

## EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BY H. LÜDERS, Ph.D.; ROSTOCK.

(Continued from page 41.)

**No. 11. — Mathurā Buddhist inscription on base of pillar of Sam. 47;**  
 edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 127, No. 1, and Plate;  
 by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc. New Ser.* Vol. V. p. 182, No. 1, and Plate;  
 by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 33, No. 12, and Plate.

CUNNINGHAM'S transcript of this inscription, which is engraved round the base of a pillar, is on the whole correct. It differs, however, from the facsimiles in reading *Dēvapūtrasya Hūvishkasya* and *sukham*, for which the facsimiles distinctly show *Dēvapūtrasya, Hūvishkasya* and *sūkha[m]*. The form of the king's name with the long vowel is found also in the Bombay University Library inscription edited by D. R. Bhandarkar in the *Journ. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc.* Vol. XX. p. 269.

Another difference between the transcript and the facsimiles occurs in the description of the donor. Cunningham, following Dowson, read *bhikshusya Jivakasya Udeyanakasya*,<sup>31</sup> but if there is any trust to be placed in the facsimiles, the last word is really *Ōḍīyanakasya*. As Jivaka is said to have been a monk, *Ōḍīyanaka* cannot be a term denoting a caste or profession, but most probably is the name of some nation or tribe and corresponds to a true Sk. *Auḍīyanaka*, a derivative of *Uḍīyana*. I am unable to point out such a name in the earlier Sanskrit or Prakrit literature. But perhaps it is connected with *Uḍḍiyāna*, mentioned after Sindhu, Saurāshṭra and Pāñchāla in a list of different countries in the *Srīsharḍyaṇa*, a portion of the *Rōmakasiddhānta*.<sup>32</sup>

With these corrections and some changes in the transliteration Cunningham's text runs as follows:<sup>33</sup> —

Sam 40 7 grī 4 di 4 mahārājasya rājātirājasya Dēvapūtrasya Hūvishkasya vihārē dānaṁ bhikshusya Jivakasya Ōḍīyanakasya ku[m]bhako 20 5 sarvva-satva-hita-sūkha[m] bhavatu sa[m]ghē ch[ā]turdisē.<sup>34</sup>

"In the year 47, the fourth (*month of*) summer, the fourth day. Gift of the monk Jivaka, the Ōḍīyanaka (*native of Uḍīyana* ?), to the *vihāra* of *mahārāja rājātirāja* Dēvaputra Hūvishka. Base of pillar 25. May welfare and happiness of all beings prevail in the community belonging to the four quarters.<sup>35</sup>"

**No. 12. — Mathurā Buddhist inscription on base of pillar of Sam. 47;**  
 edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 130, No. 18, and Plate.

Of this inscription Rajendralala Mitra offered the following text: —

Datana ra sara (44 ?) divasa 5 prabu(?)ddhāya dānaṁ bhikshusya Dhammadattasya.

Unsatisfactory as the facsimile is, it makes it pretty certain that the true reading is: —

Saṁvatsarē 40 7 va . divasē 5 asya purvvayē dānaṁ bhikshusya Dharmmadēvasya.<sup>36</sup>

"In the year 47, in the . . . (*month*) of the rainy season, on the fifth day, — on that (*date specified as*) above — the gift of the monk Dharmmadēva."

<sup>31</sup> Rajendralala Mitra read *bhikshu Jivakasya Ōḍīyanakasya* in the text and 'the mendicant (Bhikshu) Jivaka Uḍīyanaka' in the translation.

<sup>32</sup> Aufrecht, *Cat. Cod. Sanscr. Bibl. Bodl.* p. 340.

<sup>33</sup> The bracketed letters are not visible in the facsimiles. The third *ā* in *rājātirājasya* is distinct in Dowson's facsimile.

<sup>34</sup> Cunningham read *chaturdisē*.

<sup>35</sup> With regard to this term compare the remarks of Mr. Senart, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. VII. p. 59 f.

<sup>36</sup> The *va* of the last word looks more like *ta*, but this is the case also in the preceding inscription where the reading undoubtedly is *Dharmmadēvasya*.

With the exception of the date of the month, this text would be identical with that of the Mathurā pillar inscription edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *ibid.* No. 17, by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 5, and by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 33, No. 11. It reads according to Cunningham's facsimile: —

Samvatsarē 40 7 gri 3 divas[ē] 5 asya purvvyayē dānaṁ bhikshusya Dharmmadēvasya.

It cannot be denied that the close agreement of the two inscriptions is rather suspicious and apt to lead to the supposition that the *va* in Rajendralala Mitra's facsimile is merely a mistaken *gri*, and the whole facsimile nothing but a second copy of Cunningham's No. 11 and his own No. 17. On the other hand, Rajendralala Mitra expressly states that the originals of both inscriptions were deposited in the Museum of the Asiatic Society, and it is not impossible, after all, that Dharmadēva presented more than one pillar and at different times.

**No. 13. — Mathurā inscription on base of pillar of Sam. 47;**  
edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 127, No. 2, and Plate;  
by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 2, and Plate;  
by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 13, and Plate.

Rajendralala Mitra's transcript of this inscription reads: —

Dānaṁ Dēvilisya Dadhikarṇadēvikulikasya sam 59 divasa 80.

Dowson reads: —

Dānaṁ Devilasya Dadhikarṇa-devi-kulikasya Sam 40 7 gri 4 Divas 20 5.

Cunningham reads: —

Dānaṁ Devilasya Dadhikundi . . Devikulikasya, Sam. 47, — Gr. — 4, Divase 25.

To judge from the facsimiles published together with the three editions, the actual reading appears to be: —

Dānaṁ Dēvilasya Dadhikarṇadēvikulikasya sam 40 7 gri 4 divasē 20 9.

There is some doubt attached to the last figure of the date which, as Dowson remarks, is partly defaced. The *ī* of the *akshara vi* in *°dēvikulikasya* is quite distinct in the facsimiles of Rajendralala Mitra and Cunningham, but wanting in that given by Dowson. As, however, the latter also reads *vi* in his transcript, I think it almost certain that it is really found in the text.

With regard to the purport of the inscription my three predecessors substantially agree in considering it to record 'the gift of Devila of the race (or of the family) of Dadhikarṇadēvi.' There are two objections to this translation. Firstly, Dadhikarṇadēvi would be a name unparalleled in the Mathurā inscriptions, and secondly, there is no other instance of a man being described in this way as belonging to the family of some woman. In my opinion Dadhikarṇadēvikulika means 'the servant (or priest) at the shrine of Dadhikarṇa.' Dadhikarṇa is the name of some Nāga, and we know from an inscription edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 390, No. 18, that there was a shrine or temple dedicated to him at Mathurā. That inscription records the setting up of a stone slab '*bhagavatō nāgēndrasya Dadhikarṇasya stānē*,' and although Bühler translated this 'in the place sacred to the divine lord of snakes Dadhikarṇa,' he added himself that *stāna*, which stands for Sk. *sthāna*, might also mean 'temple.' The word *dēvikulika* is derived from *dēvakula*, and in correct Sanskrit ought to show *vriddhi*-strengthening of the first syllable. The *ī* of the second syllable is striking, but an exact parallel is furnished by the Mathurā inscription edited by Bhagvanlal Indraji in the *Actes du Sizième Congrès International des Orientalistes à Leide*, Part III. p. 143, where the drawing plainly shows the words *drāhatā dēvikulā*, 'a shrine for the Arhats.' Similar instances of the transition of *a* into *ī* will be found in Prof. Pischel's *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, par. 101-103.

I translate the whole inscription: —

"The gift of Dēvila, the servant (or priest) at the shrine of Dadhikarṇa in the year 47, in the fourth (month of) summer, on the twenty-ninth day."

This and the inscription mentioned above are valuable evidence of the great antiquity of serpent-worship in India, although unfortunately neither of them contains any hint as to the creed which the worshippers of Dadhikarṇa at Mathurā professed. That Dadhikarṇa is invoked in the *āhnika mantra* of the *Harivashā*, was pointed out already by Bühler, *loc. cit.* p. 381. It may be added that his name is also found in a list of Nāgas quoted by Hémachandra in his own commentary on the *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi*, verse 1311.

No. 14. — Mathurā Jaina stone inscription of Saṅh. 48;  
edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 15, and Plate.

Cunningham read this short fragment: —

- 1 Mahārājasya Huvishkasya Saṅh. 48 — He. 4 — Di. 5
- 2 Bama Dāsayakula ukonasaya Siviya dharā.

The photograph of the stone belonging to Prof. Kielhorn shows that the true reading is:—

- 1 Mahārājasya Huvishkasya sa 40 8 hē 4 di 5
- 2 Bramadāsīyē kul[ē] U[ch]énāgariya śākhaya<sup>37</sup> Dhar. . .

The only difficult letter is the ninth of the second line. There can be little doubt that it is meant for *chē*, and that the tail at the base is merely accidental, but it is easy to see how Cunningham came to read *kē*. The Brahmadāsika *kula* and the Uchchānāgari *śākhā* are mentioned together in numerous Mathurā inscriptions; see, *e. g.*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 381, No. 1; p. 383, No. 4; p. 384, No. 5; p. 389, No. 14, &c.

No. 15. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṅh. 40;<sup>38</sup>  
edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 11, and Plate.

Bühler read in line C.1 *āryya-Haṭṭikiyatō kulatō*, but the second *akshara* of the name is wrong. It cannot be *ṭi*, because the curve denoting medial *i* is always open to the left, whereas this sign, on the contrary, shows a curve open to the right. The *akshara* is therefore to be read *ṭa*, and, leaving aside the short vowel of the first syllable, the spelling *Haṭṭakiya* agrees with that of two other Mathurā inscriptions edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 201, No. 11 (*āryya-Haṭṭakiyatō<sup>39</sup> kulatō*), and Vol. I. p. 397, No. 34 (*āya-Haṭṭiyē kulē*).

The last three lines, which contain the description of the donatrix and her gift, are transcribed by Bühler as follows:—

- A. 3 — [sya] dhitu grami[ka]-Jayadēvasya vadhūyē
- B. 3 — mikō Jayanāgasya dharmapatniyē Sihadatā[yē]
- C. 3 — [lathambhō] danaṁ.

The reading *Sihadatāyē* is impossible. What is still visible of the last *akshara* of the line is the left portion of a *sa*,<sup>40</sup> and the correct reading apparently is *Sihadatasya*. This word must have been followed originally by *mātu*, which probably stood at the beginning of line C. 3. The description of a female donor in her fourfold character as daughter, daughter-in-law, wife and mother is exactly the same as in the inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 382, No. 2, and probably also in two others edited *ibid.* Vol. I. p. 395, No. 28, and Vol. II. p. 208, No. 34.

The *aksharas lathambhō* Bühler wants to restore to *śilāthambhō*, which would be a very peculiar term for the object which it is meant for. The inscription is incised on the four faces of the pedestal of a quadruple image consisting of four erect naked standing Jinas, placed back to back, and in all other instances (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 382, No. 2; Vol. II. p. 202, No. 13; p. 203, No. 16; p. 210,

<sup>37</sup> Compare for the locative, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 397, No. 34: *āya-Haṭṭiyē kulē Vajanāgariyā śākhāyā*.

<sup>38</sup> The unit of the date is illegible.

<sup>39</sup> Possibly *āryya-Haṭṭakiyatō*, the *ā*-stroke being not clear in the photo-lithograph.

<sup>40</sup> Compare the same letter in *Jayadēvasya* in line A. 3.

No. 37) statues of this sort are termed *pratimā sarvatōbhadrīkā* in the inscriptions.<sup>41</sup> Bühler's reading is therefore *a priori* improbable. But quite apart from this consideration, I own that I do not see how these letters can possibly be read *lathanbhō*, even assuming, as Bühler did, that the last two consonants are only half formed. The last sign can hardly be anything but *ya*, which would seem to indicate that the word is the name of the donatrix, but unfortunately neither the vowel-sign above the *ya* nor the preceding letters are distinct enough in the photo-lithograph to allow any positive reading on this authority alone.

Nos. 16 and 17. — Mathurā Jaina image inscriptions of Saṁ. 52 and 54 ;  
edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II, p. 203, No. 18, and Vol. I, p. 391, No. 21, and Plates.

Bühler's transcripts of these two inscriptions, placed side by side, read as follows :—

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Siddha sainvatsara dvāpanā 50 2 hēmantā-              | . . . dham sava 50 <sup>42</sup> 4 hēmantā-   |
| [mā]sa pratha . . divasa pañchaviśā 20 5              | māsē chaturthē 4 divasē 10                    |
| asma kṣuṇṇē K[o]ṭṭiyātō gaṇāt[ō] <sup>43</sup> Vērātō | asya purvāvāyān Koṭṭiyātō [ga]ṇātō Sthāni-    |
| śakhatō Sthānikiyātō kulāt[ō] Śrīgrihatō              | [y]ātō kulātō Vairātō śākhātō Śrīgrib[ā]tō    |
| sambhōgātō vāchakasy=āryya-Ghastuhastisya             | sambhōgātō vāchakasy=āryya-[Ha]stahastisya    |
| śiśhyō gaṇisya=āryya-Maṅguhastisya shaḍha-            | śiśhyō gaṇisya ayya-Māghahastisya śraddha-    |
| charō vāchakō ayya-Divitasya nirvartanā               | charō vāchakasya ayya-Dēvasya nirvartanē      |
| Sūrasya Sramanakaputrasya Goṭṭikasya lōhikā-          | Gōvasya Siha-putrasya lōhika-                 |
| kārukasya dānam sarvvasatvānām hita-sukhāy-           | kārukasya dānam sarvvasatvānām hita-sukhā     |
| āstu ।  | ēka-Sarasvatī pratishṭhāvitā avatalē raigāna- |
|   | [rttan]ō mē [  ]                              |

The two records so closely agree with each other as to leave no doubt about the identity of the persons mentioned in the first portion. *Ghastuhasti* and *Hastahasti*, *Maṅguhasti* and *Māghahasti*, are nothing but various spellings of the same names. A very similar case occurs in two other Mathurā inscriptions, *Vienna. Or. Journ.* Vol. I, p. 172, and *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II, p. 204, No. 19. They contain the name of a preacher which in the former is spelt *Kakasaghasta*, while in the latter it reads *Karkuhastha*. However, I am not quite sure that Bühler was right in reading *Maṅguhastisya*. The *anusvāra* is very indistinct in the photo-lithograph, and the true reading may be *Māguhastisya*, which would come nearer to the form used in the other inscription.

Bühler's reading °*Divitasya* in the first inscription cannot be upheld. Neither the first nor the second vowel-sign can be *i*, as the *i*-sign is much more rounded in this alphabet, and Bühler appears to have been aware of it himself, as in a note he quotes °*Dēvētasya* as a possible reading. The correct reading undoubtedly is *aryya-Dēvō tasya*, and I think I can discern the traces of the second *ō*-stroke in the photo-lithograph. The spelling of the name therefore is the same in both inscriptions. As for the construction compare the inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 382, No. 3 (*aryya-Mātrīdāmaḥ tasya nirvarttanā*), p. 383, No. 4 (*vāchakō ayya-Sihā tasya nirvarttanā*), Vol. II, p. 204, No. 19 (*Graha-bālō ātapikō tasya nirvartanā*), p. 209, No. 37 (*aryya-Kshērakō vāchakō tasya nirvatana*), &c.

In the second portion of the first inscription Bühler translated the words *Sūrasya Sramanakaputrasya Goṭṭikasya lōhikākārukasya dānam* by 'the gift of the worker in metal Goṭṭika, the Sūra, the son of Sramanaka,' taking the word Sūra as the name of Goṭṭika's family or clan. But from the parallel description of the donor in the second inscription as *Gōvasya Sihaputrasya lōhikākārukasya* it is evident that, on the contrary, Sūra is the real name and Goṭṭika a qualifying epithet. The meaning of this word is difficult to ascertain. It may be a proper name characterising Sūra as the

<sup>41</sup> Compare the analogous term *sarvatōbhadra*, applied to a *śloka* the single *aksharas* of which, if written twice on the squares of a chessboard, yield the same text from whatever side they may be read. For examples, see *Kīrtīstāvjanīya* XV, 25 ; *Sisūpālavadha* XIX, 27, &c.

<sup>42</sup> The figure is quite distinct.

<sup>43</sup> The bracketed signs of the last two words are distinct in the photo-lithograph.

member of some tribe or as the native of some country or town, but no such name is known to us, and I venture to suggest a different explanation. Bühler has shown<sup>44</sup> that in the dialect of these inscriptions the aspiration of conjunct hard aspirates is frequently neglected; in the present inscription also the photo-lithograph shows *Sthānikiyātō*<sup>45</sup> instead of *Sthānikiyātō*, as transcribed by Bühler. *Goṭṭika* may therefore possibly stand for *goṭṭhika*, the Prakrit equivalent of Sk. *gōṣṭhika*, which means the member of a Pañch or committee entrusted with the management of religious endowments and in this sense occurs, e. g., in the Pehevā inscription from the temple of Garibānāth.<sup>46</sup>

With regard to the last words of the second inscription I am unable to offer any explanation, though it will be readily admitted, I think, that neither Bühler's reading nor his translation of them are satisfactory. The date also of this inscription has been called in question, but, as it seems to me, without sufficient reason. Bühler originally took the date of the year to be 84,<sup>47</sup> but changed it into 54 on comparing Growse's inscription No. 5,<sup>48</sup> where the date 57 is given both in words and figures. Lately Mr. V. A. Smith, in his monograph on '*The Jain Stūpa and Other Antiquities of Mathurā*,'<sup>49</sup> has asserted that the plate clearly reads 44. I own that I cannot discover any resemblance between the first figure of the date and the numeral sign for 40, whereas, on the other hand, I do not see how that figure differs from the signs for 50 occurring in the Mathurā inscriptions, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 219, No. 11; *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 203, Nos. 17 and 18. And the date Sañ. 54 is also in perfect keeping with the facts to be derived from the first inscription. If Dēva was acting as the spiritual adviser of a member of the *lōhikakāraka* caste in Sañ. 52, it is quite natural to find him in exactly the same capacity in Sañ. 54.

**No. 18. — Mathurā Jaina inscription of Sañ. 60;**

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8, and Plate.

Bühler read the numeral sign indicating the year of this inscription as 40, adding 60 in brackets and with a note of interrogation, but from his remark in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, note 61, it may be gathered that he would have adopted the second alternative himself, if he had had an opportunity of reverting to this inscription. As to the rest, I only want to point out that instead of *ayya-Vēriyāṇa sākhāyā* in line 1, the plate clearly reads *aryya-Vēriyāṇaṇ sākhāyā*.

Vṛiddhabasti, the *vāchaka* in the Koṭṭiya *gaṇa*, the *Sthānikiya kula* and the *sākhā* of the venerable Vēriyas, mentioned in this inscription, is probably identical with the person of the same name and vocation referred to in the Mathurā inscription of Sañ. 79, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, No. 20.

**No. 19. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Sañ. 62;**

edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. XX. p. 37, and Plate V. No. 6,

and by Bühler, *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. I. p. 172.

This inscription appears to record the dedication of a statue by the Jaina lay-woman Vaihikā at the request of some ascetic. The phrase containing the latter statement was first read by Bühler *Rāvakasya Aryakakasaghastasya śishyā Ātapikōgahabaryasya nirvartana*, and translated '(this being) the *nirvartana* of Ātapikōgahabarya, the pupil of Arya-Kakasaghasta (*Ārya-Karkaśagharshta*), a native of Rārā (*Rādhā*).' But when he had got another Jaina inscription from Mathurā, dated in the same year and recording some donation *vāchakasya āya-Karkuhashta[sā] Vāranagaṇi-*

<sup>44</sup> *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 376.

<sup>45</sup> Compare *stīṭā* in the Gīrnār version of the Aśoka edicts, VI. 4; also *dharmamānusastīya* III. 3; *°sasṭīyā* IV. 5; *°sasṭī* VIII. 4; *°sasṭīm* XIII. 9; *tiṣṭantō* IV. 9; *tiṣṭēya* VI. 13; *dhāmadhiṣṭānāya* V. 4; *śeṣṭō* IV. 10; *Risṭhka* V. 5, and below, No. 31.

<sup>46</sup> *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. pp. 186, 188, 190, note 50. See also *gōṭhī* in the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscriptions Nos. 3, 5 and 9, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 327 ff.

<sup>47</sup> *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. III. p. 239.

<sup>48</sup> *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 218, and Plate; *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 210, No. 38, and Plate.

<sup>49</sup> *Arch. Surv. of Ind.* New Imp. Ser. Vol. XX. p. 55 f. Mr. Smith also thinks that the number of the day, according to the plate, is rather 11 or 12 than 10, and in this he may be right.

*yasa śiśhō Grahabalō ātapikō tasa nīvartanā*,<sup>50</sup> he recognised at once that the persons referred to in the two inscriptions were identical, and that *Ātapikōghabaryasya* was to be altered into *ātapikō Grahabalasya*.<sup>51</sup> Another correction seems to be equally certain. The facsimile makes it quite sure that the second *akshara* of the word read by Bühler *Rāvakasya* cannot be *ra*. What appears in the facsimile, evidently is nothing but the right and lower portion of a *cha*, and as Kakasaghasta or Karkuhastha is called a *vāchaka* in the inscription quoted above, I have no doubt that also the supposed *rā* of the word is simply a mistake for *vā*. With these emendations the phrase reads: *vāchakasya arya-Kakasaghastasya śiśhyā ātapikō Grahabalasya*<sup>52</sup> *nīvartana*, 'at the request of the *ātapika* Grahabala, the pupil of the preacher, the venerable Kakasaghasta.' The epigraphical evidence for a country of the name of Rārā thus falls to the ground. As to the rest of Bühler's transcript, Cunningham's facsimile suggests some minor alterations, such as *ārahantānaṃ* for *arahantānaṃ*, *śiddhānaṃ* for *śiddhāna*, but, of course, these are not certain.

No. 20. — Mathurā stone-slab inscription of Sam. 74;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX, Part I. p. 129, No. 15, and Plate; by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 4, and Plate; and by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 32, No. 8, and Plate.

The upper right corner of the slab which bears this inscription, is broken off, so that the first two lines of the text are mutilated. But the next three lines are complete, and a transcript of what is actually preserved of the first five lines would therefore read as follows<sup>53</sup> :—

- 1 Mabār[ā]jasya r[ā] . . . . .
- 2 sya Dēvaputrasya Vāsu . . . . .
- 3 samvatsarē 70<sup>54</sup> 4 varsha-mā-
- 4 sē prathamē divasē
- 5 tri[m]ś[ē] 30 asya purvayē.

The three editors agree in restoring the first lines as

- 1 Mahārājasya rā[jātirāja]-
- 2 sya Dēvaputrasya Vāsu[dēvasya].

However, if one takes the trouble to measure the available space, it will appear that the restoration of the second line is highly improbable. There is room for two *aksharas* at the most, especially as the letters are cut pretty carefully and of uniform size. Under these circumstances we are forced, I think, to restore the name of the king to *Vāsu[shkasya]*, and this is exactly the name that is to be expected for the time to which the inscription belongs.

The last epigraphical date of Huvishka is the year 60 (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8; see above, p. 105). The inscriptions which refer to the reign of Vāsudēva are dated in the years 80 (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 392, No. 24), 83 (*Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 16, and below, No. 21), 87 (*ibid.* p. 35, No. 18, and below, No. 22), and 98 (*ibid.* No. 20, and below, No. 23). From the period between 60 and 80 we have only two records mentioning a king's name, besides the present one, a Mathurā inscription dated in 76<sup>55</sup> and recording repairs in the reign of Vāsushka, and another from Sāñchi,<sup>56</sup> dated [*mahārāja*]sya *rājātirājasya* [*Dēva*]putrasya *Shāh[ī]* Vāsushkasya *sam* [70] 8 hē I [di 5] [ē]tasy[ān] [p]u[r]v[ā]y[ān].

One is accustomed to look upon Vāsushka as a mere variant of the name of Vāsudēva, because the inscriptions dated in his reign seemed to be mixed up with inscriptions referring to the reign of

<sup>50</sup> *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, No. 19.

<sup>51</sup> *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. V. p. 63.

<sup>52</sup> The correct reading, however, is possibly *ātapikō Grahabalō tasya*.

<sup>53</sup> Of the next lines I can make as little as the former editors.

<sup>54</sup> The first figure of the date was originally read 40, but Cunningham corrected it to 70; see *Num. Chron. Ser.* III. Vol. XII. p. 50, note 6. Compare the sign for 70 in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 199, No. 2, and in the Kāman inscription, *ibid.* p. 212, No. 42.

<sup>55</sup> Bühler, *Progress Report, 1895-96*; according to V. A. Smith, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1903, p. 13.

<sup>56</sup> *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 369; compare also Bühler's note 10, *ibid.*

Vāsudēva. From the facts collected above it will appear that this is not the case, and I see no reason whatever why Vāsushka should not be treated as an individual name and different from Vāsudēva. In that case we should have four Kushapa rulers at Mathurā, whose dates would be according to the inscriptions: Kaṇishka 5-18, Huvishka 33-60,<sup>57</sup> Vāsushka 74-78, Vāsudēva 80-98. But even those who should prefer to adhere to the belief in the identity of Vāsushka and Vāsudēva, will probably admit that the difference in the use of the two names cannot be due to mere chance, and they will have to assume that about the year 79 Vāsushka, in order to please his Hindu subjects, adopted the name of one of their national heroes.<sup>58</sup>

**No. 21. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Saṃ. 83 ;**

edited by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 184, No. 6, and Plate,  
and by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 16, and Plate.

Cunningham's transcript of this inscription is a great improvement on Dowson's tentative reading, and taking no account of the inaccuracies of his transliteration, his reading of the first line may be called correct. The second line he transcribes : —

. . tridattasya vagrayevya . cha . sya gad-dhikasya . . vichitiye Jina-dāsiya protima.

Bühler has already suggested (*Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. IV. p. 324) to alter *gaddhikasya* into *gandhikasya*, and from Cunningham's facsimile it appears that we have to read *tu* instead of *tri*, and *pra* instead of *pro*, which perhaps is only a misprint. Before the *tu* in the beginning of the line there are traces of another *akshara* which cannot be anything but *dhi*. The *gra* looks rather queer, and I have no doubt that in reality it is *dhu*. Finally, I am convinced that the word between *gandhikasya* and *Jinadāsiya* is to be read *kuṭumbiniyē*. The *tu* is quite distinct, and that the next sign in fact is *mbi* and not *vichi*, is proved by Dowson's facsimile in which in this case is the more accurate of the two. Besides, the latter facsimile has some letters omitted in Cunningham's drawing. On the right, almost between the first and the second line, it shows a *dha*, and on the left, at the beginning of the first line *ānaṃ*, which certainly is to be restored to *dānaṃ*. Of course, the text cannot have commenced with this word. Apparently the inscription runs in a circle round the pedestal of the statue, and [*d*]ānaṃ is to be read at the end of the first line. And this also cannot have been its proper place, but it was probably placed there only for want of space in the second line. A similar disarrangement of the words of the text is found in the inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 202, No. 15. The *dha* which I take to belong to the second line I would hesitatingly restore to *dharma* and connect with [*d*]ānaṃ. With these corrections the whole text reads : —

- 1 Siddham mahārājasya Vāsudēvasya<sup>59</sup> saṃ 80 3 grī 2 di 10 6 ētasya pūrvvayē  
Sēnasya
- 2 [dhi]tu Dattasya vadhuyē Vya . . cha . . sya<sup>60</sup> gandhikasya kuṭumbiniyē Jina-  
dāsiya pratimā dha[rma]dānaṃ.<sup>61</sup>

"Success! In the year 83 of *mahārāja* Vāsudēva, in the second (*month of*) summer, on the sixteenth day, — on that (*date specified as*) above, — an image, the pious gift of Jinadāsi (*Jinadāsī*), the daughter of Sēna, the daughter-in-law of Datta, the wife of the perfumer Vya . . cha . . ."

The description of the donatrix agrees with that of the inscriptions quoted above, p. 37.

<sup>57</sup> Probably Huvishka was already on the throne in 28; see above, p. 39.

<sup>58</sup> I would state that it was Dr. Fleet who first expressed his doubts about the identity of Vāsushka and Vāsudēva in a letter to me, but his arrangement of the list of the Kushapa kings is different from mine. I should like to add that these notes were written before Dr. Fleet's paper on the subject had appeared in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* for 1903, p. 325 ff.

<sup>59</sup> According to Dowson's facsimile the reading would rather be *Vasudēvasya*.

<sup>60</sup> Dowson's facsimile seems to read *Vridacalasya*, which cannot be correct.

<sup>61</sup> The last two syllables stand at the end of line 1.

No. 22. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Sañ. 87;  
edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 35, No. 18, and Plate.

The photograph of this stone which Prof. Kielhorn possesses, enables us to supplement and to correct Cunningham's reading of the date, though, unfortunately, it is not sufficient to restore the rest of the inscription. The first lines read:—

- 1 Siddham |<sup>62</sup> Mahārājasya rājātīrājasya Shāhir=Vāsudēvasya
- 2 sañ 80 7 hē 2 di 30 ētasyā purvāyā . . .<sup>63</sup>

"Success! In the year 87 of *mahārāja rājātīrāja* Shāhi Vāsudēva, in the second (*month of*) winter, on the thirtieth day, — on that (*date specified as*) above . . ."

No. 23. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription of Sañ. 98;  
edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 35, No. 20, and Plate,  
and by Bühler, *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. I. p. 177, No. 8.

In his paper on this inscription Bühler first gave a revised transcript of Cunningham's facsimile, and then tried to emend the first two lines in accordance with the statements of the *Kalpāsūtra*. I have compared his corrected text with the photograph of the front of the stone in the possession of Professor Kielhorn. It is not large and distinct enough to allow a thorough reading of the inscription, but it is sufficient to show that not all of Bühler's emendations can be accepted. The facsimile reads as follows:—

- 1 Siddha ô namô arahatô Mahāvīrāsye dēvanāsāsya | rājña Vāsudēvasya sañ-  
vatsarē 90 8 varsha-māsē 4 divasē 10 1 ētasyā
- 2 purvayā aryya-Dēhīniyātō<sup>64</sup> gaṇa . . Puridha . . kâ kulava Pētaputrikâtē  
śākhātō gaṇasya aryya-Dēvadata . ya<sup>65</sup> na
- 3 ryya-Kshēmasya
- 4 prakagiriṇām(?)<sup>66</sup>
- 5 kihadiyē praja
- 6 tasya Pravarakasya dhitu Varāṇasya gandhakasya<sup>67</sup> ma . uya Mitrasa . . . . .  
. . . datta gā
- 7 yē . . . . . vatô maha . . . . .

In the first line Bühler corrected *siddha ô* to *siddham*, but the photograph shows that the supposed *ô* or *m* is the peculiar stop mentioned above, No. 22, followed here by two vertical strokes. Above the *ddha*, I think, I can discover the sign of an *anusvāra*. The word *dēvanāsāsya* was taken by Bühler as an epithet of *Mahāvīrasya* in the sense of 'destroyer of the gods,' but he had grave doubts about the correctness of the word. On the photograph the *dē* is faintly visible, whereas no trace is recognisable of the second and third *aksharas*. The last *akshara* is distinctly *ya*, and the last but one may be *ga* or *śra*, only the subscript *r* being quite certain. Under these circumstances I fail to see which word can possibly be meant here.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>62</sup> The stop is expressed by a curve open to the left with a horizontal bar in the centre, which sign is found also in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 9, and in the Kāman inscription, *ibid.* Vol. II. p. 212, No. 42; see Bühler's note on the latter passage.

<sup>63</sup> Three *aksharas* after *purvāyā* are uncertain.

<sup>64</sup> Bühler: °*Rdhīniyātō*.

<sup>65</sup> Bühler: °*Dēvadata . va .*

<sup>66</sup> Bühler: °*prakagiriṇā*.

<sup>67</sup> Bühler: °*gatvakasya*.

<sup>68</sup> The restoration *Dē[vaṇ]rasya*, which at first sight would seem natural, becomes improbable by the one, or perhaps even two, horizontal strokes after the word, which apparently are meant as a sign of punctuation.



Of greater importance are the names of the *gaṇa*, the *kula*, and the *śākhā*. Instead of *aryya-Dēhiniyātō* Bühler read *Aryya-Rēhiniyātō* which he at first proposed to correct to *Aryya-Rōhaniyātō* and afterwards<sup>69</sup> to *Aryyōdēhikiyātō* or *Aryyādēhikiyātō*. The photograph proves that he was right in his last conjecture, though which of the two forms is to be accepted, is here just as doubtful as in the other inscription which contains the name of this *gaṇa*, *Ep. Ind. Vol. I. p. 391, No. 19*. The words *Puridhā . . . kā kulava* were corrected by Bühler to *Parihāsakakulātō*, but the photograph has *Paridh[ā]sikātō<sup>70</sup> kulātō*. The form *Paridhāsika* shows that the *Pārihāsaya* of the *Kalpasūtra* must be rendered in Sanskrit by *Pārihāsaka*, and not by *Parihāsaka* as done in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXII. p. 290. We next come to the name of the *śākhā*, which Bühler altered from *Pētaputrikātō* to *Pōnaputrikātō* in order to conform it to the *Pārnaputrikā* of the *Kalpasūtra*. But the reading *Pētaputrikātō* is beyond all doubt in the photograph, and the various readings of the *Kalpasūtra*, *Puṇṇa<sup>o</sup>*, *Panna<sup>o</sup>*, *Sunna<sup>o</sup>* or *Suwaṇṇapattiyā*, must be considered corruptions. Such distorted names are by no means rare in the 'List of the *Sthaviras*,' other examples being *Chāraṇa* for *Vāraṇa*, *Vārija* for *Thāpija*, *Pīdhammiya* for *Pivammiya*, &c., and the fact and even the reason thereof was known already to the *Jaina* theologians of the fourteenth century. Thus *Jinaprabhamuni* says in his *Saṃdēhaviśvaśāhādhī<sup>71</sup>*: *bahavō 'tra vāchanābhēdā lēkhakavaigunyāj jātāḥ | tattatstha-virāṇān cha śākhāḥ kulāni cha prāyaḥ sāṃprataṇ nāmwartantō nāmāntaratirōhitāni vā dhavishyanti | atō nirṇayaḥ kartvaṇ na pāryatē pāḥēshu.*<sup>72</sup>

Bühler's corrections of *Mahāvīrasya* to *Mahāvīrasya*, of *purvayā* to *purvayē*, and of *gaṇasya* to *gaṇīasya* are confirmed by the photograph. In line 6 the photograph has *Varuṇasya gandhikasya vadhūyē* and in line 7 *bhagavatō Mahā[vira]sya*, as conjectured by Bühler. With these emendations the text will run as follows:—

- 1 Siddha[m] ॥<sup>73</sup> Namō arahatō Mahāvīrasya dē . . . . rasya | rājā Vāsudēvasya  
sāmvatsarē 90 8 varsha-māsē 4 divasē 10 1 ētasyā
- 2 purvayē aryya-Dēhikiyātō<sup>74</sup> ga[nātō] Paridh[ā]sikātō kulātō Pētaputrikātō śākhātō  
gaṇīasya aryya-Dēvadata[s]ya na-
- 3 ryya-Kshēmasya<sup>75</sup>
- 4 prakagiriṇam(?)
- 5 kihadiyē praja
- 6 . . . tasya<sup>76</sup> Pravarakasya dhita Varuṇasya gandhikasya vadhūyē Mitrasa . . . .  
. . . . . datta gā(?)
- 7 yē . . . bhagavatō<sup>77</sup> Mahā[vira]sya.

"Success! Adoration to the Arhat Mahāvira (*Mahāvīra*) the . . . . ! In the year 98 of *rājan* Vāsudēva, in the fourth month of the rainy season, on the eleventh day, — on that (*date specified as*) above, [at the request of] . . . the *gaṇī* (*gaṇin*) the venerable Dēvadatta (*Dēvadatta*) out of the venerable Dēhikiya (*Dēhikiya*)<sup>78</sup> *gaṇa*, the *Paridhāsika kula*, the *Pētaputrikā* (*Paitāputrikā*?) *śākhā*, [the gift of] . . . . of the venerable Kshēma . . . the daughter of Pravaraka, the daughter-in-law of the perfumer Varuṇa, . . . Mitrasa . . . . [Adoration] to the holy Mahāvira (*Mahāvīra*)!"

<sup>69</sup> Vienna Or. Journ. Vol. II. p. 144.

<sup>70</sup> The supposed u-stroke in the first syllable of this word seems to be a flaw in the stone. The ā-stroke of the third syllable is not quite certain.

<sup>71</sup> *Kalpasūtra*, ed. by Jacobi, p. 119.

<sup>72</sup> *Pētaputrikā* seems to be equivalent to Sanskrit *Paitāputrikā*. In the *Kalpasūtra* it is preceded by the name of *Maipattiyā* which is rendered by *Matiputrikā*, but in analogy to *Pētaputrikā* one feels tempted to correct it to *Māyaputtīyā*, Sansk. *Mātiputrikā*.

<sup>73</sup> Regarding the sign of punctuation see above.

<sup>74</sup> Lines 3-5 are quite unintelligible.

<sup>75</sup> Probably namō is to be restored before *bhagavatō*.

<sup>76</sup> Or, possibly, *aryyōdēhikiyātō*.

<sup>77</sup> Before *tasya* traces of an *āshara* are visible in the photograph.

<sup>78</sup> Or *Udēhikiya* (*Udēhikiya*).