the Puranic king Daśaratha. But, on this view, the name of the city should have been Daśarathapura or Dasarathore. Fleet points out that even now, the township includes some twelve to fifteen outlying hamlets or divisions (Khilcipur, Jankūpurā, Rāmpuriyā, Candrapurā, Bālagañja, etc.) and that 'when it was originally constituted, it included exactly ten (daśa) such hamlets (pura)'.[247] This view of Fleet is more appealing.

Mandasor, the full form of the name of the town by which it is officially known and which is entered in maps, is also explained in two ways:

As suggested by Bhagwan Lal Indraji, it may represent Manda-Daśapura, "the distressed or afflicted Daśapura," referring to the overthrow of the town, and the destruction of the Hindu temples in it, by the Musalmans, in memory of which, even to the present day, the Nāgar brāhmaṇas of the area do not drink water there. This is supported by the fact that some paṇḍits still call it Mannadasor.[248]

F.S. Growse suggests that the name combines the two names of Mad and Daśapura: the former[249] being the name of a village (also called Afzalpur) about eleven miles south-east of Mandasor, from which, it is said, were brought, from ruined Hindu temples, the stones that were used in the construction of the Musalman fort at Mandasor.[250]

It is very difficult to choose between the two explanations, but the second seems to be more reasonable.

(4) *Indrapura* (No.16, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.8) :
The inscription states that an endowment was given by a brāhmaṇa named Devaviṣṇu for the maintenance of a lamp in a temple of the Sun established by the merchants of the town of Indrapura kṣatriyas named Acalavarman and Bhrukuṇṭhasiṁha at Indrapura.

In line 5 we get 'Candrāpuraka-Padmā' as the reading taken by Fleet[251] and he thus considers it a separate town than Indrapura.[252] But the correct reading should be as 'Cendrapuraka-Padmā', since we find a small stroke by the left side of 'c'. The stroke in other lines for 'e' is very clear (e.g. in L.2) though it is not very clear in L.5 still we cannot read it simply 'c'. The reading 'ce' for 'c' has been suggested by Sircar and Jagannath.[253] Thus we see that the Padmā referred in line 5