

CHAPTER 2

SATAVAHANA EMPIRE AND ITS FEUDATORIES*

INTRODUCTION.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE SATAVAHANA EMPIRE IN C. 220 B.C. is an important mile-stone in the history of the Deccan. The Ramayana refers to the depredations of Ravana in the Dandakaranya of the Deccan and Rama's conquest of Lanka or Ceylon. But these events belong to the realm of legend and not of history. The Bhojas, apparently belonging to modern Berar, are referred to in the later Vedic literature, but we know nothing of their history. Panini hardly evinces any knowledge of the society and cities of the Deccan. Ashoka's records mention the kingdoms of the Andhras, Colas, Ceras and Pandyas, and also refer to the Rathikas, the Bhojas and the Petenikas who were ruling as feudatories in the northern Deccan, but we can hardly reconstruct their history in the pre-Satavahana period. Connected history of the Deccan begins with the foundation of the Satavahana empire.

Before the foundation of the Satavahana empire, the Deccan was covered with a large number of petty kingdoms, which were often at war with one another. The Satavahanas for the first time wielded the Deccan into a powerful State and gave a cohesion and integrity to its history. The Deccan prospered immensely under their strong rule. At a time when northern India was suffering from a series of invasions by foreign powers like the Bactrians, the Sakas, the Parthians and the Kusanas, the Deccan was enjoying relative peace. Among the foreigners, the Sakas eventually succeeded in establishing a base at Ujjayini, from which they proceeded to attack the Deccan. For a time the Satavahanas had to give way and portions of Konkan and Northern Maharashtra were lost to them. But very soon the Satavahanas drove out the foreigners from the Deccan and restored freedom to the conquered provinces. The role of the Satavahanas in this connection is comparable to that of the Vijayanagar empire in later times.

The invasions of the Deccan by northern powers are more frequent in Indian history than the invasions of Northern India by Deccan powers. The latter process was first started by the Satavahanas.

* This Chapter is contributed by the late Dr. A. S. Altekar, M.A., LL.B., D. Litt. Some notes based on later research have been contributed by Dr. V. V. Mirashi, M. A., D. Litt.

There is no doubt that they were holding Malva. and Jabalpur area for several decades. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that they had penetrated into the Gangetic plain and it appears probable that they had occupied for some time even Pataliputra, the imperial capital of northern India.

Trade and industry prospered in the Deccan under the Satavahanas. Economic life was given a cohesion by the guild organisation which had permeated almost every profession. Banking was highly developed and a number of western ports were carrying on a rich trade with Rome and Western Asian countries. Eastern ports were taking keen interest in founding Indian colonies in Insular India and carrying on a lucrative trade with them.

The Satavahanas were orthodox Brahmanas, but Buddhism prospered under them both in western India and Andhra country. Remarkable impetus was given to sculpture and architecture under their aegis. Nagarjuna and Gunadhya, who are important personalities in philosophy and literature, were associated with their court. Prakrit literature received great encouragement at their court. The importance of the Satavahana period in the history of the Deccan cannot be exaggerated.

DIFFICULTIES IN RECONSTRUCTING SATAVAHANA HISTORY.

In spite of the researches in ancient Indian history extending over more than a century, it is not yet possible to give a connected and complete history of the earliest and the biggest empire of the Deccan, the empire of the Satavahanas. They have not left us many monuments, and literary references to the rulers of the dynasty are few and far between. Archaeological explorations and excavations have not yet been systematically and extensively carried out in the heart of the dominion, once ruled over by them. Puranas give us the names and reign-periods of the different rulers of the dynasty. But the information they give is scanty and often self-contradictory. Thus some Puranas state that there were only 18 kings in the dynasty, while others aver that their number was 30. According to one tradition they ruled only for 300 years; according to another, they were in power for more than 450 years. Even the number of the kings in the dynasty does not give an approximate idea of the duration of their rule. It is argued by some scholars that the longer list of 30 kings is formed by including the members of subordinate branches of the main dynasty. Others hold that the father and the son were ruling together during a pretty long period of the history of the dynasty and the longer period of 460 years of the duration of its rule is made by adding together the years of the contemporary reigns of the father and the son ¹.

Epigraphical and numismatic data for reconstructing the history of the dynasty is no doubt considerable. It is much more copious than that available for the history of the Shungas and the Kanvas.

¹ R. G. Bhandarkar had first advanced this view in the first edition of the present work ; B. C, I, ii, 165.

But unfortunately both these data fail us during a long stretch of about 140 years when kings No. 10 to 22 of the longer Puranic list, from Svati to Cakora Satakarni, were ruling. Epigraphical and numismatic data are often dubious and inconclusive and lead themselves to diverse interpretation.

Chronology and geography are rightly stated to be the two eyes of history; neither of them however enables us to get a clear glimpse of the Satavahana history. There are wide differences among scholars both about the time when the Satavahanas rose to power, as also about their original home. One school holds that the Satavahanas established their power in the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C.; the other opines that they began to rule in the second quarter of the first century B. C. One school holds that their home was somewhere in Andhra country or Telangana ; the other holds that it lay somewhere in Maharashtra, either in Western India or near Pratisthana, their traditional capital. It will be convenient to settle these controversial points before we proceed to give an account of the history of the dynasty.

WHEN DID THE DYNASTY BEGIN ITS CAREER ?

In the first edition of this work, R. G. Bhandarkar had advanced the view that the rise of the Satavahana power should be placed during the second quarter of the first century B. C.¹ This view has been subsequently accepted by D. R. Bhandarkar², H. C. Roy Chaudhuri³ and D. C. Sircar⁴. The arguments in favour of this view are not without weight. (1) The most cogent evidence in support of this theory is the unanimous statement of the Puranas that Simuka, the first Andhra (i.e. Satavahana king), will rise to power after overthrowing the last Kanva ruler Susarman and destroying what remained of the Shunga power⁵. It is generally assumed that the Shungas ruled from c. 187 to 75 B. C. and the Kanvas from c. 75 to 30 B. C. It is therefore maintained by this school that the rise of Simuka, the founder of the Satavahana dynasty, should be placed in the third quarter of the first century B.C.

(2) This would lead to the conclusion that the dynasty ruled for about two and a half centuries only; we can now well understand why one Puranic tradition asserts in round number that the rule of the Satavahanas lasted for three centuries only.

(3) Normally speaking about 17 or 18 kings only can flourish during this period, and we can now well understand why one Puranic tradition enumerates 18 Andhra kings only.

(4) If we assume that the Satavahana dynasty consisted of about thirty kings who ruled for about 450 years, we have to assume a big gap of about 150 years between the earlier and later Satavahana kings, known to us from inscriptions and coins. This gap disappears almost altogether if we place the rise of Simuka in c. 30 B.C.

(5) R. P. Chanda has drawn attention to the palaeographical difficulties in accepting the theory that Satakarni, the 3rd Satavahana

¹ B. G., I. ii, 166,

² I. A, 1918, p. 71,

³ P. H. A. I, p. 337,

⁴ S. I., p. 183,

⁵ *Kanvayanams tato bhrtayah Susarmanah prasahya tam | Shunganam c-aiva yoc chesam ksapayitva baliyasah | Sisuko-ndhrah sa-jatiyah prapsyat-imam vasundharam ||*

ruler known to us from his Naneghat record, flourished in c. 175 B.C. He points out that palaeographically the Naneghat inscription of Satakarni comes midway between the Besnagar inscription of Heliodorus (c. 100 B.C.) and the Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela (c. 25 B.C.)¹ ; this would place the 3rd Satavahana king by the middle of the 1st century B. C. and not of the 2nd century B. C.

(6) Marshall has further pointed out that plastic and architectural considerations show that the Chaitya Hall at Nasik does not belong to the middle of the 2nd century B.C. but is about 100 years later. The form of the entrance door-way, the lotus design on the face of its jambs, the miniature Persipolitan pilasters, the rails of the balustrade flanking the steps and the treatment of the *dvarapala* (door-keeper) figures besides the entrance, all bespeak the date approximately contemporary with the Sanci *Toranas* (gateways) i.e. c. 50 B.C.

The above arguments are no doubt weighty, but they are not strong enough to establish the case they seek to support. It may be pointed out that if we assume that Simuka rose to power after overthrowing the last Kanva king Susarman and subduing what remained of the Shunga power, his rise has to be placed in c. 30 B.C. It is admitted on all hands that the Satavahana dynasty ended in c. 210 A.D. The duration of the dynasty would then be of only 240 or 250 years and not of 300 years. The Puranic tradition of the Andhra rule extending over 300 years therefore does not support this school and the argument No. 2 above fails.

As to argument No. 4 above, it is no doubt true that there is a big gap of about 150 years between the earlier and the later Satavahana kings as known from the Puranas. But we need not therefore dismiss them as purely imaginary. The last seven Shunga kings are not known from any inscriptions or coins. Do we dismiss them as imaginary ? For a long time not a single one among the nine Magha kings of Kausambi was known from their coins or inscriptions. Now, however, the existence of most of them is proved by epigraphical or numismatic evidence. Archaeological sites of the Satavahana period of both the States of Andhra and Maharashtra, over which the Satavahanas ruled, are not yet properly explored ; it is therefore too early to say that the rulers between Satakarni II and Gautamiputra Satakarni were all imaginary. Recent numismatic discoveries have proved the existence of four Satavahana rulers not known to the Puranas, Kumbha Satakarni, Karna Satakarni, Saka Satakarni and Kosikiputra Satakarni. It would therefore be hazardous to say that the Puranas exaggerate the number of the Satavahana kings when they give it as 30. It is quite likely that the existence of many of the Puranic kings would be proved in course of time by further archaeological, epigraphical and numismatic discoveries. It is therefore hardly sound to assume, as is done in argument No. 3 above, that there were only 18 kings in the dynasty and therefore it could not have ruled for 450 years.

¹ M. A. S. B., I, pp. 14-15.

If we assume that the Satavahanas rose to power in the Deccan by c. 50 B.C., there arises a vacuum of more than a century which cannot be explained. The Maurya empire which included the State of Maharashtra, collapsed by c. 200 B.C. This region was not completely integrated in the empire; a number of Rathikas, Bhojas and Petenikas ruled in them in a feudatory capacity, enjoying considerable autonomy. It is therefore rather difficult to assume that no movement for the establishment of an independent state arose among them, when the Mauryan empire began to show signs of weakness. If we assume that Simuka rose to power in c. 50 B.C., we have to assume that no ruler arose to take advantage of the confusion resulting from the collapse of the Mauryan empire for about a century and a half. This is rather inexplicable. We are not faced with this difficulty if we place the rise of Simuka towards the end of the third century B. C. The span of the dynasty can then exceed four centuries, as is suggested by the Puranas. We can also well understand how the number of kings, who ruled during this period, should be about 30 and not 18.

As to argument No. 1 above, it is true that the statement of the Puranas that Simuka, the founder of the dynasty, rose to power after overthrowing the last Kanva king Susarman, no doubt tends to support the theory of the rise of the Satavahanas by c. 30 B.C. If we assume this statement to be literally true, it goes against the assertion of the Puranas that the Andhras (i.e. Satavahanas) ruled for three centuries. The duration of the dynasty would be of only 240 years, a view which is not supported by any Puranic tradition. We have therefore to explain the Puranic tradition in some other way. There is sufficient evidence to show that the Satavahanas extended their power to Malva. by the middle of the 1st century B.C. It is quite possible that they may have come into conflict with the last Kanva king at this time, as also with some scions of the Shunga family, who may have been ruling as petty feudatories in or near Malva, which was probably their ancestral home. The Puranic tradition probably confused the overthrower of Susarman with the founder of the Satavahana dynasty and ascribed him that feat, thus making him live by the middle of the 1st century B.C. A verse in the *Bhavisya Purana* says that the base-born Andhra king will rule only for a short time after killing Susarman.¹ This would suggest that the Andhra intervention at Pataliputra was of a short duration. The keepers of the Puranic tradition, who belonged to Madhyadesa, did not know much about the Andhra interloper and therefore confounded him with the founder of the dynasty, when they later got its full list in the 4th century A.D., at the time the Puranas were given their present form.

We should further note that the statement of the Puranic tradition that Simuka, the founder of the Andhra (Satavahana) dynasty overthrew the last Kanva king, is inherently difficult to believe. How can the founder of a new house at distant Pratisthana or Paithan

¹ *Hatva Kanvam Susarmanam tad-bhrtyo vrsalo bali | Gam bhoksyaty Andhra-jatiyah kancit-kalam a-sattamah ||*

grow suddenly so powerful as to overthrow the imperial dynasty of northern India ruling at far-off Pataliputra ? The Calukyas defeated Harsa, the Suzerain of northern India, but during the reign of Pulakesin II, the 4th ruler of their house. The Rashtrakutas shattered their rivals in northern India, but during the rule of Dhruva and Govinda III, the 4th and 5th rulers of their dynasty. The Marathas could bring the Moghals of northern India under their control, but only a century after the rise of their power under Sivaji. Logic of history thus favours our hypothesis that not Simuka, the founder of the dynasty, but a descendant of his succeeded in defeating the last Kanva ruler sometime in c. 30 B.C. This ruler was probably confounded with the founder of the dynasty, when the Puranic accounts were given their final form in the 4th century A.D.

We shall now consider other arguments advanced in support of the theory of Simuka being a ruler of the middle of the first century B.C. The Palaeographical argument (No. 5 above) of Chanda is not quite convincing. He argues that the script of the Naneghat inscription places it in c. 50 BC, showing that that was the time of the third Satavahana king. He maintains that the script of this inscription is later than that of the Besnagar inscription of Heliodorus (c. 100 B.C.) and earlier than the Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela (c. 25 B.C.)¹ To compare the palaeographical developments in such widely separated provinces as Orissa, Malva and Konkan and to conclude that a particular script in one province is earlier than that in another by 50 years or so is rather hazardous with reference to an age when communications were very difficult. Palaeographical evidence is not sufficiently decisive when the difference in time is only about a century and records concerned belong to places widely separated from one another by hundreds of miles.

Stray occurrence of advanced or archaic forms is too slight an evidence to determine precisely the date of a record when the difference between the two views is of less than a century. There is no doubt that the relievo statues at Naneghat were raised at one and the same time. Bhagwanlal has however pointed out how² the palaeography of the inscriptions over the first and last statues shows archaic characteristics like those in the inscription of Krishna, and how the inscriptions over the 2nd and the 3rd statues show palaeographical affinity with that of the records of Gautamiputra Satakarni and Vasisthiputra Pulumavi. We cannot therefore make much of the palaeographical peculiarities, when the difference is of less than a century.

Argument No. 6 above, trying to fix the date of the dynasty by the architectural forms at Nasik caves is also not convincing. Marshall has no doubt pointed out how the Satavahana Chaitya hall at Nasik has to be placed by the middle of the 1st century A.D. and not by the middle of the first century B.C. Even if we assume his view to

¹ M. A. S. B., I, pp. 14-15.

² *Nasik Gazetteer* (first ed.), pp. 607 ff.

be correct, it does not follow that the rise of the Satavahana power took place in c. 50 B.C. Mahahakusiri, the grandfather of the donor of the hall, is certainly not identical with the prince Hakusiri who was a son or grandson of the third Satavahana king. The record gives no regal titles to him, while it carefully records the official titles of a number of other personages mentioned in it, who are described as *rajamatya*, *bhandagarika*, etc. It is clear that Hakusiri was not even a minister, much less a king. We cannot, therefore, identify him with prince Hakusiri, who flourished in the 2nd century B.C. Palaeographically the record of Hakusiri is quite late and we can well accept Marshall's theory of the Chaitya hall being excavated in c. 50 B.C., without drawing the corollary that the Satavahanas rose to power at about the time the hall was excavated, *viz.*, c. 50 B.C.

It may be pointed out that the date of Kharavela is not inextricably connected with the rise of the Satavahanas. We can well place the Kalinga king in the 1st century B.C., and still hold the view that the Satavahana empire was founded in c. 200 B.C. by assuming that the Satakarni, who is mentioned as the opponent of Kharavela in that record, was not the third but the sixth ruler of the dynasty. We definitely know that a number of Rathikas and Bhojakas continued as the feudatories of the Satavahanas, as they once were the subordinates of the Mauryas. Kharavela could well have defeated some of them by the middle of the 1st century B.C. also.

Nasik inscription of Krishna, the second Satavahana king, refers to *Samana mahamatras*. This close imitation of a peculiar feature of the Ashokan administration would suggest that Krishna and Ashoka were not far removed in time from each other. This circumstance lends additional weight to the view that the 2nd Satavahana king flourished in c. 200 B.C., rather than in c. 50 B.C.

In our opinion Hathigumpha inscription supplies fairly conclusive evidence to show that Kharavela ruled in the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C. It is true that we can no longer maintain the view that the record contains a date described as 164th year of the Mauryakala or Mauryan era. Rapson's argument that this year in the Mauryan era shows that Kharavela flourished in c. 165 B.C., does no longer hold good. It seems very probable that there is reference to the Greek king Dima in line 8 of the Hathigumpha inscription ; this ruler can be no other than Demetrius I or II. The time of Kharavela would thus be c. 185-165 B.C. That would be the time of his Satavahana opponent king Satakarni. We shall show later how the probable time of this ruler is c. 189-179 B.C.; and how the two earlier kings ruled from c. 222 to c. 189 B.C.

A critical discussion of the available evidence thus shows that the Satavahanas rose to power in the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C., soon after the death of Ashoka. If we place the accession of Simuka in c. 220 B.C., we can explain satisfactorily all known facts of contemporary history. We have therefore accepted this date for the rise of this dynasty as a working hypothesis.

If the Satavahana dynasty consisted of about 30 kings who ruled for about 450 years, the question may be asked as to how one section of the Puranas happens to record a tradition stating that there were only about 18 or 19 kings of the House, who ruled for 300 years only. The answer is not easy to give. It, however, appears very probable that this Puranic tradition notices the duration of the dynasty subsequent to the fall of the Kanvas. Smith has pointed out how the duration of the dynasty works out to be 300 years if we deduct from 457 years, the real rule-period of the House according to one Puranic tradition, the sum of 157 years, which is the sum of the rule-periods of the Shungas (112 years) and the Kanvas (45 years). The Satavahana rule was of a short duration in the north and therefore the full details of its list of rulers were not known to all the custodians of the Puranic tradition. Some Puranas accepted the entire list and gave the dynasty a duration of 457 years. Others deducted from this period 157 years, the reign periods of the Shungas and Kanvas, and assigned a rule of only 300 years for the house. They naturally had to knock out some kings from the list and they omitted about ten names in the middle. Smith's hypothesis is an ingenious and probable one and better explains the tradition of 300 years' rule of the dynasty than the theory which places the rise of the house in c. 27 B.C. For according to this view, the duration of the dynasty extends over 240 years only.

HOME OF THE SATAVAHANAS.

The home of the Satavahana dynasty is still not definitely known. Since the Puranas unanimously describe the dynasty as Andhra, it was for a long time assumed that its original name was Andhra and early scholars like Bhandarkar, Smith and Rapson¹ naturally proceeded to locate its home in the Krishna-Godavari delta, the headquarters of modern Andhradesa. The Sunahsepa story in the *Aitareya Brahamana* shows that the Andhras were originally living on the outskirts of the Aryan settlements. Their association with the Pulindas would suggest that they were somewhere near the Vindhya from where they seem to have spread to the mouths of the Krishna and the Godavari. Jataka No. 3 mentions Andhrapura or the city or capital of the Andhras as situated on the Telavaha river flowing on the border of Madhyapradesa and Madras States. The Krishna-Godavari doab is the centre of Andhradesa since c. 350 B.C. The Andhra Kingdom was a powerful one even before the rise of the Mauryas; it had 32 big towns and a standing army of 1,00,000 of infantry and 1,000 elephants. Rock edict 13 of Ashoka shows that the Andhras enjoyed semi-independence under that emperor. There is, therefore, nothing improbable in their establishing an independent kingdom after the death of that monarch. The original nucleus of this kingdom was in the Krishna-Godavari delta. From there the dynasty extended its sway to Maharashtra and Western India after subduing the numerous Bhoja, Rathika and Petenika chiefs who were ruling there with a view to found a solid empire in the Deccan which could serve as a bulwark against any future invasion from the north.

¹ B.G. (first ed.), I,ii; Z.D.M.G., 1902, p. 657; C.C.A., p. xvi.

The theory of Andhradesa being the home of the dynasty is no doubt the earliest one in the field, but it appears to be untenable now. That the Puranic appellation can hardly have any significance about the early home of the dynasty becomes fairly certain when we remember how the early kings of the house describe themselves always as Satavahanas and never as Andhras¹. Smith's view that Srikakulam in Andhradesa was the capital of the early Satavahanas is based upon a passage in the *Trilinganusasanam*, which is now proved to be a late work composed even later than the 11th century. The statement in this work that Andhra Visnu, the son of the first Andhra king Sucandra, was a patron of the first Telugu grammarian Kanva, can have no historical value. It has to be remembered that neither Puranas nor inscriptions attest to the existence of kings Visnu and Sucandra in the Satavahana dynasty. It is therefore futile to argue that they were ruling at Srikakulam in Andhradesa.

R. G. Bhandarkar held that Nasik inscriptions Nos. 2 and 3 showed that Gautamiputra Satakarni was the lord of Dhanakata. He derived Dhanakata from Dhannakataka of Amravati inscriptions and identified it with Dharnikota in Andhradesa. Even if we assume Bhandarkar's view to be correct, the Nasik inscriptions will only show that in the days of Gautamiputra Satakarni, in c. 100 A.D., Dharnikota in Andhradesa had become a secondary capital of the Satavahana empire; it cannot prove that it enjoyed this honour in the 3rd century B.C. It may however be pointed out that the reading *Dhanakata-sami* has been recently challenged. At this time the letters *dha* and *ba* were similar, and it has therefore been suggested that the reading is *Benakata-sami* and not *Dhanakata-sami* [Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, p. 19.]. Gautamiputra would thus become the lord of the banks of the Bena which may be either Wainganga of Vidarbha or Krishna-Vena of Maharashtra.

In the Stupa at Amravati, we have discovered several votive Buddhist records belonging to the second and first centuries B.C. None of them refers to any contemporary Satavahana ruler or his officers. This is rather significant; for the second Satavahana ruler Krishna, is known to have appointed a special officer (Mahamatra) to look after the Buddhist Sramanas. It is clear that Buddhism received State patronage and it is therefore strange that if Amravati in Andhradesa was really included in the Satavahana empire, no votive records at the place belonging to the pre-Christian period, should have referred to Satavahana rulers or their officers. The only Satavahana kings figuring in the Amravati Stupa records are Vasisthiputra Sri Pulumavi and Sri-sivamaka Sata, who flourished in the 2nd century A.D. That the Amravati records should refer to only these two late

¹ In the Naneghat inscriptions, Simuka calls himself a Satavahana and not an Andhra. It is possible to argue that the inscriptions give the family name of the dynasty whereas the Puranas give its ethnic or territorial name. This argument fails to carry conviction. If they were Andhras, they should have given this name at least in some of their numerous records.

rulers of the dynasty and should be silent about their early predecessors would show that the latter did not rule over the Krishna-Godavari doab. This latter could not therefore have been their home.

There is fairly conclusive evidence to show that at about 200 B.C., the Satavahanas were not ruling in Andhradesa. The Bhattiprolu inscription, which by general consent is placed a few decades after Ashoka, refers to a king named Kubiraka as ruling in the locality¹. It is clear that he did not belong to the Satavahana family. King Kharavela, who flourished from c. 185 to 165 B.C. as shown already, refers to his destruction of the city of Pithunda in the 11th year of his reign and to the consequent break up of the confederacy in Tramira (Dravida) country. Pithunda of the Hathigumpha inscription is obviously identical with Pithunda of Ptolemy, which has been located in the Krishna-Godavari doab. No opposition of the Satavahanas is mentioned in connection with the destruction of Pithunda, as it is in connection with another expedition sent to the west in the second year of the reign. It is thus clear that the Satavahanas had not established themselves in Andhradesa by c. 200 B.C. It could not therefore have been their home.

Negative evidence is not generally conclusive, but when it becomes many sided, it cannot be ignored. All early Satavahana records have been found only in Western India. Why should not some of them at least have been found at Amravati, which has many records going back to the second and first centuries B.C. ? Most of the coins of the early Satavahana rulers come from Western India or Malva; hardly any hail from Andhradesa. One coin of a very early king named Satavahana has been found at Warrangal, but two other coins of this ruler were picked up, one in the heart of former Hyderabad State and the second at Poona. The evidence of the find-spot becomes conclusive only when a large number of coins have been found at an ancient site, and not otherwise. Rapson has no doubt attributed a large lead coin found in the Godavari district and weighing 559.5 grains, to an early ruler of this dynasty. The legend on this coins is extremely fragmentary and therefore we cannot attribute it with confidence to any particular ruler. It may be also doubted as to whether it is a Satavahana coin at all.

On the strength of the use of the early form of *da* opening to left, Rapson assigns one coin bearing the fragmentary legend *gha Sadasa* to Meghasvati, the 9th king of the dynasty and another to Madhariputra Sakasena of the Kanheri inscription². Even if we accept these attributions, they will only show that Andhra province was under the Satavahana rule in the first century B.C., as is clear from other evidence as well. They cannot prove that, that province was the home of the dynasty and the starting point of its expansion in c. 200 B.C. It is indeed strange that if Andhra province was the home of the dynasty, only one coin of an early ruler should have been found in it. The earliest rulers whose coins are found in the Andhra country is

¹ Cf. *Sagathinigamaputanam rajapamukhanam Kubirako raja E.I.*, I, p. 328.

² C.C.A., p. 10; p. 28.

Vasisthiputra Pulumavi, who flourished in c. 120 A.D. It is interesting to note that most of the big hoards of the Satavahana coins have been found in Maharashtra in districts like Canda, Akola and Nasik. None has been found in Andhra country.

If Andhradesa was the home of the Satavahanas, it is indeed strange that the early rulers of the dynasty like Simuka, Krishna and Satakarni I should have selected no place in their home province to inscribe records commemorating their glorious achievements; instead we find them selecting a far off and out of the way place like Naneghat in Western India to place their statues and inscribe their records commemorating great sacrifices and conquests. We have only three or four Satavahana records found in Andhra country, and these too belong to the rulers of the 2nd century A.D. This fact can hardly support the Andhra origin of the Satavahanas.

It has been recently argued that the inscriptions of the first three rulers are found in Western India, not because that was near their home, but because they had to shift their head-quarters to the west to counteract foreign invasions¹. The first invasion of the Greco-Bactrian rulers took place not earlier than c. 180 B.C.; and it had not threatened the Deccan in the least. It is therefore difficult to understand why Simuka and Krishna should have shifted their head-quarters to Nasik and Thana districts as early as 200 B.C., if the aim was to make better preparations to thwart the Greek attack. Generally most of the northern invaders used to make Ajmer their base of attack and penetrate into the Deccan by crossing the Vindhyas and the Narmada near Housangabad. If Simuka and Krishna wanted to thwart an invasion from the north, they should have shifted their head-quarters to Itarasi-Barhanpur area, and not to Nasik or Thana district.

Dr. V. S. Sukhtankar has advanced the theory that the home of the Satavahanas should be located in Bellary district, where a Satavahana record was discovered at Myakadoni, recording the construction of a tank in the reign of Sri Pulumavi². This record describes the tank as situated in Satavahani-hara and it is possible to argue that the Bellary district happened to be so called because it was the original *ahara* or district of the Satavahanas. This argument considered by itself, is not without some force. But we have to note that hardly any early Satavahana antiquities like coins and inscriptions have been found in Bellary district or its neighbourhood. And it is quite possible to explain the origin of the term Satavahani-hara for Bellary by another assumption. The inscription refers itself to the

¹ Dr. Ram Rao has advocated this view in *Satavahana Commemoration* Volume, pp. 22, 37. On p. 56, he states that invasion of Saurashtra by Salisuka and the capture of Ayodhya and Pataliputra by Antiochus were responsible for Simuka fixing his head-quarters in Western India. The power which had occupied Pataliputra could be better thwarted by shifting the headquarters to Jabalpur than to Nasik district. Saisuka's invasion of Saurashtra is hardly a historical event. It may be passingy stated that not Antiochus but Demetrios or Menander had occupied the Gangetic plain and Pataliputra.

² E.I.; XIV, pp. 151- ff, Hirahadagalli plates of Sivaskandavarman issued in c. 250 A.D. also refer to Bellary district as Satavahani-rattha.

reign of Pulumavi, who most probably was Vasisthiputra Pulumavi; very probably he had recently annexed Bellary district to the Satavahana dominion ; and therefore it began to be called the district of the Satavahanas (Satavahani-hara), in order to distinguish it from the kingdom of the neighbouring kings. During the British rule, it was customary to describe Satara as a British district as distinguished from its neighbour Kolhapur, which was under an Indian ruler. Satara however was not under the British from early times. The names British Borneo, Dutch Borneo, French Guiana, etc., given to different islands or provinces denote that they are under the British, the Dutch or the French. In the same way Satavahana-hara may have denoted a district recently annexed to the Satavahana empire. It is also possible that like the terms Govardhanahara, Mamalahara and Kodurahara, the term Satavahanihara may be due to a town named Satavahana being its headquarters. A village named Satunuru exists in Bellary district and its name may be a corruption of Satavahani¹.

It is also not impossible that the capital of a branch of the Satavahana dynasty may have existed in Bellary district, which may have given the name Satavahani-ahara to it.

The origin of the name Satavahani-ahara for Bellary district is probably to be explained by one of these hypotheses. There is no evidence to show that it was the original home of the Satavahanas in c. 200 B.C., from which they extended their power to north-west and north-east.

The available evidence thus tends to show that the home of the Satavahanas was somewhere in Maharashtra rather than in Andhra province. The Jain tradition mentions² Pratisthana or Paithan in Marathvada as the capital of the Satavahanas. Naneghat and Nasik are within about 200 miles to the west of Paithan and one can therefore well understand how the earliest Satavahana records are found inscribed at these places. It is not unlikely that some deity in the vicinity of Naneghat was the tutelary god of the Satavahanas, which induced them to have their statues and early records at that place. The queen of the third ruler of the dynasty was the daughter of a Maharathi chief and there is ample evidence to show that Berar and Maharashtra were studded with Rathika and Bhoja feudatories. More than 75 per cent. of the Satavahana epigraphs have been found in Maharashtra ; this renders it extremely probable that their home lay somewhere in that province.

The circumstance that the Satavahana king adopted Maharastri as their court language and extended their liberal patronage to the poets in it, lends additional support in the view that their home was somewhere in Maharashtra. It has no doubt been argued³ that just as the continuance of English as the official language by the Indian

¹ *Satavahana Commemoration Volume*, p. 26,

² *The Kalakacharya-kathanaka* states how Kalaka had visited Pratisthana, the city of Satavahana.

³ *Satavahana Commemoration Volume*, p. 23.

Republic does not show that it is the mother-tongue of Indians, so also the continuance of Prakrt as the court language by the Satavahanas would not necessarily show that they were not Telugu-speaking people. Prakrt, it is contended, was the court language of all the early powers of the Deccan, the Satavahanas, the Ikshvakus and the early Pallavas. Though the Satavahanas were Telugu-speaking people, they adopted Prakrt as their court language, because it was the fashion of the age.

There is not much force in this argument. It is claimed that the Desi-bhasa, which is referred to in the story of Gunadhya along with Sanskrit and Prakrt, was the mother-tongue of the Satavahanas. If Telugu language existed so early, if it was the mother-tongue of the Satavahanas, one fails to see why Telugu literature should not have flourished in their court. No Telugu work can be taken back to the Satavahana era. The language of the conqueror is continued during the transition period ; English will not be the official language of India after some time. Why should Prakrt have been continued by the Satavahanas as their official language for more than 400 years ? Why should king Hala have extended his patronage to the poets of Maharashtra Prakrt and not of Desi-bhasa or Telugu, if it existed in his days and was his mother-tongue ? The tradition that the Satavahanas had made a rule that Prakrt should be spoken even in their harem is no doubt recorded by a late poet (Rajasekhara), but this circumstance along with Hala's patronage of the poets in the Maharashtra tends to show that Maharashtra Prakrt was the mother-tongue of the Satavahanas. Their home also should, therefore, be placed somewhere in that province and not in Andhra country.

Where precisely this capital was, is not yet definitely known Pratisthana or Paithan in Marathvada appears to have the greatest claim to be regarded as the capital of the dynasty during the greater part of its rule.

What particular region in Maharashtra was the home of the Satavahanas is not yet possible to state. Prof. Mirashi has argued that we should consider Berar as the home province of the dynasty and Dr. D. C. Sircar has tried to controvert his view¹. The evidence of the Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela, on which Prof. Mirashi relies, is not, however, quite conclusive on the point. It no doubt describes king Satakarni as a western neighbour of Kharavela and describes how the armies of the Kalinga ruler marched to the Kanhabenna and harassed Musikanagara. It is true that the river Kanhan, which flows through Berar, was known as Kanhabenna, as Prof. Mirashi has pointed out. But Musikanagara², which was harassed during the course of this campaign, was most probably situated on the bank of the Musi river, joining the Krishna. on the outskirts of the Guntur district. The Krishna also was known as Kanhabenna in ancient times. A power which ruled over the wide territory

¹ *J.N.S.I.*, II p. 94, III, p. 61.

² The correct reading is Asikanagara as pointed out by Barua. Asika, Sanskrit, Rsika, was the ancient name of Khandesh A.B.O.R.I. XXV, 40 (V.V.M.).

including northern and central Hyderabad, Berar and parts of eastern Madhyapradesa, could have been appropriately described as his western neighbour by Kharavela¹ and the home of its ruler could have been as well in Berar as in Pratisthana or modern Paithan. We cannot choose one of these places in preference to the other and maintain that it alone was positively the home of the Satavahanas.

The mention of Gautamiputra as Benakatasvami or lord of the bank of the Bena, would suggest that eastern Vidarbha through which the Wainganga flows, may have been the home of the Satavahanas. This territory was known as Benakata, during the rule of the Vakatakas also. But another river also known as Venna, flows through the Satara district, and this district also may quite possibly have been known as Benakata in the past.

The occurrence of the earliest Satavahana inscriptions at Nasik and Naneghat may indicate that the Satavahana home was either in Poona or Nasik district, while the circumstance that Pratisthana was the capital of the dynasty may lend some weight to the view that the home of the rulers was located in its vicinity. We have as yet no evidence to decide this question.

It is interesting to note that the Puranas nowhere describe the dynasty as Satavahana and inscriptions nowhere name it as Andhra. How are we to explain this paradox? K. Gopalachari advances an ingenious theory in this connection. He suggests that the Satavahanas were really Andhras by ethnical extraction. Under Ashoka, we find a Greek governor, probably a native of Kamboja, appointed to rule over Kathiavad. In the same way some scions of the extinct Andhra dynasty may have been appointed as governors or district officers to rule in Maharashtra. Later on when Ashoka's empire began to decay, Simuka, who was one of the Andhra officers governing at Pratisthana, declared independence and founded a new dynasty. Puranas knew this real origin of Simuka and have given the correct name to his house².

This theory is ingenious, but not convincing. We have similar parallels in later history. The Calukyas and Rashtrakutas established branches of their dynasties in Andhradesa and Gujarat; the Senas from Karnataka established a dynasty in Bengal. There is, therefore, nothing impossible in one of the Andhra officers of Ashoka having established a house in Maharashtra. But why should the real name of the dynasty not occur even in a single official record issued by it? The Calukyas of Vengi and the Rashtrakutas of Gujarat always called themselves as scions of the Calukya or the Rastrakuta family. They never use any other name. Why then should the Satavahanas have been so careful as to eschew their

¹ Kalinga which Kharavela ruled, extended from the Godavari to the Vaitarani and Baster State, Canda district and Berar, and Adilabad, Karimnagar and Warangal districts of the ex-Hyderabad State can all be described as situated to its west.

² Gopalachari, *Early History of Andhra Country*, pp. 25-26.

original name from all their official records ? Surely, there was no provincialism running riot in those days. A name which was so carefully boycotted by the dynasty from all its official records is not likely to be known to the Puranic writers who probably hailed from the distant Gangetic plain.

The only probable explanation of the fact of the Puranas describing the Satavahanas as Andhras, would appear to be the assumption that they knew only of the later history of the dynasty, when the centre of its power was shifted to Andhradesa. The inscriptions of Ashoka and the account of Megasthenes show that the modern Andhradesa was known by that name in the 3rd century B.C. The Mayidavolu plates prove that the nomenclature continued down to the 4th century A.D.; for it refers to a district in Andhrapatha. A power which was ruling over the territory in c. 200 A.D. was naturally described as Andhra by the Puranas. The nomenclature has no connection with the Andhaka subdivision of the Yadavas, who had no connection with the Satavahanas. Nor does it seem to be connected with the rivulet Andhra flowing near Karli¹.

SATAVAHANA AND SATAKARNI NAMES.

We have tried above to explain the derivation of the term Andhra as applied to our dynasty in the Puranas. But the derivation of the term Satavahana, as used for this house in inscriptions and literature is not easy to understand or explain. Rapson has observed that Satavahana was the name of a clan and Satakarni was the name of the dynasty². He has adduced no evidence in support of the theory. It may be pointed out that Satavahana is clearly a personal name, when it appears on the three early coins which have the legend *rarhno Satavahanasa*. It is also a personal name when it is written under one of the statues at Naneghat. It is clear that Satavahana was the founder of the fortunes of his family as Sri-Gupta was in the case of the Gupta dynasty, and that the descendants in either case were known after the founder as the Satavahanas or the Guptas.

In later times Shalivahana is used as a variant name for the dynasty, but it occurs nowhere in any contemporary records. The term is used in connection with the Saka era only after the 13th century, when it was believed to have been founded by a king named Shalivahana. Rajawade's explanation that the dynasty was called Shalivahana because its carts (*vahanas*) were full of rice (*sali*), which is so plentiful in Andhra country, cannot be of much help to us, for the simple reason that the family was not known by that name at any time during its existence.

¹ S. A. Joglekar argues that the Satavahanas were called Andhras because they lived on the banks of the river Andhra flowing near Karla. *A.B.O.R.I.*, XXIII, pp. 169-205. If the Satavahanas had got the name Andhra because of the association with the river Andhra, one wonders why their inscriptions should not have described them as Andhras at least in some places.

² *B.M.C.A.*, p. xv.

Several derivations have been suggested for the term Satavahana, but none of them can be regarded as convincing. The root *san* in Sanskrit means to give and the term Satavahana can therefore be explained as those who used to give conveyances (liberally) (*satani vahanani yaih*), or as those to whom a conveyance was given (as a mark of honour by their overlords) (*Satani vahanani yebhyah*). Gopalachari has proposed the latter derivation and suggested that the Satavahanas were so called because they had received from their overlords, the Mauryas, a conveyance as a mark of appreciation of their service¹. This is a possible explanation, but we do not know whether it is historically true. The first explanation refers to a legend recorded in the *Tirthakalpa* of Jinaprabhasuri as to how the founder of the dynasty was the son of a maiden through Sesa, how he was bred up in a potter's house where he used to make toy carts and horses for giving to his playmates, and how they were endowed with life by Sesa, the father of the boy in order to meet an invasion. This explanation is more interesting than historical. The same remark has to be made about another legend narrated in the *Kathasaritsagara*² where we are told how a Yaksha named Sata fell in love with a sage's daughter from whom he got a son; as his presence was disliked, he used to assume the form of a lion and carry the boy on his back ; hence he was called Satavahana.

Przyluski thinks that Sata and *vahana*, the constituents of Satavahana, are both Munda words; the former is the Sanskritisation of the Munda word *sadam* meaning a horse and the latter of *hapan* meaning a son. Satavahanas were "sons of horse" as they believed themselves to be born of the chief queen with the sacrificial horse in the Asvamedha sacrifice³. This derivation appears to be extremely fanciful. So many kings in the Puranic dynasties as well as in historic ruling families were celebrated performers of the Asvamedha sacrifice ; the descendants of none of them adopted the surname of *Asvaputras* or *Vajiputras*. Why should the Satavahanas, who had championed the Vedic religion and the Prakrit language, accept a surname derived from the Munda language ? The earliest Satavahana king to celebrate the horse-sacrifice was Satakarni I; but we find the founder of the dynasty bore this name, though he is not known to have performed any horse-sacrifice. The theory of Przyluski is thus hardly convincing.

Barnett identifies Satavahanas or Satakarnis with Satiyaputras of Ashoka's inscriptions⁴. The latter, however, were in the extreme south of India and were outside Ashoka's dominions along with the Colas, the Pandyas and the Keralas. It may be, therefore, doubted whether any scion of the stock had migrated to the Deccan to found the Satavahana empire. Further, Barnett takes *Sata* to be a proper name and *vahana* as a descendant; Satavahana thus becomes the

¹ Gopalachari, *Early History of the Andhra Country*, p. 31.

² I. 67.

³ *J.R.A.S.*, 1,929, p. 273.

⁴ *C.H.I.*, I., p. 599.

descendant of Sata. The Canarese word for the son is *magana*, but it becomes *vagana*, when it is the second member of the compound; Satavagana was later Sanskritised into Satavahana. Barnett derives the name Satakarni in the same manner. *Kanya*, daughter, must have had a masculine form also as *Kanya*; Satakanya or Satakanna or Satakarna would be a son or descendant of Sata¹. On several coins Sata appears as a proper name, and there is nothing improbable in Satavahana or Satakarni meaning a descendant of Sata. But one does not feel quite certain when one has to postulate a Sanskrit word *kanya* for the son or when one has to accept *vahana* as a natural transformation of the Canarese word *magana*.

It has also been suggested that *vahana* and *karnin* both mean “oars” and Satavahanas were so called because they had many ships with hundred oars². It is a possible derivation, but we have no evidence of the Satavahanas being a great naval power. Jayaswal took Sata as a corruption of *Svati* meaning a sword and interpreted Satavahana as one who carried a sword, i.e. one who is a warrior³. The word *Svati* for a sword is not in general use and the name should have been *Satavahi* and not *Satavahana*, if it was intended to denote a warrior.

The sun’s carriage is drawn by seven horses and he can, therefore, be well described as *saptavahana*, which can be easily transformed into *satavahana*. S. A. Joglekar has, therefore, argued that the Satavahanas were so called because they were the devotees of the sun⁴. We may, however, point out that the sun does not figure among the several deities to whom homage has been paid at the beginning of the larger Naneghat inscription⁵. Among the numerous donations of the dynasty recorded in its inscriptions, there is none in favour of the sun or a solar temple. It is, therefore, far from certain as to whether the Satavahanas were really devotees of the sun and owed their family name to the circumstance.

The name Satakarni appears frequently in the dynastic list and deserves a few remarks. Rapson’s view that it denoted the dynasty is not at any rate true of its early period. The name is borne only by two early rulers before the time of Gautamiputra Satakarni. It, however, becomes more common in later times. In the Tarhala hoard we have the legends of Kana Satakarni, Kubha Satakarni, Khada Satakarni, and Saka Satakarni. It is likely that these later rulers may have used the term Satakarni as a family name or surname, but there is so far no evidence of the earlier rulers having done so.

The derivation of the term Satakarni is as uncertain as that of Satavahana. A sage named Satakarni is referred to in the *Raghuvaimsa* XIII, 38-40 ; so the name was not uncommon. But what

¹ *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. IX, p. 327.

² *Aravamuthan, Kaveri, Maukhari and the Sangam Age*, p. 63.

³ *History of India*, p. 168.

⁴ *A. B. O. R. I.*, XXVIII, p. 237 ff.

⁵ [This is not correct. Homage is paid to both the sun and the moon in that inscription V.V.M.]

it means it is difficult to say. Barnett explains the term as the descendant of Sata, as pointed out already. But we do not know whether Sanskrit had really a word like *kanna* denoting the son. Rajawade has explained the word in a different way. *Saptakarna* means bulls or horses whose ears were marked with the figure seven ; Satakarnis were those who had several bullocks or horses whose ears were so marked. One, however, does not know why the Satakarnis should have had bulls or horses marked with figure of seven only, and not with any other figure. It must be admitted that the proper derivation of the term Satakarni is not yet known to us. Sata, Sati and Svati were its abbreviations and Satakarni, Salakana and Svatikarna were its variations.

The Satavahanas were Brahmanas by caste. Gautamiputra is described in his mother's eulogy not only as *ekabamhana*, the pre-eminent or unique Brahmana, but also as *Khatiyadapama-nadamana*, 'the destroyer of the pride and haughtiness of the Ksatriyas'. This would show that he was not a Ksatriya, but a Brahmana. Satakarni I (or his widow) had celebrated a number of Sattras like *gavamayana*, which could be performed by Brahmanas only. It is, therefore, evident that the Satavahanas were Brahmanas who had, like their contemporaries, the Shungas and the Kanvas, given up the sacrificial laddie for the sword.

KINGS OF THE DYNASTY AND THEIR PERIOD.

A few words are necessary at the outset about the number of the kings in the dynasty, their names, reign-periods and the total duration of the rule of the family. We have assumed that the dynasty consisted of 30 kings as stated in the *Vayu*, the *Brahmanda*, the *Bhagavata* and the *Visnu Purana*. It must be, however, pointed out that though these Puranas agree with one another in giving the number of rulers as thirty, they do not give 30 names. Different manuscripts of the *Vayu* give 17, 18, or 19 names only; the *Brahmanda* gives 17, the *Bhagavata* 23 and the *Visnu* 23 or 24. On the other hand, while the *Matsya* states that there were only 19 kings, three of its manuscripts give as many as 30 names. Shorter lists usually omit kings Nos. 4-5, 9-14 and 24-25 of the list of kings accepted in this work. On the other hand, there are at least half a dozen kings known from coins and inscriptions whose names do not occur in the Puranic list. The data at our disposal is thus far from satisfactory to determine either the number of kings or their relative order. We have assumed as a tentative hypothesis that the Puranic list of 30 kings may be taken as approximately correct and have given our account on that basis. The kings known from coins and inscriptions but not occurring in the Puranic list, may perhaps have belonged to collateral branches. Their problem will be discussed at the end in a separate section.

There is considerable uncertainty also about the exact duration of the rule of the dynasty. We have already shown how the tradition in the *Bhavisya* Purana of the Andhra rule lasting for 300 years cannot be accepted. The dynasty had obviously ruled for more than 400 years. Our authorities are not unanimous about the exact duration. According to the *Matsya Purana*, the dynasty

ruled for 460 years, according to the *Brahmanda* and the *Visnu* for 456½ years and according to the *Vayu* for 411 years. If we total together the reigns of the individual kings and accept the longer reign-periods where two are given, the duration of the dynasty is found to be 45½ years. According to the hypothesis accepted by us, the dynasty ruled from c. 222 B.C. to 226 A.D. and thus ruled for 448 years.

We are not likely to be far wrong in this assumption. The *Puranas* appear to have had a fairly reliable tradition. In the case of four kings ruling almost successively,—Hala, Mandalaka, Sundara Svatikarna and Cakora Svatikarna,—they record very short reign periods of 5, 5, 1 and ½ year, respectively. This must be due to a definite and reliable tradition existing about their short rule. The *Puranas* assign a rule of 29 years to Gautamiputra Yajnasri Satakarni, and we have found a record of his dated in the 25th year. Vasisthiputra Pulumavi ruled for 29 years according to *Puranas* and we have one of his records dated in his 24th regnal year. In the case of Gautamiputra Satakarni, there is a discrepancy ; the *Puranas* give him a reign of 21 years, while epigraphs show that he ruled at least for 24 years. But the discrepancy is a small one and does not affect seriously our general conclusion that the reigns as given in the Puranic tradition may be accepted as correct as a working hypothesis. It will be further shown how most of the known facts of history as determined by epigraphical, numismatic and foreign sources are quite in consonance with the main outline of the Puranic chronology.

A few words of caution, however, are necessary about the names of individual rulers and their reign-periods. Sometimes there is considerable difference in the form and spelling of the names of individual kings. Thus Simuka appears as Sisuka and Sindhuka, Satakarni I as Mallakarni, Purnotsanga as Purnasanga, etc. We have selected that spelling which appeared to be the most probable one; but there is no certainty about its absolute correctness. Individual reign-periods are given only in some *Puranas* and they often differ. In the case of the 2nd king, Krishna, the reign-period is 18 years according to some authorities and 10 years according to others. The 15th king Puloma I ruled for 36 years according to one authority and for 24 years according to another. Reign-periods of the 19th king Purindrasena and the 27th king Sivaskanda Satakarni are not given at all. In such cases, we have been mainly guided by known or probable incidents of history in determining their probable reign-periods. It should be clearly understood that the dates given by us are merely tentative.

Satavahana and simuka.

According to the unanimous testimony of the *Puranas*, Simuka (Srimukha) was the founder of the dynasty¹. The dynasty, however, is expressly described as Satavahana-kula in several epigraphical records including the earliest ones. Just as the Gupta

¹ His name is also spelt as Simuka, Sivraka, Sindhuka, etc. But Simuka may be taken to be the correct form, since it occurs in the Naneghat inscription, which is an almost contemporary and official record.

dynasty owes its nomenclature to its progenitor king Gupta, who was undoubtedly a historical personage, it may well be argued that the Satavahana dynasty also owed its name to its founder bearing that name. In this connection it is worth noting that the Naneghat inscriptions expressly describe Simuka as Satavahana. The Nasik inscription of Krishna describes him as born in the Satavahana family. One of his grandsons bore the name of Satavahana. It is very likely that like king Gupta of the Gupta dynasty, king Satavahana of the Satavahana house occupied an humble status and was not an independent ruler of any consequence. He, however, probably laid the foundation of the future greatness of his house and posterity gratefully remembered him by naming the family after him. Some later princes of the family were given the founder's name as occurred in many other houses of ancient India. How much earlier than the time of Simuka, king Satavahana, flourished we do not know. But since Simuka calls himself Satavahana and his brother Krishna is described as born in the Satavahana family, it may not be improbable that he may have been the father of the two brothers¹. In the phrase Simuka Satavahana of the Naneghat record, Satavahana may be a *taddhita* from Satavahana, meaning the son of Satavahana. As Ashoka's empire was more or less firmly rooted in the Deccan down to c. 240 B.C., it is not likely that Satavahana, the eponymous ancestor of the family, could have lived much earlier than Simuka. We may, therefore, well assume as a tentative hypothesis that Simuka's father was Satavahana. The Puranas may have omitted his name as he was eclipsed by his son Simuka, who established the independence of the family.

Recently, however, three coins have been found bearing the clear legend Satavahana. Two of them are in copper and the third in lead. On the obverse they have elephant with the legend *Siri Sadavahanasa*; on the reverse there is the Ujjayini symbol. Prof. Mirashi, who published the first Satavahana coin, says that Satavahana preceded Simuka and Krishna by some generations. The Puranas he argues, do not name him, probably because he was a local ruler who had not yet attained imperial status; that he had declared independence is, however, clear from his coins².

There are serious difficulties in accepting the above view. Prof. Mirashi places the rise of the Satavahanas under Simuka in c. 225 B.C. The time of Satavahana, who preceded him by a few generations, could not be earlier than c. 275 B.C. At that time the Mauryas were ruling over Northern India and the Deccan and even they had not started issuing inscribed coins. It is, therefore, difficult to imagine how a small feudatory of theirs, ruling in the far off Deccan, should have thought of issuing inscribed currency, which was then practically unknown in India. If, however, we do not attribute these Satavahana coins to the founder of the dynasty, we are faced with the inconvenient fact of there being no later ruler in the dynasty

¹ [Had Krishna been a son of *Satavahana*, the inscription would have used *Satavahana-pute* (not *Satavahana-kule*) *Kanhe rajani*.—V.V.M.].

² *I. N. S. I.*, Vol. VII, pp. 3-4.

who bore that name and who could, therefore, be regarded as their issuer. Naneghat inscriptions no doubt refer to Kumara Satavahana as one of the sons of Satakarni, but he does not figure in the Puranic list. It is not unlikely that Kumara Satavahana of the Naneghat inscriptions survived his elder brother, who died in his minority, and ascended the throne with the *biruda* of Purnotsanga, which alone is preserved by the Puranas. The time of this ruler was c. 175 B.C., when inscribed coins had begun to be issued in Mathura, Paricala and Kausambi. Satavahana *alias* Purnotsanga may also have started them in the Deccan and the three Satavahana coins may be ascribed to him. This theory, however, is a mere hypothesis and lacks positive proof.

Satavahana, the father of Simuka was probably a mere feudatory under Ashoka. Sahaji paved the way of the future greatness of Sivaji, though he remained all along a feudatory. In the same way Satavahana may have helped the rise of his son Simuka to independence by the secret preparation he made in his life time. His time may be presumed to be c. 245 to c. 222 B.C.

Shalivahana, the reputed founder of the Saka era, is undoubtedly confused in later tradition with Satavahana, the founder of the dynasty of that name. The latter, however, neither founded an era nor flourished at c. 78 A.D., when the era started. The Satavahana records use regnal years and not any era ; the era of 78 A.D. began to be called Shalivahana Saka only after c. 1300 A.D.¹ The Satavahanas had nothing to do with its foundation; it was a Scythian era.

Satavahana was succeeded by his son Simuka, who may be presumed to have declared independence in c. 222 B.C., about ten years after the death of Ashoka. The Puranas unanimously give him a reign of 23 years ; we may, therefore, presume that he ruled from c. 222 to 199 B.C.

Western India and Maharashtra were studded with Rathikas and Bhojakas even during the reign of Ashoka and they enjoyed a semi-independent status. When the Mauryan empire began to disintegrate, they must have declared independence. Satavahana and Simuka probably belonged to one such Rathika or Bhojaka family². The opposition to their founding a new kingdom must have proceeded partly from the Central Mauryan Government and partly from other Rathikas and Bhojakas, many of whom must have aspired to become the head of a new Deccan State. Simuka overcame this twofold opposition successfully, but how he did it we do not yet know.

Simuka is known from a relievo statue of his found in Naneghat which bears the legend *Simuka Satavahano* under it. Whether his home and capital was somewhere [Those who hold that the Satavahanas were Andhras argue that the capital of Simuka was at Pithunda, and with that as his base, he proceeded to subjugate all the Rathikas and Bhojas and annexed all the territory up to Naneghat. *Satavahana Commemoration Volume*, p. 55.] in the territory in which the

¹ [The earliest record calling it as the era of Salavahana is dated A. D. 1251, *E. I.*, XXVI, p. 210, V.V.M.].

Naneghat is situated, or whether it was near Pratisthana, which soon became the capital of the dynasty, we do not know, nor do we have any definite information about the extent of his kingdom. Probably it may have extended from Nasik to Pratisthana or Paithan.

The Puranas state that Simuka overthrew and killed Susarman, the last Kanva ruler and also mopped out the remains of the Shunga power. This would suggest that he advanced into the Gangetic plain, perhaps penetrated to Pataliputra, and for some time occupied that imperial capital. Such an achievement for the founder of a ruling family in Western India is difficult to believe. In later times the Rashtrakutas defeated the rulers of the imperial families of Northern India, but this feat became possible for them only during the 3rd and 4th reigns of their house. We have shown already that Simuka was not a contemporary of Susarman, who died in c. 25 B.C. A feat that was done by a later Satavahana king by the middle of the 1st century B.C. has been wrongly ascribed to Simuka by the Puranas. Simuka was too small a king even to venture an expedition in the Gangetic plain, much less to score a sensational victory in it.

There is a Jain tradition stating that the first Satavahana king built Jain temples, but that in the closing years of his reign he became wicked and was dethroned and killed¹. Whether this tradition is trustworthy we do not know. The statues of Simuka, Krishna and Satavahana which are preserved at Naneghat, would suggest that the three kings had normal careers and reigns. It does not appear probable that either Satavahana or his son Simuka was dethroned and killed.

The revolts of Cetus in Kalinga and Simuka in Maharashtra were almost simultaneous. It would appear that the Andhras, who had a powerful kingdom before the rise of the Mauryas² also revolted at about the same time and founded a kingdom of their own in the Krishna-Godavari doab. This kingdom was, however, different from that of the Satavahanas and appears to have come to an end when Kharavela destroyed its capital Pithunda in c. 190 B.C.

Krishna c. 199-189 B.C.

Simuka probably had no son and was, therefore, succeeded by his younger brother Krishna. Unfortunately history knows very little about the career and achievements of this ruler. We may presume that he was co-operating with his elder brother during his reign³ and that he continued the work of expansion after the latter's death. Since Simuka had ruled for 23 years ; it is not likely that Krishna, who was his younger brother, had a long reign. We may, therefore, assume that the Vayu Purana which ascribes to him a reign of ten years, is likely to be more correct than the *Matsya* which makes him rule for

¹ *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, Vol. X, p. 134.

² According to Pliny their army consisted of 1,00,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants. They had thirty towns defended by walls and towers. *Natural History*, Book VI, 21-3.

³ The absence of his statue at Naneghat may be accidental; we need not necessarily infer from it that the two brothers were not on cordial terms. It may be further pointed out that there is clear evidence to show that two statues have disappeared. One of these may have been that of Krishna.

18 years. It is not unlikely that Krishna may have added southern Mahsrastra and Konkan to his ancestral dominion. This statement, however, is based upon mere conjecture.

Krishna's administration was to some extent modelled on that of the Mauryas. The only epigraph of his, known so far, refers to a cave excavated by a Nasik official, who is described as *Samananam mahamatra*. Obviously this office of *Samananam mahamatra* was analogous to Dharmamahamatras of Ashoka. The officer was expected to look after the Buddhist establishments and meet their needs. The Satavahanas were Hindus, and yet we find them solicitous about the welfare of the Buddhists.

The cave excavated in Krishna's reign is the earliest one at Nasik and is therefore naturally of no high architectural grandeur. Pillars have no capitals ; they are square at the top and bottom and octagonal in the middle.

Satakarni I c. 189-179 B.C.

The next ruler of the dynasty was king Satakarni¹. It is difficult to state whether he was the son or nephew of Krishna. Puranas make him Krishna's son, but the relievo figures at Naneghat however omit Krishna altogether. First comes the statue of Simuka, then those of Sri Satakarni, Naganika and Kumara Bhaya. Then there is empty space of two statues now lost, after which follow the statues of Maharathi Tranakayira, the father of Naganika, Kumara Hakusiri and Kumara Satavahana. Krishna is omitted altogether. This is rather inexplicable, if Krishna were the father of Satakarni. The order of the statues suggests that Satakarni was the son of Simuka. We have, however, assumed that the Puranic tradition is correct and taken Satakarni to be the son of Krishna.

A flood of light is thrown upon the Satavahana history of the time of Satakarni and his predecessors and successors by several inscriptions discovered at Naneghat. The inscriptions are, however, mutilated and lend themselves to several conflicting interpretations. Buhler, who last edited the Naneghat inscriptions, maintained that the larger inscription was engraved during the minority of prince Vedisri, when his mother Naganika was ruling as queen-regent. This view has been recently challenged by Prof. V. V. Mirashi, who maintains that Vedisri was not a minor but a ruling king at the time when the record was incised². Bhagwanlal Indraji, who first edited the inscriptions also thought that it was incised not during the regency of Naganika, but in the reign of her son Vedisri³. Naganika is usually taken to be the widow of king Satakarni, but since her relievo figure at Naneghat follows that of Simuka and precedes that of Satakarni, it is possible to argue, as Dr. Katare

¹ Mallakarni and Santakarni are two other variations of the name of this infer.

² *J.N.S.I.*, XIV, p. 26f. Prof. Mirashi does not construe the term *Kumuravara* with word Vedisri immediately following, but takes it to be the name of Karttikeya, to whom homage is paid along with other deities.

³ *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, Vol. XIII, p. 312.

has done¹, that Naganika was the wife of Simuka and mother of Satakarni. The Naneghat inscriptions further refer to Vedisri and Sati, princes Bhaya, Hakusri and Satavahana. It is not yet possible to determine with certainty the relations of these princes either with Naganika or Simuka or Satakarni, nor can we identify them with any rulers mentioned in the Puranas.

Naneghat inscriptions undoubtedly refer to a mighty ruler ruling over the entire Deccan. The inscription of Kharavela also refers to a king named Satakarni, ruling over the Deccan; he eventually succeeded in stemming the tide of Kharavela's invasion. We, therefore, assume that it is king Satakarni, the third ruler of the dynasty, whose greatness and victories are described in the larger Naneghat inscription and that Naganika was his widow. The Puranas give a reign of only ten years to Satakarni and it is, therefore, quite possible that his widow Naganika may have survived him by several years. Possibly she was a regent in the beginning². Kumara Bhaya may have been a brother of king Satakarni or a son of his who died early. Vedisri Hakusiri and Satavahana³ were probably the sons of king Satakarni and queen Naganika. Vedisri and Hakusri probably died in their childhood and Satavahana succeeded his father at the end of the regency with the *biruda* of Purnotsanga. It should be however clearly understood that all these hypotheses are pure assumptions ; we have no evidence to substantiate them, or any other rival theory, as proved facts of sober history.

Let us now revert to the career of king Satakarni. Naganika's inscription at Naneghat describes him, as the first and the most prominent hero on the earth (*pathaviya pathamavirasa*), whose victorious army met no opposition (*apratihatacakasa*), who was the lord of Daksinapatha and who performed Rajasuya once and Asvamedha twice. It is therefore, quite clear that Satakarni had a number of victories to his credit which eventually made him the lord of the Deccan. Who his opponents were, is, however, not known.

It is not, however, possible to determine the precise extent of his kingdom. Daksinapatha vaguely denotes the Deccan but this need not necessarily prove that the dominion of Satakarni covered the entire peninsula. In the first century A.D., we find the Periplus distinguishing Dachinabades (Daksinapatha) from Damarica, the extreme south of the peninsula. Daksinapatha, over which Satakarni ruled obviously excluded that portion of the peninsula which was to the south of Mysore. Kharavela's record shows that in the Eastern Deccan there was a Dravida confederacy in c. 200 B.C. It would, therefore, appear that Satakarni I did not rule over the eastern Deccan as well. We would not be far wrong if we assume that his dominions included the modern States of Maharashtra and Mysore. His

¹ I. H. Q., XXVII, p. 213.

² [This is not likely. See her description in the Naneghat inscription as one who used to fast for a month, lived in her house the life of an ascetic, was self-controlled etc.—V.V.M.].

³ It is possible to argue that Hakusiri and Satavahana were the grand sons of Satakarni and sons of Vedisri.

queen Naganika belonged to Kalalaya family, coins issued by which no doubt at later date, have been found in Mysore. Kalalayas were, Maharathis and therefore merely feudatories and we may then well presume that the former princely State of Mysore was also included in Satakarni's dominion. This is also suggested by his title Daksinapathapati. The conquest of Bombay, Karnatak and Mysore was probably the achievement of Satakarni. He may have celebrated it by the performance of one of his two Asvamedhas.

A fairly large number of copper coins have been found in Malva with the legend Siri Satasa, and it has, therefore, been assumed by some scholars that Malva might have been annexed by king Satakarni I¹. Malva has always been a bone of contention between the imperial powers of the north and the south and had changed hands frequently in the course of Indian history. There is, therefore, nothing improbable in Satakarni having annexed it to his dominion in c. 180, when the Mauryan power had collapsed and the Shungas had not yet succeeded in firmly establishing themselves. It is, however, not unlikely that king Sata of the Malva coins may be Satakarni II. If Satakarni I had conquered Malva, it could be retained by his house only for a short time. For we find Agnimitra, the crown-prince of Pusyamitra Shunga, ruling there as Viceroy in c. 160 B.C.

According to the chronology accepted by us, king Kharavela of Kalinga was a contemporary of Satakarni I and gave him considerable trouble. In the second year of his reign he sent an expedition to the West defying the power of Satakarni and attacked Musika-nagara, situated on the confluence of the Krishna and the Musi, about 100 miles south east of the city of Hyderabad. Two years later he penetrated perhaps further west, as he claims to have received allegiance from a number of Rathikas and Bhojakas, who were Satavahana feudatories ruling in Maharashtra. The humiliation of these feudatories must have been a blow to the prestige of Satakarni. It appears that he was taken by surprise by these unexpected invasions and lost his ground in the beginning. He, however, soon managed to put his eastern frontier in a proper state of defence. Kharavela does not claim to have undertaken any further expedition against Satakarni later than his 4th year. We may, therefore, well presume that Satakarni soon succeeded in re-establishing his authority right up to the eastern border of the former State of Hyderabad.

Satakarni was a devout orthodox Hindu and celebrated a number of Vedic sacrifices. These are all enumerated with due pomp by his widowed queen in her famous inscription at Naneghat. Two of these, Rajasuya and Asvamedha (which was performed twice) undoubtedly had political significance and probably commemorated important victories or achievements. Others were purely religious. Among these were Agnyadheya, Aptoryama, Dasaratra, Bhagala-dasaratra, Trayodasaratra, Angirasatriratra, Satatiratra and Chando-pavamanatriratra. Gavamayanasattra was performed twice. Only Brahmanas are entitled to perform this *sattra*; this would show that the Satavahanas belonged to that caste.

¹ C.H.I., I, p. 522.

Honoraria to the presiding priests were given on these occasions in a liberal way. In the Asvamedha sacrifice for example the *daksina* consisted of an elephant, a horse with its silver accoutrement, a village and 14,000 *Karsapanas*¹. In Gavamayana, the honorarium consisted of 10,000 cows.

The Naneghat record opens with a salutation to Prajapati, Dharma, Indra, Sankarsana and Vasudeva of Candravamsa, and the four Lokapalas—Yama, Varuna, Kubera and Vasava. It is interesting to note that at the time of the record Vasava was distinguished from Indra and Yama from Dharma. Satakarni had also a leaning towards the Bhagavata school, which was becoming popular at this time ; for Sankarsana and Vasudeva, mentioned in the record, are the special deities of that school. Whether the last deity referred to in the record is Kumara or Kartikeya is not quite certain².

The Puranas unanimously allot a reign of only ten years to this ruler. It seems to be rather short for his numerous achievements. But the short reign is confirmed by the Naneghat inscription, which shows that his queen Naganika had to act as regent for a long time after the death of her illustrious husband³. The king left behind him not more than three sons, again showing that his life was cut short in its prime. The Naneghat records make distinct reference to three princes, Kumara Vedisri, Hakusari and Satavahana. The Puranas, however, unanimously state that the successor of Satakarni was Purnotsanga. Purnotsanga was probably a *biruda* of one of these princes, most probably Satavahana. One of the Nasik records mentions a donation by a lady who is described as a daughter of the royal minister and a grand-daughter of Mahahakusri. Scholars have identified the grand-father of this lady with prince Hakusari, the son of Satakarni. This, however, appears to be extremely improbable. The characters of the record definitely belong to the 1st and 2nd century A.D. The record gives the titles of all other relations of the lady ; some of them are seen to be Amatyas (ministers or officers) and some Bhandagarikas (treasurers). But it is strange that Hakusari, the grandfather, has no title whatsoever. This would prove that he was a mere commoner and not a king or a prince. The Jain tradition refers to a Satavahana king named Saktikumara, who is described as a lascivious king. But whether Saktikumara, can become Hakusari, is not certain. It appears that princes Vedisri and Hakusari though elder ones, did not ascend the throne⁴. They probably died before attaining majority. The youngest prince Kumara Satavahana seems to have succeeded his father with the *biruda* of Purnotsanga. We feel inclined to make this assumption because the coins bearing the legend Satavahana undoubtedly belong to the 2nd century B.C. and Kumara Satavahana, the younger son of Satakarni, is the only king

¹ *Karsapanas* were silver pieces weighing about one-third tola. They are described as punch-marked silver coins in modern numismatic works.

² (See S.J., Vol. I, pp. 121 f. V.V.M.).

³ (*Loc. cit* V.V.M.).

⁴ (It seems, on the other hand, that Vedisri was reigning at the time. See S. I., Vol. I, pp. 121 f. V.V.M.).

with the name Satavahana who could have issued these pieces¹. We, therefore, suggest the identification of Prince Satavahana, the younger son of Satakarni, with Purnotsanga, mentioned as his successor in the Puranas.

Purnotsanga c. 179-161 B.C.

The next ruler of the dynasty was Purnotsanga² of the Puranic list and we have tentatively identified him with *Kumara* Satavahana of the Naneghat record. He is not known to us from any epigraphs and Puranas do not give his relationship with his predecessor, Satakarni I.

If the time allotted to this ruler is correct, he may well have come into hostile contact with the Shungas. The Shunga crown-prince Agnimitra was ruling at Vidisa (modern Besnagar near Bhopal) and the *Malavikagnimitra* refers to his conflict with Yajnasena, a king in Berar. The latter had imprisoned his cousin Madhavasena and had refused to set him free, unless his own brother-in-law, who was a minister under the Mauryas was released by Pusyamitra. Agnimitra then invaded Berar, defeated its king Yajnasena and got Madhavasena released. Kalidasa tells us that he then ordered that Berar should be divided between Yajnasena and his cousin Madhavasena.

The plot of the drama, as given by Kalidasa, refers to Yajnasena as an independent king. It is, however, not unlikely that he was under the sphere of influence of the Satavahanas. Otherwise, it would appear improbable how an insignificant king should thus boldly challenge the power of Agnimitra and his father Pusyamitra who was the lord paramount of northern India. The plot of the drama would suggest that Berar was not being directly administered by the Satavahanas by c. 150 B.C. It was in the interest of Purnotsanga to give diplomatic and military support to Yajnasena, who was a partisan of the Mauryas. For his immediate northern neighbours, the Shungas, who were his rivals in the Deccan, were the deadliest enemies of the Mauryas. This probably was the beginning of the long struggle between the Satavahanas and Shungas.

If our suggestion that Kumara Satavahana of the Naneghat inscription is identical with Purnotsanga is correct, the three coins bearing the name Satavahana should be attributed to this ruler. At this time c. 150 B.C., coins with the legend giving the king's name had become common in the north. Agnimitra, the Satavahana's rival at Vidisa, had issued coins bearing his own name. Satavahana Purnotsanga might have emulated his example. These coins have an elephant

¹ Professor V. V. Mirashi has attributed these coins to king Satavahana, the founder of the dynasty. He flourished in c. 250 B. C. and at that early period the pattern of inscribed coins was not adopted even by the kings of northern India, who were in closer contact with the Greeks. It, therefore, seems more probable that king Satavahana of the three coins was a later ruler and identical with the prince of the name mentioned at Naneghat. It may be pointed out that we have a similar case in the Vakataka history. The regent Prabhavati-gupta had three or at least two sons Divakarasena, Damodarasena *alias* Pravarasena or Damodarasena and Pravarasena; of these Pravarasena, the youngest succeeded to the throne at the end of the regency.

² Purnotsanga and Purnasangha are other variations of this name. Purnotsanga appears to be the correct reading.

on one side and the Ujjayini symbol on the other¹. One of them was found in Kondapur excavations and two others were purchased in the former Hyderabad State. It is likely that the type was intended for circulation in the home province of the Satavahana empire.

KING OF THE DYNASTY.

Skandastambhi 161-143 B.C.

The next ruler Skandastambhi (c. 161-143 B.C.) is a shadowy personality. He is not only not referred to in the inscriptions, but those Puranas which give the shorter list of about 18 kings of this dynasty, also usually omit him. His relationship with his predecessor is also not stated. We do not know of any events in his reign. The Puranas state that he was succeeded by Satakarni II, but the relationship of the two kings is not given.

Satakarni II 143-86 B.C.

Satakarni II (c. 143 B.C. to 87 B.C.) had the longest reign in the dynasty; the Puranas unanimously state it to be of 56 years. During the long reign of Satakarni II, the Shunga power was on the decline. It is but natural that Satakarni should have taken advantage of this situation and pushed his frontiers further to the north. It appears that after defeating the Shungas, he annexed Malva— Jabalpur region to the Satavahana empire in c. 90 B.C. The Shunga king, Bhaga was probably his opponent.

This inference is based almost entirely on the evidence of coins. A large number of coins have been found in Malva and Western India bearing the legend *Siri Sata* (or Sri Sati) or Siri Satakanisa. The provenance of the coins published by Rapson was vaguely known as Western India; some of them had elephant with trunk upraised on one side and Ujjayini symbol on the other², while others substituted the elephant by the Hon. In 1942, five more coins of Sata were published by the present writer; 4 of them had an elephant on one side while the fifth had a lion. Other symbols were similar to those occurring on the Malva coins. In some cases the legend was Sata, in some Satakarni and in some Rano *Siri Satakanisa*³. The precise provenance of these coins was not known. Prof. Mirashi published in 1947 a lead round coin of the Bull type with the legend *Ramno Sara Satakanisa*⁴. In 1951 Dr. Katare published a new Satakarni coin found in Hosangabad district of the usual Eran type but having the clear legend Siri Satasa. In 1952 a large number of copper coins collected in Malva have been published, which have the usual Satavahana motifs like Elephant, Lion etc., but are uninscribed⁵. Rapson, Mirashi and Katare are all inclined to ascribe these coins to Satakarni I. This king was a powerful ruler and there is nothing improbable in his having issued some of these coin-types, even

¹ J.N.S.I. VII p. I; XI p. 5.

² B.M.C.A.K. Pl. 1-5-6. Quite recently (in 1952) a large number of copper coins have been published, collected in Malva by Mr. N. R. Advani, which have the usual Satavahana motifs of Elephant, Lion, etc., but are uninscribed. One of them contains a fragmentary legend, probably standing for [Sata] kani, J.N.S.I. XIII.

³ J.N.S.I., IV., pp. 25-28.

⁴ *Ibid* VIII 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XIII, 209.

though he had a short reign of ten years. Inscribed coins had, however, not become common in his time (c. 189-179 B.C.) and were rare even in the Northern India. Tree within railing, river with fish and Ujjayini symbol, which occur on most of the coins of Satakarni, are characteristically Malva symbols and their occurrence on these coins may presuppose the conquest of that province, which had not taken place at the time of Satakarni I; the Shungas were firmly entrenched in Malva in 170 B.C. and were trying to interfere with the politics of the Deccan. It is difficult to understand how the coins of their opponent Satakarni I could have become current in their dominion of Malva. The coin of Satakarni published by Katare was actually found in Malva. It is true that on the strength of palaeography, it has been argued that the Satakarni of the coins should be identified with Satakarni I. But the difference between Satakarni I and II is only about fifty years, Satakarni II and palaeography, especially on coins, will not be able to give any decisive clue. For instance the form of *ta* on the coin of Sata published by Rapson (PI, I, 1-2) is almost Ashokan, while that of the same letter on the coin published by Katare shows a round lower limb suggesting a later date. All things considered, I am inclined to attribute most of the early coins¹ having the legend Sata or Satakarni to Satakarni II². A few of them might have been issued by Satakarni I.

A short record on one of the Sanci gateways (*toranas*) refers to its erection by Ananda, a foreman of king Satakarni. This record renders it probable but not certain that Satakarni, the master of Ananda, was ruling over Sanci. This probably is rendered almost certain by the discovery of the coins of king Sata or Satakarni in Malva. For the reasons, already discussed above, we prefer to identify the king Satakarni of the Sanci record with king Satakarni II. Towards the end of the rule of this king (143-87 B.C.) the power of the Shungas had declined, and Malva could well have been wrested from them by the Satavahanas. According to our view, the Sanci gateway was erected some time between 100 and 75 B.C.

Recent numismatic discoveries tend to show that after occupying Malva, Satakarni II marched eastwards and occupied Dahala or Jabalpur area also. Two copper coins, one with the name Satakarni and the other with the name Sati, were found in a village at Tewar near Jabalpur. A third coin of this king was found in the excavations at Tripuri in 1952, in a definitely Shunga stratum. Copper coins usually do not travel long and the discovery of these three coins near Jabalpur makes it fairly certain that their issuer Satakarni II had occupied the province of Dahala also. This may be a step towards the march on Pataliputra.

Lambodara, c. 87-69 B.C.

Apilaka, c. 69-57 B.C.

Meghasvati, c. 57-39 B.C.

Svati, 30-21 B.C.

¹ King Satakarni of the coins published in *B.M.C.A.*, VII, 179 to G. P. 4, is a ruler of the second century A.D.

² Smith had assigned these paintings to king Svatikarni or Satakarni, the 10th ruler in the Puranic list, *Z.D.M.G.*, 1903, p. 607.

The Puranas expressly state that Lambodara was the son of Satakarni II and that he was succeeded by his son Apilaka. The relationship of the next two rulers with each other or with Apilaka is not stated. There is divergence among the Puranas about the duration of the reign of the last king. We have assumed that he ruled for 12 years rather than 18. The name of this ruler Svati or Svatikarna may have been an abbreviation and corruption of Satakarni.

Very little is known about the political events in the Satavahana history of this period, but there are clear indications that the Satavahanas were extending their sphere of influence in the east and north-east at this time. There is some evidence to suggest that the Satavahanas had annexed Andhra province during this period. A coin of Meghasvati, the third ruler of the above group was found in Andhra province. The legend on the coin is fragmentary and reads only *Ghasada* : but it can hardly stand for the name of any other ruler than Meghasvati. Its palaeography also suggests that it was issued in the 1st century B.C., and according to our chronology the time of Meghasvati is 57-39 B.C. A coin of Apilaka, the 2nd ruler in the above group, was picked up in the Mahanadi, in the Chattisgad division of Madhya Pradesh¹. The find-spot of this coin would tend to show that by c. 60 B.C. the Satavahanas were gradually advancing north-east perhaps with Pataliputra as their ultimate goal. They had already occupied Jabalpur in the reign of Satakarni II. It is true that the evidence for the spread of the Satavahana rule over Chattisgad and Jubbulpore is very slender; it consists of only the find-spots of solitary coins. But it is confirmed by the Puranic tradition which ascribes the conquest of the Shungas and Kanvas to the Satavahanas at c. 50 B.C. The Satavahanas must have used Chattisgad and Jubbulpore as spring-boards for the invasion of the Gangetic plain.

The power of the Shungas and the Kanvas was declining during c. 87-21 B.C., when these rulers were ruling. With Chattisgad and Jabalpur in their possession, the Satavahanas could well have penetrated into the Gangetic plain. We may therefore well believe the Puranic tradition in this respect, which suggests but does not prove that sometime between 75 B.C. and 25 B.C., the Satavahanas crossed sword with both these powers and perhaps penetrated right up to Pataliputra. The occupation of Malva and Jabalpur in the time of Satakarni II would also have helped the northern

¹ See J.A.S.B., 1937 N. p. 93 for the coin of Apilaka. its legend is *Ramno Sivasiris Apilakassa*. K. N. Dikshit, who published this coin, thought that its palaeography would place it in the 1st century A.D. rather than in the 1st century B.C. Since no Apilaka is known to have ruled in the 1st or 2nd century A.D., it is best to attribute the coin to Apilaka of the 1st century B.C., Palaeography of coins cannot be decisive when the difference is of 100 years only. The coin of Apilaka is blank on one side, suggesting that it must be fairly early. The spelling of the king's name on the coin as Apilaka would show that the variations of this king's name as Apitaka, Apadava, Apistava are all due to the textual corruption.

expedition. In later times we find that when the Rashtrakutas got a foothold in Malva, they used it as a spring-board for marching into the Gangetic plain.

We have so far discovered no Satavahana coins or inscriptions in the Gangetic plain or at Pataliputra. The reason seems to be the short duration of the Satavahana occupation of the Gangetic plain. The *Bhavisya Purana* distinctly says that the base-born Andhra king, who will kill the Kanva ruler Susarman will enjoy the earth (i.e. Pataliputra or Kanva dominion) only for a short time¹. The Yuga-Purana in the *Gargi-samhita* states that the excellent Sata king will frustrate the efforts of the Sakas, desirous of conquering Kalinga and Satavahana kingdoms, and then rule the earth for ten years only². This statement may, however, refer to the Kusana occupation of Kalinga in the days of Wima Kadphises and Kaniska and an attempt to invade the Deccan from the east.

We have marshalled above such evidence, no doubt very slender, as is available at present to suggest the invasion of the Gangetic plain by the Satavahanas sometime between c. 50 B.C. and 25 B.C. It is far from conclusive, but renders the Puranic account not altogether unbelievable. We cannot state which king or kings are to be credited with this achievement. It may very probably have been Svati or Svatikarna,³ the last ruler of this group, who ruled for eighteen years, from c. 39 to 21 B.C.

The Jain tradition, which states that Satavahana was the son of a maiden born from Sesa, narrates how king Vikramaditya attacked Paithan in order to kill Satavahana., We do not know whether king Vikramaditya, the reputed founder of Vikrama era, was a historic king at Ujjayini, and if so, whether he was at war with the Satavahanas. If there was a war between the two, we shall have to place it sometime during c. 40 and 30 B.C. The Malavas who were at this time occupying Jaipur-Ajmer area, may not have liked the Satavahana occupation of Avanti and Akara (Malva) and this may have been the cause of the war. Satavahanas, however, retained their hold on Malva, it may be after a short expulsion by Vikramaditya. The history of the whole period is extremely obscure and we can only suggest some tentative reconstruction on the above lines. Future archaeological discoveries alone will enable us to reconstruct it with confidence and certainty.

Skandasvati, Mrgendra Svatikarna, Kuntala, Svatikarna, and Puloma I (21 B.C.—22 A.D.)

The relationship of these four kings is not given by the Puranas. They had very short reigns. Together they ruled for 20 years only. This would suggest disputed succession, internal commotion or foreign invasion. It is not unlikely that there was a revolt in the south

¹ *Hatva Kanvam Susarmanam tad-bhrtyo vrsalo bali\ Gam bhoksyaty Andhra-jatiyah kancit-kalam a-sattamah* \ D.K.A., p. 38.

² J.B.O.R.S., XVI, p. 22.

³ It is quite likely that Svatikarna occurring in the name of the king may have been a corruption of Satakarni.

during the reigns of Skandasvati and Mrgendra Svatikarna, in which the province of Kuntala was lost and Mrgendra lost his life. His successor may perhaps have reconquered this province and taken the title Kuntala Svatikarna. If we are to believe the tradition recorded in the *Kamasutra*, this king put an end to the life of his chief queen by a pair of scissors¹. His successor Svatikarna had a very short reign of only one year. What was the cause of his quick exit, we do not know.

It is very probable that these short reigns are concealing a number of sordid facts ; we, however, get no clue to their nature. Political turmoils and internecine wars might have been rampant. If Pataliputra had been really occupied at c. 25 B.C., it must have been lost during this troubled period. We can therefore well believe in the Puranic tradition of a short rule of the Satavahanas in the Gangetic plain.

The Puranas give no clue to the relationship of Puloma I, the 4th king in the above list, either to his predecessor or to his successor. His name has been frightfully distorted in different manuscripts of the Puranas; some of them credit him with a reign of 24 years and others with 36 years. We have accepted the former alternative. Since this king had a long reign, we may well presume that he restored stability to the empire after the period of anarchy through which it had passed.

Arishtakarna.

Puloma's successor was Aristakarna², and he had also a long reign of 25 years. It was towards the end of his reign that Bhumaka, the Saka Ksatrapa, succeeded in establishing his rule in Gujarat and Kathiavad. These provinces did not belong to the Satavahana dominions, but towards the end of Aristakarna's reign in c. 45 A.D. Bhumaka invaded Malva. Aristakarna was unable to oppose Bhumaka and the Satavahanas appear to have lost Malva towards the end of his reign (c. 47 A.D.)

Hala Mantalaka, Purindrasena, Sundara, Satakarni, Cakora Svatikarna, and Sivasvati (47—86 A.D.)

The next period of about 40 years, during which as many as six kings mentioned above came to throne was undoubtedly a dark period in the history of the Satavahana dynasty. The Puranas do not enlighten us about the mutual relationship of these six rulers. Their short reigns tell their own tale. The first two kings Hala and Mantalaka³ ruled for five years each. The reign period of the next king Purindrasena is not recorded in the Matsya-purana, and is variously given as 12 or 21 years in others. We have assumed it

¹ *Kartarya Kuntalah Satakarnih Satavahano Mahadevim Malayavatim jaghdna— Kamasutra.*

² NemiKrishna, Nemikamsa, Aristavarna are some of the important variations of the name of this ruler.

³ Mundulaka, Kundalaka, Pantalaka and Pattallaka are some of the important variations of the name of this ruler.

to be one year only since most of the reigns of this period are of short duration. The next king Sundara Satakarni ruled for one year and his successor Cakora Svatikarna¹ for six months only. The Puranas must be relying on a definite tradition when they give short reigns of one year and six months. These short reigns may be due to internal revolts, disputed successions or foreign invasions and consequent disruption. There is ample evidence to show that the last is the correct hypothesis in the present case. It will be shown in Chapter VI how the date of Nahapana can be shown to be c. 60 to 110 A.D. His predecessor Bhumaka had already conquered Gujarat and Kathiavad. Nahapana conquered Malva and then proceeded to attack the Satavahana dominion in its home province. There was a long struggle between the two rival houses ; one Jain tradition records how the Satavahana king used to invest Broach every year. In the earlier phase of the struggle the Sakas inflicted several defeats on the Satavahanas ; it is not improbable that some of the six kings of the above group had short reigns, because they were killed in war. The defeat on the battle field may have encouraged revolts at home. There may have been also disputed succession owing to sudden deaths of the ruling kings. During this period the Satavahanas lost Konkan, Northern and Central Maharashtra and Malva. Some kind of stability may have been restored by Sivasvati who could maintain himself upon the throne for twenty-eight years, from c. 58 to 86 A.D

The first king of the above group, Hala, is the reputed author of a Prakrt anthology of erotic verses named *Gathasaptasati*. A later tradition, as known to - Rajasekhara, asserted that the Satavahanas had issued a regulation that Prakrt alone should be used in their court. All their official records are in Prakrt; it is therefore no wonder that one of the kings of the dynasty should have completed an anthology of Prakrt verses. It is likely that some of the poets, whose verses have been selected by Hala, may have received patronage at his court. A tradition known to Merutunga asserted that he paid fabulous sums for the verses he selected. The *Gathasaptasati* in its present form is a redaction of the 4th century A.D.,² but its kernel goes back to the 1st century A.D. and may be assigned to king Hala. Tradition asserts that Gunadhya, the author of the original *Brhatkatha*, as also Sarvavarman, the author of the Katantra grammar, were the ministers of king Satavahana of Pratisthana. Smith has identified this Satavahana with Hala³ but the identification is by no means certain. Hala had a short and troubled reign and one may wonder whether it was marked by an extensive literary activity.

A recently published Prakrt work named *Lilavai* credits king Hala with an effort to invade Ceylon⁴. The adventure eventually became unnecessary as the king of Ceylon offered his daughter

¹ Cakora is one of the mountains which was included in the kingdom of Gautamlputra Satakarni. Whether Qakora Satakarni was connected with it we do not know.

² (It is of a still later age. See S. I., Vol. I, pp. 76 f.-V, V. M.)

³ Z.D.M.G., 1902, p, 660.

⁴ *Satavahana Commemoration Volume*, p. 100.

Lilavati in marriage to Hala. Hala had a short reign of five years and the rise of the Saka power under Bhumaka and Nahapana must have rendered any military expedition to Ceylon almost impossible; Sober history is unaware of any Satavahana king having ever undertaken an expedition to Ceylon. The feat is not ascribed even to Gautamiputra Satakarni, the greatest military genius of the dynasty. We need not therefore attach any historical value to the political events casually and cursorily mentioned in the *Lilavati*.

Sivasvati¹ the last king of this group, had a fairly long reign of 28 years from c. 58 to 80 A.D. He seems to have succeeded in establishing a stable rule and reorganising the administration in what remained of the old empire. Smith has identified this ruler with Mathariputra Sivalakura of the Kolhapur coins². This identification is, however, untenable; it will be shown later how the Kolhapur kings who issued the bow-and-arrow type of coins do not belong to the Satavahana dynasty. It is also very doubtful whether he can be identified with king Sakasena of Kanheri inscriptions Nos. 14 and 19.

The Yugapurana of the *Gargi-samhita* describes the Saka occupation of Pataliputra and then narrates how the greedy Saka king will attack the Kalinga and Sata (i.e. Satavahana) kingdoms and perish in the attempt. Whether this prophecy has any historical foundation, we do not know. The Sakas never reached Pataliputra. It is possible that Wima Kadphises, who had penetrated right up to Pataliputra in c. 70 A.D. may be the king referred to as the Saka invader. The discovery of the Puri Kusana coins in large numbers in Orissa renders the invasion of Kalinga either by Wima Kadphises or Kaniska very probable. It may be that Kaniska launched an attack on the Satavahanas from Kalinga, while his Satrapa Nahapana was harrying them from the north and the west. Sivasvati and possibly his successor Gautamiputra Satakarni had thus to fight the Scythian war on several fronts. We are only suggesting these possibilities without claiming any definite historicity for them. The evidence available is too slender to warrant a definite conclusion.

Gautamiputra Satakarni. c. 86-110 A.D.

Gautamiputra Satakarni³ ascended the throne in c. 86 A.D. and ruled for about 24 years. His relationship with his predecessor is not given in the Puranas. The fortunes of his family had reached the lowest ebb at the time of his accession. Nahapana had conquered a number of Satavahana provinces and was firmly entrenched there. Kaniska was perhaps trying to penetrate from the east. Before the end of his reign, Gautamiputra not only reoccupied all the lost provinces, but also carried the war into Nahapana's dominions and conquered some of his provinces like Kathiavad and Kukura (south-

¹ Z.D.M.G., 1902, p. 602.

² Sivasvami is another variation of this name. Sivasvati may also have stood for Siva Satakarni.

शकानां सततो राजा ह्यर्थलुब्धो महाबलः । दुष्टभावश्च पापश्च कलिंगान्समुपस्थितः ।
कलिंगशातराज्यार्थं विनाशं वै ममिष्यति । J. B.O.R.S. XVI. 22.

³ The Puranas assign him a period of 21 years only; the postscript to Nasik Inscription No. 10 is however dated in the 24th year of his reign. We may therefore presume that he ruled for 24 years.

east Rajputana). He may, therefore, well claim to be the establisher of the glory of the Satavahana dynasty, as he is actually described by his mother in her well-known record at Nasik. Gautamiputra combined an attractive and majestic personality with rare personal courage and remarkable power of military leadership¹. How he reorganised his forces after their successive defeats in the earlier reigns, and how he reconquered provinces after provinces we do not know. Obviously he must have reconquered Central and Northern Maharashtra first and Konkan thereafter. Eastern and Western Malva (Akara-Avanti) and south-east Rajputana (Kukura) must have been then occupied. A Jain tradition records that the Satavahana forces used to invest Bharukacha, the capital of king Naravahana (obviously Nahapana) every year for a long time, but without success. It is obvious that the struggle between the two dynasties was a long and protracted one and seems to have lasted for the greater part of the reign of Gautamiputra. . Each side tried to weaken the other by diverting the ships to its main port—Kalyan in the case of the Satavahanas and Broach in the case of Nahapana. Eventually not only was Nahapana overthrown, but his whole Ksaharata family was uprooted². Apparently there were some Saka and Parthian feudatories of Nahapana in Kathiavad ; they shared the same fate³ and that province was also annexed. Gautamiputra celebrated his memorable victory over Nahapana by recalling his silver currency and over-stamping it with his own symbols and legend. A large hoard of such coins was found at Jogathembi near Nasik in 1907.

The precise extent of Gautamiputra's entire dominion is not easy to determine. The question whether his mother's inscription describes his entire dominion or names only the provinces he had conquered is hotly debated. That all the provinces of the kingdom are not mentioned would be clear from the circumstance that southern Maharashtra, and Karnataka which undoubtedly formed part of Gautamiputra's kingdom are omitted from the list. The provinces mentioned are probably the important ones in the kingdom of Gautamiputra they included Asmaka (district watered by the lower Godavari), Mulaka (Paithan district), Vidarbha (Berar), Akara and Avanti (Malva), Kukura (south-eastern Rajputana), Suratha (Kathiavad) and Aparanta (Konkan). That Gautamiputra's empire extended much further to the south and the east is shown by the inclusion of the mountain Siritana (Sristana or Srisaila in Kurnool district) and mountain Mahendra which was situated between the Krishna and the Godavari. The inclusion of Mahendra mountain and Asmaka would show that Andhradesa formed an integral part of the empire. We have shown ahead;- how it was conquered as early as 75 B.C. during the reign of Satakarni II.

¹ Cf. *Patipunnacandamandalasasirikapiyada.sanasa varavarana vikamacaruvika-masa aparimitam anekasamaravajita-ripu-saghasa, ... ekasurasa Nasik Iscr. No. 2*

² *Khaharatavansa-niravasesakarasa.*

³ *Saka-Yavana-Pallava-nisudanasa.* It is doubtful whether there were also Some Yavana principalities in the Deccan or Central India which Gautamiputra could have crushed. The mention of Yavanas is probably conventional.

The view that it was conquered only in the days of the next king Vasisthiputra Pulumavi, seems untenable. The non-discovery of the coins of Gautamiputra in that province is purely accidental¹. The description of Gautamiputra as one whose draft animals had drunk water of the three oceans² would also suggest that Andhradesa was included in his kingdom.

The exact southern extent of the kingdom of Gautamiputra is not easy to determine. Ptolemy mentions as the contemporaries of Polemaios (Pulumavi, the successor of Gautamiputra), Baleokuros of Hippokoura, Kerolothros (Keralaputra) of Karonra (Karur) and Pandion of Modoura (Madura). It is doubtful whether Pulumavi had made any fresh conquests in the south. Sristana hill in Kurnool district is expressly included in Gautamiputra's dominion. It may have included part of the Coromandal coast. But the territories to the south and south-west of Mysore were excluded from it.

The prosperity and stability of the reign of Gautamiputra is fairly reflected in his coinage³. When he exterminated the Kshaharata family, he recalled the silver currency of Nahapana and counterstruck it with the legend giving his name; he also introduced the symbols of his dynasty on the coins like Chaitya above the river, Ujjayini symbol etc. Whether Gautamiputra imitated the example of Nahapana and issued his own silver currency is difficult to state. The Jogathembi hoard, which contained more than 10,000 silver coins counterstruck by Gautamiputra, contained not a single silver coin which was his own issue. The coins in the hoard were in circulation for more than twenty-five years, and if they contained no silver coins of Gautamiputra, the presumption is that he issued none. We have however recently found a few rare silver coins, having the legend Gautamiputra only. They are most probably the issues of Gautamiputra Yajnasri Satakarni⁴.

Gautamiputra however issued a large number of potin coins with Elephant on the obverse and the Chaitya on the reverse. In the Tarhala hoard of about 1,200 decipherable coins, 573 were of Gautamiputra Satakarni. The attribution of large round potin coins with Elephant on the obverse and Tree with large leaves on the reverse to Gautamiputra is doubtful, as there is no full and clear legend upon them. The term Gautami is there on these coins, but they could as well have been issued by Gautamiputra Yajnasri Satakarni who also had occupied southern Gujarat. It is now definitely proved that these coins were circulating in Gujarat⁵. It is therefore clear that during their short occupation of this province, the Satavahanas had issued their own currency for the use of their new subjects.

¹ [As a matter of fact, some coins of Gautamiputra have been found in Andhra.-V.V.M.]

² *Thamudtoyapita-cahanasa*.

³ D. R. Bhandarkar held that Gautamiputra Satakarni was himself defeated by Rudradaman, *I.A.*, 1918, p. 154. This view presupposes the joint rule of the father and the son, which is very improbable. About the identity of the king defeated by Rudradaman, see Chapter VI.

⁴ See *J.N.S.I.*, VIII, p. III. For a contrary view, see *Ibid.*, IX p. 93, X, p. 23.

⁵ *J.N.S.I.*, XII, p. 26.

We shall now discuss a number of incidental problems connected with Gautamiputra. R. G. and D. R. Bhandarkar have argued that Gautamiputra Satakarni and his son Vasisthiputra Pulumavi were ruling conjointly. This theory is untenable. In Nasik inscription No. 5 inscribed in the 24th year of Gautamiputra, his mother is described as *mahadevi* and *rajamata*; in Nasik inscription No. 2, issued in the 19th year of her grandson Pulumavi's reign, she is in addition described as *maharajapitamahi*, obviously because her grandson was then on the throne. If we assume that the description of a lady as *mahadevi* and *rajamata* justifies the inference that she was the wife and mother of a king at the same time, showing thereby that her husband and son were ruling jointly, will it not follow that the description of Balasri also as *maharaja-pitamahi* would show that her husband, son and grandson were ruling together at one and the same time? And yet the Bhandarkars do not accept this conclusion. The argument that Nasik inscription No. 10 issued in the 18th year of Gautamiputra's reign refers to a cave donated in the second year of Pulumavi in inscription No. 2, and thus shows that the two kings were ruling together at the end of the father's reign is also untenable. The inscription in question refers to an enlargement of the cave donated in the 18th year of Gautamiputra, which was carried out in the second year of the reign of Vasisthiputra. It does not prove that the second year of Pulumavi was earlier than the 18th year of Gautamiputra. There is thus no ground to assume that Gautamiputra was ruling with his son. A king named Gautamiputra Vilivayakura is known from the Bow and Arrow type coins found in Kolhapur. It will be shown later that this prince cannot be identified with Gautamiputra Satakarni.

It is from the time of Gautamiputra Satakarni that we notice inscriptions giving metronymics to many of Satavahana kings. It has been argued that this was due to matrilinear succession, the crown passing in the Satavahana dynasty, not to a ruler's son but to his sister's son. In several cases, however, the Puranas expressly state that the successor was the son of the predecessor. Gautamiputra Satakarni himself was succeeded by his own son and not his sister's son. There is in fact not a single known case in the Satavahana family of a sister's son succeeding the predecessor.

The custom of giving the metronymic was popular in Kausambi, Central India, Maharashtra and the Eastern Deccan from c. 100 B.C. to c. 300 A.D. Not only the kings but also the commoners are seen following it. It may be probably due to polygamy. Thus Ajatasatru was called Vaidehiputra to indicate that he was the son of a Vaidehi princess, and not of a Kosala one, both of whom were among his father's spouses. It is also possible that the custom of mentioning the *gotra* of the mother may have originated in families where not only the father's but also the maternal uncle's *gotra* was avoided in selecting a bride or bridegroom as is the case with the Yajurvedi Brahmanas of Maharashtra even today. It is however not yet possible to give any convincing reason for the adoption of this nomenclature

by a number of families during the centuries preceding and following the Christian era. The custom in a restricted sense goes back to "the Vedic age. We find Kausikiputras and Kautsiputras mentioned in the Vedic literature. But why it died down soon after the beginning of the Gupta age, is a mystery.

Gautamiputra died after a reign of about 24 years in c. 110 A.D. He was the greatest ruler among the Satavahanas and had the reputation of being a just and efficient ruler also. It is interesting to note that he owes the recognition of his place in history to his devotion to his mother¹. The latter had the misfortune to survive her son, and records his glorious achievements in a eulogy which she had got inscribed in a cave which she had jointly dedicated with her son. Had not this eulogy been composed, we could hardly have known much about the achievements of this distinguished ruler.

Vasisthiputra Pulumavi c.110-138 A.D.

Gautamiputra was succeeded by Vasisthiputra Pulumavi in c. 110 Puranas expressly describe him as Gautamiputra's son and inscriptions confirm this information. The Puranic statement that he ruled for 28 years is rendered probable by one of his inscriptions being dated in his 24th year. We may, therefore, place his reign from c. 110 to 138 A.D. He is identical with king Polemaios of Baithana mentioned by Ptolemy and was the contemporary of Tiastenes or Castana of Ujjayini who ruled from c. 115 A.D. to 125 A.D., as will be shown in Chapter VI.

Rapson has advanced the view that king Satakarni, the overlord of the Deccan, who is claimed to have been defeated by Rudradaman twice before the year 150 A.D., should be identified with Vasisthiputra Pulumavi. He further identifies this ruler with, Vasisthiputra Sri Satakarni of the Kanheri inscription, who was the son-in-law of a daughter of Mahaksatrapa Rudradaman². There are almost unsurmountable difficulties in accepting this view. It is difficult to believe that Rudradaman would have committed the mistake of misnaming the king, who was his near relation and whom he had defeated twice. How could he have confounded a Satakarni with a Pulumavi who ascended the throne in c. 110 A.D. It is not very likely that Pulumavi could have married a granddaughter of his contemporary Castana. In the Nasik *prasasti* (eulogy) of his grandmother, issued in his 19th regnal year, there is nothing to suggest that the extensive conquests of her son had already evaporated before the 19th year of her grandson's reign³. The silence of the record about the achieve-

¹ *Avipana-matu-sususakasa*. Rapson thinks that in the Post-script of Nasik inscription dated in the 24th year of Gautamiputra's reign, the queen mother is associated with him probably because she was taking an active part in the administration owing to her son's failing health. This does not seem probable. If Gautamiputra was rather too old to administer the kingdom unaided, the case of his mother might have been worse. The association of the mother must obviously have been due to the charity in question being sanctioned at her request.

² *B.M.C.A.K.*, Introduction pp. xxxviii.

³ Rapson thinks that Pulumavi had been already defeated before the 19th year of his reign because the territorial titles which Gautamiputra won 'by this conquests are not seen inherited by him. The construction of the *prasasti*, however, did not make it possible to again describe Vasisthiputra as the ruler of the provinces, ruled over by his father.

ments of Pulumavi is obviously due to its express purpose being to eulogise Gautamiputra who was associated with the original dedication of the cave. Rudradaman claims to have wrested Konkan from the Satavahanas; we have got some records of Vasisthiputra at Kanheri, which was certainly included in it. We have a large number of inscriptions of Pulumavi at Nasik and Karli, and none of them suggests that he had been defeated.

There are serious chronological difficulties in assuming that Gautamiputra continued to rule down to c. 130 A.D. and that his son was defeated by Rudradaman. These will be indicated in Chapter VI. In order to overcome them, R.G. Bhandarkar and D.R. Bhandarkar assumed that the father and the son were ruling together. We have however, already shown above how this theory of joint rule is untenable.

Political events in the reign of Pulumavi are shrouded in mystery. Castana was sent down from the north to reconquer the Deccan for the Scythians. From his outpost at Ajmer, he conquered Ujjayini and then proceeded to occupy Cutch and Northern Gujarat. Vasisthiputra Pulumavi reconciled himself to the loss of Malva but decided to oppose any further expansion. In the meanwhile Castana died and was succeeded by his son Jayadaman. It seems very probable that towards the end of his reign, Pulumavi defeated Jayadaman and reduced him to the status of a mere Ksatrapa¹. It is not improbable that the marriage of a daughter of Rudradaman with his younger brother Vasisthiputra Satakarni was dictated on the battle-field by Pulumavi.

The discovery of the coins of Pulumavi in Andhra country and of an inscription of his at Amravati afford clear evidence of his holding a firm sway over that province. Several scholars have argued that it was Pulumavi, who for the first time conquered Andhra province². But we have already shown above how it is very likely that the province was annexed to the Satavahana kingdom in the reign of Apilaka and Meghasvati by the middle of the 1st century B.C., if not even earlier. As shown in the last section there is no doubt that Gautamiputra was ruling over it. It was once argued that Pulumavi's sway extended over Coromandal coast also³. The coins with the motif of ship with two masts found near Coromandal coast, which were once doubtfully attributed to Pulumavi, have now been proved to be the issues of Sri Yajna Satakarni⁴. A record of Pulumavi has been found in Bellary district of Madras State. But whether he is this ruler or the last king of the dynasty, it is difficult to decide.

¹ The other alternative is to hold that Jayadaman is seen using the lower title Ksatrapa on the coins, because he predeceased his father Castana. See Chapter VI.

² *J.B.B.R.A.S., N.S.I.*, pp. 10-11; *Early History of Andhra Country*, pp. 62-63.

³ *B.M.C.A.K.*, pp. xxxix.

⁴ *J.N.S.I.*, Vol. III, pp. 43 f.

The record does not give the characteristic epithet of Pulumavi to him, viz. Vasisthiputra. On the other hand it is dated in the eighth year of the king's reign, whereas the Puranas state that the last king Puloma ruled for seven years only. Whether the record belongs to Vasisthiputra Pulumavi or not, there can be no doubt that his dominions included the ceded district of the Madras State.

The belief long entertained by scholars that Vasisthiputra Pulumavi was the king crushed by Rudradaman has prevented the proper appreciation of his career and achievements. It was no doubt true that he could not retain trans-Narmada territories conquered by his father. But it must be admitted that very few Deccan states have succeeded in doing so in Indian history. There is no doubt that Pulumavi continued to hold northern Maharashtra and southern Gujarat. It appears that he succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat if not on Castana at least on his son Jayadaman. A portrait silver coin of his discovered in 1952 shows that his features showed an aquiline nose and grim determination. He was a worthy successor of his father. He continued the toleration policy of his dynasty ; we find him making several donations to Buddhist establishments, though he himself was an orthodox Hindu.

Sivasri Satakarni c. 138-145 A.D.

According to the Puranas Vasisthiputra Pulumavi was succeeded by Sivasri Satakarni, who is credited with a short reign of seven years. Puranas do not give the metronymic in any case; it would therefore appear very probable that this Sivasri Satakarni is identical with Vasisthiputra Satakarni of the Kanheri record who had married a daughter of king Rudradaman. We may well infer from the common epithet Vasisthiputra that Vasisthiputra Pulumavi and Vasisthiputra Satakarni were uterine brothers; some weight is lent to this view by the circumstance of [Vasisthiputra] Sivasri Satakarni having a short reign of 7 years only. He had succeeded a brother who had a long reign of 28 years, and so his own reign was naturally not long. Puranas do not give the relationship between these two rulers. King Sri Sivamaka Sata of the Amravati record may perhaps be identical with this ruler.

Vasisthiputra Siva Sri Satakarni was the son-in-law of the Saka King Rudradaman who ascended the throne in c. 140 AD. The long standing rivalry between the two houses may have been probably kept under check for some time by this circumstance.

It appears that some Saka chiefs entered the service of the Satavahanas as their generals and were granted the feudatory status with the right to issue coins. The coins of a Saka king named Mana who was the son of Bharadvaja have recently come to light¹. His family was ruling in south Hyderabad.

¹ *J.N.S.I.*, VII, p. 90; *J.N.S.I.* XI, p. 59.

The marriage of Vasisthiputra Satakarni with the Saka princess had a curious numismatic consequence. The son-in-law took a fancy for the Ksatrapa coinage and issued some silver pieces, having the bust of the king on the obverse as on the Saka coins. One such coin of this ruler, existing in the Prince of Wales Museum collection in Bombay, has been recently published¹.

Numismatic and epigraphical evidence shows that this ruler was ruling over most of the Satavahana empire. The discovery of his record at Kanheri shows that he held Konkan. The Tarhala hoard, which contained 32 coins of this ruler, proves that he was holding sway over Berar. The lead coins with the legend Vasisthiputra Siva Sri Satakarni found in Andhra country attest to his rule over it.

This king ruled down to 145 A.D. and it does not appear that Rudradaman launched any attack on him. The Junagad inscription describes the Satavahana king defeated as not a distant relation and surely that is not the phraseology to be used for a son-in-law.

Sivaskanda Satakarni. 145-175 A.D.

Puranas mention Sivaskanda Satakarni as the next ruler. He was the son of his predecessor Sivasri Satakarni, as stated in the Puranas. Sivaskanda Satakarni may have been abridged into Skanda Satakarni, which in Prakrt would appear as Khada Satakarni. The present ruler may thus be identical with king Khada Satakarni, 23 of whose coins were found in Tarhala hoard². On some coins in Andhra districts we have the name of the king as Vasisthiputra Sri Canda-Satakarni. It is not unlikely that the issuer of these coins may also be identical with the present ruler. Skanda can also become *Canda* in Prakrt. Letters *ca* and *kha* are undistinguishable at this period and *ca* on the coins of Andhradesa can also stand for *Kha*. We therefore tentatively suggest the identity of Siva Khada Satakarni with Sri Canda Satakarni. Rapson has suggested that Vasisthiputra Siva Canda (=Sivaskanda) Satakarni may have been a brother of Vasisthiputra Pulumavi, as suggested by common metronymic. But there is nothing against a nephew of Vasisthiputra Pulumavi having married a bride of Vasistha *gotra* like his uncle.

King Satakarni, defeated twice by Rudradaman I before 150 A.D., was most probably Sivaskanda Satakarni. Polygamy was common among kings and therefore Sivaskanda Satakarni may well have been a son of Siva Sri Satakarni, but born of a queen other than the Saka princess. He would thus be a step son of Rudradaman's daughter and the Junagad record may well describe him as not distantly-related with the Saka conquerer. Rapson has assumed that the king

¹ A king named Rudra Satakarni is known from some coins found in Andhradesa, *B.M.C.A.K.* pp. 46-7. The name does not occur in the Puranic list and it is not impossible that he may be identical with Siva Sri Satakarni. Siva and Rudra are synonyms.

² *J.N.S.I.* II. p. 83.

defeated was Vasisthiputra Pulumavi who was Rudradaman's son-in-law, but we have already shown how this suggestion is untenable. All the known facts of history are very well explained by assuming that it was Sivaskanda Satakami who was defeated by Rudradaman. The defeated ruler is described as a Satakarni and Sivaskanda Satakarni had that name. He is shown above to be a contemporary of Rudradaman. He was most probably his daughter's step son, and is therefore naturally described as a not-distant relation.

The Satavahanas had probably lost Malva and Northern Gujarat earlier. As a result of the two defeats suffered now, they lost Kathiavad and Northern Konkan. Their sway over Maharashtra, Berar and Andhra country was not affected by these defeats. Sivaskanda Satakami is represented by 23 coins in the Tarhala hoard and a large number of his coins are found in Andhra country.

Puranas do not give the duration of the rule of Sivaskanda Satakarni, and it is not therefore easy to determine it. One Ms. of the *Vayupurana*, however, omits king Sivasri Satakarni and mentions a Satakarni as the immediate successor of Vasisthiputra Pulumavi and credits him with a long reign of 29 years. We have therefore assumed that this ruler is identical with Sivaskanda Satakarni and assigned him a reign of 29 years. This however is a pure hypothesis, to be proved or disproved by later discoveries.

One of the Kanheri records is dated in the 13th year of a king named Vasisthiputra Chatarapana Satakarni. It is clear that the ruler belonged to the Satavahana dynasty but his identity is difficult to determine. The earlier view that he is to be identified with the father or son of Yajna Sri Satakarni is no longer tenable ; for it is now clear that the legend does not at all contain the name of Chatarapana. The identity of the ruler would be difficult to determine until the meaning of the mysterious term Chatarapana is known. If however our assumption that Sivaskanda Satakarni ruled for about 29 years is tenable, it is not unlikely that he may be identical with the king Vasisthiputra Chatarapana Satakarni of the Kanheri record. We have shown above how it is quite likely that this ruler may have had the epithet of Vasisthiputra. The ruler of the Kanheri record cannot be identified with Gautamiputra Satakarni and Yajnasri Satakarni, because they were both Gautamiputras. He cannot be identified with Vasisthiputra Pulumavi, because he was not a Satakarni. He therefore may be tentatively identified with Vasisthiputra Sivasri Satakarni.

The reason why we have credited this ruler with a long reign of 29 years may be indicated here. His successor Gautamiputra Yajna Sri Satakarni is known to have wrested some of the lost provinces from the Sakas. There was an internecine war in the Saka dynasty from c. 181 to 196 A.D. It is likely that this struggle rendered the conquests of Yajna Sri possible. We have therefore to place his reign between c. 174 and 203 and thus prolong that of his predecessor to c. 174 A.D.

Gautamiputra Yajna-Sri Satakarni c.174-203 A.D.

Sivaskanda Satakarni was succeeded by Gautamiputra Yajna Sri Satakarni as the Puranas do not mention the relationship between the two rulers. Yajnasri's inscription found at Chinna Gajam is dated in his 27th year; we may therefore well presume that he ruled for 29 years, as stated in most of the Puranas¹.

Yajnasri Satakarni was an able and ambitious prince; he considerably retrieved the fallen fortunes of his dynasty. A war of succession arose between Saka Ksatrapa Jivadaman and his uncle Rudrasimha in c. 180 A.D. Yajnasri took its full advantage and attacked the Sakas from the south. There is no doubt that he wrested back northern Konkan from them, for two records of this ruler are found at Kanheri, giving endowments to the monks staying there. One of these is dated in his 16th year; this would show that the reconquest of Northern Konkan took place by c. 190 A.D. One silver coin of Gautamiputra Yajnasri Satakarni was found in Kathiavad and another in Besnagar. But it would be hazardous to conclude from this that he had succeeded in reconquering Kathiavad and Malva. The solitary coins may have travelled there through commerce.

This king continued to rule over the territory from Konkan to Andhradesa. His inscriptions have been found at Kanheri in Konkan, Nasik in Maharashtra and Chinna Gajam in Andhradesa. In the Canda and Tarhala hoards he is richly represented², showing that he had a long and prosperous reign. In Andhradesa, his coins are found in large numbers at several places. The ship-mast type of coins which were for a long time attributed to Vasisthiputra Pulumavi, have now been shown to be the issues of Gautamiputra Sri Yajna Satakarni. The findspot of these coins would suggest, but not prove, the extension of the Satavahana power to Coromandal Coast. The Satavahana empire under this rule extended practically over the whole of Deccan to the south of the Narmada and the north of the Pennar river³.

Vijaya Satakarni.Candra Sri Satakarni. Pulumavi III.

Our knowledge of the Satavahana history is very meagre subsequent to the death of Gautamiputra Yajnasri Satakarni. According to the Puranas. three kings mentioned above succeeded him in the stated order. Of these the second is stated by the Puranas to be the son of the first, but his relationship to the third ruler is not given. He is on the other hand described as some one among the Andhras. He may have been a distant scion who usurped the throne. Bhandarkar had thought that the rule of the last riders was confined only to the Eastern

¹ Some Mss. assign him a reign of 19 years only. One Matsya Ms. changes the tense into the present and says *Nava tvarsani Yajnasrih kurute Satakarnikah*. Pargiter *Dynasties of the Kali Age* p. 42. This suggests that the Purana was written in the 9th year of this monarch's reign.

² The Tarhala hoard of about 1225 coins had 250 issued by this ruler.

³ A silver coin of this ruler was found in 1951 near Jabalpur ; it may lend some weight to the view that the upper Narmada valley was also included in his empire. We cannot however exclude the possibility of the coin having gone there with a pilgrim or a trader, *J.N.S.I.*, XIII, p. 46.

Deccan, where the coins of Candra Sri¹ have been found. But four coins of Vijaya and Pulmavi each were later found in the Tarhala hoard, suggesting that the dominion included both Andhradesa and Berar and the adjoining territories.

How the mighty Satavahana empire dissolved in less than thirty' years after the death of Yajnasri Satakarni is not clearly known. We do not get any records of the successors of Yajna Sri in Konkan and northern Maharashtra. On the other hand we begin to get inscriptions of the Abhiras there towards the end of the 2nd century. These Abhiras were building their power carefully. We find them playing the part of the king-makers at the Ksatrapa court at c. 175 A.D. It appears that they eventually became strong enough to oust the later Satavahana rulers from Northern and Central Maharashtra.

¹ The *Kaliyugarajavrttanta* states that Andhra kings Candsri and Pulomah were in the occupation of pataliputra just before the accession of Chandragupta I in c 300 A.D. There was a difference of at least 75 years between Puloma III and Chandragupta I and so they could not have been contemporaries. The Satavahanas are not at all likely to have held Pataliputra towards the fag end of their dynasty, when their power had become extremely feeble. The *Kaliyugarajavrttanta* is more probably a late forgery. See *J.N.S.I.*, VI p. 34.