Chapter-3
Genealogy and Marriage: Explicit Markers of Kinship

Kinship, in the context of elites, was relevant as a mode of transferring status and power. Kinship relations are mentioned in the context of succession and marriage alliances among the royal families. The data can be obtained by taking recourse to the genealogical method, i.e. establishing the biological relation between the members of the group under study and correlating them to the social structure. Inscriptions and texts provide details of the elites through the genealogical sections and descriptions of marriage alliances. Royal genealogy can also be seen as an assertion of the king’s status through his position in the kinship structure. Trautmann holds that hereditary kingship was in effect the politics of kinship, inferred from the dynastic succession and royal marriages.

There is a debate among sociologists regarding the connotation of the term kinship. Kinship was believed to be a physiological fact emphasized by society. It was a status marker and provided a bond with the group in a larger context. Kinship was held to perform a two fold function: first, it was the rule of group membership and second, it regulated behavior. Michel Verdon holds that kinship is the fact of consanguinity, wherein an individual traces link to a common ancestor. The family operates to generate kinship, and marriage is a derivative. Thus, kinship, marriage, and family are connected. Kinship study is divided into three segments, viz., its classification, kinship groups and institutions, and marriage. Indian kinship was considered heterogeneous with regional, communal, social, and cultural divisions. Trautmann distinguishes between the Dravidian and Indo-Aryan kinship. The difference between the two was based on the marriage pattern, which permitted cross-cousin alliance among the Dravidians.

---
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kinship system prohibited cross-cousin marriage.\textsuperscript{10} The marriage alliance of the elites had a political implication. Besides kinship structures are also an important means of constructing and maintaining gender identities.

In the present chapter an attempt is made to understand the politics of kinship through the \textit{Matsya Purāṇa} and the inscriptions. The chapter is divided into three broad sections; the first deals with genealogy. This section is further subdivided into segments, dealing first with the information related to ancestry in the \textit{Matsya Purāṇa} and then in the Vākāṭaka and the Kalacuri inscriptions. The second section of the chapter deals with marriage. The first sub-section deals with references to marriage in the \textit{Matsya Purāṇa} and the second deals with alliances as mentioned in inscriptions. The last section evaluates the references to genealogy and marriage and compares the politics of kinship as represented in the two sources that are explored.

I

Genealogies are the records of the past, constructed in terms of links with real or imagined ancestors. The convention of referring to genealogies in inscriptions can be traced to the Purānic traditions. The \textit{vaṃśaṃucarita} i.e. the succession of the ruling families was an integral part of the Purānic \textit{paṇca-lakṣaṇa} or the five facets. In this section descent was traced from Manu to the present and the ‘future’ kings of the dynasty. Thus the genealogical sections were very important in terms of an imagined ancestry. The Purāṇas used myths, legends, and fables to construct the past. This made the Purānic genealogies controversial as historical material. F.E. Pargiter uses the Purānic sources to construct the dynasties of the \textit{Kali yuga}.\textsuperscript{11} He holds that they were based on authentic versions of the past. However, historians question the use of genealogies as factual statements. Romila Thapar opines that genealogy was constructed as a perception of the past rather than as an accurate record. The genealogical section of the text can be divided into three sections, viz., origin of creation in cosmological time, lineages of the ruling clans and lists of kings and dynasties of the monarchical state.\textsuperscript{12}

Another facet which invites discussion is the role of genealogies in legitimizing political structures. Legitimacy can be claimed through various methods of which tracing ancestry was one. B.P. Sahu points out that from the Gupta period onwards various strategies were used to strengthen control which included construction of genealogies, appropriation of Itihāsa-Purāṇa traditions, patronage of art and literature and land grants to brāhmaṇas, tīrthas, temples, and monasteries. The inscriptions mention inflated genealogies, which were seen as a marker of status and power. Romila Thapar holds that the relevance of genealogies was enhanced by their association with political power. They can be interpreted as memories of social relations, derived from social institutions, and can be seen as a method of deriving legitimacy. By referring to the past, the rulers were claiming status and asserting their right to rule, thus, authenticating their power. The genealogical part of an inscription generally extols the dynasty and mentions the conquests and achievements of rulers of the dynasty. At the same time, it plays a relevant role in the construction of the past. It may be fabricated but the connections acclaimed become relevant. The genealogies were an agent of mobilization for families of obscure origin.

The importance given to this tradition in the legitimization process was questioned by many scholars such as R. Champakalakshmi, who suggest bhakti as a powerful concept for the construction of legitimacy in the case of south Indian history. However, George Spencer in his study on the Colas holds that genealogy was a relevant method of enhancing political authority. According to him, it was the connection between the past and present, gods and the king and between the order of the cosmos and the Cola power. Aruna Pariti in her study of Cālukyan genealogies divides lineage into three sections: mythical, semi-historical, and historical. She sees genealogies as a method of constructing
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social identity.¹⁹ Scholars agree about the role played by genealogy in the process of legitimization but also highlight perceptible changes over time and region. Nicholas Dirks notices change in the notion of sovereignty from the early Pallavas of Kanchi to the Colas.²⁰ In the earlier period, sacrifices and other rituals were essential, whereas in the later period the focus shifted to land grants. The focus was on the new social classes which gained prominence such as viñāpī i.e. petitioner in the Pallava grants. The royal dānas provided the space for eulogizing the royal genealogy and at the same time referred to the exploits of the rulers. Nandini Sinha Kapur’s study on state formation in Mewar under the Guhilas shows how brāhmaṇas settled through land grants, legitimized political authority through inflated genealogies.²¹ The state formation in Camba, according to Mahesh Sharma, shows attempts to replicate the dominant north Indian model of genealogies besides giving land grants to brāhmaṇas, legitimizing social stratification and hierarchy etc.²² However, some scholars highlight the relevance of ideology and culture over legitimization in the process of state formation. According to Sheldon Pollock and Daud Ali, the voices of dissent have to be considered while studying the construction of legitimization structures.²³ Legitimization should be seen as communication between the ruler and the ruled which made it susceptible to change.

The study of genealogies and changes therein are relevant to understanding methods of legitimization of political power. The use of genealogies played a significant role in the process of state formation. It represented various strategies used to claim power and at the same time, reflected significant social relations. What makes genealogies more interesting for gender history was that genealogy as a method of claiming power and status was used differently by men and women. References to women in the genealogical section in both


the sources were sparse, which in itself is a significant indicator of the different ways in which gender identities were constructed.

I (a)

Of the various Purāṇas, the Matsya Purāṇa is one of the oldest and contains a huge section on genealogy. It was believed that the Bhavisya Purāṇa was the first Purāṇa to give an account of the dynasties of the Kali yuga and the Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa got their accounts from it. The genealogical content of the Matsya Purāṇa can be studied in two parts i.e. the legacy of the gods and then ancestry of the royal lineages till the downfall of the Āndhras and some local dynasties.

The ancestry of the gods was generally hypothetical, as could be seen in the creation cycle. It generally referred to thousands of sons born, and without any further details they were mentioned as lost. Generally, there was no mention of any daughter born. When creation first began, children from Brahmā and Gāyatrī, who was called janani, were born. They were Manu, Rati, Tapas, Manas, Dik, Sambhrama, and Mahāttatva (MP, 4.24-25). Brahmā’s mānasa putra were Marīcī and others who were born first, and then Vāmadeva and Sanatkumāra were born (MP, 4.26-27). Then the text described the varṇas born from Vāmadeva, dvija from his mouth, rājanya from his arms, and the śudra from his feet (MP: Akhtar, 4.28). The first family tree mentioned was that of Manu and his progeny. The line was traced till the birth of gods and demons, besides rivers, plants, and animals. Interestingly, only a few prominent family trees were mentioned and details of the rest were absent. Only marriage alliances considered relevant were mentioned. While the parentage of women was mentioned several times, these references were gendered as only the father was mentioned. The terms used for wife were patnī and bhāminī while, kanyā and ātimajā was used for the daughter. The women’s capability to procreate was described by using terms such as jāyata, utpanna etc. i.e. from whom sons were born. In the case of Manu, it was mentioned that he got his wife after performing severe penances. The references generally were made to birth of sons and only in case of Dakṣa there was mention of sixty daughters being born. These daughters, kanyā were given to Dharma,

Kaśyapa and Soma. These daughters were important as they were the progenitors of devas, rākṣasas, man and other creatures (MP, 4.54-55).

The first genealogical table mentioned in detail was that of Manu and Anantī (MP, 4.33-55) in the Matsya Purāṇa is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svyayambhu Manu</th>
<th>Anantī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priyamvratā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttanapāda m. Śūntā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d/o Dharma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrūva m. Dhanyā</td>
<td>Apasyati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūtimān</td>
<td>Apasyanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīṣṭa m. Succhāyā</td>
<td>d/o Manu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d/o Agni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛpa</td>
<td>Ripuṇjaya Vṛta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛka Vṛkatejasa</td>
<td>m. Virīṇa granddaughter of Brahmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakṣu m. d/o Virīṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cakṣuṣa Manu m. Naḍvalā (rājānīyā)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Purū Śatadyumna Satyavāka | Havi Urū Agniṣṭut Atirātra Sudyumna Aparājīta Abhimanyu m. Āgniṣṭō |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Agni                      | Suman           | Khyāti            |
| Rūt                        | Angirā           | Gaya m. Sunīthā d/o Piṭṭ |
| Vena                      | Churned by sages |
| Pṛthu                      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antardhāna</th>
<th>Havirdhāna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. Śikhanḍinī</td>
<td>m. Dhiṣṭā d/o Agni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārīca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pracinabarhiṣa</th>
<th>Sangā Yama Śukra Bala Śubha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. Savarṇā d/o Samudra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Pracetas m. Mārīṣā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d/o Soma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prajāpatī Dakṣa</th>
<th>Vṛkṣa, aupaṣadha and nādi Candravatī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The ancestry chart listed above reflects the patriarchal nature of the text. Women were mentioned only in context of their giving birth to sons. Only the main line of the genealogy was mentioned. The others were simply ignored. Women were described generally as a daughter and in a few cases as wife. The families of women were mentioned sometimes but again the text mentioned only the father. The genealogy above mentions a princess, rājakanyā but the details are missing. There was reference to incest as in the case of Cakṣu. It is also interesting to note that although the genealogy is patrilineal it does not emphasize promogeniture consistently.

The story about the birth of the sixty daughters of Dakṣa is peculiar. First the text referred to thousands of sons who were born by maithuna, sexual intercourse, and then lost. Then Dakṣa created sixty daughters, kanya. The descendants of these daughters was mentioned as they were the progenitors of devas, dānavas and gandharvas (MP, 5). Thus women as progenitors were accepted in the text as it was from these women, created by Dakṣa that various creatures came into being. Ten daughters who were Dharma’s wives, bhāmini, were Marutavatī, Vasu, Yāmī, Lambā, Bhānu, Arundhatī, Sankalpā, Muhūrtā, Sādhyā, and Viśvā, who gave birth to devas. The interesting feature of the ancestry was the use of mothers’ names. The chart is as below:

The most powerful devas, born as Vasus were eight in number. The Matsya Purāṇa mentions the genealogy of the Vasus as follows:
In the same chapter, there was reference to Vāmadevas i.e. Rudras. They were Ajāikapāda, Ahirbudhnya, Virūpākṣa, Raivata, Hara, Bahurūpa, Tryambaka, Śāvitra, Jayanta, Pīṇākī, and Aparājita. They were created by the mind of Brahmā. They had a common wife Surabhī and had many offsprings, ‘surabhiṣgarbhasambhava’ i.e. born from Surabhī’s womb (MP, 5.32).

The progeny of Kaśyapa was more detailed and included not only gods and demons but also plants and animals (MP, 6). He had thirteen wives, who were daughters of Dakṣa. They were Aditi, Diti, Danu, Ariśṭā, Sursā, Surabhi, Vinatā, Tāmrā, Kṛodhavaśa, Irā, Kadru, Viśvā, and Muni. Matrilineal links were emphasized in the lineage. The sons from his first wife, patni called Ādityas were as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaśyapa = Aditi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaśyapa = Diti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiranyakaśipu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiranāyakṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahlāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayuṣamāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāji (100 sons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The progeny of the third wife, Danu were demons. There were hundred demons of which the names of a few were mentioned; among them most important was Vipracita (MP, |
One interesting feature was that all the demons had daughters and the progeny used matrilineal names. For instance, the demon Svarbhānu gave birth to a daughter, *kanyā* named Prabhā. Another demon, Pulomā had a daughter Śaci, another son of Danu Maya had Upadānavī, Mandodārī and Kuhū. Śarmiṣṭhā, Sundarī and Candrā were the daughters of Vṛśaparvan and Vaiśvānara gave birth to Pulomā and Kālakā. They got married, *pānigraha* to the demon Mārīca and they gave birth to sixty thousand demons (*MP*, 6.23). These demons were known as Paulomas and Kālakeyaśa. Unfortunately these demons were killed by Viṣṇu and the only progeny that survived belonged to the line of Vipracita. They were known as *Saimhikeya*, born from Simhikā, sister, *bhaginī* of Hiranyakaśipu (*MP*, 6.24-25). They were Vyansa, Kalpa, Nala, Vātāpi, and others.

The progeny of the fourth wife of Kaśyapa was unusual. He had six daughters, *kanyā* from her and they were birds and animals. The progeny was as mentioned below:

```
Kaśyapa = Tāmrā

Šuki | Šyenī | Bhāsi | Sugrivi | Gridhrikā | Šuci

Šuka | Uluka | Šyena | Kurara | Aja, Aśva, Gridhra | Kapota
Meṣa, Uṣṭra, Kharāṇa etc.

Hamsa

Šārasa

Vaka
```

The progeny of the next wife, Vinatā again were birds and animals.

```
Kaśyapa = Vinatā

Garuḍa | Aruṇa | Saudāminī (kanyā)

Sampāti | Jātāyu

Vabhru | Śadhriga | Karṇikāra | Šatagāmī | Sārasa | Rajjuvāla | Bherunda
```

The progeny of the rest of the wives included serpents, plants etc.

```
Kaśyapa (wives)

Kadrū | Krodhvāśa | Surabhī | Munī | Ariṣṭā | Irā | Viṣvā

Serpents | Krodhavasā demons Rudras, Cows & Buffaloes | Munis & Apsarā | Kinnara | Reeds, trees | Yakṣa & & Gandharva & creepers | Demons
```

The progeny of Kaśyapa was interesting as it included not just men, *muni*, *apsarā*, but birds, animals, as well as plants. Another interesting feature was that all the daughters of
Dakśa and their progeny were mentioned. The rāksasa generally used their mothers’ names. Only a few daughters were mentioned in the genealogical section. Thus women as mothers were given prominence. Wives were mentioned but only in the context of their giving birth to the next progeny. Another interesting fact was that till this period ancestry was claimed from women. Thus women had a prominent position in the genealogy of the deities. There was mention of daughters and their progeny was traced.

Besides the divine genealogy, the Matysa Purāṇa further mentioned the history of the solar and lunar dynasties. In chapters 11-13, the solar dynasty is described. In chapter 43, the lunar dynasty was mentioned. The ancestry was traced to Kaśyapa and his wife Aditi. Their son again had a matrilineal name i.e. Āditya.

The progeny of the lunar dynasty was unusual. First, was the case of Sanjñā, who was unable to bear the power of the Sun and therefore ran away. In accordance with the Dharmaśastric norms, she was not allowed in her father’s home so, she wandered as a hare in the forests. In her place she installed Chāyā and the Sun was not able to differentiate between the real woman and her substitute, literally ‘shadow’; it was only after divine intervention that the substitution was known. The Sun then started looking for his wife and to appease her reduced his power. Then he took the form of a horse and enjoyed her company. The sons thus born were the Aśvanikumāras (MP, 11. 4-37). Thus it was
important to note that the Dharmaśāstra was referred to and followed in the case of royal genealogy. There were few daughters mentioned in the ancestry.

The story of Ilā/ Ilā is also very astonishing. The progeny from him through Budha is described. In her female form, she was described as beautiful. Incidentally, it was only after the asvamedha yajña performed by his brother Ikṣvāku that he regained his manhood and became a kimputruṣa (MP, 12.1-11). It is well known that the asvamedha yajña had a political connotation. The correlation between the performance of the sacrifice and regaining masculinity is interesting. All sons of Ilā became rulers of some part of the country. Ilā’s son from Budha was the progenitor of the lunar race and Ikṣvāku was of the solar clan. Below is the line of descent of the solar dynasty from Ikṣvāku as mentioned in the text (MP, 12):

```
Ikṣvāku
   ↓ (100 sons)
Vikukṣi (eldest son)
   ↓ (15 sons ruled in Mount of Meru) eldest
Kakusha
   ↓ (114 ruled to the south of Meru)
Suyodhana
  ↓ Prthu
  ↓ Viśvaga
  ↓ Indu
  ↓ Yuvanāśva
  ↓ Śrāvasta (Founder of Sravasti)
  ↓ Bṛhadāśva
  ↓ Kuvalāśva/ Dhundhumāra
    ↓ Driḍhāśva
    ↓ Danḍa
    ↓ Kapilāśva
    ↓ Paranoda
    ↓ Haryaśva
    ↓ Nikumbha
    ↓ Samhatāśva
    ↓ Akritāśva
    ↓ Ranjāśva
    ↓ Yuvanāśva
```
In this genealogy, there were hardly any references to women as mothers, wives, or daughters. Thus as we come to royal genealogies women lose their prominence. They were not mentioned, so descent from women was not highlighted. Only one or two sons were mentioned in each generation. This would reflect that they probably mentioned only the successor and important alliances. According to the Matsya Purāṇa, the last king of the dynasty was killed in the Bharata war. Interestingly, according to the ancestry, Rāma was not obviously divine as he was just mentioned without any reference to heavenly associations. The divine genealogies also referred to cross cousin marriages in many cases.
Next the *Matsya Purāṇa* mentioned the ancestry of the Yadu, the eldest son of Yayāti (*MP*, 43.5). It further mentioned that one who reads the genealogy of Jyāmagha, *Somavamśa*, would be blessed with progeny (*MP*, 44.46).
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*Yayāti*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yadu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sahasraja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śatājī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haihaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veṇu-haya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmanetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahiśmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudraśreṇya (King of Kasi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durdama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtvīrya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtgīni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtvārman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛtojā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna (cakravartin, sahasrabāhu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śurasena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadhvaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālajanghas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīthotras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāryātas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āvantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūṇḍikeras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durjaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛjinīvān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruṣāngu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṃya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citteratha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sašabindu (cakravarthin)

(100 sons)

Prthušvā Prthuyaśā Prthudharmā Prthuṇjaya Prthukṛti Prthuman
Suyajña
Uśanas
Titikṣu
Maruta

Kambalabarhiṣa

Rukmakavaca

Sons from the Sacrificial fire

Rukmeṣu Prthurukma Jyāmagha Paridha Hari
m. Caitrā (parinitā)

Vidarbhā m. a kanyā

Kratha Kaśīka Lomapāda
Kunti Cidi Manu
Dhṛṣṭṛa Caidya dynasty Jñāti
Nirvṛti
Vidūratha
Daśāha
Vyoma
Jimūta
Vimala
Bhīmaratha
Navaratha
Dhridharatha
Śakunī
Karāmbha
Devarāta
Devakṣatra
Then the Purāṇa continued with the ancestry of the Sātvats. Interesting, it abruptly traced the line from Kausalyā, whose progeny was known as Sātvat who were known for their sattva guṇa. Whether she was the wife of Jantu was not clear. Again the text mentioned the Sātvat kings Bhajin, Bhajamāna, Devāvṛdha, Andhaka, Mahābhōja, Vṛṣṇi, and Yadunandana, who were discussed under four subdivisions (MP, 44.47-48). Of these Bhajamāna had Śrījaya and Vāhyakā as his wives, bhāryā. They were daughters of king Śrījaya and their progeny was known as Vāhyakās. They begot many sons such as Nimi, Kṛmila, and Vṛṣṇi. Again the lineage mentioned few women ancestors. They were mentioned in terms of the family they belonged to, which would reflect the politics inherent in the alliances.

The progeny of Devāvṛdha was described in detail. Devāvṛdha’s wife was the river Parnāsā, although the term wife was not used in the text. The king had been practicing austerities for a son on the river bank. The river goddess decided to grant him his wish and took the form of a maiden and gave birth to Vabhru (MP, 44.51-56). This king was praised as an exemplary ruler but unfortunately the role of the river ends with his birth as there was no mention of the river goddess later in the text. It was only the father and the son who were mentioned. Thus the legend very clearly marks out the role of women as being confined to bearing sons. The family tree from Vabhru was described in detail.
Again in this genealogy there was no mention of wives. There was reference to the progeny which included both son and daughter. Devaka's four sons were Devavan, Upadeva, Sudeva, and Devarakṣita. The seven daughters of Devaka who were all given to Vasudeva were Devaki, Śrutadevi, Mitadevi, Yaśodharā, Śrīdevi, Satyadevi and Sutāpi (MP, 44.73). Ugrasena was the father of nine sons and Kaṃśa was the eldest. His other sons were Nyagrodha, Sunāmā, Kanka, Sanku, Ajabhū, Rāṣṭrapāla, Yudhamuṣṭi, and Sumuṣṭi. He had five daughters viz. Kaṃsā, Kaṃsavatī, Sutantū, Rāṣṭrapālī, and Kankā. They were described as varāṅgaṇā i.e. brave.

Thereafter there was reference to the ancestry of Bhoja. This family was known as Andhaka. Towards the end of the family tree, there was mention of Ajāta's three sons, Sudanstra, Sunābha, and Krṣṇa (MP, 44.84). As in earlier genealogies women were missing in this genealogy as well. It only mentioned the father and his valiant sons. As in earlier instances, the text declares that one who reads the genealogy of the Andhakas obtain a large family (MP, 44.85). One unique feature is that daughters were mentioned. Besides, they were described not in terms of their beauty, as was common, but in terms of their bravery.

The next chapter mentioned the family tree of Vṛṣṇi (MP, 45). The chapter also mentions the struggle between the two clans over the śyāmantaka gem. The fight was between the Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis. In this legend Śrīkrṣṇa was portrayed as divine and as a manifestation of Viṣṇu (MP, 45.15). The family tree mentioned was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Madri = Vṛṣṇi = Gāndhārī (bhāryā)} & \\
\text{Yudhāji} & \quad \text{Devamidhuṣa} & \quad \text{Anamitra Śibi} & \quad \text{Kritalakṣaṇa} & \quad \text{Sumitra}
\end{align*}
\]
All the three daughters were praised for their qualities and were described as beautiful with lotus eyes, *kamalalocana*. Satyabhāmā was best among women and Vratinī was known for her vows (*MP*, 45.21). All the three were given to Kṛṣṇa, although the term marriage was not used. The legend mentioned that to please Kṛṣṇa all the three daughters were given to him. The daughters in the present genealogy were mentioned as they were given to Kṛṣṇa but other women of the dynasty were not mentioned.

The family tree becomes a little confusing as the text mentioned a family of the same person in a different manner without giving any reason for the disparity. The family of Anamitra was mentioned as above, then again it was described as the family of Śīni and was as follows:

```
Anamitra
  Śīni
Satyaka
  Sātyaka
  Yuyudhāna (described as grandson of Śīni)
    Asanga
    Dyumna
    Yugandhara
```

Then again there was mention of Anamitra and the family of the Vṛṣṇi.

```
Anamitra
  Yudhājit
    Vṛṣabha
      Kṣatra
        m. Jayantī d/o Kāśirāja (sutā, bhāryā)
        Jayanta
        Akrūra
```
wives

Ugrasena  Aśvinī  Ratnā d/o Śaibya

2 sons  13 sons  11 sons

At the end of the chapter the text again mentioned that just as Śrīkrṣṇa saved himself from defamation by killing Jāmbavant, similarly one who reads or recites these verses to others would never be falsely defamed (MP, 45.37). The next chapter also dealt with the genealogy of the Vṛṣṇis. The line was traced to Ikṣvāku.

Puruṣa = Aikṣvāki d/o Ikṣvāku
Śūra/ Adbhutamidhuṣam m. Bhoja
Sons
Vasudeva  Devamārga  Devaśravā  Anāḍhṛṣṭi  Śīni  Nanda  Śriḥjaya  Śyāma  Śāmika  Samyūpa
[Wives]

Daughters
Śrutakṛtī  Prthā  Śrutadevi  Śrutāsvavā  Rajādhidevi

Sons
Devakī  Rohiṇī of Puru family m. Kaikaya m. Paṇḍu m. Kṛita m. king Caidya
Anuvṛata  Sugrīva  Sunītha

Daughters
Yudhīṣṭhira  Bhīmasena  Arjuna  Nakula  Sahadeva
From Madrī

It was one of the few genealogies where the daughters were mentioned. It mentioned the lineage from ten sons and five daughters and the family of the daughters was given space. But then a selective process was evident as only Vasudeva and his progeny were mentioned in detail. The legend also cited the story of Prthā/ Kuntī who was given to Kuntibhoja. And further it mentioned sons born to her. For the rest, details were not provided or were briefly mentioned. The ancestry of the Kurus was discussed in detail in the preceding chapters of the text.

The family of the sons of Sura was further mentioned with special reference to the progeny of Vasudeva and his wives. Vasudeva had many wives of whom one belonged to the vaiśya clan. Thus inter-caste marriage was accepted. At the same time, it is noteworthy that of all the wives, name of the wife from the vaiśya clan was missing in the text.
The progeny of the other brothers of Vasudeva were also mentioned. Devamārga’s son was Uddhava known for his learning. Anādhṛṣṭi was married to Ikṣvāku and was father of Śatrughna and Śrāddha. Nandana had two sons, Tantipāla and Tanti. Śamhika had four sons Virāja, Dhanu, Śyamya and Śrīnjaya. The text also mentioned that one who hears or recites the birth and family history of Śrīkṛṣṇa will be liberated from all sins and go to heaven (MP, 46.29).

The next chapter deals with the family tree of Kṛṣṇa. He had sixteen thousand wives of whom the principal ones were mentioned. They were Rukmini, Satyabhāmā, Satyā, Nāgajanī, Subhāmā, Śāivyā, Gāndhārī, Lakṣmāṇā, Mitraṅḍā, Kālindī, Jāmbhavatī, Suśilā, Mādri, Kaushalyā, Vijayā, and others. The progeny from some of these wives was mentioned. Again the term marriage was missing and the family/families to which these women belonged was also not mentioned.

The Purāṇas continued with the lineage from Turvasu and gave details of the Soma vamsa (MP, 48). Special mention was made of Mahāmanā who was said to be the king of the seven continents and was a cakravartin ruler. He had two sons, Usīnara and Titikṣu. Usīnara had five queens who were daughters of a rāja. They were Bhṛṣā, Kṛṣā, Navā, Darśa, and Drśadvatī. They begot many sons. The next lineage was of the second son of Mahāmanā, Titikṣu. The famous daitya king Bali belonged to this family. Bali was described as son of Sutapā. Very interestingly, the story of Bali’s sons was peculiar. Noticing Bali’s five sons, the sages asked about the mother and the sage who begot the sons (MP, 48. 30-31). Thus it was clear that they were not Bali’s sons and it was well received. And women were acknowledged as significant or even dominant partners in procreation. It may be possible that the genealogical patterns for a daityas were represented differently. The text continued in detail describing the birth of sons and the sage Dirghatama. The story discussed incest in a very casual manner. It again suggests the
patriarchal nature of the text as women in the legend resisted but the sage had an upper hand and never lost his qualities although he indulged in this kind of unlawful relationship. The text does not regard the story as incest, but explains that the sage followed the animal law and not the human one.

The next genealogy mentioned in the Purāṇa was that of the Pauravas (MP, 49), as shown below. It also included the story of Śakuntalā in brief with reference to Bharata and the progeny known as Bharatas. As usual, most of the genealogy does not mention any women. But it mentioned the āpsārā as the progenitor of the family line. Again surprisingly after Bharata the next ruler was an adopted son as he was the son of Bṛhaspati and his brother’s wife Mamatā. Again incest was referred to but in a casual manner.

```
Puru
   | Janañfajaya
   | Prācītvata
   | Manasyu
   | Pītāyudha
   | Dhūndhu
   | Bahuvidha
   | Sampāti
   | Rahamvarcā
   | Bhadrāśva = Dhṛtā (apsarā)

| Auceyu Hṛṣeyu Kakṣeyu Saheyu Diṣṭeyu Vineyu Sthāleyu Dhārmeyu Saṁeyu Puṇeyu |
m. Jvalanā d/o Takṣaka (ātmajā, bhāryā)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahipati Ratināra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasyini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilianā d/o Yama (kanyā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amūrtarayas Trivana Gaurī (Kanyā) Son (not named) = Upadānavī

| Māndhātā | Rṣyahta | Duṣyahta |
m. Šakuntalā |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bharata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharadvāja/ Vitatha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Son of Bṛhaspati given to Bharata by Marutas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
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### Bhuvamanya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bṛhatkṛṣṇa</th>
<th>Mahāvīrya</th>
<th>Nara</th>
<th>Garga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kṣiti/Hasti</td>
<td>Urākṣvata</td>
<td>Mahāśā = Satkṛṣṭi</td>
<td>Saibya Gargāś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bhāryā) m. Viśālā</td>
<td>Sankṛṣṭi</td>
<td>Śibi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triyūṣṇa</td>
<td>Puṣkari</td>
<td>Kavi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gurdhi</td>
<td>Ranideva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajamīḍhā</td>
<td>Dvimīḍhā</td>
<td>Purumīḍhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Patni of Kuru clan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bhūminī (another wife)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bṛhadānu</th>
<th>Kaṇva</th>
<th>Nila</th>
<th>Yuvānara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhamta</td>
<td>Medhātithi</td>
<td>Suśānti</td>
<td>Dhṛtimāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhanmanā</td>
<td>Purujānu</td>
<td>Satyādhiṃti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhadhanu</td>
<td>Pṛthu</td>
<td>Drḍāñemi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛhadiśu</td>
<td>Bhadrāśva</td>
<td>Sudharmā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadratha</td>
<td>Kapila</td>
<td>Jaya</td>
<td>Brihadiśu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucirāśva</td>
<td>Kāyva</td>
<td>Dhridharatha Vatsarāja</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛthuseṇa</td>
<td>Samara</td>
<td>Divodāsa</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paura</td>
<td>Sampāra</td>
<td>Pāra</td>
<td>Sadāśva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīpa</td>
<td>Pṛthu</td>
<td>Suśṛtasa</td>
<td>Rājā Caidyavara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 sons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīmāna (Nīpās)</td>
<td>Vībrāja</td>
<td>Sudāsa</td>
<td>Amogha-vīrya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuḥa m. Kṛṣṇi d/o Šukra</td>
<td>Ajamidhā II = Bhūminī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viratha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brahmadatta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yugadatta</td>
<td>Somaka</td>
<td>Rkṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇuṃkṣaṇa</td>
<td>Janta</td>
<td>Samaranāṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udaksena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 sons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Janamejaya
Śatānīka

Adhisoma Kṛṣṇa
Future kings

Vivakṣu
18 sons
Bhūri

Citraratha

Śucidrava

Vṛṣṇimān

Suśena
Sunitha

Nṛcaksu

Sukhībala

Pārśnava

Sutapā

Medhāvi

Purañjaya
Urva

Tigmātmā

Bhadratha

Vasudāmā
Śatānīka

Udayana
Vāhinara

Dandapāṇi

Niramitra

Kṣemaka
The most interesting feature of the genealogy was the combination of 'past' and 'future' kings. The ancestry chart mentioned only a few wives but women as ancestors were important here. But the details about the women were missing. Again the genealogy mentioned only the heir apparent and not others. Daughters were mentioned only in a few cases. From a gender perspective the progeny of Draupādi was considered important as there was a distinction between the sons born from her and those from other wives, even though Draupādi’s sons did not succeed to the throne. The sons of Draupādi were called Draupadeyas and sons from other queens were called Pāṇḍavas. Many scholars have used the genealogy of the Pūrāṇas and constructed the length and reign of the kings of the Pauravas and other dynasties.25

After these dynastic details of the past kings, the Matsya Purāṇa mentions the family tree of the ‘future’ Sūrya dynasty and the Yādavas from chapter 271 onwards. It starts with the Ikṣvākus after the Mahābhārata war. These were described as the dynasties of the Kali yuga and the text recounts that they will perish during the Kali yuga. The genealogical record does not mention any women. They only mentioned kings and their successors without any mention of women as wife, mother, or daughter. In these details, the king was described in very simple terms such as Sahadeva of the Ikṣvaku dynasty was illustrious, mahāyaśa (MP, 271.6). Thus these were early polities where simple titles were claimed by the rulers. The Ikṣvāku were described from Divākara to the last rāja Sumitra. Another dynasty described was that of the Bārhadrathas. The length of the reign was also mentioned along with the kings and their successors. It started with Jarāsandha and was listed till Ripuṇjaya. The detail given in the text was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jarāsandha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sahadeva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somādhi (58 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srutaśravā (64 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apratīṭpī (36 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niramitra (40 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of years of reign added up to eight hundred and fifty five years although according to the text the dynasty would last for a thousand years (MP, 211.30). There was mention of the dynasties of Pradyota and Śiśunāka as well. Then there was mention of contemporary kings, who would flourish during the Kali yuga. There would be twenty-four Ikṣvāku kings, twenty-seven Pañcālas, twenty-four Kasi kings and twenty-eight Haihaya kings. The thirty-two Kaliṅga kings, twenty-five Aśmaka kings, thirty-six Kurava, twenty-eight Mithilo, twenty-three Śūrasena, and twenty Vitahotra kings were said to be contemporary and would rule at the same time (MP, 272.14-15).

The Matsya Purāṇa then mentioned the reign of the Nandas. Interestingly, it mentioned that Mahāpadma would be an incarnation of kāli and would be born of a śūdra woman and would annihilate all kṣatriya kings; thereafter all kings would be of śūdra origin (MP, 272.18). The text also mentioned the Mauryas who would rule for a hundred and thirty seven
years and would be followed by the Śuṅgas. Then there was reference to the Kanvāyanas, Āndhras, Ābhiras, Hūṇas, and other local dynasties. The *Matsya Purāṇa* thus contains a great deal of details on genealogies but women were hardly mentioned. It only referred to the successor and left out the lines which lost prominence. Only a few daughters were mentioned. Women generally were not mentioned in the ancestry especially in the family tree of the ‘future’ dynasties. Thus only the genealogies of the gods mentioned women as ancestors whereas in royal genealogies women were not given much prominence. A comparison with the details as provided in the inscriptions would show a different pattern and as in the ‘past’ dynasties mentioned in the Purāṇa, inscriptions mentioned some of the prominent women in their records.

I (b)

One of the most important sections of an epigraph was the part which describes the family and its achievements. The records extolled the family as well as the individual. It is evident that by proclaiming achievements of the ancestors or the individual king the dynasty could claim a legitimate right to rule. The characteristics of kingship changed over a period of time as has been discussed in the earlier chapter. In this section, the genealogy as mentioned in the Vākāṭaka and Kalacuri inscriptions will be studied to analyze the trend and its relevance as a method of legitimization. The position of women in the genealogy can be inferred from their location in the genealogies and in the way they were mentioned. For the Vākāṭakas of the eastern branch, the Jāmb plates of Pravarasena II, was the first to record the genealogy. All the other inscriptions follow the same trend with minor additions. This again reflects the standardization of the records of the Vākāṭakas. The mention of queens, if at all, was in the sense of one through whom the successor was born. The general term used in the context of women was ‘*utpanna*’ i.e. produced from. Thus the identity of women was not always sharply delineated. The genealogical pattern suggest that only the successor mattered. Only a few women were mentioned.

In the Vākāṭaka inscriptions, the genealogical part was missing in three instances, viz. Deotak, Mandhal plates of Rudrasena II, and India Office plates of Devasena. The rest of the inscriptions mentioned the line of rulers starting with Pravarasena I. He was described as *samrāt* while all other rulers use *mahārāja* as their title. Thus the tendency was to claim
a higher status for an ancestor although the later rulers could not claim that position. The genealogy of the Eastern branch as mentioned in the Jamb Plates of Pravarasena II\textsuperscript{26} was as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
  samrāṭ Pravarasena I
   c.270 CE
  Gautamiputra
   m. d/o Bharasiva of Bhavanāga
   mahārāja Rudrasena I (daughtra)
   c. 330 CE
   mahārāja Prthivisena I
   c. 350 CE
   mahārāja Rudrasena II
   c. 400 CE m. Prabhāvatīguptā d/o Devagupta
  para-maheśvara –mahārāja Pravarasena II
   c. 420 CE m. mahādevī
Māndhal plates of Prthivisena year 11\textsuperscript{27} mahārāja Narendrasena
   c. 450 CE m. Ajjhikabhaṭṭārikā, d/o Kuntaladhipati
   mahārāja Prthivisena II
   c. 470 CE
\end{verbatim}

The genealogical chart indicates that all wives or queens were not prominent as they were not mentioned. The Bharasiva and the Gupta alliances were mentioned in almost all the inscriptions. It is obvious that these were prominent political alliances. Of the women mentioned, no title was ascribed to Ajjhikabhaṭṭārikā. The Masoda plate of Pravarasena II was given at the request of an unnamed queen, bhaṛyā mahādevī but details were missing.

In the case of the genealogies of the Vākāṭaka kings, there was no inscriptive evidence of Pravarasena I, the first king mentioned and of Gautamiputra. It is noteworthy that Gautamiputra used a matrilineal name and was bereft of any title. Probably the first ruler was Rudrasena I. Thus the marital alliance becomes significant. It was noteworthy that after the Gupta alliance Pravarasena II also used a superior title of mahārājādhirāja. Again the importance of the matrimonial alliances was highlighted in the records. But women themselves were rarely visible.

The use of matrilineal names would again suggest the importance of the family of the mother, as probably was the case of Gautamiputra. But the details were not mentioned in the records. According to D.C.Sircar\textsuperscript{28} matronymics denotes the paternal gotra of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{26}] Jāmb Plates of Pravarasēṇa II, CII, Vol. 5, pp.10-15.
\item [\textsuperscript{28}] Sircar, D.C., ‘Gōtrāntara or Change of a Women’s Gōtra’, IHC, Vol. 8, 1945, pp. 50-51.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
mother. But I.K. Sarma points out that it was a method of following the Brāhmaṇical custom. Gautamīputra was succeeded by Rudrasena I who was described as *dauhītra* and was ascribed the title of *mahārāja*. The term *dauhītra* meant that the person inherited the property of his grandfather in the absence of any other heir. Trautmann points out that Manu mentioned that *dauhītra* was the *putrikā-putra* i.e. one who inherited his grandfather’s patrimony, but not of his own father. But Hans Bakker opines that the kings were not disinheriting the son by marrying him to a brother-less maiden; rather they arranged the marriage of that son with a *putrikā*, whom they had destined to be their own heir. The Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena I inherited parts of the kingdom of his grandfather Pravarasena I as well as territories of the Bharaśivas, a branch of the Nāga dynasty that ruled Padmāvatī. But unfortunately the women with whom the alliance was sought do not find reference in the records.

Prabhāvatīgupta’s Poona plates and Riddhapur plates has a special place in terms of genealogy. The records as in other aspects were different as they mentioned the Gupta lineage rather than that of the Vākāṭakas. Thus the Guptas were explicitly proclaimed as important and she claimed status through her parentage and not through the dynasty she was probably ruling. In the genealogy she claimed a superior title of *mahārājādhirāja* for Candragupta II as well as Samudragupta while ascribing a lesser title of *mahārāja* for Rudrasena II. She also specified her *gotra* as *dhāraṇa* whereas the *gotra* of the Vākāṭakas was *viṣṇuvṛddhī*. The Riddhapur plates of Prabhāvatīgupta was similar to the Poona plates in terms of the genealogy except for a few changes as she mentioned Kumāradevī as Licchavī and used a lesser title of *mahārāja* for Samudragupta. She also mentioned Samudragupta’s wife *mahādevī* Dattadevī. She does not ascribe any title to Kūberanāgā. She claimed for herself the title of *agramahasī* and *mahādevī*. In the inscription she described herself as the mother of *mahārāja* Damodarasena Pravarasena which has been a matter of contention among scholars who were divided as to whether it referred to two

---

kings or one. The genealogy of the Guptas as mentioned in the Poona plates of Prabhāvatīguptā\textsuperscript{31} is as below:

\begin{verbatim}
mahārāja Ghaṭotkaca

mahārāja Candragupta I
   m. mahādevī Kumāradevi

mahārājādhirāja Samudragupta

mahārājādhirāja Candragupta II
   m. mahādevī Küberanāgā
   sutayā

agramahiṣi Prabhāvatīguptā
   m. mahārāja Rudrasena II
   yuvārāja Divākārasena
\end{verbatim}

There were differences between the genealogy and title of the Guptas given in the inscriptions of Prabhāvatīguptā and the standard Gupta genealogy. The Guptas did not mention any gotra. The name of the queen of Candragupta II was Dhruvādevī i.e. the mother of the successor to the throne. Prabhāvatī was not mentioned in Gupta genealogies. In the Bhitari stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta\textsuperscript{32} the genealogy of the Guptas was as mentioned below:

\begin{verbatim}
mahārāja Ghaṭotkaca

mahārājādhirāja Candragupta I
   m. mahādevī Kumāradevi

mahārājādhirāja Samudragupta

mahārājādhirāja Candragupta II
   m. mahādevī Dattādevī

mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta
\end{verbatim}

A comparison shows that Prabhāvatīguptā used eloquent titles only for her father. She mentioned several aśvamedhas performed by Candragupta II, which were assigned to Samudragupta in the Gupta inscriptions. Her main concern was to highlight her father and

\textsuperscript{31} Poonā Plates of Prabhāvatīgupta, \textit{CII}, Vol.5, p. 7.

mother rather than the lineage of the Vākāṭakas. She claimed legitimacy through the sacrifices and qualities of her paternal family, especially her father. Prabhāvatīguptā distinguished her identity carefully emphasizing her differences from the Vākāṭakas. The Vākāṭakas in their inscription mention the Gupta alliance but they use the title of mahārājā for Candragupta II in some and mention Devagupta instead of Candragupta. The mention of the Guptas would imply that it was an important relationship for the Vākāṭakas. But they claimed a status equal to the Guptas rather than regarding them as belonging to a superior social or political group.

Another royal family was mentioned in the grants made by Prathivīśena II. The Mandhal Plates, year 2, mentioned Ajjhikābhāṣṭārikā, mother of Prathivīśena II and daughter of the lord of Kuntala, kuntalādhipati. H. Heras identifies her as mother of Narendrasena and Kākūsthamārman of the Kadamba dynasty as the lord of Kuntala. However, A.M. Shastri on the basis of the Mandhal Plates of Prathivīśena II, year 2, identifies her as the wife of Narendrasena and mother of Prathivīśena II; the grant was made for her religious merit.

For the Vatsagulma/ western branch, the genealogy as given in the Basim plates of Vindhyāśakti, 392 CE and Thalner plates of Hariṇēna was as follows:

```
dharmamahārājā Vindhyāśakti I
  dharmārāja samrāṭ Pravarasena I
    mahārājā Sarvasena I
      dharmamahārājā Vindhyāśakti II (described as Haritputra)
        mahārājā Pravarasena II
          mahārājā Sarvasena II
            mahārājā Devasena
              mahārājā Hariṇēna
```

The inscriptions do not mention any queen or wife. It was probable that they had no important diplomatic matrimonial alliance to proclaim. Probably the Western branch was

33 Mandhal Plates of Prathivīśena II, Year 2, ASCI, p. 73 &100.
a minor power. Clearly in this branch, women did not hold a significant position, neither as a mother nor as a wife.

The genealogical section was not restricted to the royalty as there are references to the ancestry of ministers and feudatories during the later Vakataka period. Thus it was no more a royal prerogative to claim a glorious past. A change could be noticed in the records of the ministers. The inscriptions of Varahadeva,\(^38\) c.475-499 CE, minister, saciva of Harisenā, does not mention the genealogy of the minister and gives the genealogy of the Vatsagulma branch but does not ascribe high sounding titles to the rulers. In the Ghatotkaca inscription of Varahadeva,\(^39\) the genealogy of the ministerial family was given, which belonged to a category of brāhmaṇa called vallūras.\(^40\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yajñapati} & \\
\text{Deva} & \\
\text{Brāhmaṇa wife m. Soma m. Kṣatriya wife} & \\
(\text{Sons}) & \\
\text{established and} & \text{Ravi} \\
\text{carried out duties} & \text{Pravara} \\
\text{as vallūras} & \\
\text{Śrī-Rāma} & \\
\text{Kirti} & \\
\text{Kośo}\(^41\) Haśibhoja & \\
\text{saciva Varahadeva} &
\end{align*}
\]

In this genealogy, the varna identity was highlighted. Soma had two wives, bhāryā; one was a brāhmaṇa while the other was a kṣatriya. The brāhmaṇa wife was mentioned first and the sons from her performed the duties as vallūras. The sons from the kṣatriya wife performed ministerial roles. But the issue of intercaste marriage was not relevant in the record. The record mentioned only Devasena and Harisenā. They did not mention the usual ancestry of the Vatsagulma branch. In a way they claimed their status by referring to their ancestry and the kings with whom they were associated. As these grants were for the support of Buddhist caves, probably the kings were not directly associated with these

\(^{38}\) Ajañṭa Cave Inscription of Varahadeva, CII, Vol. 5, pp. 103-11.


\(^{40}\) Mirashi uses this evidence to argue for the south Indian origin of the Vākātakas. A. M Shastri does not agree with it.

\(^{41}\) It was probably Haśi kośo, designation of an officer.
grants. But it was important to note that the wives of the minister were mentioned in contrast to the royal records where women do not find any mention. The record mentioned the caste identity of these women but their names and details were missings.

Similarly, in the inscriptions of the feudatories such as the Ajanta caves XVII\textsuperscript{42} inscription, the genealogy of Ravisamba, ruler of Khandesh was given. Only Harišena was mentioned and the Vatsagulma lineage was again missing. The family tree of Ravisamba was as mentioned below:

\begin{verbatim}
Narādhipati (Name lost)  
| 
| Dhītarāstra  
| rājno Harisāmbo  
| ksitipāla Saurisāmbo  

prthuṣāṁśkirtidhru Upendragupta  
|  
| Kaca I  
|  
| narādhipati Bhikṣudāsa  
|  
| nrpa Niladāsa  
|  
| Kaca II  
|  
| nrpa Kṛṣṇadāsa m. Aṭicandṛā  

|  
| Dharādhipa\textsuperscript{43} Ravisāmbo
\end{verbatim}

Only Kṛṣṇadāsa's wife was mentioned but unfortunately her lineage and other details were missing. But as compared to the records of the rulers of the Vatsagulma branch, we find the mention of women, even though as the mother of the feudatory.

The Vākāṭaka records do not show much variation in the royal genealogy and in the later records the ancestry of the ministers and feudatories was mentioned. Only a few women were mentioned. The only exception was Prabhāvatīguptā who held a special position as regent and belonged to a powerful dynasty. The lineage of other queens was not mentioned.

The Kalacuris, unlike the Vākāṭakas, did not claim the right to rule because of a powerful ancestor; rather they traced a mythical origin. The Kalacuris traced their origin to the

\textsuperscript{42} Ajanta Cave XVII Inscription, CLI, Vol. 5, pp. 124-25.

\textsuperscript{43} Mirashi says that name is lost while A.M. Shastri says that the name was Dharādhipa.
moon. Mythical origin was a way of claiming a long ancestry as well as legitimacy. Most interestingly the Kalacuri genealogy claimed links to the Haihayas mentioned in the Purāṇas. The actual line started from Kokalladeva who married the Candellā princess Naṭṭā. In the records, they claimed ancestry from Manu and then mentioned Kārttavīrya who had defeated Rāvana according to the Purāṇic legend. Thus the attempt was to claim legitimacy by tracing the genealogy to the famous Haihayas. The Tripuri branch mentioned the military achievements of kings in the genealogy, unlike the Vākāṭakas. The ancestry as mentioned in the Banaras plates of Karna, 1042 CE\(^4\) was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Maṇu} & \\
\text{Kārttavīrya} & \\
\text{Kokalladeva I m. Naṭṭā (Candellā)} & \\
\text{rājā Prasiddhadhavala/Mugdhatuṅga} & \\
\text{Bālalārṣa} & \\
\text{Yuvārājadeva I} & \\
\text{Lakṣmanarājadeva II} & \\
\text{Śaṅkaragaṇadeva III} & \\
\text{Yuvārājadeva II} & \\
\text{Kokalladeva II} & \\
\text{nrpa Gāṅgeyadeva/} & \\
\text{Vikramāditya} & \\
\text{mps Karna m. Ávalladevi} & \\
\text{(Huṇa)} & \\
\text{mps Yaṣahkarṇa} & \\
\text{mps Gayakarṇa m. Áhaṇadevi} & \\
\text{nrpa Narasimha} & \\
\text{mps Jayasimha} & \\
\text{m. Gosaladevi} & \\
\text{mps Vijayasimha} & \\
\text{mahākumāra Ajayasimha} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Jabalpur Plates of Jayasimha, Year 918\(^4\)

Bhereghat Gauri Sankara
Temple Inscription of Vijayasimha\(^4\)

In the genealogical section, the king was described as meditating at the feet of parama-bhāṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara Vāmadeva; probably he was the founder of the

\(^4\) Banaras Plates of Karna: (Kal.) Year 793. \(CII\), Vol. 4, Pt. 1, pp. 241-44.
\(^4\) Jabalpur Plates of Jayasimha: (Kal.) Year 918. \(CII\), Vol. 4, Pt. 1, p. 327.
northern Kalacuri power. Scholars do not agree regarding the identification of Vämadeva. D.C. Sircar identifies him according to the Prthiviraja-vijaya, as the ascetic Vämadeva, to whom king Sāhasika of the Kalacuri dynasty dedicated his empire. The king was identified as Gāngeyadeva. On the basis of the Malkapuram stone inscription V.S. Pathak identifies him with Śāivācārya Vāmāśambhu and the king was identified as Yuvarājadeva II. V. V. Mirashi holds that Vämadeva was the founder of the Kalacuri dynasty and belonged to the end of the 7th century. He further mentions that he was the unnamed brother of Lakṣmanarāja mentioned in the Kahla Plates of Sodhadeva. According to him Vämadeva was the founder of the Cedi branch and Lakṣmanarāja was the founder of the Saryupara branch. But the inscriptions do not mention any further details in this regard.

Unlike the Vākāṭaka records, the Kalacuri inscriptions were not standardized. The Khairha Plates of Yaśahkarna, (Kal.) year 823, unlike the earlier records, do not trace the beginning from Manu. Rather the inscriptions traced the ancestry to Viṣṇu and then mentioned Brahmā, Atri, Soma, Purūravas, Bharata, and Kārttavīrya. It is obvious that the Kalacuris were claiming legitimization by referring to prominent Purānic figures. They even compared the kings with other famous epic and Purānic characters. References to the queens was as ‘jananya’ i.e. progenitor of the successor. Their lineages were generally not elaborated. As usual it was only the important alliances which were referred to in the family tree.

Every branch of the Kalacuris i.e., Saryupara and Ratnapur besides Tripuri, mentioned their specific ancestry with only one similarity. They all mentioned Kokalladeva I, after whom they branched off. The genealogy of the branch of Saryupara according to the Kahla Plates of Sodhadeva, (Vikrama) year 1135, also started from moon.

```
Purūravas = Urvasi (priyā)
```

51 Refer Kahla Plates of Sodhadeva: (Vikrama) Year 1135, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, pp. 386-89.
Unlike the Tripuri branch, these kings were mentioned along with their wives but unfortunately the lineage was not mentioned. As usual the wives were mentioned without any titles. Terms such as priyā and jāyā were used. Thus they were referred to as wife/beloved or mother. Kings do not use any title except the lesser title of rājā and nṛpa. Only Sodhadeva claimed the high sounding title of parama-bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja. Probably the Saryupara branch was a minor power. It is important to note that in this branch, the wives of nearly all the rulers were mentioned, which would imply that they had a significant role in the dynasty. It would also imply the strategy of enhancing power through marriage. But it was not explicitly mentioned in the records.

52 Mirashi points out that according to the Agnipuruṣa Nahuṣa was the grandson of Pururavas. Ibid, p.392.
53 Mirashi holds that Bhīma was known as Guṇasāgara III as opposed to Kielhorn who held it to be Guṇasāgara II. Ibid, p. 384.
The Ratanpur branch of the Kalacuris traced their origin from Manu like the other branches. Most of the inscriptions gave details of genealogy. The ancestry of the branch as was mentioned in the Sarkho Plates of Ratnadeva II, (Kal.) year 880\(^54\) is as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kārtavīrya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kośkala I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliṅgarāja (youngest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratnaraṇa I m. Nonnāḷ (parinītā) d/o Vajuvarman, (sūtā)

Pṛthūvīdeva I m. Rājalla

Akaltara Stone Inscription of Ratnadeva II\(^55\) Jājalladeva I m. Lāchalladevi (patnī)
```

\[bhūpati\] Ratnadeva II

```
Pṛthūvīdeva II
```

```
Jājalladeva II
Brother
```

```
Pratapamalla
```

Kharod Stone Inscription of Ratnadeva III\(^56\) Jājalladeva II

```
Somalladevi
```

```
Pratapamalla
```

Bilaigarh Plates of Pratāpamalla\(^57\) Ratnadeva III

\[bhūpati\] Ratnadeva III

The genealogical section was not standardized and information differed from inscription to inscription. The Bilaigarh plates of Pratāpamalla do not mention Jājalladeva II whose reign was described in the Kharod stone inscription of Ratnadeva III. Only a few queens were mentioned in the genealogy. They were not assigned any title. This suggests that they were given less prominence in the dynasty.

Regarding the place of women in the genealogical chart, in the Bilhari stone inscription of Yuvarājadeva II,\(^58\) the royal genealogy started with Kokalladeva I and continued to

\(^{54}\) Sarkho Plates of Ratnadeva II: (Kal.) Year 880, CII, Vol. IV, Pt. II, pp. 423-29.

\(^{55}\) Akaltara Stone Inscription of Ratnadeva II, CII, Vo. 4, Pt. II, p. 432.

\(^{56}\) Kharod Stone Inscription of Ratnadeva III: Chedi Year 933, CII, Vo. 4, Pt. II, pp. 536-37.

\(^{57}\) Bilaigarh Plates of Pratapamalla: (Kal.) Year 969, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, pp. 545-46.

Yuvarājadeva/ Keyūravarśa. In verses 30-37 the genealogy of Nohalā was mentioned. It reiterated that the sage Bhāradvāja took a handful water to curse Drupada and a warrior was born. The family which descended from him came to be known as the Cālukyas. In a way the record mentioned not just the family of Nohalā but highlighted the origin of the Cālukyas. This highlights the importance of Nohalā in the Kalacuri dynasty as she belonged to a powerful dynasty. The genealogy of Nohalā was as given below:

```
Simhavarman
  (son)
  Sadhanva
Avanivarman
  (kanyā)
  Nohalā m. Keyūravarśa/Yuvarājadeva
Lakṣmanarāja
```

Another record, which mentioned the ancestry of the queen Ālhaṇadevi, was the Bhere-ghat stone inscription of Narasimhadeva, (Kal.) year 907. The record traced the royal genealogy from the moon to Gayakarṇa and then mentioned the genealogy of Ālhaṇadevi. The genealogy as mentioned in the epigraph is as follows:

```
Gobhilaputra
  nrpa Hamaspāla
  vasudhāpati Vainsimha
    prthīvīpati Vijayasimha m. Śyāmalādevī d/o Udayāditya (sutayā)
      Daughter
    Ālhaṇadevi m. nareśvāra Gayakarṇa
      Sons
    nrpa Narasimhadeva Jayasimha
```

This record not only mentioned the family of Ālhaṇadevi but also referred to the family of his mother, Śyāmalādevī. She was the daughter of Udayāditya who ruled the Malava maṇḍala. This indicates that she held an important position in the Kalacuri dynasty. Again it exhibited the relevance of a matrimonial alliance. These two queens were prominent in the dynasty. The Bhere-ghat Gaurī-Śaṅkara Temple inscription of Vijayasimha did not cite any genealogy. There was only mention of mahārajīṇī Gosaladevi.

---

Of the inscriptions which recorded joint grants by both men and women, the Karitalai Stone inscription of Lakṣaṇa-rāja II mentioned three Kalacuri princes Yuvarājadeva, Lakṣaṇa-rāja and Śaṅkaragaṇa, but nothing was specified about Rāhaḍā, wife of Lakṣaṇa-rāja II. The Rewa stone inscription of Karna (kal.) year 812 mentioned the royal genealogy from Kokalla II but there was no reference to women.

In the records of the Ratnapur and Saryupara branch there was no mention of any ancestry of women in the records. Nevertheless, the records mentioned women as the wife of the ruler. In the records by women other than queens, their genealogy was not mentioned.

Of the records of the grants by the officials of Tripuri branch, only the Rewa stone inscription of Karna, (kal.) year 800 and the Rewa stone inscription of Vijayasimha (kal.) year 944, briefly mentioned the royal genealogy while the Choti-Deori inscription of Śaṅkaragaṇadeva, Makundapur stone inscription of Gāṅgeyadeva, Bahuriband statue record of Gayakarna, Lāl-Pahad and Alha- ghat of Narasimhadeva along with Rewa and Tewar records of Vijayasimhadeva did not mention any genealogy. The Rewa stone inscription of Vijayasimha (Kal.) year 944, besides giving the royal genealogy mentioned the genealogy of the donor Malayasimha.

![Genealogy Diagram]

Jāta (head of viṣaya under king Karna)

Yaśāḥkarna (under Gayakarna)

Pādmasimha

Candraśimha

{(gehasaciva of Vijayasimha)

Kirtisimha

Malayasimha m. Talhanadevi

Pṛthivīdhara (name lost)

It was not only the minister whose ancestry was mentioned, there was also reference to the family of the various officers such as the superintendents of the excavations of the tank, Vidyādhara, who belonged to the family of Vāstavya. The genealogy was traced upto the grandfather or great grandfather. Besides, the record also mentioned the family of the poet

Puruṣottama. The Rewa plate of Vijayasimha, (Vikrama) year 1253\textsuperscript{64} mentioned the genealogy of Salakṣaṇavarman, feudatory, sāmanta of Vijayasimhadeva.

\begin{verbatim}
  Dhāhilla
  Vaijūka
  Dandūka
  Khojūka
  Jayavarman
  Vaisarāja
  Kirtivarman  Salakṣaṇavarman
\end{verbatim}

Vappulla was a minister whose genealogy was mentioned in the records of the Tripuri branch. The royal genealogy was mentioned briefly in the Rewa Stone inscription of Karna, (Kal.) year 812, followed by the ancestry of Vappulla\textsuperscript{65} who was the donor.

\begin{verbatim}
  (Name lost)
  Vijjalarāṇaka  Vigraharāja
  Vappulla= Nayanāvalī (patnī)
\end{verbatim}

Another interesting genealogy in the Tripuri branch inscriptions was that of the Śaiva ascetics from Kadambaguhā. The genealogy in this case was through the disciple and they were the royal preceptors. The Chandrehe Stone inscription of Prabodhaśīva, (Kal.) year 724\textsuperscript{66} mentioned the line of descent of the Śaiva ascetics. The record does not mention the royal genealogy. It referred to the spiritual genealogy of Prabodhaśīva of the Mattamayūra clan.

\begin{verbatim}
  Purandara
  Śikhaśīva (lord of Madhumati)
  Prabhāśīva (invited by Yuvarājadeva I)
  Praṣāntaśīva
  Prabhoḍaśīva
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{64} Rewa Plates of Vijayasimha: (Vikrama) Year 1253, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. I, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{65} Rewa Stone Inscription of Karna: (Kal.) Year 812, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. I, pp. 281-82.
\textsuperscript{66} Chandrehe Stone Inscription of Prabodhasiva: (Kal.) Year 724, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. I, pp. 200-01.
The spiritual ancestry was mentioned in the Bilhari and Gurgi Stone inscriptions. The Bilhari Stone inscription of Yuvarajadeva II mentioned the spiritual genealogy of the Śaiva ascetics from Kadambaguhā in the third section of the grant.67 The genealogy mentioned was as follows:

Rudraśambhu (disciple of the lord of Mattamayūra)  
Mattamayūranātha (initiated the king of Avanti)  
Dharamaśambhu  
Sadaśiva  
Mādhumāteya  
Cūḍāśiva  
Hṛdayaśiva (invited by Laksmanaśāya)  
Agholāśiva

According to Mirashi, Cūḍāśiva was Śikhāśiva of the Candrehe inscription whose disciple Prabhāśiva was given a grant by Yuvarajadeva I.68 In the same record the queen Nohalā gave a grant to the Śaiva ascetic Īṣvaraśiva for his scholarship.69 The spiritual genealogy of the ascetic from Pavanaśiva, also called Mādhumāteya was also mentioned. His disciple was Śabdaśiva and his disciple was Īṣvaraśiva who was given the grant. Besides the genealogy of the ascetics the record also mentioned the family of the poet Dhāmsata. The inscription mentioned that dīksīta Mehuka, who was well known and was foremost among good men, had a son Jeika. His son was Dhāmsata from the womb, odare of Amarikā.

Of the records of the Ratnapur branch which gave the genealogy of the officers, the Rajim stone inscription of Prthiviḍeva II,70 (Kal.) year 896 mentioned the genealogy of the donor Jagapāla from thakkura Sāhilla of the family Rājamela who migrated from Vadahara.

---

69 Ibid, p. 212.
70 Rajim Stone Inscription of Prithvideva II: (Kal.) Year 896, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, pp. 453-54.
It was the sole instance where a title was ascribed to an elite woman who did not belong to the royalty. It was also interesting to note that except the first member no one used any title. And Udayā was using the equivalent of that title. It shows that she had a dominant position in the family.

In the Ratnapur stone inscription of Prthivīdeva II,\(^{71}\) (Vikrama) year 1207, the royal genealogy was given from Jājalladeva I and then the genealogy of the donor, Devagañā, was mentioned.

This inscription was the only instance where a daughter was mentioned in the ancestry chart. This probably shows that the daughter held some important position in the family. The Akaltara inscription of Ratnadeva II\(^ {72}\) mentioned the mother of the king and gave the genealogy of the donor, Vallabharāja, of vaiśya lineage. The Ratnapur stone inscription of Prthivīdeva II, (Kal.) year 910 mentioned the donation of Vallabharāja where it also cited his wife, \(\text{patnī}\) Svetalladevi.\(^ {73}\) In the Koni stone inscription of Prthivīdeva II,\(^ {74}\) (Kal.) year 900 after the royal genealogy, the lineage of the donor Puruṣottama was mentioned as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Govinda (Vastava family)} & \\
& \downarrow \\
\text{Māme} & \text{Rāghava} \\
& \downarrow \\
\text{Ratnasimha m. Rambhā (patnī)} & \\
& \downarrow \\
(vadhū) \text{Prabhā m. Devagañā m. Jāmbo (patnī)} & \\
& \downarrow \\
& \text{(santāna) (duhitā)} \\
& \downarrow \\
\text{Jagatsimha} & \text{Rāyasimha} & \text{Bhopā} \\
& \downarrow \\
& \text{Sodhadeva (minister of Prthivīdeva I)} \\
& \downarrow \\
\text{Nimbadeva m. Lakhamā} \\
& \downarrow \\
\text{Puruṣottama} & \\
& \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{71}\) Ratnapur Stone Inscription of Prithvideva II: (Vikrama) Year 1207, \(\text{CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, pp. 486-87.}\)
\(^{72}\) Akaltara inscription of Ratnadeva II, \(\text{CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, p. 432.}\)
\(^{73}\) Ratnapur Stone Inscription of Prithvideva II: (Kal.) Year 910, \(\text{CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, p. 499.}\)
\(^{74}\) Koni Stone Inscription of Prithvideva II: (Kal.) year 900, \(\text{CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, pp. 468-69.}\)
The Ratnapur stone inscription of Prthivideva II, (Kal.) year 915, mentioned the genealogy of the donor, Brähmanadeva, son of Prthivipāla. Similarly, the Mallar stone inscription of Jajalladeva II, (Kal.) year 919 gave the genealogy of the donor, brāhmaṇa Sumarāja, who was the son of Gaṅgādhara and grandson of Prthivīdhara of kṛṣṇatriya gotra from the village Kumbhati in Madhyadesa.

In the Sheorinarayana stone inscription of JajaHadeva II, (Kal) year 919, the donor Āmanadeva and Vikkannadeva belonged to a collateral branch of the Kalacuris. Their genealogy was as given below:

```
Prthivideva I
  younger brother
  Sarvadeva (at Sonthiva)
    (son)
  Āmanadeva I (probably)
    Rājadeva

Tējalladeva  Ullanadeva  Gopāla  Vikkannadeva

Āmanadeva II
```

The Kharod stone inscription of Ratnadeva III, year 933, gave the genealogy of the mantrin Gaṅgādhara.

```
Devadhara (kaśyapa gotra)
  Rājadeva m. Jīvā (priyā)
    (bhāryā) Rālha m. Gaṅgādhara m. Padmā

Sūprada  Jijāka  Khadgasimha
```

The trend of using genealogies as a method of claiming status was well established. The inscriptions of both the dynasties show the relevance of ancestry as nearly every record had a genealogical section. This was a feature of the Purāṇas as well. The genealogical section was one of the five main characteristics of a Purāṇa. In the later period it was not only the kings who mentioned their ancestry but the officials recorded them as well. In

---

75 Mallar Stone Inscription of Jajalladeva II: (Kal.) Year 919, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. II, p. 514.
many of the inscriptions the donor's ancestry was provided but not of the royalty. Thus the practice was widely prevalent. In the context of the record of the ancestry of the queens we have reference to Prabhāvaṇiguptā of the Vākāṭaka dynasty and Nohālā of the Cālukya dynasty who gave details of their ancestry. It is evident that they claimed status through their paternal ancestry. For other queens generally there was only mention of the dynasty such as Naṭṭā of the Candellā dynasty or the name of the father of the queen like Nonnalā. In the context of women, the Vākāṭakas described their relationship with the king as one who produced the successor. Only in the Ghatotkaca cave inscription a direct relation was specified i.e. patnī. The Kalacuris also use similar terms for women. The terms used were jāyā, jananyā, and sutayā. In a few cases the word priyā was used, which means beloved. It was interesting to note that the inscription of ministers and feudatories use terms such as patnī, vadhū, jāyā, bhāryā and priyā. Also the term duhitā was used. There was no mention of daughters except in the Ratnapur stone inscription of Prthivīdeva II where the daughter of the donor was mentioned. In this context the inscriptions were similar to the Purāṇas. We have seen that women were mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa. They were referred as the wife or mother. In understanding the genealogical patterns it is noteworthy that significant marital alliances were documented. Marriage alliances were more of a political bonding than a social relationship. In the next section we look into marriage and its political connotation with the help of royal genealogies.

II

Marriage according to Levi-Strauss represents the main expression of the principle of exchange upon which social life rests as it creates alliance between the exchanging units. An alliance actually defined the very identity of these units or groups and kinship was a by product of the union and its purpose was maintainence and furtherance of alliance.78 Rubin posits that the woman was nothing more than the symbol of her lineage.79 This view was best represented in various social exchanges especially marriage. The position of women only as symbol of her lineage can best be seen in the dynastic records which referred to queens, only if they belonged to a powerful dynasty. Obviously, women, if

they belonged to a famous dynasty were given status. Thus marriage alliances were more political in nature and the position of women was dependent on it. Marriage was a significant ritual which gained prominence in Brâhmanical literature. By the later Vedic period marital status was the primary form of identity for women.\(^8^0\) She could accompany her husband in the śrauta rituals as wife, *patnī*. The Gr̄hyasūtras usually begin with marriage, *vivāha*, as it was the origin and centre of all domestic sacrifices.\(^8^1\) Its codification attained centrality in both Gr̄hya and Dharmaśūtras which attempted to formalize and regulate the process.\(^8^2\) It was an important rite of passage for both men and women. According to the Dharmaśāstras, the main purpose of marriage was *dharmasampatti*, *praţiṇa*, and *rati*\(^8^3\). The first was to perform sacrifices as a householder in honour of the gods and his patrilinial lineages, secondly, to perpetuate the lineage by producing sons and lastly for sexual and other pleasures. The Dharmaśāstras mentioned the qualities of a prospective bride. There were prohibitions against marrying *sagotra*, *sapravara*, or *sapi̇na* girls. Such marriages were held as void. According to Trautmann gotra was monofunctional. Its function was regulation of marriage. On the other hand sapinda ties had several functions and were important for occasions such as marriage, death, and inheritance.\(^8^4\) The *smṛtis* also condemn cross cousin marriages,\(^8^5\) alliances that takes place in such cases would be between those regarded as *sapiṇḍa* and *sagotra*. Further it is mentioned that if a woman was married in the first four forms of marriage i.e. *brāhma*, *prājāpatya*, *arṣa* and *daiva*, then she would have the gotra of her husband. But if she was married in the *gāndharva*, *āsura*, *rākṣasa*, and *paiśāca* forms then she retains her paternal gotra. The Sūtra literature mentioned eight different forms of marriage and various rules and conditions to be followed in a marriage alliance. Trautmann holds these forms as the means by which the control over women could be relinquished.\(^8^6\) Trautmann points out that the Dharmaśāstras prescribed isogamy i.e. marriage of status-equals, as

both Gautama and Vasīṣṭha Dharmaśāstras advised for a sadṛṣī i.e. similar (in status).⁸⁷

According to the Dharmaśāstras marriages were alliances or transactions between groups rather than the union of two individuals who act freely and of their own volition. The transaction was between the bride’s family and the groom. The transaction was of domination over the women who were transferred from one family to another.⁸⁸ The texts do prefer savarna marriage but are not rigid on that aspect. But a savarna alliance was given the first preference. In the context of the asavarna union, it was of two types. The first was anuloma, hypergamous, in which a man of a higher varṇa marries, a woman of a lower varṇa. The second type was pratiloma i.e. hypogamous in which a man of a lower varṇa marries women of a higher status. This kind of marriage was strongly condemned. Smṛtikārṣas were not unanimous on the number and forms of these unions.

The importance of marriage in society is well documented in literary texts, especially the Grhyasūtras which deal extensively with marriage and rituals associated with it. The first reference to marriage was found in the tenth mandala of the Rgveda where the marriage between Soma and Sūryā was mentioned. The saṃskāras of marriage were divided into three parts, pāṇigrahana, home and going around the fire and saṃtapatī. These were the central rituals while seeing the pole star etc. were subsequent rites. The rituals such as testing the qualities of the bride, vadhūvara-gunaparikṣā, negotiating for the girl’s hand, varapreśana, followed by settling of marriage, erecting the pandal, going to the bride’s house etc., were the next stage in the process. These were followed by getting the bride ready, i.e. snāpana, making the bride bathe, paridhāpana, wearing new clothes and sammahana, girding her with a rope of darbha. The main rituals included pāṇigrahana, holding the hand of the bride, lājahoma, offering of fried grain into the fire by the bride, agniparinayana, going around the fire and water jar, saṃtapatī, taking seven steps together, naksatra darśana, journey to the new home along with other such rites.⁸⁹

The texts on marriage rituals seldom refer to the political function. They deal with the various rituals. The main purpose of the ritual was to enable the bridegroom to become a yajamāna and perpetuate the lineage. Thus marriage according to the Dharmaśāstra was a transaction between two groups rather than individuals. This was demonstrated by Werner
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⁸⁸ Ibid.
F. Menski as a union of not just the two individuals and their families, but also their larger family and society and the cosmic universe on the whole.  

II (a)

Dynastic succession and genealogy was discussed in detail in the Purāṇa but on the issue of marriage the Matsya Purāṇa was silent. It does not lay down rules related to marriage. Generally the reference to marriage was implicit. There was only one reference to marriage, that too in the chapter on Prayag māhātya. The text mentioned that one who gives away his daughter, kanyā, in proper marriage, arṣa vivāha, according to one’s means at the confluence of Ganga and Yamuna never goes to hell (MP, 106.8-9). Generally, the text referred to progeny as could be seen from the genealogical section and that seems to be regarded as the relevance of marriage. The first reference to marriage was that of Brahmā with Śatarupa or Sāvitri and the birth of Manu. This marriage was controversial as it was seen as an instance of incest. The text itself questions the marriage and reasons out why Brahmā committed a sinful act (MP, 4.1-2). The text further questions why children of Brahmā intermarried in their paternal circle, disregarding the Dharmaśastric norm of marriage. The Matsya Purāṇa mentioned that creation was different for celestial beings and hence the same rules do not apply to them. ‘The devas have a super-sensuous body and they beget progeny in a different manner. The celestial beings come into being in other ways and it is very difficult for men having sensuous bodies to understand this secret’ (MP: Akhtar, 4.3-5). In the case of Brahmā, Gāyatrī was his better-half and that was the reason she appeared from his body (MP, 4.7). This alliance was important as Manu was born to them.

All marriage alliances were not mentioned and generally the term marriage was not used to describe the relation between man and woman. Women were said to be given. It was the progeny from the alliance that was prominent and not the marriage. Interestingly, the issue of marriage was discussed in the text in the context of Kaca and Devayānī, daughter of Śukra (MP, 25-26). In the story Devayānī proposes marriage to Kaca. However, Kaca did not agree to marry her as she was the daughter of his preceptor and the marriage according to him was unlawful. She cursed him (MP, 26.17). This was a fight between
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norms and desires and Devayānī was described as a woman who strongly expressed her desires. The story of Devayānī does not end here. The story then continued with the clash between the king and the preceptor in the background. The legend described the tussle between Devayānī, daughter of Śukra and Śarmiśṭhā, daughter of king Vṛṣaparvan. Devayānī complained that she was called the daughter of one who accepts gifts and sings praises of the king whereas Śarmiśṭhā was the daughter of one who gave gifts. Besides the long discussion on this clash of egos between the daughters, there was the story of the marriage of Devayānī and Yayāti. Here the issue of asavarna marriage was raised as Yayāti reiterated that the marriage between a brāhmaṇa woman and ksatriya man was not permissible under the Dharmāstātric norms (MP, 30.18). He further stated that this would lead to confusion of castes. Thus he was referring to varṇasamkara although he finally agreed with the marriage proposal as Śukra affirmed that as he was selected by his daughter the king would not incur any sin in the process. Thereby Yayāti got married, to Devayānī. There was no reference to any rituals related to marriage. There was only reference to circumambulation by Yayāti. Śarmiśṭhā was given along with Devayānī with the condition that the king would not have sexual relations with her (MP, 30.34-36). Then the story continued with the progeny of the king from Devayānī. Śarmiśṭhā on the other hand was described as sad as she was without any husband and longed for a son. And very interestingly, she invited the king and said there was no sin in speaking untruth at the time of indulging in sexual pleasures, on the occasion of marriage, when life was in danger, wealth was at stake, and in a joke (MP: Akhtar, 31.16). Even then the king does not agree as according him the king should abstain from untruth in all conditions. Śarmiśṭhā further stated that ‘one’s own husband and husband of her companion are equal therefore he was wedded to her as well’. Further she asked the king to save her from immorality by his righteousness (MP: Akhtar, 31.21-22). Here she was called the daughter of a demon as she clearly pointed out her wishes. Then the king accepts her proposition and she had two sons from him. Again she was described as a woman who had strong desires and convinced the king according to her wishes. The king was shown as being well versed with the norms but agreed to these strong women in the end. When the king was accused of transgressing virtues, Yayāti explained that one who does not satisfy the desire of a damsel after the termination of her menstruation, commits a sin of slaying a brāhmaṇa; and one who does
not grant the desire of a damsel, even on her making such a request, he is said to commit a sin equal to that of slaughtering a great brāhmaṇa (MP: Akhtar, 32.32-33).

Yayāti was then cursed by Śukra that he would become old and could exchange his old age with his son who would be blessed with children, be illustrious and long lived. The story took a turn with this condition. The condition was accepted by Puru who became a great king. He was the founder of the Paurava dynasty which was later known as the Kuru clan (MP, 34.31). Thus the text does not deal with marriage but through the legend discussed the problems encountered. It is evident that Dharmaśāstric norms were not adhered to in this context but the norms had developed by then.

The only section which dealt with marriage, vivāha was linked with gotra, vamśa, avatāra, and pravara. The Matsya Purāṇa in chapter 195 – 202 mentioned the family of various rṣis. It described the birth of rṣis such as Bhṛgu, Aṅgirās, Atri, Kapīśa and others from Brahmā’s semen poured into fire (MP, 195. 6-11). Then each rṣi of the Bhṛgu clan was described along with five pravaras, i.e. Bhṛgu, Cyavana, Āpnuvān, Aurva, Jamadagni. Further it mentioned that Bhṛgu, Cyavana and Āpnuvān cannot intermarry (MP, 195, 30-32). Similarly the chapter mentioned sets of pravara which cannot intermarry. In the Aṅgirās family again there was mention of rṣis and their pravaras and it was mentioned that they cannot intermarry (MP, 196). The same was mentioned for the family of Atri, Viśvāmitra, Kaśyapa, Vasīśtha, and Parāśara. Once again the Matsya Purāṇa mentioned that one who recites these names will be liberated from all sins (MP, 202. 14). The Dharmaśāstras also refer to asapravara marriages, i.e. one who does not belong to the same pravara. The pravara constitutes the name of the rṣis in order of descent from one another. It was thus not a social unit, rather a formula of ancestral names shared by the members of an implied social unit.91

Thus the Matsya Purāṇa which contains a lot of Dharmaśāstric matter does not refer much to marriage rules. Only in a few stories the problem of marriage was discussed. But it was only in the context of divine persons and demons and not in terms of the ordinary mortals.

Dynastic marriages provide a way to understand the trends of alliance especially among the royalty. H.T. Bakker opines that towards the end of 4th century CE the Vākāṭakas consolidated their power by matrimonial alliances. In the Vākāṭaka dynasty there was mention of two important alliances. The first was the marriage of Gautamīputra with the daughter of Bhavanāga of the Bhāraśivas. This matrimonial alliance between the Vākāṭakas and Nāgas of Padmāvatī was significant as after this alliance, Rudrasena I claimed a higher status. Rudrasena I was referred to as dauhitra, a daughter’s son, and heir, similar to Samudragupta. Most probably he inherited the region around Padmāvatī. During this period, the Nāgas were very powerful therefore Pravarasena I allied with them matrimonially. This alliance was referred in most of the records. Thus it was an important alliance.

The marriage of Prabhāvatiguptā with Rudrasena II was another important matrimonial alliance. Prabhāvatiguptā was the daughter of Candragupta II and Kuberanāgā of the Nāga dynasty. This marriage was sapinda because Rudrasena II was maternally linked with the Nāga dynasty and Prabhāvatiguptā’s mother belonged to the Nāga dynasty. This marriage alliance was against the Dharmaśāstric norms, as sapinda marriage was not permissible. The alliance was also pratiloma in terms of royal status as Rudrasena II was mahārāja while Candragupta II was mahārājādhirāja. Thus alliances if politically important as probably in the case of Prabhāvatiguptā, were permissible even if it was not according to the norm. According to the Dharmaśāstra the gotra of a woman changed when she got married. But Prabhāvatiguptā mentioned her gotra as dharani whereas the Vākāṭakas belonged to the viśnuvarddhī gotra. She emphasized her descent from the Nāga family and also intended to make up for the obscure origin of the Guptas. D.C. Sircar points out that the gotra of women changed if the marriage was according to the Dharmaśāstric norms.
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Prabhāvatīguptā retained her maternal gotra as well as her paternal cognomen. Similarly, her mother Kuberanāgā of the Nāga dynasty did not give up her paternal family name at marriage. Thus mentioning the matrilineal descent of the king appears to have been continued by the Guptas. 98

Another interesting alliance was that of Atibhāvati, 99 daughter of Prabhāvatīguptā, and Ghaṭotkaca of the Gupta dynasty. 100 This type of marriage of the maternal uncle-niece, bhāgineyī, was against the Dharmaśātric norm. 101 The inscription also referred to her forced, balāt, return after the death of her husband. Prabhāvatī probably wished to consolidate the matrilineal bonds. 102 In this case the term pānigrahanam cakāra was used. Further the inscription mentioned that the unlucky princess, manujendraputrī, busied herself with pious activities such as building temples and also a lake, sudarśana. 103

The term marriage was mentioned in a few inscriptions such as the Bhere-ghat Stone inscription of Narasimhadeva which referred to the marriage according to rituals, vivāhavidhimaďāhāya for his parents Gayakarna and Ālhanadevi. 104 The Akaltara stone inscription of Ratnadeva II mentioned the marriage, pānigrahanam of Jájalladeva I and Lāchalladevi. 105 Otherwise the term was generally absent; there was only an implicit reference to marriage.

Among the Kalacuris the most astonishing was the matrimonial relation with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa- Kalacuri alliances were:
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The first alliance was between Kokalla’s daughter and Kṛṣṇarājā II. The Banaras plates of Karna mentioned that Kokalla I gave protection to Bhoja, Vallabharāja and Śrī Harṣa. Vallabharāja was identified as Kṛṣṇa II of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty. Kokalla’s daughter was married to him. Thus there was an indirect reference to the matrimonial alliance in the inscription. This was a fine example of cross-cousin marriages. Altekar holds that these kinds of marriages were permitted in the Deccan. But Trautmann says that it was not merely permitted rather it had a political significance. The Kalacuris as wife-givers had a status lower than the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the wife-takers. The Kalacuris hardly made any reference to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty in their records. And surprisingly it was the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who mention this alliance in their records. The Cambay Plates of Govinda IV, besides the Rāṣṭrakūṭa genealogy, mentioned in verse 14 that Kokalla of the dynasty of Sahasrārjuna had a daughter, ātmajā who was given to Akālavarsa i.e. Kṛṣṇa II. Her son was Jagattuṅga whose wife, jāyā, Lakṣmī was daughter of Raṇavigraha, son of Kokalla. In verse 20 of the same inscription there was mention of the son of Kokalla of the Haihaya dynasty, Arjuna, whose son was Ammanadeva. Ammanadeva’s daughter was

106 In Mirashi’s diagram Yuvarāja I was the son of Kokalla I, CII, Vol. 4, Pt. I, p. lxxxi. While Trautmann in his diagram marks him as above, loc.cit. Fig. 6.4, p. 381.
Vijāmbhā married to Indrarāja III. A similar genealogy was mentioned in the Sangli Plates\textsuperscript{111} as well. In the Karda Plates of Amoghavarṣa III,\textsuperscript{112} verse 16 mentioned that mahādevi of Akālavarsa was Kokalla's tanayā and Saṅkaragaṇa's anujā. Verse 18 mentioned that Jagattuṅga was married to Ceditāja Saṅkaragaṇa’s daughter, duhitā. It further mentioned in verse 20, that Indra III’s wife Govindāmbhā was the daughter of maternal uncle, matula Saṅkaragaṇa. The references show that the alliance was important for the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Kalacuris in their records do not mention the daughters or the Rāṣṭrakūṭa alliances. Secondly these cross-cousin marriages were probably quite common among the royal families. The Dharmaśāstric norm was not followed. The relation between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Kalacuris probably got strained as there were evidences of clashes between Yuvarājadeva I and Kṛṣṇa III.\textsuperscript{113}

Besides the Rāṣṭrakūṭa alliance, Kokalla I was married to the Candellā princess Naṭṭā, but references to her parentage were missing in the record. The next alliance mentioned was of the Yuvarāja and the Cālukya princess, Nohalā. The records mentioned her parentage as stated elsewhere. But Avanivarman could not be traced; he may be linked to Avantivarman of the Cālukya dynasty\textsuperscript{114} but records corroborating this were not found. Another alliance was established by Laksmanarāja whose daughter was married to Vikramāditya IV. The Nilgunda plates of Vikramāditya VI mentioned in the genealogy section, verse 24-25, that the Cedi vaṁśa Laksmanarāja’s daughter, Bonthādevi had a proper marriage with rites and rituals, vidhivatparinaye with Vikramāditya IV.\textsuperscript{115} There was epigraphic evidence that later around the 11th century there was a conflict between the Cālukyas and the Kalacuris over the supremacy in the Deccan.\textsuperscript{116}

The Kalacuris also had matrimonial links with the Pālas. In one of the inscriptions, there was mention in verse 5 that Jayapāla’s son Vigrāhapāla whose wife, patnī, was Lajjā

\textsuperscript{112} Karda Plates of Amoghavarṣa III, \textit{IA}, Vol. 22, p. 265.
\textsuperscript{114} Mirashi, V.V., \textit{CII}, Vol. 4, Pt. 1, pp. Ixxxiii.
\textsuperscript{115} Nilgunda Plates of Vikramāditya VI, \textit{EI}, Vol. 12, p. 151.
belonged to the Haihaya vamśa. But no further reference was found. Mirashi holds that Kaṁa who was married to Āvalladevī, a Huna princess had two daughters and a son Yaśahkarna. The Huṇas probably ruled Central India but the exact location was not known. Kaṁa’s daughter Vīraśī was married to Jātavarman of Eastern Bengal as mentioned in the Belava plates of Bhojavarman. The other daughter Yauvanaśī was married to Vigrahapāla of North-east Bengal as was mentioned in the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākāranandin. Whether Yauvanaśī and Lajja were the same is not known. Thus marriage alliances were more political and as a result Dharmaśāstric norms were not followed. It is likely that these rules were meant for the ordinary people and could be violated by potential or actual ruling lineages. This was seen in the cases of the Vākāṭakas and Kalacuris. The records mentioned the alliances that were prominent. The records do not mention daughters although we have insessional evidence of daughters who were married to other dynasties. Both the Vākāṭakas and the Kalacuris do not mention the dynasties where they were wife-givers. They only mentioned the dynasties where they were wife-takers. This may indicate that the status of the wife-taker was higher than that of the wife-giver, so they only referred to the alliances where they had a superior status.

III

Genealogy was an important aspect of both the Matsya Purāṇa and the inscriptions. As we have seen, the genealogical section was one of the five important characteristic features of a Purāṇa. The ancestry that was given was divine and included the family tree of ‘future’ kings as well. The Purāṇas in the divine genealogy mentioned the origin of not only gods, demons, sages and kings but also of plants, rivers, birds and other animals. The concern was with creation of all kinds. This was especially true for the progeny of Kaśyapa and his thirteen wives. The Purāṇic genealogy had two distinct patterns. The divine genealogy mentioned women as ancestors. Generally the early genealogy talked about the creation of the world and gave importance to women as progenitors but later in the genealogy women gradually lost their position. In the second type, that is royal genealogy, women do not figure as ancestors. The focus was on the ruler and his successor. There was no mention of women as wives, mothers, or daughters.

117 IIA, Vol. 15, p. 305.
The Purāṇas represented diverse traditions. This is evident in the use of matrilineal names such as Āditya, son of Aditi. Similarly, the term Draupadayās was used for the sons of Draupadī whereas other offspring of the Pāṇḍavas were mentioned in terms of their fathers. This would suggest that these women held an important place in the family. These were part of divine and semi divine genealogies. This probably also reflects an early social formation. However the role of women was as one from whom the successor was born. Thus her main role was connected with procreation. Gradually women’s role in reproduction was minimized by referring to sons born without the intervention of women. For instance, Bharadvāja was born from the seed of Brhaspati, which fell on the floor, although in this case Mamatā, was present on the spot. But Satyadhṛti cast his seed in water at the sight of an apsarā; as a result a son and daughter were born to him (MP, 50.10).

The genealogy mentioned very few women. Thus in the kinship structure women did not have an important position. Her status was confined to reproduction as visualized from these legends in the text. The term used for women were jāyā, bhāmini etc. Thus the reference was as one from whom son/sons were born. And in the royal genealogies mentioned in the text women do not seem to play any role. There was no mention of women as ancestors.

A similar pattern was seen in the inscriptions. It was interesting to note that the kings used various myths and genealogies to claim power and status. They however never claimed women as ancestors. Many a time women were mentioned if they belonged to a powerful family. In many cases the name of the dynasty survived but the queen’s name was lost. For instance, the Vākāṭakas mentioned the Bharasivas but they do not refer to the wife of Gautamiputra. Although the next ruler, Rudrasena I claims to be a dauhitra, the inscriptions do not mention the woman in question. Similarly, when women mentioned their family it was only their parents and given the patriarchial context it was generally only the father who was mentioned. The Bilhari stone inscription of Yuvarājadeva II mentioned Nohalā’s genealogy. Although it mentioned the origin of the Cālukyas, the ancestry was not traced till her father, Avanivarman. Even Prabhāvatīguptā in her records does not trace her ancestry from Śrīgupta, rather it was marked out from Samudragupta.
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Except for a few instances, women, royal or non-royal, did not mention genealogy in their records. This would show that tracing a genealogy was not an identity marker for women. But in the case of men, both royal and non-royal men traced ancestry, thus they identified themselves in terms of the kinship structure. Even officers such as poets, scribes, and others sometimes mentioned their family tree. What was interesting to note was that while the kings traced a mythical origin, other elite men mentioned only their father or grandfather in the records. Sometimes they also mentioned their mothers or wives. Thus the genealogy of non-royal men was more diverse and realistic. They also, as in one case, mentioned their daughter. But none of the royal grants mentioned daughters.

Thus the method of claiming legitimacy was different for men and women. Men used myths and legends to create their high ancestry. This was especially true for the Kalacuris. It was not just the kings; even the ministers and feudatories and other officers mentioned their ancestry. But again they did not claim a divine origin. Women generally do not mention their ancestry. Except a few queens who claimed a different position by referring to their paternal family, the rest just mentioned the dynasty or the father. This was the same for all elite women.

An interesting aspect in both the text and the inscriptions was the near absence of the mention to daughters. The Purāṇas mentioned a few daughters but their importance was in terms of their progeny: thus Dakṣa’s sixty daughters were mentioned along with their progeny. Similarly a few daughters along with their progeny were mentioned in the text. Pārvatī as the daughter of Himālaya was mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa. It further mentioned that women were important as there can be no progeny without women (MP, 154.156). Further women were said to be weak and could not read the Śāstras. At the same time it mentioned that women were said to be equal to ten sons according to some Śāstras (MP, 154.157). But again it mentioned that a women who was not modest causes pain and then her birth causes disgrace to her parents. A woman who was blessed with husband and sons was fortunate (MP, 154.159). Thus the role of women was clear. And that was limited to being the mother of the successor. The women who get good husbands give peace and comfort to both paternal and maternal families and their lives becomes successful (MP, 154.164). A few women were described as brave, strict to vows, and sometimes as beautiful. But again these were divine or semi divine women.
In the inscriptions there was no mention of daughters born to the king. In the case of the Vākāṭaka records, there was reference to Atibhāватī, the daughter of Prabhāватīguptā and Rudrasena II. She gave a grant; the record was unfortunately fragmentary. But in the royal genealogy there was no mention of a daughter married to Ghaṭotkaca, her maternal uncle. The reason may have been the cross cousin marriage which was against Dharmaśāstric norms. The rulers mentioned only their wives in case the alliance was prominent, but not their daughters even though they were married to powerful dynasties. For instance, the Kalacuris do not mention the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in their inscriptions. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas mentioned their alliance with the Kalacuris in their records. Probably it was considered as a status marker to be a wife-taker rather than wife-giver.

Again in the context of marriage we hardly find the term vivāha, pānigrāhanam etc. in the texts and the inscriptions. The Matsya Purāṇa does not mention any detail on marriage. In the genealogical section it mentioned implicit marriage alliances. Generally the term given, was used for daughters in the context of marriage in the Purāṇa. Many a times there was mention of penance performed to get a wife as Manu did for Anantī. But it was an early reference to marriage and was again in a divine context. The Purāṇas also mentioned intercaste marriage as well as cross cousin marriages. For instance, Yayāti and Devayānī and again Vasudeva had a vaiśya wife. What was interesting was that in the case of Devayānī, the daughter of Śukra she was a daughter of a brāhmaṇa and married Yayāti a ksatriya. Thus it was a pratiloma marriage. The asavarna concept was discussed but it was overruled. Thus Dharmaśāstric norms were known but still they were not followed. In the story of Vasudeva surprisingly the name of all the wives except the wife of vaiśya caste was mentioned. Thus in this case the caste rule was not followed but the relation was not highlighted.

Incest was also mentioned in the text but was treated in a very casual manner as in the story of Dīrghatamas and Brhaspati. Thus marriage was not sacrosanct as was portrayed in the Dharmaśāstras. There were references to inter caste and cross cousin alliances which were against the norm.

In the inscriptions it was noticed that only important alliances were mentioned. Any deviations were not recorded. Only the chief queen was mentioned. For instance, Prabhāvatīguptā mentioned that she was the agramahīṣī. A few queens of the Kalacuri
dynasty such as Naṭṭā, Nohalā, Āvalladevi, Rāhadā, Nonnalā and others who were mentioned in the records and belonged to powerful dynasties. The records generally did not mention any title such as wife or mother, except for a few women. Terms such as jāyā, bhāminī, etc. were commonly used. But interestingly when officers mentioned their wives terms such as priyā, patnī etc. were frequently used. Thus women as wife were more important than women as mother in these contexts.

It is evident that the kinship structure was gendered in the early medieval period. The kinship structure was reiterated in the genealogies as well in the formation of marriage alliances. The claim to a kin was considered relevant and was an important method to claim legitimacy and power by elite men rather than women. It was a more important identity marker for elite men to trace their ancestry, real or imagined. Only a few women like Prabhāvatiguptā and Nohalā who claimed status through their paternal family. Generally women do not claim identity through the kinship structure.

Unlike the political field which was relatively fixed in terms of the roles assigned to women, religious beliefs and practices seem to have provided a more open space. To understand gender relations in early medieval context it is equally important to look at religious beliefs and practices of elite men and women through a study of the Matsya Purāṇa and the inscriptions, and we will turn to this dimensions in the next chapter.