19 Pulumavi, which he could not have been, if he died (as is usually held) before Pulumavi's accession? I believe this is a correct summary of Professor Bhandarkar's position. (See *IA.*, 1918, pp. 152-3, and *JBBRAS.*, xxiii, pp. 70-1.)

The answer to this question is not so very difficult as it seems at first sight. It is contained partly in the statement of Mr. R. D. Banerji: "I would take the veranda in cave No. 3 at Nasik to be the original cave dedicated by Gautamīputra Śatakarni, and the remaining parts of cave No. 3 to be the work executed by the queen Balasri" (*JRAS.*, 1917, p. 283). It has been carried one stage further by M. Dubreuil, when he makes the suggestion that the entire form of the long inscription of the queen-mother of the year 19 of Pulumavi (*a*) implies that it is a funeral oration, so to say, of a disconsolate mother. It may be noticed that the positions of the inscriptions in the cave support the view taken by these scholars. A study of the plan and description of this

cave seems to leave no doubt that the so-called veranda must have been executed long before the main cave and the cells on its sides. There is a very serviceable account of this cave in Mr. Havell's *Ancient and Medieval Architecture of India*, pp. 80-1.

Whether the veranda was all that was thought of originally, and the main cave was an afterthought, as Mr. Banerji suggests, or whether a really complex original design was executed in parts, and possibly with some interval between the completion of the veranda and the commencement of the main cave, cannot now be decided with any certainty. One thing, however, is very clear, viz. that the so-called veranda is and was meant to be at one time a self-contained unit. Here is the part of a description of the cave relating to the veranda : "The veranda is considerably above the level of the court ; the steps leading up to it in the centre are decayed.¹ The front is carved to represent the veranda as upheld on strong beams, the ends of three of which, on each side of the steps, are each supported on the shoulders of a colossal dwarf, the fourth at each corner of the court, upon a short square pilaster. The outer side of the veranda parapet above these has been carved in panel work, ornamented with projecting rosettes of lotus-flowers, with a frieze of wreaths above, and another, probably of animals, below ; but the details are now all obliterated by decay. . . . Above the columns of the veranda is a frieze somewhat similar to that on the outside of the parapet below. The veranda has a bench at the left end and along the columns, and a cell with a couch at the right end ; there is also a cell with a couch in the back wall near the left end." "The main cave," on the other hand, "is plain, with a bench round three sides. There are five cells on the left side, seven on the right, and six at the back. . . . The sculpture, especially above the doorway, is of very indifferent execution." The veranda, then, with its high level, the benches, and the two cells may well have been in itself a separate gift, and monks

¹ This was written by West in 1862, *JBBRAS.*, vii, p. 44.

may have been residing in them even before the main cave and its eighteen cells came into existence.

The history of the cave, then, may be finally reconstructed thus. Gautamīputra began the cave. The veranda and the two cells attached to it were completed and dedicated in the eighteenth year of Gautamīputra (c). The monks began living there immediately; six years afterwards Gautamīputra had perhaps, owing to failing health (Rapson), to associate his mother with him in carrying on the administration, and the exchange of fields in the interest of the monks mentioned in (d) took place towards the end of Gautamīputra's rule in the twenty-fourth year of his reign. The main cave and its cells were, it would appear, part of the original scheme which was delayed for some reason or other. That is probably why we find the inscriptions of Gautamīputra engraved, at a time when the cave was incomplete, on a side wall of the veranda. When the whole scheme was completed, Gautamī Balasrī, who should have been associated with the work from about the twenty-fourth year of her son's reign,¹ placed the chief inscription recounting the exploits of her son in the place which should have been from the beginning intended for it above the entrance of the main cave. This was in the nineteenth year of Pulumavi, as we see from the inscription.

CHIDAMBARAM.

April, 1926.

¹ The statement of Mr. Banerji that "after the death of Gautamīputra Satakarni, his mother caused the cave to be enlarged by adding chambers, which she claims to be her own benefaction" (*JRAS.*, 1917, p. 283) is not accurate. If by "chambers" he means "cells" he is clearly wrong. These inscriptions carefully distinguish between caves (lena) and cells (ovarako), and the queen-mother makes a gift of a "lena" (cave)—line 10 of Nasik Inscription No. 2.