

EIAD 242. Pillar from Chinaganjam – reign of Yaññasiri-Gotamīputta

Arlo Griffiths and Vincent Tournier

Authors of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths, Vincent Tournier

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSEIAD00242

Repository: Early Āndhradeśa (tfb-eiad-epigraphy)

File path: texts/xml/DHARMA_INSEIAD00242.xml

Language: Middle Indo-Aryan [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-09-22 13:22 (151ff65), last modified 2026-09-22 13:22 (151ff65)

Edition

⟨1⟩ sidharī _ na(mo) bhagavato [5×] raño gotamī⟨2⟩putasa Araka-siri-yaña-sātakaṇisa
vasa-satāya saṁvachara sata(v)i⟨3⟩saṁ 20 7 _ hemaṁtānaṁ pakhaṁ catuthaṁ
4 di[vasaṁ paṁca]maṁ 5 Etīya⟨4⟩ puvāya Araka-mahatarakena mahā[.]e[ca.
10×]⟨5⟩yājina mahādaṁ[...] [bu]⟨6⟩dhāya [...]

Apparatus

⟨1⟩ na(mo) bhagavato [5×] ◇ *na(mo bha)gavato [3×](vasa)* B; *na(mo) bhagavato
vā(sude)va(sa)* M; *[[namo bha]]gavato [[namo bhavato]]* V • Bühler explains in his footnote
5: “After □□□□ five, possibly six, letters have been obliterated. The last two seem
to have been □□.” Majumdar commented on his reading *vāsudevasa* filling the gap:
“This word was left unread by Bühler. But the above reading is certain. The triangular
shape of the first letter indicates that it can only be a v ; the third letter is apparently

de, and those that follow, as Bühler also has stated, are to be read as *vasa*. Under these circumstances, *vāsudevasa* would, in my opinion, be the only reading possible.” Venkataramayya rightly questioned Majumdar’s confidence, and explained his own understanding of the situation as follows: “The scribe after inscribing *namo bhagavato* after *sidham* seems to have again repeated by mistake the letters *namo bhavato* (omitting *ga*) and realised that he has by mistake repeated the same portion which he had already written before. So he seems to have tried to erase, and partially succeeded in erasing, the first three letters *namo bha* following *sidham*. By the time he erased these three letters he seems to have further discovered suddenly that he had not corrected written the duplicated *namo bha ga vato* in which he omitted the letter *ga*. So he quite naturally retained the first which was the correctly written *namo bhagavato* and wilfully erased the duplicated and incorrect portion *namo bhavato*.” We for our part remain agnostic about what has happened here, but add as further possibility that the illegible segment, whether wilfully erased or accidentally damaged, originally read *tathāgatasa*. Based on the parallel in EIAD 1 one might expect *Agapogalasa*, but this cannot be squared with the shapes of the remaining vestiges of characters. — <1> gotamī- V ◇ *gotami*- B M.

<2> sata(v)i<3>saṁ ◇ *sata(vi)<3>maṁ* B; *sata(vi)[1*]saṁ* M • Majumdar misinterpreted the dash at the end of Bühler’s reading of line 1 as expressing a gap, whereas it merely expressed that the linebreak falls in mid-word; the (ma) for (sa) was probably merely a printing error. Majumdar’s note therefore seems quite far off the mark: “Bühler reads *saṁvachara sata(vi) maṁ* 20 7. Apparently, he would restore it as *saṁvachara sata[vi][sa*]maṁ* 20 7. But the letter before the numeral sign for 20 is clearly *saṁ*. Therefore, the lost letter can only be *se*.” There is not, in our opinion, any lost character here.

<3> hemaṁtānaṁ M V ◇ *hematānaṁ* B. — <3> di[vasaṁ paṁca]maṁ • Thus restored by Bühler. — <3> Etīya M ◇ *Etīya* B V.

<4> mahā[.]e[ca. 10×] ◇ *mahā[s]e* M • Majumdar proposes to restore *mahāsenāpatinā*. This seems convincing.

<5> mahādaṁ[...] • Majumdar proposes to restore *mahādaṇḍanāyakena*. This seems convincing.

Translation

Success! Homage to the Bhagavant! Of King Gotamīputta, the noble (*araka*) Siriyāñña Sātakaṇṇi — may he live one hundred years! — the twenty-seventh 27 year, fourth 4

fortnight of the cold season, fifth 5 day. On the above, the noble chief, great general, the ... sacrificer, the great judge, ... to the Buddha.

Bibliography

First edited by Bühler and again edited by Majumdar, both times from estampages; edited once more by Venkataramayya based on direct inspection of the stone as well as estampages. Re-edited here by Arlo Griffiths & Vincent Tournier from a photo of an estampage and from photos of the stone.

Primary

[B] Bühler, Johann Georg. 1892. "A new inscription of the Andhra king Gautamiputra Yajñaśrī." EI 1, pp. 95–96.

[M] Majumdar, Nani Gopal. 1920. "Cinna inscription of the reign of Śrī-Yajña Sātakarṇi." JPASB new series 16, pp. 327–330. [URL].

[V] Venkataramayya, M. 1965. "A note on the Chinna-Ganjam inscription of Goutamiputra Yajña Satakarni: year 27." JIH 43 (1), pp. 241–244.

Secondary

ARIE 1887–88 (2/3). G.O. No. 745, 27th July 1888. *Archaeology. Recording letter from the Director-General, Archaeological Survey, forwarding Dr. Hultzsch's progress report for February, March and April 1888.* Edited by Eugen Julius Theodor Hultzsch. Madras: Government of Madras, Public Department, 1888. Page 3, page 3, section 7.

Lüders, Heinrich. 1912. *A list of Brahmi inscriptions from the earliest times to about A.D. 400 with the exception of those of Asoka.* Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and record of the Archæological Survey of India 10. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing. [URL]. Item 1340.

Aiyappan, A. & P.R. Srinivasan. 1960. *Guide to the buddhist antiquities.* Revised edition. Madras: The principal commissioner of Museums, Government Museum. [URL]. Item 50.

Hanumantha Rao, B. S. L., N. S. Ramachandra Murthy, B. Subrahmanyam & Īmani Śivanāgīreḍḍi. 1998. *Buddhist inscriptions of Andhradesa.* Secunderabad: Ananda Buddha Vihara Trust. Page 128.

Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本 圭生. 1996. 南無阿彌陀仏 I, Text, Note, 南無阿彌陀仏 南無阿彌陀仏 *I: Text, Note, Wayaku [A comprehensive study of the Indian Buddhist inscriptions, Part I: Text, Notes and Japanese Translation]*. Kyōto-shi 京都府: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店. Volume 1, item China 001.