The Post-Maitraka Period

The period that followed the fall of the Maitraka kingdom witnessed the ascendancy of several parallel powers in Gujarat. The Rāstrakūtas extended their power over the central parts of mainland Gujarat, while the Pratihāras held supremacy over the local powers in Saurashtra. However, Saurashtra was divided into several kingdoms under the Saṅdhuvas, the Čalukyas and Čāpas who seem to have acknowledged the supremacy of the Pratihāras. The northern part of Gujarat was ruled over by the Cavādas, whose existence has not been provided by epigraphic evidence. But from literary traditions it is known that they were ruling over North Gujarat throughout this period.
(1) The Valabhi Era

The Valabhi era, which was in common use during the Maitraka period, now continued to a certain extent even after the fall of the Maitraka kingdom of Valabhi. Among the known epigraphic records of this period, this era appears in three records. They are as under:

(i) The Hilol plates of Mahāśīmaḍaṇta Candraditya, a feudatory of Rājādhīrāja Kakka, are dated in the year 470 of an unspecified era\(^1\). Chronologically this Kakka is identified with the Rāstrakūṭa King Kakkarkaṇja II of the Gujarat branch and the year 470 is ascribed to the Valabhi era\(^2\). Accordingly the year of the grant would correspond to 788-89 A.C.

(ii) The Devli grant issued by the Rāstrakūṭa King Govindarāja Prabhūtavarsa of the Gujarat branch, is dated in the Valabhiya Samvat (Year) 500\(^3\). This is the earliest known instance of the specific mention

---

of the Valabhi era by its name—The year corresponds to 818-19 A.C.

(iii) The Una Plates of the Čalukya Mahāsāmanta Balavarman, a feudatory of Mahārājādhīrāja Mahendrāyudhadeva, identified with the Pratihāra King Mahendrapāla, are dated in the Valabhi year 574 which corresponds to 892-93 A.C. 4.

At the time of the Hilol plates, the Maitrakakaśi kingdom of Valabhi had shortly come to an end and the Rāstrakūta power seems to have extended over North Gujarat only a month or so before 5. It is, therefore, just likely that the Valabhi era which was in vogue in Gujarat for the last three centuries, continued to appear in the grant issued by Candrāditya, though he was a feudatory of the Rāstrakūtas, and that the name of the era was left unspecified as in the records of the Maitraka Kings.

---

4 Prof. F. Kielhorn EL, Vol.IX, PP. 1 ff.
5 From the evidence of this grant it is inferred that the fall of Valabhi took place in the beginning of the Kārtikādi Vikrama year 845 (i.e. Valabhi year 470) and the Rāstrakūta power extended over Northern Gujarat shortly before Mārgasīra su. di. 7 of the Valabhi year 470 (Valabhi Vidyanagar Research, Bulletin, Vol. I, issue 1. p.36)
After about twenty years another branch of the Rastrakūtās was established in Gujarat. The plates of Karkaraṇa Suvarṇavarga of this branch are dated Śaka year 734 (812-13 A.C.) to Śaka year 7466 (824-25 A.C.), while the plates of his brother Govindaraja Prabhūtavarga are dated Śaka year 735 (813-14 A.C.) to Śaka year 749 (827-28 A.C.). These kings held steady power over mainland Gujarat and dated their records pertaining to it in the Śaka era. However, the Devli plates which record a grant of land situated in Saurashtra form an exception and are dated in the Valabhi era which had been in common use there for a pretty long period of about three centuries. But as the Rastrakūta records were usually dated in the Śaka era and as this record is dated in the Valabhi era prevalent in Saurashtra, the year was expressly specified as a year of the Valabhi era.

The same circumstances account for the use of the Valabhī era, with its name specified, in the Una plates of Balavarman.

Thus dates in the Valabhi era occur only

6 H.G. Shastri, Gujarātano Prācīna Itihāsa, P.139
7 Ibid, P. 140
in a few records of this period, but they clearly indicate that the name of the era got specified by this time.

As for the system of the year and the month, these dates do not yield any particulars for verification. The Devali plates do not mention even the month and the lunar day. The Hilol plates and the Una plates give the months, the fortnights and the lunar days. The Hilal plates mention even the weekday. It well tallies with the lunar day on ascribing the year to the Valabhi era and calculating according to the epoch of 317-18 A.C. But as the month falls between Kartika and Phalguna and as the lunar day belongs to the bright fortnight, the date does not admit of verification about the commencement of the year and the completion of the month. Presumably the year continued to be Kartikādi.

8 They simply refer to a solar eclipse in the Valabhi year 500. The year was probably Kārtikādi as in the Maitraka period. There were two solar eclipses in the Kārtikādi year 500—one in (Asanta) Pauṣa and the other in (Asanta) Asadhā. If the years were Caitrādi only the second eclipse would apply.

9 The date of the Hilol plates, year 470 Mārgasīra su. di. 8 7 Bhauma, corresponds to Tuesday, 11th Nov, 783 A.C.

The date of Una plates, Valabhi year 574, Māgha su. di. 6 roughly corresponds to 23th Dec, 892 A.C.
and the month to be Pūrnimānta as in the bāitraka period.
(ii) The Gupta Era

The discovery of Saindhava Copper-plate grants from Saurashtra enables us to state definitely that the Gupta era also was in vogue in the Western parts of Saurashtra during this period. The occurrence of the Gupta era in Western Saurashtra is ascribed to the Saindhavas who hailed from Sindh. Among the known epigraphic records of the Saindhava Kings, the Gupta era appears in four of the six copper-plate grants from Ghumli and the Morbi copper plates of King Jaika. Out of the six Ghumli plates, the grant of Mahāsamanta Jaika is curiously left undated, while the date of the grant of King Rānaka is not known as the second plate is missing.

The remaining plates are dated as follows:


The Dhiniki plates issued by King Jaikadeva from Bhumilika (Ghumli) belong to the Saindhava dynasty but the record is dated in the Vikrama era and has proved to be a forged one (EI. Vol XXVI, P. 189)

2 EI., Vol. XXVI, PP. 203 ff

3 Ibid, PP. 207 ff.
(i) The Ghuali copper plates of the time of the Saindhava King Agguka II are dated in the year 513 of an unspecified era, identified with the Gupta era. Accordingly the (Gupta) year 513 corresponds to 832-33 A.C.

(ii) The grant of Mahāsamanta sri Rānaka of a subordinate Saindhava branch is recorded in the year 555 of the Gupta-Kala, which corresponds to 874-75 A.C.

(iii) The grant of Mahāsamantādhipati Agguka III Agguka III is dated in the Gupta Saivat 567, the corresponding Christian year of which is 886-87.

(iv) The Morbi copper plate of the Saindhava King sri Jāikadeva is dated in the Gupta year 585, which corresponds to 904-05 A.C.

(v) The copper plates of Mahāsamantādhipati sri Jāika II are dated in the Gupta Saṭ 596. The year corresponds to 915-16 A.C.
The uniform use of the Gupta era in the records of the Saindhava Kings who hailed from Sindh and established their power in Western Saurashtra by the end of the Maitraka period (during which the Valabhi era was in common use), clearly indicates that they must have adopted the Gupta era from Sindh, where the Gupta era presumably prevailed as in other parts of North India.

Accordingly, the Gupta era which was introduced into Saurashtra during the Gupta period, but which got modified into the Valabhi era during the Maitraka period, thus, seems to have been re-introduced into Saurashtra under its original nomenclature during this period.

As for the system of the years and the months of the Gupta era used in the Saindhava records, the dates yield the following observations:

1. The Chumli grant of the time of Agguka II was made in year 513, on the 12th day (of an unspecified month) on the occasion of Uttarayana. The given particulars clearly indicate that the day fell in the dark fortnight of Amanta Pausa (or Purnimaanta Magha) and corresponds to the 22nd of Dec. 332 A.C.9

9 H. G. Shastri, MG., PP. 233 ff
The difference of 319 years in December clearly indicates that the date applies not to the Kartikādi Valabhi years but to the Caitrādi Gupta years. As the name of the month is not specified, it cannot be inferred whether the month was Purnimānta or Amānta.

(ii) The Ghurāli grant of Rānaka dated in the Gupta year 555 does not mention the month, the fortnight and the day of the grant.

(iii) The grant of King Aṣguka III, dated in the Gupta year 567, makes mention of a lunar eclipse in the month Suci10, which corresponds to Aṣadha or Jyestha. On referring the date to the Tables, it is found that the name Suci here applies to Jyestha as a lunar eclipse took place in that year on the full-moon day of Jyestha.

10 The editor of this grant does not seem to have followed the meaning of certain words given in the verse pertaining to the date. According to him the grant was made on a new-moon day, the month of which is not given, but the verse refers to the conjunction (yoga) of the moon (Indu) with Sāṃśya, and not with the sun (Jhanu), and the word Suci is to be taken as referring to the name of the month Suci (Jyestha or Aṣadha) rather than as an attribute of Indau. The verse thus really refers to a lunar eclipse, which took place on the full-moon day of Suci.
and not of Asadha. However, the date does not admit of verification regarding the system of the year, as the month would fall in the year 567, according to the Caitrādi system and the Kārtikādi system as well.

(iv) The Morbi plate of Jaika, dated year 585 Phālguṇa 5, refers to the grant made on the occasion of a solar eclipse in the Gupta year 585. On referring the date to the Tables, it is found that no solar eclipse took place in the Kārtikādi year 585, whereas a solar eclipse took place on the new-moon day of Pūrṇimānta Margasira of the Caitrādi year 585, which corresponds to Nov. 10, 904 A.C.\(^\text{11}\).

(v) The grant of King Jaika II dated in the Gupta year 596 mentions the month, the fortnight and the day, but the exact date cannot be verified in the absence of further details like the week-day.

From these observations it becomes clear that the dates given in the Saindhava grants apply to the original Gupta era, the years of which were Caitrādi and not to the modified Gupta era, known as the Valabhi.

\(^{11}\) Vide Pillai's Table X.
era, the years of which were Kartikādi. The available data do not admit of any verification about the system of months, but the months of these dates were most probably Pūrṇimānta, as the months ended in Pūrṇima both in the Gupta era of North India and the Valabhi era of Gujarat.

The Saindhava kings who established their power in Western Saurashtra for about two centuries, thus continued the use of the Gupta era, which was current in North India. This deserves special notice in view of the fact that the early Saindhava kings were feudatories of the Maitrakas who used the Valabhi era, and that the later Saindhava kings seem to be feudatories of the Pratiharas who dated their records in the Vikrama era. The Gupta era disappears in Gujarat along with the end of the Saindhava dynasty.

12 A.S. Altekar, EI, Vol. XXVI, P. 187
13 Ibid, PP. 191 f.
(iii) The Saka Era

Shortly after the fall of the Maitraka kingdom of Valabhi, the Rāstrakūta King Karka II in South Gujarat extended his power over Central Gujarat. But the Lāṇa branch soon lost its power in Gujarat.

In about 800 A.C. the Imperial Rāstrakūtas of the Deccan occupied Gujarat and another Lāṇa branch was established under Indra, the younger brother of Govind III. Shortly after 888 A.C. it lost its power to the Imperial Rāstrakūtas, who held direct sway over Lāṇa upto about 930 A.C. The Parmāra kings in North-East Gujarat acknowledged the supremacy of the Rāstrakūta emperors upto about 950 A.C. Thus the Rāstrakūtas held sway over parts of Gujarat almost during the whole of this period.

As noticed in the previous chapter the Rāstrakūta Kings dated their records in the Saka era. Their known records found in the form of copper-plate

1 The use of the Valabhi era in the Devgtarant of Govinrāja Prabhūtavarga forms an exception. The occupation of Saurashtra by the Rāstrakūtas is not known from any other records.
Grants range from the Saka year 730 (808 A.C.) to the Saka year 852 (930 A.C.). These dates generally consist of the year, the month, the fortnight and the lunar-day. The number of year is generally mentioned in words and/or sometimes in figures. It is expressly referred to the Sakanraksana. The number of the lunar day is also given in words. The week-day is rarely given. The dates sometimes contain references to Parvas, eclipses and nakṣatras. The name of the Saṃvatsara is sometimes given along with the number of the year.

The Wadhavan plates of the Cāpa king Dharaniyarāha are expressly dated in Saka Saṃvat (year) 836. The use of the Saka era in the Cāpa kingdom of Wadhavan seems unusual especially in view of the fact that the Cāpa king acknowledged the supremacy of the Pratihāra King Mahipāladeva. For the era used in the Pratihāra empire is found to be the Vikrama era. The use of the Saka era in this kingdom perhaps implies the cultural bearing of the adjoining region of the mainland Gujarat where the Saka era was current under the regime of the Rāstrakūtas.

2. In one instance the year is introduced as 'Saka Saṃvat' Kapadvanj grant of Krsna II dated 5,208 (LI., Vol. I PP. 52 ff.).
The Saka dates in literary records are found in a few Jain works of this period. These dates range from the Saka year 772 (850 A.C.) to the Saka year 853 (931 A.C.) They are given in words. They generally consist of the year, the month, the fortnight and the lunar day. The era is generally introduced as Sakanrapaka and sometimes as Saka Kala. Sometimes the name of the Saṃvatsara is also mentioned.

3. This date occurs in Silākā's tīkā on Acārāṅga Sūtra (Muni Jinavijayā, Introduction to Jīmakalpa Sūtra, p. 12). Some other MSS date the commentary Saka year 734 (Ibid, P. 11) or S.E. 793 (IA., Vol. XV, p. 183). Another Ms. however gives the date as year 772 of the Gupta era. (Ibid. P. 188), Acārāṅga Sūtra tīkā published by Agamodaya Samiti, p. 317). But here the word (Gupta) obviously seems to be a misnomer for Saka. For it is not possible to date Śrīśaka as late as in the 11th Cent. A.C. according to the Saka dates given above the commentator seems to have flourished in 9th Cent. A.C. Muni Jinavijayaji proposes to date him about one century prior to it.

The Gupta era seems to have already been extinct by this time. The error of misrepresenting a current era as some extinct era also occurs in a few cases in the case of the Vikrama era. (For instance vide, H. G. Shastri, 'The Date of the Fall of Valabhi,' IHQ., Vol. XXIII, pp. 243 ff., also vide section iv. of this chapter and chapter VII below).
The epoch and origin of this era are already discussed above.

As regards the system of its years, the years of the Saka era are always Caitrādi and the year usually commences with Caitra 5u.4.

As regards the system of months, it may be noted that only one of the known Saka dates of this period contains the weekday, which falling in the bright fortnight, throws no light on the system of the completion of months. However, two other factors enable us to determine the system. All the three known dates of solar eclipses tally with the names of the corresponding months according to the Āmānta and not the Pūrṇimānta system of months. Similarly the date mentioned as marking the so called commencement of the Utrāyaṇa in a grant of the Saka year 789 (867 A.C.) also falls within the specified month only according to the Āmānta system. This leads us to the conclusion that the months used in the Saka dates of this period were usually Āmānta. The change-over from the Pūrṇimānta system to the Āmānta system in

4. Ojha, Bharatiya Pracina Lipimālā, P. 173
Gujarat appears for the first time in the Saka dates of the post-Maitraka period. Presumably it owes its origin to the Deccan from where the Saka era got introduced into Gujarat through the Rastrakuta kings.

The mention of the name of the Samsatsara along with the number of the year appears in the known records of Gujarat, for the first time during this period. These appellations belong to a cycle of sixty Barhaspatya (Jovian) years. But there are a number of different modes of citation of Jovian years. The general practice is that the name of the samvatsara current at the commencement of the year (solar or lunar) is attached to the whole of that year notwithstanding that the Jovian samvatsara may have been succeeded by the next one before the end of that year. Occasionally, the samvatsara named on a particular day is found to be the Jovian year that was actually current on that day. The mention of Vyaya (20) on Vaisakha, su. 15 in Saka year 730 and that of Sarvajit (21) on the Amavasya of Sravana of the same year, evidently signify that the calendar used in Gujarat during the Post-Maitraka period followed the latter practice i.e. the practice of citing the samvatsara that was actually current on the specified day.

5 Pillai, Indian Chronology, pp. 39 f.
The different schools of Indian Chronology differed slightly with regard to the length of the saṃvatsara as well as that of the sidereal solar year. In the absence of specific data it could hardly be possible to determine which of these schools was followed by the calendar used in the dates given in the records of this period. In the known records of this period we come across six cases of Saṃvatsara - five in epigraphic records and one in literary records. In order to determine the probable school or schools of chronology followed in these dates, it will be worth attempting to calculate the commencement of the given Saṃvatsara according to the different schools which would have been prevalent by this time and to examine whether it fits in with the given dates. Among the different schools of chronology the following seem to be the principal schools that may have been prevalent in Western India during this period:

(1) The original Sūrya Siddhānta (ii) The first Ārya Siddhānta and (iii) The Brahma Siddhānta. In his Brhatasāhīta Varāhamihira also deals with the Jovian years and explains how to arrive at the Jovian saṃvatsara
in a Saka year and the commencement of the Samvatsara.

The Saka years in the given dates may have been either expired or current. First we may calculate the position of the Jovian saṃvatsaras on the given dates according to the different systems mentioned above on assuming that the Saka years given here are expired. The results may be tabulated as under:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Given date</th>
<th>Samvat-</th>
<th>Samvatsara arrived at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sara</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.E.730</td>
<td>Vyaya</td>
<td>Sarvajit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vai, si.15</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S.E.730</td>
<td>Sarvajit</td>
<td>Sarvadhāri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. ba.30</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S.E.735</td>
<td>Nandana</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pau, Si.7</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.E.793</td>
<td>Nandana</td>
<td>Nandana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pau.</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S.E.836</td>
<td>Yuva(9)</td>
<td>Yuva(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phā. Si.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.E.853</td>
<td>Khara</td>
<td>Nandana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Varahamihira, Brhat-Samhita VIII, 20-22
Among the six cases noted above, the given Sāṃvatsara corresponds to the saṃvatsara arrived at on all the four calculations, only in the case No. 4. In cases Nos. 1, 2, and 3, the sāṃvatsara arrived at on these calculations uniformly corresponds, not to the given Sāṃvatsara, but to the succeeding one. Analogically the sāṃvatsara arrived at in the case No. 6 must be Vandana (26) succeeding Khāra (25) the given sāṃvatsara. In case No. 5 the sāṃvatsara arrived at on calculations based on the original Sūrya Siddhānta and the Brhatasamhita rule corresponds to the given saṃvatsara, whereas the sāṃvatsara arrived at on calculations based on the first Arya Siddhānta and the Brahma Siddhānta corresponds to the sāṃvatsara succeeding the given one. Thus if the given Śaka years be expired, the Jovian Sāṃvatsara in the given dates tallies only in one or two cases out of six ones.

7 Calculated according to the methods and Tables in Indian Chronography by Sewell

8 The given date comprises only the year; the month fortnight and titni, are not specified. As remarked above, the calculations of the sāṃvatsara imply that the date of the record fell somewhere during the first 8 or 9 months.

The Vikrama year 989 given in this date along with the Śaka year 853 obviously seems to be erroneous. It must be 987 or 983.
Let us then assume that the given Şaka years are current. The results arrived at on the calculating of the position of the Jovian saṁvatsaras on the given dates, may accordingly, be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Given date</th>
<th>Given Saṁvatsara</th>
<th>Saṁvatsara arrived at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.E.730</td>
<td>Vyaya(20)</td>
<td>Vyaya(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vai.ṣu. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S.E.730</td>
<td>Sarvajit (21)</td>
<td>Sarvajit (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srā.Va. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S.E.735</td>
<td>Nandana (26)</td>
<td>Nandana (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pau.Su.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S.E.836</td>
<td>Yuva (9)</td>
<td>Yuva (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phā.Su.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noticed above here also the samvatsara mentioned in relation to Saka year, 853 seems to be falling in the former part of the Saka year. Accordingly the Jovian Samvatsara mentioned in the given dates fully tallies with that arrived at in accordance with the calculations made according to all the four systems in 4 cases out of 6 ones. In the case of No.5 the given samvatsara tallies with that arrived at according to the first Arya Siddhânta and the Brahma Siddhânta. According to the Original Sûrya Siddhânta and the Brhatsamhitâ rule the samvatsara arrived at corresponds, not to the given samvatsara but to that preceding it. The same is the case with the samvatsara given in relation to Saka year 793, wherein the samvatsara arrived at corresponds to the preceding samvatsara according to all the four systems.

It is obvious that the Samvatsara given in relation to S.E. 793 falls one year earlier in comparison to the other samvatsaras in case the Saka years are taken to be expired or current. It should also be noted that the samvatsara Nanda which fell in Saka year 735 (No.3) could not recur at the interval

9. Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6
of 58 years in S.E. 793. It, therefore, seems clear that the Saka era 793, if given correctly must be taken as expired, while all the other Saka years must be taken as current. In other words the Saka year 793 must be treated as expired and equated with 794 current, or it is also probable that the true year intended to be given was 794 and not 793.

Accordingly, it appears that the samvatsaras given in the dates mentioned above would fit in if the Saka years be taken to be current rather than expired. The samvatsara mentioned in relation to Saka year 836 would then tally according to the first Arya Siddhanta and the Brahma Siddhanta, but not according to the original Surya Siddhanta and the Brhatsamhita Rule. Hence it may be inferred that the calendar followed by these records was probably based on either the First

10 The actual expression given in the record reads Sakanpakalatitasamvatsarasasatesu Saptasu navatratayatydhikeu. The last Pada is obviously incorrect. The editor has suggested to correct it into Navatryuttarayadhikeu (EI. Vol. XVIII, P. 250, F. n. 20). But the Phraseology would not correspond to that given in the other records of the Rastrakutas. In accordance with the usual phraseology given in the Kastrakuta records the number 93 should have been expressed as Trinavatyadhiteseu. The record is full of inaccuracies and it is, therefore, not unlikely that the scribe committed some error in this phrase too.
Arya Siddhānta or the Brahma Siddhānta.

As the former is used in Kerala and Madras States, while the latter was followed till recently, in Gujarat and parts of Rajasthan, it follows that the Brahma Siddhānta prevailed in Gujarat during this period.

Presumably the intended phrase was to be Caturnavatyadhikesu.

11. Vide No. 10 above.

12-13 - V.B. Ketkar, Indian and Foreign Chronology P.42
(iv) The Vikrama era:

The known epigraphic records of the post Maitraka period hardly give dates in the Vikrama era. Exceptionally the Una Plates of the Cālukya king Avanivarman II, a feudatory of the Pratihāra sovereign Mahendrapāla are dated in the year 956 which, though unspecified, obviously seems to belong to the Vikrama era.

Among literary works of this period, *Bṛhatkathākosa* by Harisena is specially dated in the year 989 of the Vikrama era along with the year 853 of the Saka era. As the samvatsara Khara tallies with the Saka year, the number of the corresponding Vikrama year seems to be corrected into 983.

The year 962 given for the completion of *Upartramavaprapancākathā*, seems to belong to the

3. Accordingly 'Navastanavakesvag' should be corrected into 'Astāsttanavakesvag'
Vikrama era, though the era is left unspecified therein.

The Prasasti of *Candrakevalīcarita* dates the composition of the work in the year 598 of an unspecified era. Mironow assigns the year to the Gupta era and the year would accordingly correspond to the V.E. 974 (917 A.C.) This year well fits in with the (Vikrama) year 962 given in the *Upemiti bhavaprāpancabkāthā*. But it seems very doubtful that the Gupta era was in such common use as late as the 10th Cent. A.C. that it was left unspecified. It is, therefore, probable that there is some clerical or scribal error in the verse containing the date.

Presumably the reading *Vasvankeṣumite Varse* may be corrected into *Vasviṣvankamitevārse*. The number of the year would accordingly be corrected into 958.

If both the works mentioned above belong to one and the same Siddharsī, it is hardly possible that the dates in the two works may be given in two different eras, and that both of them maybe left unspecified. In

4 *Upemiti bhavaprāpancabkāthā* of Siddhārṣiṣūri, Nirnayasāgara edition, P. 776
5 M.D. Desai, *JSSI.*, P. 185, f.n. 181
view of the eras prevalent in Western India during this period, it is the Vikrama era rather than the Gupta era, that would be, common enough to be left unspecified.

Among these four dates, two comprise only years. The two other dates contain the month, fortnight and the lunar day also. But one of them gives no weekday, while the other also gives the weekday and the Naksatra\(^6\). On referring this date to the Tables\(^7\), it is found that the lunar day falls on the given weekday according to the Kārtikādi system and not the Caitrādi system, of years. As the lunar day belongs to the bright fortnight, the date does not help us to determine whether the month was Pūrṇimānta or Amānta. Though the work was published in Bhillamāla, the use of the Kārtikādi system of years implies its close association with Gujarat where the system was in common use in the Kalacuri and Valabhi eras during the Maitrakā period.

The adoption of the Vikrama era in these records seems to be rather uncommon among the dates.

\(^6\) 'Jyeṣṭhe Sitapancamyaṃ Puravasau Gurudine'

\(^7\) Pillai, IC., Table X.
of this period. Probably its use was adopted from the adjoining region of Rajasthan which had close bearing, political as well as cultural, on Gujarat during the post-Maitraka period.

The traditional accounts of the Cāvadā dynasty contain some dates which fall within this period. They range from the V.E. 861 to 998. Many of the dates given in the Prabandhacintāmāni contain particulars about the months, fortnights, lunar days and weekdays in addition to years.

A critical examination of these dates clearly indicates that the particulars do not tally in most of the cases. As remarked above, these traditional dates hardly have any historical basis.

8 Vide, the table given in Rāmāl Cunilāl Modi Lekhasahagraha, F.I. P. 43

The Vicārasrepi uniformly dates all the events 19 years later, the total period ranging from 821 to 1017. But the Sambhār Inscription of Siddharāja Jayasimha (J.A., LVII, P.234) has firmly established that Mūlarāja founded his dynasty in the V.E. 998. This year also marks the end of the Cāvadā dynasty.

9 Vide, Pages 19/ff. above
they are probably fabricated conjecturally in later times. Even if the initial year 802 be ascribed to the Śaka era instead of the Vikrama era, it is not possible to treat all the subsequent dates accordingly because the year 998 marking the lower limit of the Gāvaḍā rule, definitely belongs to the Vikrama era.¹⁰

These doubtful dates given in later traditions, therefore, deserve no consideration for determining the chronological systems of this period.

¹⁰ Vide n. 11 above.