CHAPTER XI

The chronology of the Chandragiri manuscripts
Introduction.

Thanks to the yeoman service rendered by great Indologists like J.G. L. Rice and R. Narasimhasar and others who with indefatigable efforts and untiring zeal discovered and published most of the inscriptions of Sravana Belagola, we are now in a position to realize the importance of this place. The epigraphic and the palaeographic data being the sure test regarding the age of the monuments, the efforts of these scholars helped in no small way in ascertaining the chronology of a good number of the monuments. But as the primary interest of these scholars was epigraphy rather than architecture, they showed little interest in discussing the dates of the monuments where epigraphical data was unavailable, except, of course, in an extremely casual way. Secondly, these scholars, more often than not, summarily viewed an entire temple as one unit and did not pay much attention to the transformation that a structure underwent in different periods of history. As a result, a systematic and exhaustive study was never made to ascertain the dates of various monuments; nor any scientific and logical explanations were offered for the conclusions arrived at by them.

Various Sources and Methods.

As is well known, the epigraphical data is the surest means for ascertaining the date of a monument. It is true, no amount of speculation based on architectural, iconographic data could take us as near the truth as the epigraphs; but, at the same time, it would be wrong to dismiss or under-estimate the use of this data for this purpose.
The present study is based on the realisation of this factor and it is patterned on the following points:

First, the relevant epigraphical data is critically considered. If the data is direct and conclusive, it is taken as a sure testimony, and its verdict is taken as final. When the epigraphs are not explicit and specific, the contents of the epigraphs are analysed and the truth is ascertained through the indirect references. In such cases, wherever it is possible, correlation is attempted at with the known facts and inferences are drawn.

Secondly, while arriving at certain conclusions, it is examined whether the reference made to in the epigraph is (1) to the whole monument or only to a part of it; (2) whether the monument, referred to in the inscription, is the same one that exists at present. In case the inscription refers to only a portion of a monument, the enquiry is further pursued in order to ascertain the dates of different portions of the monuments.

Thirdly, where the epigraphical data is completely absent, an effort is made to fix the chronology on the architectural, iconographic characteristics and other details. Conclusions arrived at through this method are not naturally specific and final, but general and approximate. While the epigraphical data helps us to ascertain the exact date of the construction of a temple or the consecration of a deity, the architectural and iconographic data guides us merely to come to a broad understanding of an epoch or a dynasty to which a monument may be attributed. This process, though limited in its range and value, is the only method through which the epoch to which the monument belongs to, will have to be ascertained. Here also, through
a correlation of various kinds of data, it is possible to come to a broad understanding. In the cases where even this is not possible, the data and the details of the monuments are lost for ever, unless a chance discovery resurrects the whole issue and moves once again the world of scholarships into a new enquiry. The present author was fortunate enough to come across some such revealing data. Some of the inscriptions brought to light in the present study throw an interesting light on the monuments and help us to fix their dates with a fair degree of confidence. All these efforts, the chronology of all monuments of Sravasti could not be fixed with accuracy, and should not be taken as final. However, the problems connected with such monuments would be discussed thoroughly and plausible solutions would be given.

THE BASTI OF CHANDRAGIRI

For the sake of convenience, this study will be divided into two parts: (1) the chronology of Chandragiri monuments is dealt with in the present chapter, and (2) the chronology of the rest of the monuments - those on Vindhyagiri and in the town and the neighbouring area is taken up in the next chapter.

Bhadrabahu Basti.

As in most of the holy centres of India, Chandragiri is associated, through a legendary account with a heavy antiquity. The legends and myths about this hill are so popular and strong that they have almost attained the level of historical truth. As a result, to a critical student of history, it is embarrassing to-day either to reject or

---

1. See App. No. I.
accept them in toto. As myths and legends have their own value in history, they will have to be considered here along with other sources.

There is an unostentatious structure to the east of Lakki-Yone which is named after the well-known Jain saint Dhindarbahu. The structure itself has no architectural or aesthetic value; but traditions attribute it to a remote period and connect it with Bhadrabahu, the preceptor of Chandragupta Maurya. This tradition cannot be dismissed away summarily, since the literary and epigraphical sources of a later period have confirmed it. This tradition, as it occurs in inscriptions and literary works, has been discussed by the scholars, and it is needless to repeat it here.

‘Whatever may be the validity of this tradition, that the basti on Chandragiri became the basis of belief in this tradition cannot be questioned. Though literary works from the 10th century onwards record it in detail, the inscriptions record the tradition as early as about 600 A.D.² (This clearly points out that by about 600 A.D.) the tradition was already well-known. But this tradition, which stands as a background for the present Bhadrabahu Basti, cannot summarily lead us to the conclusion that the latter structure was erected in about the third century B.C. We have no trace of positive evidence on Chandragiri, so far known, which takes the antiquity of the place earlier (than 600 A.D.)

1. (2) II, Introduction Pp. 36 ff.
2. (2) II, JB 1.
To start with, when Bhadrabahu came to Kalbappu, there was in all probability, nothing but a natural rocky shed under which the muni and his disciple took shelter and lived. When the muni attained his samādhi, either his immediate disciple or some one later, carved the marks of his feet and worshipped them. In course of time, when the tradition began to spread far and wide and the place, where this saint had stayed (or supposed to have stayed), gained in importance, attempts were made to carve inscriptions and to erect structures. One such inscription was carved in about 1100 A.D. stating that a certain Jimchandra bowed to the feet of Bhadrabhaseswāmi.\(^1\) (The side-wall on the western portion probably rose only in a later (?) period.)

The portico of the basti was an addition made very recently when some repairs were undertaken.\(^2\) In view of these complexities and uncertainties, it may be said that today we have very little that is original, in this structure, excepting, probably, the foot-prints (?). Even the date of the carving of these foot-prints cannot be taken back to the days of Bhadrabahu or Chandragupta with certainty. Moreover, as this structure has no architectural or aesthetic

1. \(^{20}\) II, 38 168 (?1) This inscription is not seen now. It is supposed to have been erased or destroyed during the course of a repair made some decades ago.

2. When Narasimhachar readited the inscription of this place in the year 1925 the renovation had already taken place.
merits, further discussion on these points would be uncalled for. 

No definite date could be fixed for this structure.

Chandragupta Basti.

Closely connected with the above tradition is a small basti called after Chandragupta. It has been guessed that the date of the original structure might go back to 9th or 10th century A.D. But no reasons have been given to justify this surmise. Let us examine this problem in detail.

According to the tradition, Chandragupta who accompanied his guru, Bhadrabahu, is said to have tended the latter till his death, carved his feet-prints and worshipped them. Most of the accounts - either literary or epigraphical - do not state that he built a basti, nor that any one else built it in his memory immediately after his death. But just as the memory of the visit of Bhadrabahu was celebrated by carving his feet-prints and by erecting a cove, the memory of Chandragupta was also celebrated by designating the hill as Chandragiri and by

---

1. Śrīvatsa Sālgola (Kannada), p. 33.
2. According to the 19th century work of questionably authenticity, called Ṛājāvalīkātaka, the grandson of Chandragupta came to worship the feet of Bhadrabahu and to pay respect to this place where his grandfather had lived. He is said to have built some Jaina temples and founded a city called Sālgola. Ṛājāvalīkātaka by Urvashchandra Ma. in HII, pp. 143 ff.
constructing a basti after his name. ¹

Considering the size of the basti (cf. VII, ³) and its architectural characteristics, it is undeniable that this structure appears to be one of the earliest built on the hill. The height of the structure is about 64' and it imitates the early cave temples in all respects excepting their massiveness. There are no piers within, though pilasters are found on the walls. As in rock-cut temples, the towers (cf. vii, ³) of this temple are simple and rise immediately above the roof. They are square and carry semi-circular arch-motifs at all the four sides. This motif, boldly executed with ornamental designs, appears to indicate an advancement over the square sikhara of Saṅgamēśvara temple at Pāṇḍakulam of early 8th century A.D.² In the kārita also we have some interesting motifs which deserve a careful examination. Here, the roll-cornice carries the shaitya-windows or kūṭas. These kūtas have been crowned by peculiar triangular heads and not by the kīrtimukha faces. Secondly, the windows are hollow and devoid of decorative figures or heads. This feature, though distinct in its own way, stands in contrast to the kūta with kīrtimukha heads which are supposed to have become popular from early-Chāla period itself ³ in the temples of Dravidian order. Hence, the present variety found on Chandragiri could be assigned to pre-Chāla period. Moreover, in the early-Dravidian temples, there is a row of gandhārvas at the underside of the cornices; but

¹. The name 'Chandragupta Basti' does not occur in the inscriptions.
². Gravelly P.U. and Ramachandran I.N., The Three Main Styles etc., ¹I. II, fig. 2.
³. Dubrueil, Dravidian Architecture, fig. 32, p. 44.
The decorative details such as **sañjñeśas** and **āṣāntas** and the **Kudvastraśānas** have been examined earlier. In the walls of Chandragupta Basti, these three features exhibit their own peculiarities. The **sañjñeśas** are without images and without **āṣāntas**. The mouldings of the upper section of the pilasters indicate their own peculiarities, which definitely put them prior to all those found in the other structures or bastis on the hill. A broad comparison of the details of these architectural features with those in other temples of the 6th and early 9th centuries elsewhere and with those in the later structures of Chandragiri makes one think that the antiquity of this basti can be pushed back to about 9th century.

Unfortunately the images in the three **gārbeṣapēya** cells and in the **sukhanāṣi** do not help us much in fixing the chronology. The images in the **gārbeṣapēya** and those in the **sukhanāṣi**, excepting the standing Yaksha, are not original. They are in broad agreement, in the physiognomical features and decorative details with the Hoysala sculptures. The standing Yaksha image in the **sukhanāṣi** is unique in many ways. This image is not only different in workmanship but

---

1. For example, see in the *śallava* temples of *Deccan* period - *Vide*, Longhurst *op. cit.*, Pt. II, Pl. VII (A).

2. The inscription on the *śalā* of the small image in front of *Kāraññarāṣṭrayaśay* in Chandragupta Basti (*KII 38 71* of about 1130) supports this view.
exhibits distinct features even in decorative characteristics. But we have no images whose dates are established or ascertainable with which this sculpture could be compared. But it may be put along with the Yaksha image found in the sukhanasi of Chandraprabha Vasti to about the 9th-10th centuries.

**ADDENDA AND ALTERATIONS:** Now, let us pass on to the additions which this Vasti received in the subsequent period. As indicated above, most of the images of this Vasti belong to the Hoyala period. Second, the door-frame, the perforated screens which are supposed to depict scenes from the life of Bhandabahu and Chandragupta, were added during the Hoyala period. This gives an idea that the present sukhanasi was an outcome of the erection of the door-frame and not an original characteristic of the structure. Moreover, the door-frame is worked out with pot-stones, which was the favourite medium of the Hoyala craftsman in this region. The door-jams and the panels were probably finished by a sculptor called Dāśāja. An inscription bearing this name appears in the third row on the eastern half of the screen. On the palaeographical basis this inscription has been assigned to the middle or the 12th century, when probably, the door-frame and the panels were also completed.1 Dāśāja also appears as the an engraver of an epitaph erected after the death of Jāntala's mother Māchikamba and her guru, Prabhāchandra-Siddhāntādeva,2 in 1145 A.D. In all probability these two inscriptions indicate the same person. In the inscription of 1145 ... , Dāśāja has been called "son of? Savanuballara-dēva the sculptor.

---

2. *Ibid., CB 140.*
Rānōja. Though it is difficult to make out the exact meaning of this phrase, it establishes beyond doubt that this Rānōja was different from another famous sculptor Rānōja who lived in the same century and worked on the famous temple of Charahāṣṭya at Selur and other temples at Kannikattu, etc. The latter was called "Ballīpūrama Hōtiśa" and had a distinctive title of "the smiter of the crowd of titled-sculptors".

In conclusion, we may summarise as follows:

a. The original structure of Chandragupta Jātā, in all probability, seems to have been erected in about 9th century.

b. Secondly, the present structure appears to be not complete in itself, but only a portion of the original structure.

c. Thirdly, most of the images in the three cells and in the present anthanasi - excluding the image of Sarvāhna Yaksha - appear to be the works of the 12th century.

d. Lastly, the screen panels and the door-jambs were later (in about the middle of the 12th century) added to the structure, and they were the works of a sculptor called Rānōja.

1. XXX V, Bl. 34, 36, 37, etc. At Kannikatte he is mentioned as an engraver, but it appears probable that he worked as a sculptor there also - Vide, XXX V, Ax 52.
Chandraprabha Basti.

At the back of Sāmanc basti and a few yards from No.2 - Bāravēnaṭha Basti is a low-roofed small temple called Chandraprabha Basti. Writing on the chronology of this Basti, Narasimhachar tried to identify the temple with the help of an inscription found on a rock near the basti and said that if "this temple would be one of the oldest on the hill, its period being about 800". The inscription, to which Narasimhachar has referred is not within the temple, nor on it, but it is found about a few feet away and is written on the rock-bed. As we have already pointed out elsewhere, Chandragiri is a vast rock-hill on which a number of inscriptions have been engraved and a number of temples have been erected. Within a space of about 150 yards about a dozen temples, half a dozen mantapa are built; while hundreds of inscriptions cluster and jostle at every yard or foot. This inscription which is about 7' to the north-west of the navaranga wall of the basti reads as "śīvāṛāṇa-baṣadi" or the 'baṣadi of śīvāṛa'. On palaeography of this record, śīvāṛa of this record is identified with the Jaiga king of that name who ruled round about 800 A.D. There is always a great amount of risk in identifying the names found in such small labels with the well-known personalities of history, and more so in identifying the existing monument always with well-known persons. Seldom did the rulers themselves build temples - and though instances for and against the contention could be searched out - it is always reasonable to have a certain amount of restraint over the conclusion.

1. IV II, Introduction Pp. 5 ff. This inscription is actually on a rock about 7" away from the outer wall of the navarāṇa of the basti. Scholars have often mistaken it to be an inscription in the navarāṇa of this basti.
drawn from such evidences. In the present case, Śivamāra of our inscription may or may not be the Gaṅga Kini of that name. But a more serious doubt is the identification of the Śivamāra Basti with the Chandrapartha Basti. It is usually customary to have an inscription engraved either on any part of the temple or on a specially erected pillar for it. From assuming that inscriptions were carved on a nearby rock surface, it requires a more definite proof to show that the inscription makes the reference to the same basti which now stands there. However, these could be found in the architectural and iconographical details.

Narasimhačār’s one strong feeling was “The position of the epigraph and... the absence of any other building near it.” These are, indeed, two strong evidences in favour of the identification of the present structure with the one mentioned in the inscription. Fortunately, the pillars and the images found in the temple appear to throw some light on the date of this basti. The pillars in the Narasamāra are octagonal and proto-bell-shaped. The śaka-bēti Śiva which sits over the pillar resembles the brackets normally found in the early-Chāla period. But these architectural evidences are not enough to warrant a conclusion. However, the images found in the garbhārṣika and aukhamāni throw some interesting light on this aspect. These images are in sharp contrast, in decorative details and physiognomical features, to the rest of the sculptures on the hill. Of the three images

1. MII, Introduction p.5.
2. Dubrovil, op. cit., p.41; Gravelly and Śivāvarasacūrti, op. cit., p.17.
Found in Chandrasprabha Basti, the image of Yakshi (Pl. Ivi, b) provides a great many details for our study. Each image of Yakshi are not come across in any other Bastis of Karntaka, excepting in the Pañchakuta Basti at Kumbadahalli.\textsuperscript{1} The Yakshi in the Adinatha Basti in Kumbadahalli broadly agrees in physiognomical features with our sculpture. The U-shaped face, the portruded portion of the chin, the flat fore-head, the extremely slender waist with the waistline on the navel and the portion below the navel slightly protruded with a vertical line running straight below the navel, the round huge breasts with nipples looking slightly upwards form common features in both. of the decorative elements the sīwr-chastra, the kaṇḍā-makara, the armlets, the rippet long-diaphanous undergarment reaching to the ankles, broadly agree with each other. The necklaces are much simpler in both compared to the Hoyala sculptures, but of the two, one at Kumbadahalli wears a finely worked-out kanti.\textsuperscript{2} Both the sculptures have the sūrvravāvikāgākāra with stringed-pendants in the centre. A comparison of the physiognomical features and the decorative details of these sculptures with those of the sculptures of the early-Janaka period\textsuperscript{3} convinces us that they are coeval in time, though they might have been carved by different ruvārīyas. But whether these ruvārīyas were patronised by the Janagas or the Rachhtrakutas one will never be able to know. However, on the strength of these evidences, we may say that this temple in contemporary with the Pañchakuta Basti and fix its date between the 9th and the 10th centuries.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] Madras, Pl. VIII, 2 and 3.
\item[2.] Śivaramakur, C, South-Indian sources
\item[3.] Pp. 30 ff.
\end{itemize}
Jñātinātha, Majjigama and No.2 - Pārvānātha bastis.

The dates of these bastis are shrouded in mystery. None of these reveals any architectural details. They are all rectangular and plain structures with no decorative motifs on the walls. Of these, Jñātinātha basti and No.2 Pārvānātha are devoid of even piers, and the pilasters. In Majjigama basti there are bell-shaped pillars which are slightly advanced over the pillars of Chandraprakha basti. There are no independent Yaksha and Yakshi sculptures in this temple. However, Majjigama basti appears to be later than Chandraprakha basti and much nearer, in chronology, to Chāvundarāya basti. Of the remaining two, the date of the Jñātinātha basti cannot be ascertained at all, whereas that of No.2 Pārvānātha could be guessed from the workmanship of the door-jamb and the sculptures. The door-jamb exist features which appear to be much nearer to the Śākapūrāya works. Even the image cannot be later than the 11th century. However, we may tentatively place the two structures to any year between the later part of the 10th century and the later part of the 11th century. The only, reasonable ground in support of this contention is that these images in these bastis differ from the other bastis on the hill examined above, and from those which were built under the Hoyasalas in the 12th century.

Chāvundarāya basti.

Chāvundarāya basti is obviously the most ornate and one of the biggest and most important temples on the hill. As the name indicates, it is connected with Chāvundarāya, the great minister of the Ganga king Bhesamalla, who caused the colossal gopura to be made. The local traditions favour the view that this basti was built by him. To support
this, we have two brief inscriptions on the upper cornice of the aukha sthapana of the eastern wall. The two inscriptions are identical and read: "Śri-Śānuḍandarāja-jaśālādīśā" or "Śānuḍandarāja caused (this) to be made". Narasimhaschar assigned these inscriptions to about 962 A.D. This has been, more or less, accepted by the later scholars.

The basis on which A. Narasimhaschar assigned this epigraph to about 962 A.D. is unknown; and the reasons which he had to put this inscription earlier by one year than the other inscription of Śānuḍandarāja engraved on the ant-hill of Čemāṭa is also not clear. But, while assigning them to their respective dates, the scholar somehow seems to have unnoticed the difference in the paleography which these records present.

Palesographic evidence, like architectural and iconographic evidences, merely helps us to ascertain the epoch, period or the dynasty to which a record belongs, but it never helps us to ascertain the exact

1. An. II, 23122 (See Pl. LXXIII facing p. 46 of transliteration.)
year of a record. Hence, the assignment of certain records exact to the year - as made by Narasinhachar - cannot be taken as conclusive unless they agree with the known facts of more explicit nature. Hence, it is felt imperative, here, to analyse the chronology of these records in the light of the well-known palaeographical data.

A detailed study of the palaeography of these two inscriptions is made elsewhere and its results may be noted here. The two identical inscriptions found on the adhishthana of Chāvunḍarāya -mati are much later in date compared to the ant-hill inscription of Chāvunḍarāya. While the latter inscription palaeographically agrees with the other 10th century inscriptions of the Ganga period, the former two appear to be not earlier than the 11th century. Hence, it may be said, that the two inscriptions engraved on the adhishthana were probably engraved in the 11th century either immediately after the completion of the construction of this basti or some time later.

There is one more inscription on the pedestal of the image in the upper storey ( or the mathanādi of the tower ) of Chāvunḍarāya Basti. It says:

2. 26 II, 56 122 (37).
Jina-grhoman Belgola-dol-jenam-ellam Pogale mantri

Chāmaṇḍana nandana(a) rolaviś mādiseva Jina-

devanam-Ajita-sunipara gudaa

This has been translated into English as: "Jinadeva, son of the minister Chāmaṇḍana and the lay disciple of the lord of sages Ajitasēra, caused to be made, with pleasure, a Jaina temple at Belgola to the acclamation of all the people." The inscription lends itself to be interpreted in another way: "The Jaina temple was caused to be made at

1. The word nandana-volaviś is split up by Narasinhačandra as nandana-volaviś (Prathamā vibhakti), but it could be more accurately split up as nandana-volaviś (Shakti-vibhakti) in which case, the identification of Jinadeva would be the subordinate of the son of Čāmaṇḍana. This is justified by one other reason also. If we have to identify Jinadeva as the son of Čāmaṇḍana, the name of the former should have been immediately followed by the latter. There is one more aspect which is to be noted here. More the expression 'son' may convey the literal meaning or it could have been used in the sense of a subordinate.

2. Ibid., P. 50 (Translation)
Belgola, to the acclamation of all people, by the graceful consent of the son of minister Chāvundarāya, by Jimādeva, the lay disciple of the lord of sages Ajitāśena”.

This inscription has been assigned to about 900 A.D., by the epigraphist. In the light of the discussion made on the palaeography of the inscription no. 182 above, it is to be assumed that even this inscription could be assigned to a period later than the 11th century. However, as Jimādeva is referred to as the lay-disciple of Ajitāśena-munipā (and though the last date of this gene is unknown) the inscription cannot be pushed to a much later date. As far, scholars thought that the basti was actually built by Cāvundarāya, and that the upper storey was added by his son. There are no architectural traces to prove that the temple was built in two successive stages. A perfect unity (Pl. xi, a and b ) in design, plan and workmanship in the upper storey and the main wall at the ground floor clearly support this view. Some of the architectural features and motifs here are borrowed and adopted from the earlier Pravidian structures of the hill – but the workmanship is definitely superior here. However, this structure does not belong to the time of the hoysalas, and it is not built in two stages. These points are proved by the sculptures found on the attic of the ground floor and of the upper floor. The attic of the ground floor bears some of the most ornate images (Pl. xx ) yet to be met with in any temple of southern Karnataka. These images differ in workmanship, decorative details and the physiognomical features from the hoysala works. They bear to exhibit an influence of the chaḷa- and later chaḷukyan workmanship. However, these sculptures

1. Ibid., Introduction P.e. Moreover neither in the inscriptions nor in Chāvundarāyasūryavamsa the son of Chāvundarāya is mentioned.
and the workmanship of the upper portions of the pilasters, attics in the two storeys clearly prove that both these units of the temple were built at the same time.

LATER ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS: Though the temple could be assigned to about 11th century, like some other bastis on the hill, Chāvunḍarāya Basti also has received some additions in the subsequent periods. But no substantial architectural alterations or additions seem to have taken place here. The pillars in the porch are cylindrical and bell-shaped. The nyātīta has a central vertical neck, while the capital imitates a disc. The abacus and the corbel also exhibit the shape of a wheel with horizontal lines and roller-designed-four-square-brackets, respectively. This feature is obviously found more commonly in the Hoysala period and a relevant example which broadly resembles these pillars is found in the Mahāśāndra samaya on the same hill. But the strength and grace that mark the latter pillars are lacking in the pillars of Chāvunḍarāya Basti. However, they could be assigned to the Hoysala period, though it is difficult to fix their exact date.

While the structural alterations and additions are least conspicuous in the basti, it is not the case in regard to the images. Excluding, probably, the image of varaṇavāha on the upper storey, none of the images enshrined in the temple, is original. The image in the gārhaśāhī, according to the inscription on its pedestal, originally belonged to a basti called 2nolokyamāhī or Boppa-Jaityālaya. This inscription of which some portion had escaped the attention of the early scholars, has been now re-examined and edited

1. No. 2 - App. I.
in the present study. According to the inscription, 
Gaṅgāraja’s son Āchāra built the above Jinaśālā in which 
the present image was enshrined. In addition to this 
information, it is now known that the image was finished by 
Gaṅgāraja—Vārāhāmihir who was the son of Śikṣānātha and 
who carried a distinctive title, “an ornament to the 
forehead of the titled sculptor”. This sculptor was known 
so far as an engraver and was either called as Gaṅgāraja 
or Vārāhāmihir. He was active between 1118 and 1129, 
though one of the inscriptions engraved by him is doubtfully 
assigned to about 1179. The latter date is obviously a 
mistake.

Commenting on the inscription, Harasimhachārī 
remarked “that either the image of Kālīśvara or its pedestal 
did not originally belong to this bāsti, but must have been 
brought here at some subsequent period from the temple founded 
by Āchāra…” Here the doubt could be solved by observing 
the features of this Pārthaśāhtra and by comparing it with 
the Pārthaśāhtra images of the Hoysala period on the hill. In 
the physiognomical features and other decorative details 
the present image is in perfect agreement with any of the 
Hoysala images on the hill. Hence we could presume that 
the image (along with the nātha) was installed in this bāsti 
in a later period. Then exactly this image was installed 
in Chāvundarāya bāsti no one knows. But as the sculptor

1. 52 73 (59), 118(44), 117(43), 67(54), 127(47).
2. More details about this sculptor and Āchāra 
are given while editing this inscription - 
No.2 - App. I.
3. Ibid.
appears to have lived between 1115 and 1129, we can conclude that the actual carving of this inscription was done some time during this period. Narasimhachar has assigned this inscription to about 1130, but it appears reasonable to shift it earlier by another decade.

Not only does the sapthagriha image exhibit the features of the Hossala sculptures, but the Yaksha and Yakshini images in the sukhamandala resemble their counterparts of this period. Hence, all the three images could be assigned to the Hossala period, to any year between 1115 and 1129.1,2

Parsvanatha Basti.

Another ornate temple on Mandragiri is Parsvanatha Basti. The date of this basti is also shrouded in mystery. So far, no epigraphical data has come forth to help us ascertain the chronology of this basti; nor any effort has been made so far to ascertain its date. Writing on this basti, Narasimhachar remarked, "There is nothing to show when or by whom the temple was erected." 2

In the absence of a direct epigraphical evidence we have to seek the help of the architectural and iconographic features and the indirect references occurring in the inscriptions. As observed elsewhere, the basti exhibits the architectural features which are later than those of the

1. Ibid.
2. IG II, Introduction p.3.
Chāvunārāyaṇa Basti. The details in the cornice, the
elevation of the śālākṣara and the kāṣṭhā with the miniature
śikhara, the designing of the wall on the pattern of the
recesses and projections, the moulding of the upper part of
the pilasters and above all, the workmanship of the āśāta
— all these indicate a great progress over the Dravidian
bastie of this hill and elsewhere. Moreover, the piers
inside, with vertical heads on the uṇāṇa, the bell
shaped-shafts, the wheel-capital and an expanding-abacus
bring the pillar nearer to the Hoysala pillars. A compari-
sion of the piers of this temple with the piers of the
Pārvanātha Basti ( Aregal Basti ) at Jinaṇātheapura defini-
tely confirms this assumption. Apart from these architectural
features, we may also note here the iconographic features
of the standing Būthākarka. The physiognomical features,
specially the slim portion below the waist, are in con-trast
with those of the great Comaṭa image and of the Sāntiśāṭha
image of Vindhyagiri and Chandragiri respectively. But
a comparison of this image with the one found in Pārvanātha
Basti at Bōrassamāra indicates their broad agreement. Hence,
it may be assumed that this basti of Pārvanātha may also
fall into the Hoysala group of basties.

This conjecture is also supported to a large
extent, by some references occurring in the inscriptions.
The basties built for Pārvanātha in Śravāṇa Belgola are not
many — and the most conspicuous of these basties is the
present one. If the inscriptions refer to the contributions
or renovations of a Pārvanātha Basti of Belgola, they could
be taken to be references made to this; and if the details
of the record agree with the details of the present basti,
this identification will have to be regarded as established
beyond doubt.
There are two records which deserve special attention here:

One of the inscriptions while recounting the achievements of minister Nāgādēva says, that he "caused to be made a dancing hall and a stone pavement in front of god Pārvātē."¹ The same inscription in the next sentence calls the structure as Kamaṭhe-Pārvātēva samadhi.²

That all those claims of Nāgādēva are not entirely unfounded is proved by the presence of his works. The epitaph which he erected to his guru Kayakūti-Jiddhēntadēva, according to the same inscription cited above.

³

1. EB II, SB 335 (130)

2. There are two Pārvānātha bastis on Chandragīra. The one called Sūpārśeva is actually Pārvānātha, but the temple is extremely inurate and does not possess the description found in the inscriptions. Another basti in the town, "Akkana asti", is also a Pārvānātha basti, but it is never referred to in the latter name in any of the inscriptions. It is called only Akkana Basti in all inscriptions.

3. Ibid., SB.
side (south-west) of Pārvānātha āstī. It is provably this person who renovated or added the pāvaneṇa hall and the front portion of Pārvānātha and all the elaborate stone pavements and steps which lead to the mānaṣṭāṭha at present. Originally this pavement could have been more conspicuous; and when the mānaṣṭāṭha was erected in the 17th century, a part of it must have been undermined or destroyed.

There is another inscription in Śrāvāna Belgola which mentions a contribution made to Gommatadēva, Kṣatapa Pārśva and Dhanḍārayya's āstī (Kṣapāri āstī), by the saṅgha-praśāl of Belagola. This inscription, which is dated 1296, does not give us more information, but it confirms the existence of a Kṣapāma-Pārśva āstī in Śrāvāna Belgola by listing it along with Gommatā and Kṣapāri āstī.

As we have already seen above that Nāgaṇēva's inscription calls it both as Pārśva and Kṣapāma. According to Jaina Gudanāsa Kṣapāma, the enemy of Pārśva tried to disturb the latter when he was meditating. This led the disciples of Pārśva - Bharaṇānanda and Padmāvati to rise from the underworld and protect the Jina. The great serpent that raises at the back and spreads its hood over the lord is to be identified that of Bharaṇānanda. The sculptures at the base of the image probably indicate these incidents.

If these inscriptions have relevance to the Pārvānātha āstī, we can say with definiteness that the āstī was in existence in 1195, and probably a part of it was renovated or added to, in the latter year. However, t.e.

---

1. *Ibid.*, 33 347 (137b)
case of this basti can be fixed with a great measure of confidence to the early part of the 18th century. There is also an inscription in the navaranga of this basti which records the death of Hallicharya-Salachar and it is dated 1129 A.D.¹ This inscription seems to have been re-erected or replaced in this cell during the time of Sagadeva. The navaranga portion of the outer-wall indicates a difference in workmanship from the rest of the basti, thus confirming what has been mentioned in the inscription.

Kattale Basti.

Kattale-Basti is the largest of the bastis now found on this hill. A part of it covers the left wall of Pāravānātha Basti and the entrance to Chandragupta Basti. This basti has undergone many alterations in the recent period. Fortunately, we have the evidence of an epigraph on the nītha of the Tirthankara image in the sarhagrāha which throws enough light on the date of the original structure. According to this undated inscription, Gaṅgarāja, the great Jaina general of the Hoysala Emperor Vīshṇuvardhana, built it for his mother Pūchikavvē. Though it is not clear whether it was erected in her memory or on her behalf, it could be assumed that in all probability Gaṅgarāja built it on behalf of his mother during her lifetime. Otherwise, the inscription could have stated that the basti was built for her welfare in the other world: "nivṛttaka-vinavā-kārankā-nil" as is normally done. There is one more inscription which helps us to ascertain the date of the death of Pūchikavvē. According to this inscription, she attained her end through

¹. CB II, SB 07 (54).
². IAMd., SB 70 (64).
in 1120 A.D. 1 Narasimhachar has assigned the inscription engraved on the pitha of the karbharana image of the Kattale Basti to about 1118 A.D. and on the basis of this he has assigned the temple also to the same year. A dated inscription near Jasana Basti says that Janagaraja donated the village Parama for the services of the basti built by his father and his wife in 1118 A.D. Hence it could be assumed that in 1118 A.D. Kattale Basti was already in existence. Hence, it could be assigned to a date little earlier than 1118 A.D.

As stated above, the basti has undergone many changes and very recently the karbhargiris-sakhanasi walls have been completely rebuilt. According to an old drawing preserved in the basti, originally the basti had an upper storey. This is confirmed by the flight of steps found now at the left side which leads to the upper storey.

The original temple probably consisted of the present karbhargira with the circumambulatory passage and the navaranga. The pillars in the navaranga are not only well-executed but are also varied. They appear to be an improvement over the bell-shaped-pillars of Jhavundarya Basti and they exhibit the Hoyanaja features. But the front pillared-hall and the porch are of recent origin. This portion is very clumsily conceived and badly executed. The hall has not only spoiled the original order of the group of temples here, but has harmed the left wall of Pārvaṇaṭha Basti and the entrance of Chandragupta Basti. According to the statement recorded earlier by Narasimhachar, this hall was constructed

1. Ibid., 35 118 (44).
2. Ibid., 58 75 (59).
3. Ibid., Introduction p.4.
by the Mysore royal family. 1

Of the images of this basti, the śāntakāmara and the caritra and those of Yaksha and Yakshini in the saktanāsti are original. They agree in workmanship and decorative details with the Hysala images of Chārvunḍarāya basti and elsewhere. But the bhūtratāla, which is kept in the pillared-hall is a later image. The basement of this image was originally an inscriptionsal slab of the Hysala period, but it has been cut and remodelled to suit the purpose of a nathā, probably in some later period. A part of this inscription was earlier noticed by the epigraphists. 2 But no details were available from this record excepting the praise of some Jaina guru. It was assigned by them to about 1145 A.D. The present author re-examined this inscription and noted the most important portion of this inscription. 3 It is an epitaph erected in memory of a Jaina guru Bhumukirti by Bāgavātī. This lady was none else but the wife of Bāmma and mother of Jhanā. Bāmma was as is well known, the elder brother of Chāgarāja. From the inscription clearly establishes a relationship between Bāgavātī and Chāgarāja, but whether this inscription has anything to do with the present Kattale basti, no one will be able to say.

It is probably relevant here to mention one more inscription discovered by the present author which is connected with Chāgarāja and probably with the basti. 4 This inscription

---

1. Ibid.
2. EC II, SB 72.
3. No. 1 - App. I.
4. No. 4 - App. I.
is unique as it is carved on the surface of a cement coating on a stone. The characters are genuine 10th century ones. It probably formed part of the original structure of Kattale Basti, but when renovation was undertaken and a part of the structure was pulled out and replaced by a new structure, the present inscription was mixed up with the rubble that is still there at the western side of the basti. Originally it was a long inscription, but due to ravages it has an ergone, the most important portion of the inscription is erased. What remains is a praise of the services of Gangarāja and a mention of him as the lay disciple of Subhacandra Siddhānta Dīva. We do not know whether he erected this inscription after constructing the Kattale Basti.

Uśasana Basti.

Uśasana Basti which stands to the south of Chāvumdarāya basti broadly indicates an imitation of the latter structure in architectural details. Probably the architects borrowed their models from the latter basti, as it was already in existence. If there were no epigraphical evidences one could have classed it along with Chāvumdarāya basti and assigned it to the same date. Fortunately, we have a brief inscription on the pedestal of the Ārthāṅkara image in the garbhrāghna which states that this temple of Indira-Kūṭāgriha (the abode of Lakṣmi) was caused to be erected by the general Janga who was the lay disciple of Subhacandra-Siddhānta-deva.1 The inscription and the temple have been assigned by Narasimha Bhar to about 1117 A.D. Another

1. LG II, 347 (69).
inscription of 1118 which stands at the eastern outer wall of this basti, states that Gāṅgarāja after defeating the Chālukya emperor in the famous battle of Kannegal, received the village Pārama from his lord and "granted the same to provide for worship in the Jaina temples lovingly erected by his mother Pochaladēvi ( Kattale Basti ) and his wife Lakshmaidēvi ( radu Katt Basti )". Obviously, this inscription makes no reference to Indrakalāgrīma and it appears to bear no connection with Śāsana Basti, though it is now kept there. Narasimhachar took for granted that the gift was also given to Śāsana Basti. But it appears more reasonable to think that in 1118 A.D. the present structure ( of Śāsana Basti ) had not yet been erected by Gāṅgarāja. Hence the date of this basti and the inscription found on the pedestal of the image may be put to some time later than 1118.

Araṇḍu-Katte Basti.

Araṇḍu-Katte Basti is another monument of the Kayalja period. The chronology of this monument can be ascertained from the inscription engraved on the pedestal of the image enshrined in the garbhagriha of this basti. It says that Lakshmi, wife of Gāṅgarāja and a lay disciple of Śrīma- chandra-Siddhāntadeva, caused this basti to be made. The inscription has been assigned to about 1118, and on the basis of this, the date of the temple has also been fixed at 50 about 1118 A.D.

1. Ibid., SB 73 (59).
2. Ibid., SB 125 (63).
Lakshmi appears in a number of inscriptions of Jñavara Bolapura, and she has been called Lakshale, Lakshavve, Lakshadēvi, and Lakshāmbika and Lakshāmati-śāntanāyakiti. As she died in 1121 A.D., she must have erected this basti earlier than that year. But this date could be further ascertained from the indirect references made to by a dated inscription. An inscription standing against the eastern wall of Sāsana Basti, referred to while examining the date of Sāsana Basti, mentions this basti. As the date of this inscription is given as 1118 A.D., it may be presumed that this structure was built by Lakshami earlier than 1118. However, no other basti of the 11th century has been erected so far. Hence, the basti could be assigned to

Savatigandhāvarāṇa Basti.

The chronology of the Savatigandhāvarāṇa Basti could be ascertained from the two epigraphs of this place. One of the two is inscribed on the pedestal of the Vītraśkara while the other is found on the stone slab erected at the side of the same basti. Of the two, the latter not only mentions the name of the basti, but also gives the exact date of its erection.

The basti was according to these two inscriptions, built by the senior queen of Vishṇuvardana, Jñatalādēvi. She was the most famous of the queens of Vishṇuvardana.

1. Ibid., pp 128 (48).
2. Ibid., pp 73 (59), p.39 of Translation section.
3. Ibid., pp 131 (65).
4. Ibid., pp 132 (56).
Though her father was a follower of Ūïva, she and her mother were two followers of Jina. She was one of the most accomplished ladies that appear in the inscriptions of Sarnatik. Another inscription of Ravana Belgola mentions that she died in 1131 at Jivagraha. She had a distinctive title or epithet called "asvasandhāvarana" (a setting elephant to co-wives) after which the present basti has been called.

The basti was built, according to the inscription, in 1123 A.D.

Tarina Basti.

Tarina Basti belongs to the same Hysala period and was built by the relatives of Gangaraja during the time of the Hysala king, Vishnuvardhana. According to an inscription found in the upper portion of the mandapa found in front of the basti, it was built by Māchikabbe and Jāntikabbe, mothers of the royal merchants, Hysala-setti and Nemi-setti respectively. The inscription itself states that the basti as well as the mandapa were erected in 1177 A.D.

It is interesting to observe that Hysala-setti, the royal merchant is connected with Gangaraja through the latter's wife, Lakshādevi. Lakshādevi had a sister called Donati (for whom Gangaraja and lakshāi created an epitaph in Ravana Belgola), and she built the Rikūtā-Jinālaya in Hosahalalu. Her husband was Hysala-setti who is mentioned as the Paṭṭānasvāmi of Dōrasamudra, and both of

1. *MII, 3B 143 (53).*
2. *Ind., 3B 137.*
tions are mentioned as the lay disciples of Subhakarṇa
śidhānta Dēva. Since Poysala setṭi, who is referred to
in these two inscriptions, is one and the same, we may state
that Tambi Basti was erected by one of the relatives of
Gaṅgarāja.

sāntisvāra Basti.

Sāntisvāra Basti is the last of the Hōysāla group
of bastis, but its date and author were unknown so far.
Remarkmg on this Basti Narasimhachar said that, "it is not
known when or by whom the temple was founded".

This problem has been solved in the present study
on the basis of an inscription discovered by the present
author. This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of
the Kīrtimākara image in the sarbhagriha of this basti.

According to it, the basti was caused to be
constructed and the image made by hiri-Śekhinya, son of hiri-
Bhājanā. The latter is mentioned as the brother of Gaṅappayya
(Gaṅgarāja) and his guru was Subhakarṇa-śidhānta Dēva. If
these, Gaṅappayya and his guru Subhakarṇa-śidhānta Dēva
are well-known through a number of inscriptions. Gaṅgarāja

---

1. RV IV, Kr. 4. The husband of Dēmati is mentioned
as the royal merchant Brahma in another Śravansēnā
śela inscription B (129 (49). In the
present inscription, Poysala setṭi is said to be
"having the second name of Jāhrūṇḍa". He is also
called Jelabī setṭi in the same inscription.


3. No. 5 - App. I
had an elder brother or nirivanga named ōma. The latter and a son by Vēgasāho who was named ōma. The latter is said to have "was to be erected in Kōpana, Belgola and other holy places into temples..."¹ This ōma was different from another ōma who was the son of Gangaśāja who built Beppana-Chaitya.² To distinguish these two cousin-brothers who had identical names, the son of Beppana was called senior-ōma in the newly discovered inscriptions. ōma, son of Beppana, was so far known by only one record in which it has been stated that he built bastis in Kōpana Belgola and elsewhere. So far, the exact temple which he had built was unknown. With the help of the present inscription, we are now able to identify it with the Jānaliyavara Basti. Secondly, the actual name of the jāthaka installed in the Jānaliyavāra was more a conjecture than a fact all these days. The present inscription confirms the name of the Jāthaka as Santhiātha.

As regards the date of the temple, though no light is thrown directly by the inscription, it could be ascertained indirectly from it. As known from another inscription on the hill, ōma died in about 1125 A.D.³ Hence, the basti could not be later than 1135. But the appearance of the name of Gangaśāja and the Jaina guru Śūtachandra makes us push the date to a still earlier period. As this guru died in 1123 A.D., the basti could have been built earlier than this date. Hence, we can roughly assign it to about 1100 A.D.

---

1. RL II, SB 323 (144).
2. No. 2 - App. I.
3. RL II, SB 324.
4. Ibid., pp. 117 (43).
As Zārīna Bastī, which is to the left of this structure, was built in 1117 A.D. and as this is the last of the bastis in that row, the date of this basti must not be naturally earlier than 1117 A.D.

Iruve Brahmādēva Temple.

Before closing this study on the chronology of the bastis of Chandragiri, let us examine the date of one other basti which is situated to the north of the enclosure. Though this is an insignificant structure, this is one of the earliest temples of the hill. According to one of the two inscriptions found on the door-jamb of the temple, a certain lady is said to have erected this temple in about 350 A.D. There is no architectural or iconographic data to contradict or confirm the above date.

Other Monuments of Chandragiri

So far, we have discussed the chronology of the various bastis of Chandragiri, but there are some other monuments of equal interest whose dates are yet to be ascertained. These monuments could be divided into:

(i) the nishīchi-mantapa,
(ii) the nānastābhne, and
(iii) a colossal.

1. *Ibid.*, nos 150 and 151, the latter which is now erased contains the following sentence: "... she caused to be made."
(1) The nishidhi-mantapa

The nishidhi-mantapa are the structures erected for housing the nishidhis or epitaphs. The latter are in the form of inscribed slabs or pillars. They are usually located in the centre of the mantapa. However, a nishidhi-mantapa houses more than one epitaph, the latter stand side by side. It is interesting to observe that in a single mantapa, the nishidhis belonging to a single family, and more usually those of the blood-relatives, are erected. Some time the spiritual lord of that family is also included. It is not known whether the mantapa was constructed immediately after installing the first epitaph, making prior arrangement for other members of the family, or after the erection of all epitaphs. The former seems to be a probability.

However, the date of the mantapa could be fixed, taking into account the first and the last epitaph of a particular mantapa.

There are totally seven such mantapas on the hill. Some of them are isolated; while others stand side by side as twin-mantapas.

Let us examine them here:

1. The mantapa of India IV: As there is only one epitaph in this mantapa, there is no difficulty in ascertaining its date. This epitaph was erected to celebrate the death of India IV, son of Krishna III of Bhattarakha dynasty. The mantapa and the epitaph were erected in 828 when India IV is mentioned to have died.1

---

1. RC II, 83 132 (57) and PI. LIX. This is situated by the side of the entrance of Savatigandhāvarana Baṣṭi.
The mantap of Lakshmīdēvi: This mantap accommodates four epitaphs in all. These are of: (1) Śuchāga, 1 brother of Lakshmīdēvi, who died in 1113; (2) Nābhachandra-Trāvidyādēva, 2 a Jaina saint who died in 1118; (3) Lakshmīdēvi, 3 the wife of Gaṅgarāja, who died in 1121 and (4) Kēmati, 4 sister of Lakshmīdēvi, who died in 1120.

As this mantap houses four epitaphs which fall between 1113 and 1121, its date could be assigned either to 1113 or to any year between 1113 to 1121.

The mantap of Gaṅgarāja: This mantap houses an epitaph of Gaṅgarāja's mother Pūchikabbe 5 who died in 1160 and of his guru, Śūbhachandra Viḍhānta-Dēva who died in 1185. The date of this structure could be confined to one of these dates, most probably to the former one.

---

1. Ibid., SB 123 (46).
2. Ibid., SB 127 (47).
3. Ibid., SB 128 (48).
4. Ibid., SB 129 (43). The mantap is located to the east of Braḍukatī Basti.
5. Ibid., SB 118 (44).
6. Ibid., SB 117 (43).

It is to the south of Chavandaraya Basti.
The twin mahtas of Sántale: The twin mahtas house the epitaphs all of which belong to the family of Sántale, queen of Vishnuvardhana. The northern mahtan contains the epitaphs of: (1) Māchikabbe, the mother of Sántale who died in 1151; (2) Hāladēva, brother's son of Māchikabbe, who died in 1139; and (3) Śingamayya, brother of Māchikabbe, who died in 1139. Hence this structure may be assigned to any one of these two dates - either to 1151 or to 1139. The southern mahtan has a solitary epitaph. This celebrates the death of Prabhāchandra, a Jain saint, who died in 1143 A.D. The date of this mahtan is obviously 1145 A.D.

The Mahānavard mahtas: There are also twin mahtas, but each is an independent unit by itself. The southern mahtan houses two epitaphs: one of Cāvakīrtipandita-vanēva who died in 1163 and the other of Adhyātmikunsaha- parasnāthdeva, who died in 1313. Of these two, the former is

1. Ibid., SB 143 (S3).
2. Ibid., SB 142 (S2). This inscription is described as the second pillar in this series, but, it is actually the third pillar (from north to south) or the first pillar (from south to north) in this series.
3. Ibid., SB 141 (S1). The mahtap is to the east of the garbhagriha of Govardhāvarma Basti.
4. Ibid., SB 140 (S0).
5. Ibid., SB 63 (S9) and SB 64 (S0).
6. Ibid., SB 65 (S1). These mahtas are to the north-east of Sāntimūta Basti - SC II, Pl.XIII.
the original one; the latter is clumsily added in 1312. The
sanctuary, obviously belongs to 1163. The northern structure
houses a solitary epitaph of Dayākārtiśēva-muṇilātuśa, the
pari of Rujja who died in 1178. Hence, the date of this
structure could also be 1176.

(ii) The mānastābhānas.

The tall free-standing pillars are called
mānastābhānas.1 One of them (Pl. ix, a) is standing in
front of Pārvatānātha Rasti. There is no epigraphical record
to prove its date, but the workmanship of the sculptures
at the basement of this pillar reveals that it belongs to
a much later period than Pārvatānātha Rasti. This is supported
by a literary work composed by Amatavali, who, in his
Jayantśāvenacarita2 states that this pillar and the enclosure
were erected by Puṇḍaiya, a Jaina merchant, in the time of
Jaiśka-Dīvanāya-Dīgaśar of Mysore. Hence, the pillar and
the enclosure may be assigned to any year between 1671-1704.
Another free-standing pillar is called Kūge-Brahmādēva pillar.
It is near the entrance of the enclosure (Pl. vi, a). An
inscription3 engraved on the basement of this pillar commemorates
the death of Marasiśa II, a Ganga king. The inscription and
the pillar could be assigned to 974 when he is stated to have
died.

---

1. App.
2. Cited from FG II, Introduction P.4
3. Hāg., SB 59 (38)
(iii) A Sāleṣṣeṣu.

A free-standing image to the west of Fārāvanātha Basti is popularly called Bherata. It is mistaken for a work of Āriṭṭhaṇāṇi. An inscription, engraved on the rock a few feet away from the image, reads that "Āriṭṭhaṇāṇi caused to be made..."¹ but it is not known what was exactly caused to be made by him. There appears to be no connection between the image and this inscription. Else the image appears to belong to the later part of the 10th century as it broadly agrees in workmanship with the image of Somana of Vindhyagiri.²

---

¹. Ibid., SB 61 (23).
². G6, Pl. XX and Pl. I of KG II.