

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BY H. LÜDERS, Ph.D.; ROSTOCK.

THE following notes, which I hope to continue from time to time, are a small contribution towards the reading and interpretation of the most ancient epigraphical records of India. For Nos. 6, 14, 22, and 23, I have been able to use a photograph kindly placed at my disposal by Prof. Kielhorn: on the margin is written, in Dr. Fleet's hand: — "Indo-Scythian stones which belonged to Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham;" and it shows the front sides of the stones which bear the inscriptions mentioned above, and two other stones with inscriptions which will be dealt with later on. Except for that, I have had no fresh materials to work at, such as impressions, rubbings or photographs, but have had to rely on the reproductions published in the *Archæological Survey Reports*, the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, the *Indian Antiquary* and the *Epigraphia Indica*. It is hardly necessary to point out that these reproductions are of very different value. Whereas the photo-lithographs in the *Epigraphia Indica* may be considered a fairly reliable base for a critical examination of the text, the reproductions published in the older works are of course more or less untrustworthy; and perhaps it will be wondered at that I should have commented at all on inscriptions of which only such imperfect copies were available. If nevertheless I have done so, this is largely due to an external reason. By advice of some friends interested in Indian epigraphy, and in analogy to the lists compiled by Prof. Kielhorn, I am preparing a list of the Indian inscriptions prior to about A. D. 400, which will contain also a short abstract of the contents of each inscription. It was chiefly in order to render this list as free from errors as possible, also with regard to inscriptions of the kind described above, that I have ventured at revising them and publishing the results in the present shape. I am fully aware that by a re-edition of these inscriptions most of my remarks will be superseded. The sooner this will happen, the better it will be, and I can only hope that the authorities of the Indian Museums, to whose care these precious documents of the ancient history of the country are entrusted, will find a way of making them accessible to scholars in a form satisfying modern requirements.

No. 1. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṃ. 4;

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II, p. 201, No. 11, and Plate.

The inscription is mutilated. The last words of the first line are transcribed by Bühler *Vajanagarit[ḥ śā]*. After *śā* another *akshara* is visible on the photo-lithograph, and there can be no doubt that *śā* is to be restored to *śākhātō*, although both the *śā* and the *kha* seem to have somewhat abnormal forms. The editor, however, was certainly wrong in transcribing the third *akshara* of the name of the *sākhā* by *ṇa*. As a comparison with the *na* in *śiṣini* in line 2, in *Grahachēṣṇa* and *Grahaddēṣṇa* in line 3 will easily show, it is really *na*. The straight vertical at the top of the letter is nothing but the *serif*, whereas the lingual *ṇa* has a slightly bent top-line; see the words *Vāraṇātō gaṇātō* in line 1. The spelling of the word *Vajanagaritō* would thus be quite the same as in another Mathurā inscription edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 387, No. 11.¹ But it is just possible that the actual reading is *Vājranagaritō*; in the photo-lithograph, at any rate, the first *akshara* looks exactly like the first *akshara* after the date which Bühler himself read *vā*, and the stroke below the *ja* can hardly be a second *ja*, as Bühler thought, but seems to be the beginning of a subscript *va*. However, these strokes may after all be merely accidental just as the stroke below the *na*, and an examination of the impression or of the stone itself would be necessary to settle this point.

Nos. 2 and 3. — Mathurā Jaina image inscriptions of Saṃ. 5 and 18;

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II, p. 201, No. 12, and p. 202, No. 14, and Plates.

The dates of these two inscriptions, which unfortunately are badly mutilated, read according to Bühler: . . . *ṣya va 5 gri 4 dī 5*, and . . . *sha 10 [8] va 2 dī 10 1*. Bühler considers the *va*

¹ In a third inscription also, *ibid.* p. 397, No. 34, we find *Vajanāgariyā śākhāyā* with the dental nasal.

of the first inscription to be an abbreviation of *varsha*, and remarks in a note that in the second inscription also *sha* perhaps ought to be restored to *varsha*. If these views should prove correct, the two inscriptions would stand quite alone, no other inscription of this period at Mathurá employing the word *varsha* instead of *sahvat* or *sahvatsara* in the date.

Under these circumstances it would not seem out of place to draw attention to the extreme precariousness of Bühler's readings. If the supposed *sha* of the second inscription is compared with the *sh* and the *s* of the word *Arishṭaṅṅmīya* in line 2 of the same text, it will be seen that in its left portion it far more resembles the *s* than the *sh*. The small horizontal stroke at the lower end of the right vertical, which alone gives the letter the appearance of a *sha*, may be accidental, especially as the engraving of the whole inscription is rather carelessly done.² *Sa*, of course, would stand for *sahvatsarē* as in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 395, No. 28; Vol. II. p. 201, No. 11; p. 202, No. 13, &c.

In the case of the first inscription Bühler's reading is even more objectionable. In my opinion there can be no doubt whatever that the *akshara* immediately before the numeral is *mē*. Before *mē* stands a ligature, the lower portion of which cannot be a subscript *ya*, because in that case the curve would be open to the right, but clearly is *cha*. We thus are led to read . . . *chamē* 5, which entails almost with necessity the restoration [*sahvatsarē pañ*]*chamē* 5. However, the upper portion of the ligature does not look much like a *ñā*,³ but it may very well be *pa*, and *pchamē* may be an abbreviation for *pañchamē*, just as *svatsarē* in the inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 384, No. 5, is an abbreviation for *sahvatsarē*. Other instances of this tachygraphic mode of writing in the Mathurá inscriptions are *Dēvatāyá* for *Dēvatāyá*, *Gupta Inscriptions* (Corp. Inscr. Ind. Vol. III.), p. 263, No. 63, and *sāha*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 9; *sāhi*, *ibid.* p. 392, No. 24; *sāham*,⁴ *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 206, No. 26, for *siddham*.

No. 4. — Mathurá Jaina image inscription of Saṁ. 5;

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 381, No. 1, and Plate.

Bühler read this inscription as follows :—

A. 1 dē[va]putrasya Ka[ni]shkasya saṁ 5 hē 1 di 1 étasya pūrva[ā]yaṁ
Kotṭiyātō gaṇātō Bahmadāsikā[tō]

2 [ku]lāto [U]chēnāgaritō śākhātō sēthi . iha . . sya . . i . . isēnasya saḥachari-
Khuḍāyē Dē[va] . . .

B. 1 pālasya dhi[ta]

2 Vadhamānasya prati[mā] ॥

A glance at the photo-lithograph will show that instead of *saḥachari* we have to read *saḥachari*. The same term is found in two other Mathurá inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 388, No. 11 (*Datisya śisīniyē Mahanandīsyā saḥachariyē Balavarmayē Nandāyē cha śisīniyē Akakayē nirvarttanā*), and Vol. II. p. 201, No. 11 (*Puśyamitrasya śisīni Sathīśihāyē śisīni Sīhamitrasya saḥachari . . .*), while its masculine counterpart appears in the form of *śraddhachara* or *śaḍhachara* in the Mathurá inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 4 (*bṛihantavāchaka cha gaṇīna cha Ja . . mitrasya aryya-Ōghasya śishya-gaṇīsyā aryya-Pālasya śraddhacharō vāchakasya aryya-Dattasya śishyō vāchako aryya-Sihā tosyā nirvarttanā*), p. 391, No. 21 (*vāchakasy-āryya-Hastahastīsyā śishyō gaṇīsyā aryya-Māghahastīsyā śraddhacharō vāchakasyā aryya-Dēvasya nirvarttanē*), and Vol. II. p. 203, No. 18 (*vāchakasy-āryya-Ghastuhastīsyā śishyō gaṇīsy-*

² Another instance of a *sa* closely resembling a *sha* is found in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, No. 19, where Bühler himself read *étasya*.

³ The letter *ñā* occurs twice at Mathurá, in the inscription edited below, No. 23, and in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 210, No. 38, which Bühler refers to the Gupta period.

⁴ Bühler considers the sign which I read *m*, to belong to the next line and transcribes it by *va*, but this, at any rate, is impossible. Compare the *siddham* in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 206, No. 27, where the *m* is put below the *dhā* in exactly the same manner. For a doubtful case, see Bühler, *ibid.* p. 209, note 7.

dryya-Mahguhastisya sadhacharô vâchakô aryya-Dêvô tasya⁶ nirvartand). It will be noticed that in all these passages the *sadhachari* and the *śraddhachara* is further specified as the pupil of some monk, and this holds good in the present case also, the photo-lithograph leaving no doubt that the word before *Sênasya* is to be restored to *śisîni*. Between *śâkhâtô* and *śisîni* there are six *aksharas*, the first two of which are distinctly *sêthi*. The next two seem to be *niha*, the fifth is quite illegible, and the last is certainly *syâ*, so that the whole may be transcribed as *sêthi[niha]* . . *syâ*. For two reasons it appears to me quite impossible that *sêthi* should have any connection with Sanskrit *śrêshthîn* or a derivative of it, as Bühler thought.⁶ Firstly, Sk. *śrêshthîn* cannot possibly become *sêthi* with a dental *th* in any Prakrit dialect. Secondly, a woman who is characterised as the *śisîni* of some male person and the *sadhachari* of another, must have been a nun, as in the Jaina inscriptions at Mathurâ these terms are applied to nuns only and never to lay-sisters. Now it goes without saying that a nun cannot be called a *śrêshthîni*, 'the wife of a banker.' As far as I see, there are two possibilities of explaining the passage. We have to read either *Sêthi[niha]* . . *syâ śisîni*, in which case *Sêthi[niha]* . . would be the name of Khuḍâ's teacher, or *sêthi[ni Ha]* . . *syâ śisîni*, in which case *sêthîni* would be an epithet of unknown meaning referring to Khuḍâ, while the teacher's name would be Ha . .

At the end of A, after *Khuḍâyê*, Bühler reads *Dêva* . . , and combining this with the beginning of B, *pâlasya dhita*, translates: 'by Khuḍâ, daughter of Dêva . . pâla.' Such a statement would be highly improbable by itself, no other Jaina inscription of this class at Mathurâ containing a specification of the relationship of a monk or a nun. And on closer inspection it will be seen that the reading *Dêva* . . cannot be upheld. The first *akshara* is not *dê*, but a *ni*, with the left half of the base-stroke effaced, and the second *akshara* is not *va*, but clearly *rva*. After *nirva* the photo-lithograph has a distinct *ta*, possibly with a superscript *r*. *Nirva[r]ta*, of course, is to be restored to *nirvartanâ*, the last letter in the line having disappeared as in the preceding one.⁷ It thus appears that the donation was made by a lay-woman, the daughter of Pâla, and that the nun Khuḍâ only acted as her spiritual adviser, which in every respect agrees with the usual state of things.

There remain some minor points. The second *akshara* of the name of the king is a little blurred, but what is still visible of it in the photo-lithograph decidedly points to its having been *vi*, and not *ni*. There is altogether no certain instance of the spelling of the word with the dental nasal at Mathurâ. In the two inscriptions edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 391, No. 19, and by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III, p. 31, No. 4,⁸ the reading *Kaṇishkasya* is beyond all doubt, and in the one edited by Cunningham, *ibid.* No. 5, the facsimile at any rate shows distinctly the same reading.⁹

In the last line of the inscription Bühler seems to have overlooked the *d*-stroke in the *vd*, which is quite distinct in the photo-lithograph.¹⁰ On the other hand, I am unable to detect the *d*-stroke in *md*.

With these emendations the text will run as follows:—

A. 1¹¹ Dêvaputrasya Ka[ni]shkasya sa[m] 5 hê 1 di 1 êtasya pûrvv[â]yam Kottiyâtô
gaṇâtô Bahmadâsikâtô [ku]-
2 lâto [U]chênagaritô śâkhâtô Sêthi[niha] . . sya śi[ś]ini Sênasya sadhachari
Khuḍâyê nirva[r]ta[nâ]

⁶ See below, No. 16.

⁷ In his translation of the inscription he calls Khuḍâ 'consort of alderman (*sêthi*) sênâ.'

⁸ There is no reason why the *ku* should have stood at the beginning of line 2, as assumed by Bühler.

⁹ See below, p. 37, No. 6.

¹⁰ See below, No. 25.

¹¹ The reading *Vâdhamânasya* is found also in the inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 393, No. 27, though Bühler gives *Vâdhamânasya* in his transcript.

¹² Bühler wants to restore *siddhant* in the beginning of the inscription, but no traces of the word are discernible.

- B. 1 Pālasya dhita ya ū¹²
 2 Vādhmanasya prati[mā]

"In the year 5 of Dēvaputra Kaṇiṣhka, in the first (*month of*) winter, on the first day, — on that (*date specified as*) above, — an image of Vādhmana (*Vardhamāna*) [was dedicated by] . . . the daughter of Pāla, the daughter-in-law of . . . , at the request of Khuḍā (*Kshudrā*), the *śadhachari* of Sēna, the female pupil of Sēthiniha . . .¹³ out of the Koṭṭiya gaṇa, the Bahmadāsika (*Brahmadāsika kula*, the Uchēnāgari (*Uchchāndyari*) śākhā."

No. 5. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṃ. 5;

edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 30, No. 2, and Plate.

Cunningham read this inscription, which is engraved on three sides of the pedestal of a Jaina statue: —

1. — . . Bodila bhedha Vāsu Devā pravi . . Siddhah Sam 5 — He 1 — Di. 12 —
 Asya purvaye koṭ . . Sragihato
 2. — Sarvvasatwāhita Sukhaya . . . ji-to Brahmadāsika to ubhāna karita . . . Sati.

Cunningham added no translation to his transcript, but simply stated that the inscription 'records some gift by a lady named Brahmadāsi.' In his re-examination of the inscription in the *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. I. p. 176, Bühler, with the help of a rubbing, corrected the reading of the middle portion of the first line to *siddha = sa 5 hē 1 di 10 2 asyā purvāyē Koṭ[iya]*, and justly remarked that the sides had been wrongly numbered, and that the second ought to be the first, the third the second, and the first the third. And in Vol. IV. p. 171 of the same journal he corrected also the middle portion of the second line to *[ku]ḍitō Brahmadāsikātō Uchānākaritō*. This last correction admits of a little improvement. If Bühler's reading were accepted, the word *kula* would stand before the proper name to which it belongs, whereas in all other inscriptions it invariably follows the proper name. And Bühler himself seems to have been not quite sure of his reading, as he thinks it necessary to observe that the *la* is slightly disfigured on the facsimile. The facsimile, however, shows as plainly as possible a *nā*, and not a *lā*, and there can be no doubt that *nātō* is to be restored to *gaṇātō*. The word *gaṇātō* must have immediately followed *Koṭ[iya]*[*yātō*], the name of the *gaṇa*, and this proves that Cunningham has wrongly numbered not only the sides, but also the lines on each side. The first line of the first side is followed by the second line of the same side, after which comes the first line of the second side, &c. The whole inscription reads:—¹⁴

- A. 1 Siddha[m] || Sa 5 hē 1 di 10 2 asy[ā] purvv[ā]yē Koṭ[t]i[yātō]
 2 [ga]ṇātō Brahmadāsikātō Uch[ē]nakā[ka]ritō [śākhātō]
 B. 1 'Sr[i]grihātō sa[m]bhōgātō]
 2 . . sa niḍa (?)
 C. 1 . . . i bōdhilabhē ē Vāsudēvā puvī
 2 . . sarva-sat[vā]na[m] h[i]ta-sukh[ā]yē .

In this arrangement the general wording of the inscription in no way differs from the usual pattern. After the date follows the statement of the *gaṇa*, *kula* and *śākhā* of the monk at whose request the donation was made, and the phrase that it was made for the benefit of all beings, forms the conclusion. The only peculiarity of this inscription is the omission of the word *kulātō* after *Brahmadāsikātō*, which, undoubtedly, is due to a mere oversight of the engraver. The middle

¹² Restore *ya vadhā*.

¹³ Or, possibly, 'the *sēthini* (?) the female pupil of Ha . . .'

¹⁴ All signs which do not appear in the facsimile, but may be inferred from a comparison with the numerous similar inscriptions at Mathurā, have been included in brackets. The *nā* which Bühler reads in *Uchānākaritō* is not warranted by the facsimile. On the other hand, the facsimile has distinctly *hā*, although, of course, the *ā*-stroke may be merely accidental.

portion, which contains the name of the donor, cannot be made out from the facsimile.¹⁵ The rest may be translated as follows : —

“Success! The year 5, the first (*month of*) winter, the twelfth day, on that (*date specified as*) above, [at the request of] out of the Koṭṭiya gaṇa, the Brahmādāsika [*kula*], the Uchēnakari (*Uchchādnāgari*) śākhā, the Srīgrīha (*Srīgrīha*) saṃbhōga, for the welfare and happiness of all creatures.”

No. 6. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṃ. 9 ;
edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 31, No. 4, and Plate,
and by Bühler, *Vienna Orient. Journ.* Vol. I. p. 173, No. 2.

Bühler's restoration of this inscription is excellent, and his text only wants a few small corrections. The photograph of the front side of the stone lent to me by Prof. Kielhorn shows that the reading of the king's name actually is *Kaṇishkasya* as in the facsimile, with the lingual ṇ. The facsimile, again, has clearly the correct form *gaṇātō*, not *gaṇatō*, and . . . *lāta*, which is to be restored to *kuḷātō*, not *kuḷatō*. Of more importance is the reading of the name of the *kula*. Bühler transcribed Cunningham's facsimile as *tanibha* . . . , and, misled by the corrupt form *Vāṇijja* of the *Kalpasūtra*, corrected this to *Vāṇiyātō*. The facsimile, however, shows very distinctly a *tha* under the supposed *ta*. We are thus led to read *T'hānyātō*, and although such a form would not be unaccountable in itself, I consider it unlikely, because the name is nowhere else spelt in this way, but exhibits in its beginning either *sth* (*St'hānyātō*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 385, No. 7 ; p. 391, No. 21 ; *St'hānikīyō*, *ibid.* p. 386, No. 8, *et* (*St'hānikīyātō*, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 203, No. 18).¹⁶ or *th* (*T'hānyātō*, *ibid.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 3 ; p. 392, No. 22 ; *T'hānyātō*, *ibid.* p. 395, No. 28 ; *T'hānyātō*, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 202, No. 15). Under these circumstances I think it more probable that the *t* is merely due to a fault of the designer, and that the real reading was *St'hānyātō*.

No. 7. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṃ. 25 ;
edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 384, No. 5, and Plate.

Bühler read the second portion of this inscription, after the statement of the *nirvartana* : —

(I. B. 2) . . . [Nā]dia[rī]ta Jabha[ka]sya vadhu Jaya[bha]ṭṭasya kumṭūbinīya Rayaginiye [vu]suya

and translated : “ a *vusuya* (?) (*was dedicated*) by Rayagini, the daughter-in-law of Jabhaka, from Nāndigiri (?), (*and*) wife of Jayabhaṭṭa.”

The photo-lithograph allows us to correct the first word with absolute certainty. Instead of *ari* the plate shows distinctly *syadhi*. The reading *Nādisya dhita* is quite in accordance with the common practice of these inscriptions to describe the relationship of the donatrix in the order ‘daughter of N. N., daughter-in-law of N. N., wife of N. N.’ ; see, *e. g.*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 382, No. 2 ; p. 383, No. 4 ; p. 388, No. 11 ; Vol. II. p. 207, No. 32 ; p. 210, No. 37, &c. The town of Nāndigiri therefore is to be struck out from the list of the towns of Ancient India.

Also with regard to the translation of the words *rayaginiye vusuya* I differ from Bühler. I think, it will be admitted that *rayagini* has not the appearance of being a proper name, and I would suggest to take it as an appellative in the sense of ‘the wife of a *rayaga*,’ in analogy to such terms as *rihārasēdminī*, ‘the wife of a *rihārasēdmin*’ (*Gupta Inscr.*, Corp. Inscr. Ind. Vol. III. p. 263), *mahāsēdpatinī*, ‘the wife of a *mahāsēdpati*’ (*Arch. Surv. West. Ind.* Vol. IV. p. 114, No. 16), *sartavāhīnī*, ‘the wife of a *sārtharādhā*’ (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 395, No. 23).¹⁷ *Rayaga* would be the true Prakrit equivalent of Sk. *rajaka*, ‘washerman or dyer.’¹⁸ Other members of the artisan class

¹⁵ Perhaps line B. 2 is to be restored to *śya nirva[rtana]*.

¹⁶ See below, No. 16.

¹⁷ Compare also the similarly formed feminines *śiśinī*, *śiśinī*, *śiśinī*, *śiśinī* (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 2 ; p. 384, No. 5 ; p. 385, No. 7 ; p. 388, No. 12 ; Vol. II. p. 206, No. 28, &c.) and *antīvāsīkīnī* (*ibid.* Vol. II. p. 204, No. 21).

¹⁸ The transition of *j* into *y* is found in the Mathurā inscriptions also in *Whavāṇiya* (Sk. *Whavāṇija*), *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 4.

are found among the donors of images in the Mathurá inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 391, No. 21; Vol. II. p. 203, No. 18; p. 205, No. 23.¹⁹

If it is admitted that *rayagini* is an appellative noun, it follows that the proper name must be contained in the following word which Bühler read *vusuya*. The ending *-uya* indicates that the word is the gen. sing. of an *ú*-stem, which in these inscriptions generally ends in *-uyé*, and occasionally in *-úyé* or *úya*; compare *vadhuyé*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 10; p. 392, No. 24; p. 396, No. 30; Vol. II. p. 207, No. 32; and *vadhúyé*, Vol. I. p. 388, No. 11; *vadhúya*, Vol. II. p. 205, No. 22. That the spelling *-uya* is not found hitherto, is certainly merely accidental, as the *á*- and *í*-stems show the corresponding forms in *-aya*, *-iya* by the side of the common forms in *-áyé*, *-ayé*, *-iyé*, *-iyé*; compare *aya-Saṅgamikaya śiśiniya*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 388, No. 12; *Jitámitraya*, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 203, No. 16; *Déviya*, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 210, No. 37. More difficult is the settling of the first syllable of the name. It would seem easy enough to correct *Vusuya* into *Vasuya*, especially as the diminutive *Vasuld* actually occurs as a woman's name in the Mathurá inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 322, No. 2, and p. 388, No. 12, but the photograph does not seem to countenance such an alteration, and for the present it will perhaps be safest to rest satisfied with Bühler's reading.

There is still another point to command attention. Bühler thought *vusuya* to be the last word of the inscription; in my own interpretation one more word would be required to furnish the necessary supplement of the genitive *Vusuya*. Now, the photograph shows distinctly the upper part of the word *dānaṃ* below the syllables *gaṇa* in the beginning of line B. 2.

I therefore propose to read the second portion of the inscription:—

B. 2 Nādisya dhita Jabha[ka]sya vadhu Jaya[bhaṭṭa]sya kuṃṭūbiniya²⁰
 rayaginiyē²¹ [Vu]suya
 3 [dānaṃ]

and translate:—

“. . . the gift of Vusu (?), the wife of a dyer, the daughter of Nādi (*Nandin*), the daughter-in-law of Jabhaka, the wife of Jayabhaṭṭa.”

No. 8. — Mathurá stone inscription of Sañ. 28 ;
 edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 217, No. 1, and Plate.

As far as I see, it is generally assumed that Kapishka's reign extended until the year 28 of the era used in the northern inscriptions, and that in the following year he was succeeded by Huvishka. The evidence for these suppositions is chiefly derived from the inscription quoted above. In dealing with the intricate questions of the history of this period the greatest amount of exactness and discretion is indispensable, and it therefore seems to me not superfluous to point out that the assumption of the year 28 being the final year of Kapishka's reign is not only wholly unfounded, but in all probability actually wrong.

The latest reliable date of Kapishka is the year 18 in the Mānikyāla inscription (*Journ. As. Ser. IX.* Vol. VII. p. 8); the first indisputable record referring to Huvishka is a Mathurá inscription dated in Sañ. 33 (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 217, No. 2). It is true, there is another inscription at Mathurá (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 206, No. 26) mentioning the *mahārāja* Dēvaputra Huksha as he is called here, and supposed to be dated in the year 29, but the inscription is in a pitifully fragmentary state, and even if the reading *śkunati[śu]* should prove correct, it would still be quite uncertain whether this word should be taken as referring to the number of the year or, *e. g.*, of the day, so that for historical purposes the record is of no account. Of even less consequence is the Mathurá inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 385, No. 6, the date of which reads *mahārāja śhkaśa soṃ 20 9 hē 2 di 30 asma kshuṇē*. No trace has been left of the *aksharas* preceding *śhkaśa*, and these syllables may be restored to [Kaṇi]śhkaśa as well as to [Hwi]śhkaśa. The state

¹⁹ Compare Bühler's remarks, *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. IV. p. 324.

²⁰ Or, perhaps, *kuṃṭūbiniya*.

²¹ Also the readings *rayaginiyē* or *rayaginiyē* would be possible.

of things is very similar in the case of the inscription of Sañ. 28. It is only a very short fragment which reads : —

... shkasya rājya-sa[m]vatsarē 20 8 hēnanta 3 di . . .

Here, too, there is no reason whatever why *shkasya* should necessarily be restored to [Kaṇi]shkasya. The restoration [Hui]shkasya or [Hu]shkasya would suit equally well, to say the least, and there is even one little point to recommend the last-mentioned reading as the most plausible one. Before *shkasya* the photo-lithograph distinctly shows the remains of a letter, consisting of a stroke slightly bent to the right. It cannot possibly be the rest of a *ni* or *ṇi*, nor is it likely to be the lower end of the vertical of a *ka*, because this is generally either straight, or, on the contrary, turned to the left. It looks exactly like a subscript *u* and therefore [Hu]shkasya, which closely resembles the *Hukshasya* of the inscription mentioned above, appears to me the most probable reading. Of course, in that case we should have to read [Hui]shkasya also in the inscription of Sañ. 29. But until fresh materials are brought to light, I would myself not attach too much weight to these restorations, and I shall be satisfied with having shown that, as far as our evidence goes at present, we can safely claim only the years 5-18 for Kaṇishka and 33-60 for Huihshka, though the latter probably was on the throne already in 28.²²

No. 9. — Mathurā Buddhist image inscription of Sañ. 33 ;

edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 217, No. 2, and Plate.

Although this inscription seems to be in a fair state of preservation, the editor has not succeeded in making out more of it than the date and the *aksharas bhikshusya . . . hasya . . . takasya Buddhasya*. He tells us besides that Cunningham took the word ending in *takasya* to be *tripitakasya*. Unfortunately the reproduction of the inscription on the accompanying plate is on so small a scale as to make a complete deciphering of the text almost impossible. As far as I can see, the text runs : —

1 Mahār[ā]jasya dēvaputrasya Huv[ī]shkasya sañ 30 3 grī 1 di 8 bhikshusya [Maha]sya trēpiṭakasya antēv[ā]s[i]n[ī]yē bhikshu[ṇ]i[yē] trē[piṭikā]yē Buddha . . . yē
2 bhāginēyiyē bhi[kshu]ṇiyē Dha . . . niyē Bōdhisat[ṭv]ō p[ṛ]atithā[p]i[tō]
. . . sahā mātāpitihi

"In the year 33 of *mahārāja* Dēvaputra Huihshka, in the first (*month of*) summer, on the eighth day, a Bōdhisattva was set up by the nun Dha . . . ni, the sister's daughter²³ of the nun Buddha . . . who knew the *tripitaka*, the female pupil of the monk Maha (?) who knew the *tripitaka*, . . . together with her father and mother."

The reading of the *bhikshu's* name, *Mahasya*, is very doubtful. On the other hand the restoration of *trē yē* to *trēpiṭikāyē* seems to me pretty certain, though, of course, it cannot be asserted that this was the exact form of the word.²⁴ The term *trēpiṭaka* or Sk. *traiṭiṭaka* is found again in a Kanheri inscription²⁵ and in the Set-Mahet inscription mentioned below, and nuns who were versed in the three *piṭakas* are spoken of also in the *Dīpaṅkṣa*, XV III. 13 ; 19 ; 33.

This inscription is of considerable importance for the history of Buddhist art. There are comparatively very few ancient Buddhist statues with inscriptions accurately stating the character of the represented person. In his valuable paper on an ancient inscribed Buddhistic statue from Srāvastī,²⁶ Dr. Bloch has collected all the cases known to him. He enumerates five inscriptions in which the figure is called an image of *Buddha*, of *Sāstri*, of *Bhagavat*, of *Bhagavat Sālyamuni*, or of

²² I would here acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Fleet for some of the above suggestions. He drew my attention to the improbability of the reading [Kaṇi]shkasya in the inscription of Sañ. 28. But he differs from me in the final restoration of the word.

²³ Compare the Kuṇḍ inscription No. 5 (*Cave-Temple Inscriptions*, No. 10 of the brochures of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, p. 6), where a Buddhist nun is described as the *bhāginēyī* of two monks.

²⁴ It may have been also *trēpiṭakāyē*, *trēpiṭakīyē* or *trēpiṭakintīyē*.

²⁵ *Arch. Surv. Rep. W. Ind.* Vol. V. p. 77, No. 6. ²⁶ *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.* Vol. LXVII. Part I. p. 274 ff.

Bhagavat samyak-sambuddha sva-mat-āviruddha, and two — an inscription from Buddhagayā²⁷ and the Set-Mahet inscription which forms the special subject of the paper — where the statue is described as that of a Bōdhisattva. To the latter class the present inscription is to be added.

A detailed comparison of the three Bōdhisattva statues is impossible for the present, as no photographs or drawings are available either of the Set-Mahet or of the Mathurā image, and Mr. Growse's remarks, moreover, are rather brief, yet I should like to draw attention to the following points. According to the statements of Growse, Bloch and Cunningham, the three figures are all of the same material. The Mathurā statue is 'in red sandstone,' the Set-Mahet statue is 'made of a sort of reddish sandstone, the same material which the Mathurā sculptures of the Kushāṇa period are made of,' and the stone of which the Gayā statue is made is 'a sandstone like that of Mathurā, and not from a local quarry.' In size also the three figures seem to be similar. The seated Gayā figure is 3' 9" high by 3' 1" in breadth across the knees; the standing Set-Mahet figure is 11' 8" in height; for the Mathurā figure no exact measurements are given, but Mr. Growse speaks of a 'large' figure. Besides the three statues apparently agreed in attitude. Of the Mathurā figure only the crossed legs remain, which show — to use Mr. Growse's own words — that 'the left hand of the figure had rested on the left thigh, the right being probably raised in an attitude of admonition.'²⁸ The Gayā figure is a little better preserved. Of the left arm only the upper portion is left, but its direction and remains of the hand, distinctly visible on the phototype, prove that it originally rested on the left thigh. The right arm is entirely gone, but from the absence of any marks on the body or the right thigh it may be safely concluded that it was raised up without touching the body. The Set-Mahet statue also has lost the right arm, but Dr. Bloch remarks that 'we may fairly well conclude from the analogy of similar statues that the missing right arm of the figure was represented lifted up in an attitude which is usually called that of "teaching," while the left hand rested on the hip, holding up the end of the long vestment.' Whether the Mathurā figure also had the right shoulder bare like the other two figures, cannot be decided. There would thus seem to be only one point of difference: the Mathurā and Gayā figures are seated, whereas the Set-Mahet figure is standing.

The close resemblance between the three statues sufficiently shows in my opinion that they are the work of the same school of sculptors, and that they cannot be very widely separated from each other in time. Probably the Set-Mahet figure is the oldest, as Dr. Bloch describes the characters of the inscription as belonging to the Northern Kshatrapa type. The Gayā figure, on the other hand, is certainly the latest of the three, though perhaps not so much later than the others as Dr. Bloch seems to think. At any rate, the advanced form of the *sa* in the Gayā inscription, which he takes as a criterion for its late origin, is found also in the Mathurā inscription; compare *mahārājasya dēvayutrasya* and *saṃ*.²⁹

Considering the scantiness of the evidence, the question which particular Bōdhisattva is represented by the three statues cannot be touched at present. But whether they be meant for Maitrēya or one of the numerous other Bōdhisattvas, they certainly bear witness to the wide spread of the Mahāyānist Bōdhisattva worship during the first century of our era.

No. 10. — Mathurā Jaina elephant capital inscription of Saṃ. 38;

edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 32, No. 9, and Plates V. and XIV.,
and by Bloch, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. LXVII. Part I. p. 276, note 2.

This inscription is engraved on the base of the large figure of an elephant surmounting the bell capital of a pillar, and records the setting up of a *Nandivīsāla* by the *śrēṣṭhin* Rudradāsa, the son of the *śrēṣṭhin* Śivadāsa, for the worship of the Arhats. The last phrase characterises the donor as a member of the Jaina community.

²⁷ Cunningham, *Mahābōdhi*, p. 53, and Plate XXV.

²⁸ Mr. Growse adds that another mutilated figure of similar character, but without inscription, was found on the same spot, and that these were the only specimens he had with the hands in this position, in all the others the hands being crossed over the feet.

²⁹ A more detailed examination of the Gayā inscription I reserve to some future occasion.

The only word in this inscription which presents any difficulty, is *Nandivísála*. Cunningham translated it by 'this elephant (or great Nandi);' in Dr. Bloch's opinion it may mean that the pillar was 'as big as Nandin,' or it may be a technical term of unknown meaning. None of these suggestions seems plausible to me. *Nandivísála* can hardly be an appellative with the meaning of elephant, nor can it be rendered by 'the great Nandin,' as this would be *visálo Nandi* in the language of the inscription, and Nandin, moreover, is the name of Siva's bull and not of an elephant. Against Dr. Bloch's view it may be urged that it would scarcely be appropriate to compare the circumference of a pillar to that of a fabulous bull, and that such a fanciful comparison, at any rate, would be out of place in a record which for the rest is as dry and laconic as possible.

The placing of the inscription immediately below the elephant makes it highly probable, I think, that it has a special reference to that figure, and that *Nandivísála* therefore is the proper name of the elephant represented in the sculpture, and not a technical term for a sort of pillars. What makes me believe in the correctness of this interpretation, although I am unable to point out an elephant of that name in Jaina literature, is the fact that *Nandivísála* occurs as an animal's name in the Pali canon of the Buddhists. In the *Suttavibhanga*, Pách. II. 1, the Buddha tells a story of a bull at Takkasilá who could draw a hundred loaded carts, and the name of this extraordinary animal is given as *Nandivísála*. The same story was made up into a *Játaka* (No. 28), called the *Nandivísálajátaka* after the name of its hero who is identified here with the Master in a former birth. In the present limited state of our knowledge about the Jaina *Nandivísála*, it would be quite unsafe and useless, of course, to enlarge on his possible relation to his Buddhist namesake. But the name itself is of interest as proving the existence of Saivism in the fourth century B. C., for it seems to me beyond any doubt that the etymological meaning of the name is 'as big as (Siva's bull) Nandin,' and not 'Great-Joy,' as translated by Mr. Chalmers.³⁰

³⁰ *Játaka*, transl. under the editorship of E. B. Cowell, Vol. I. p. 71. From the appellation *Nandivísála* and the donor's and his father's name in the Mathurá inscription Dr. Bloch draws the conclusion that 'Jainism apparently already in those early times was as much mixed up with Saivism as its greater rival Buddhism.' Perhaps this assertion goes a little too far. Rudradása may have been a convert from Saivism to Jainism which would satisfactorily account for his name, and if my explanation of *Nandivísála* should be accepted, this name would presuppose the knowledge of Siva's *váhana*, but in no way as an integral part of the Jaina religion.