

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BY H. LÜDERS, PH.D.; ROSTOCK.

(Continued from p. 109.)

No. 24. — Mathurā stone-slab inscription of the time of svāmin mahākshatrapa Sôḍāsa; edited by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 188, No. 29, and Plate; and by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 30, No. 1, and Plate.

Dowson read this inscription :—

- ... swāmīsyā mahā-kshatrapasya Śāṇḍāsasya Gajavarena Brahmanena Sangrava-sagotrena.
 ... rani. Imā jāyamada pushkaranainām paschimā pushkaranim udapāno āramo stambhah.

Cunningham differs from Dowson only in reading *Sauddāsasya*, *Brāhmanena Segrava Sago-trena*, and *Ima kshdyamada pushkaranainam paschima*.

Fortunately the two facsimiles⁷⁹ allow us to improve these transcripts to some extent, and to add the third line entirely left out by the two editors. The facsimiles read as follows :—

- 1 ... svāmīsyā mahākshatrapasya Sôḍāsasya . . ja Virēṇa brāhmaṇena Sēgrava-sagôtrēṇa . . .
 2 ... rapī imā shāyamaḍapushkaranīṇaṁ pāschimāpushkarani udapānō āramō stambha i
 3 ... bilāpaṭṭā cha i

The slab is damaged on both sides, and it is impossible to say how much of the text may be lost on either side. The name of the *mahākshatrapa* was read correctly already by Bühler, who also proposed to restore the . . ja after the name to *rajā*, 'during the reign.'⁸⁰ The reading *Sēgrava* is quite distinct in both facsimiles, but I am unable to point out a *gōtra* of that name in Brahmanical literature. Nor can I offer any explanation of the term *shāyamaḍa*, provided that it be not the name of the tanks. In the last line *bilāpaṭṭā* certainly is a mistake for *śilāpaṭṭā*. The erection of *śilāpaṭṭas* is recorded also in the Mathurā inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 390, No. 18, and *Actes du Congrès des Orientalistes à Leide*, Part III. p. 143.⁸¹

The fragment is to be translated :—

"During the reign of *svāmi* (*svdmin*) *mahākshatrapa* Sôḍāsa, the following (*things*), the hindmost tank of the *shāyamaḍa* (?) tanks, a reservoir, a grove, a pillar, and stone-slabs (*were dedicated*) by the *brāhmaṇa* Vira, who belonged to the 'Sēgrava *gōtra*."

No. 25. — Mathurā image inscription of the time of mahārājātīrāja Kanishka; edited by Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 31, No. 5, and Plate.

This inscription is so much obliterated that it is impossible to make out any continuous sense. Cunningham transcribed it :—

- 1 ghoshaka parahasālika vairakasapāta vatah
 2 (ma)hārājātīrājasya Kanishkasya Samvatsa(re)

The facsimile is rather in favour of the following reading :—

- 1 . . . gitagē . . . lētusamē . . . ghēshakaparahasālēkavikkakasapētavatuḥ radatu . . .
 2 [ma]h[ā]rājātīr[ā]jasya Kanishkasya samvatsa[rē]

⁷⁹ Dowson's facsimile seems to be the better of the two.

⁸⁰ *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. V. p. 177.

⁸¹ Perhaps *śilāpaṭṭā* is here the nom. sing. of a feminine noun; compare the last-mentioned inscription and *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 397, No. 35, where the same ambiguity exists with respect to *śilāpaṭṭā* and *dyāgapaṭṭā*.

As long as no trustworthy reproduction of the inscription is obtainable, I consider it rather hopeless to attempt any restoration of the first line. But I wish to draw attention to another point. In the *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 129, No. 16, Rajendralala Mitra has brought to notice a Mathurā inscription engraved on the pedestal of a seated figure and consisting of two lines, the first of which is said to be illegible, while in the second he reads the words *mahārājasya rajātīrajasya Dēvaputrasya Vasu* . . . The last two syllables he wants to restore to *Vāsudēvasya*. A look at the facsimile added to the Babu's paper, however, reveals a curious fact. The first line of his inscription is exactly the same as the first line of Cunningham's inscription No. 5 given above, while in the second line the facsimile indeed agrees with the transcript. The identity of the first lines makes it quite sure, of course, that the two facsimiles are meant to reproduce the same original, and we are therefore forced to decide the question which of the two deserves the greater credit. I do not hesitate for a moment to declare myself in favour of Cunningham's facsimile. Rajendralala Mitra tells⁸² us that his facsimiles 'are taken from General Cunningham's transcripts, with such corrections and emendations as a careful examination of the original and comparison with Mr. Bayley's transcripts would warrant, leaving all doubtful letters as they were read by the General.' How little these words are in accordance with the facts, has been shown long ago by General Cunningham himself.⁸³ The total want of care and criticism displayed by Rajendralala Mitra here, as in every other work of his pen, fully justifies my opinion that in this inscription also the reference to Vāsudēva is nothing but a product of his own imagination.

No. 26. — Mathurā Buddhist stone inscription;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 129, No. 14, and Plate;
and by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 3, and Plate.

This inscription originally ran round the margin of an oblong slab, but when the stone was utilised for a new purpose, the edges on the two smaller sides of the slab were cut away together with a portion of the inscription. Dowson has recognised 'the initial letters of the word *Samvatsara* (year), the word *divase*, followed by the numeral 10, and the words *asya purvaye*, *dānam bhikshusya buddha sarvasa*;' Rajendralala Mitra's transcript is more complete, but his readings are for the most part wrong. I read the inscription from Dowson's facsimile:—

1 Sañ diva-

2 sē 10 asyā pūrvayē dānam bhikshusya Buddhanandi[s]ya . .

3

4 sarvasatv[ā]n[ām] sukh[ār]tha[m] bhavatu.⁸⁴

The year, the tenth day, on that (*date specified as*) above, the gift of the monk Buddhanandi (*Buddhanandin*) May it be for the . . . welfare of all beings."

No. 27. — Mathurā Jaina tablet inscription;

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 397, No. 35.

Bühler transcribed this inscription:—

1 [Tē] rusanādikasa putrēna Nāndighōshēna [Tē]vapikēna a ta . .
alē

2 nānam bhamdirē [ā]yāgapaṭā pratihāpit[ā]

The photo-lithograph enables us to make a few corrections. Instead of *Nāndikasa* and *Nāndighōshēna* in line 1 and *nānam* in line 2 the plate distinctly shows *Nāndikasa*, *Nāndighōshēna*, and *nāndām*. With the first two words compare such spellings as *āntēvāsisa* in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 198, No. 1, and *āntēvāsintyē*, *ibid.* p. 199, No. 4. *Tēvapika* was considered by Bühler to be a derivative

⁸² Loc. cit. p. 120.

⁸³ *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 194.

⁸⁴ There are two *akharas* before *sarvas* and two before *sukhārthan* which I cannot make out.

from the name of a nation or country called *Trivarna* or *Trivarna*. From the mentioning of a *Tévaniputra* in the Pabbhāsā inscription No. 2⁸⁵ I think it highly probable that there really once existed a country of that name, but I cannot admit that there is any allusion to it in the present inscription. The reading of the plate is unmistakably *sōvaṇikēna*, corresponding to Sk. *sauvarṇikēna*. The synonym *hairaṇyaka* is found, e.g., in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 205, No. 23. A difficult term is the word which Bühler transcribes as *bhaṇḍiré*. A comparison of the second *akshara* with the *di* in *Nāṇdikasa* and *Nāṇḍighōshēna* will show at once that Bühler's reading cannot be upheld. The correct reading is *bhaṇḍiré*, but whether this means 'at the *bhaṇḍira* tree,' or possibly stands for Sk. *bhāṇḍārē*, 'at the storehouse,' I do not venture to decide at present. I read and translate the whole text as follows:—

1 rusa⁸⁶ Nāṇdikasa putrēna Nāṇḍighōshēna sōvaṇikēna a ta . .
alē

2 nānām bhaṇḍiré āyāgapatā pratithāpitā pita⁸⁷

"By the goldsmith Nāṇḍighōsha (*Nandighōsha*), the son of the Nāṇdika (*Nandika*), tablets of homage⁸⁸ were set up at the *bhaṇḍira* of the"

No. 28.—Mathurā stone inscription;

edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 218, No. 4, and Plate.

Of this inscription, which is engraved on a slab found at the Kaṅkālī Tila, Mr. Growse published a tolerably good reproduction, but his reading is confined to a single word which he inaccurately transcribed as *Mugālī-putas*. Unfortunately the left portion of the stone, which contained the beginning of the inscription, is lost. The characters are of the archaic type, and the language is not the usual mixed dialect of the Mathurā inscriptions, but pure Prakrit. My reading is as follows:—

1 yē Mogaliputasa Puphaka bhayāyē

2 Asāyē pasādō.

"The gift of Asā (*Asā* ?), the wife of Puphaka (*Pushpaka*), the son of Mogalī (*a Maudgalī mother*)" . . .

My rendering of the last word calls for a few remarks. At first sight, one might feel inclined to alter *pasādō* into *pāsādō* and to translate, with an implicit understanding of some word like *dānaḥ* or *paṭithāpātō* or *kāritō*: 'a temple, (the gift of, or erected or caused to be built) by Asā, the wife of Puphaka.' But I think, that such an alteration is unnecessary, and that we may rest satisfied with the text as it stands. It is well known that in classical Sanskrit *prasāda* is used in the sense of 'present,' especially in the very common term *prasādīkarōti*; the *Saddakalpadruma* gives it the special meaning of *dēva-nivēdita-draḥyam*.⁸⁹ We are justified, therefore, to take also the *pasādō* of the inscription as a synonym of the more usual *dānaḥ*. In this case the object of the donation would be the slab which bears the inscription, and which probably was a so-called *āyāgapatta*.

About the name of Asā's husband I feel not quite sure. The second syllable may possibly be read *ḍha*.

Although this inscription is not dated, it may be safely assigned to the period before Kanishka on the strength of its language and characters, and from the fact that it comes from the Kaṅkālī Tila it may be further inferred that it is a Jaina record. Why Mogaliputa should be a distinctly Buddhist appellation, as Mr. Growse thinks, I am unable to see.

⁸⁵ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 243.

⁸⁶ I am unable to make out any of the *aksharas* before *rusa*, but I believe that the word ending in **rusa* was the genitive of a stem in *u*, qualifying *Nāṇdikasa*.

⁸⁷ These two *aksharas* are pretty clear in the photo-lithograph.

⁸⁸ Possibly, however, *āyāgapatā* is the nom. sing. of a feminine noun; compare the remarks, above, p. 149, note 81.

⁸⁹ See the *Petersb. Dict.* where numerous examples are quoted.

No. 29.—Mathurā Buddhist rail inscription;

edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 219, No. 6, and Plate.

Of this archaic-looking inscription, which is between two bas-reliefs on a broken Buddhist rail from the Chaubāra mounds, Mr. Growse deciphered only the last word *dānañ*. I tentatively read the whole :—

Abhyañtirōpa ayakasa Kaṭhikasa dānañ.

Below the first sign of *ayakasa* there is a circle, which, at first sight, makes the word look like *śhayakasa*, but a closer examination and comparison of the upper sign with the *sa* of *Kaṭhikasa* will show that it cannot be *sa*. The circle therefore seems to be accidental or to form part of the sculpture below.⁹⁰ As to the meaning of the inscription, I own that I can make nothing of the first word. The rest may be translated by 'the gift of the venerable⁹¹ Kaṭhika.'

No. 30.—Mathurā Jaina inscription on sculptured slab;

edited by Bhagvanlal Indraji, *Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes à Leide*, Part. III. p. 143, and Plate.

This inscription was read and translated by the Pandit as follows :—

- 1 Namō arahatō Vadhamaṇasa Dañḍāyē gaṇikā-
- 2 yē lēṇasābhikāyē dhitu śamaṇasa nikāyē
- 3 Nāḍāyē gaṇikāyē vāsāyē ārahatāḍēvakulē
- 4 āyagasabhāprapāsīlāpātā pratīṣṭhāpitaṃ nigamā-
- 5 nā arahatāyatanē saha mātārē bhaginīyē dhitarē putrēṇa
- 6 savina cha pariṇānēna arahatapujāyē.

"Salutation to the Arhant Vardhamāna. The courtesan Nandā, daughter of the courtesan Daṇḍā, built in the Ārhat temple of merchants for the residence of the assemblage of Śramaṇas and for the worship of Arhant a small Ārhat temple, seats for *āchāryas*, a reservoir and a slab of stone, with (the merit of the building to be enjoyed with) mother, sister, daughter, son and all relations."

The anomaly of the construction in the first portion of this sentence apparently did not escape the attention of the Pandit, who remarks that the syntax of the record is not smooth, and adds in a note: 'The original has *nikāyē*, but unless it be read *nikāyasa*, the inscription does not make good sense.' However, such an alteration seems to me very bold, without removing the difficulties. If the genitive *nikāyasa* were dependent on *vāsāyē*, the insertion of the words *Nāḍāyē gaṇikāyē* between *nikāyasa* and *vāsāyē* would be quite unaccountable, their proper place, of course, being after *dhitu*. Secondly, it is true that in Sanskrit and Prakrit the singular of a noun is often employed to denote the *jāti* even in cases where the plural would be required by the usage of other languages, but I doubt that a singular of this kind could ever be used in connection with a collective noun, such as *nikāya*. Considering all these difficulties, I feel quite sure that the Pandit has misread the passage, and that the correct reading is *śamaṇasādvikāyē*, corresponding to Sk. *śramaṇasādvikāyā*, 'by the lay-pupil of the ascetics.' Precisely the same term occurs in two other Mathurā inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 390, No. 17 (*śramaṇasādvikāyē*) and Vol. II. p. 199, No. 2 (*sama[na*]sādvikāyē*), while in a third inscription, *ibid.* Vol. I. p. 395, No. 28, the shorter expression *śrādvikā* is used. That *sādvikā* should appear here with the dental *s* by the side of *śamaṇa* with the palatal sibilant, will not be surprising to anybody familiar with the total want of regularity in the spelling of the Mathurā inscriptions. An exact parallel is offered by the inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 396, No. 30, where we find *śavakasya* = Sk. *śrāvakasya* by the side of *śisasya* = Sk. *śiṣyasya*. The correctness of my reading is partly confirmed also by the drawing accompanying the Pandit's edition, for although the fifth *akshara* looks more like *ni* than like *ri*, the fourth *akshara* is distinctly *sā*, not *sa*.

⁹⁰ A second circle appears to stand below the *ya*.

⁹¹ *Ayakasa* = Sanskrit *āryakasya*.

After what has been said above, it will be obvious, I think, that *vāsāyē* cannot possibly mean 'for the residence.' I take it to be an inaccurate spelling for *Vāsāyē* and look upon it as a surname of the donatrix standing in apposition to *Nādāyē gaṇikāyē* just as *Lēṇasāśbhikāyē* stands in apposition to *Daṁdāyē gaṇikāyē*.

Also with regard to the following words I differ from the Pandit's interpretation. I have pointed out already above, p. 102, that instead of *ārahatādevakulē* the drawing has *ārahatā devikulā*, and that this is a nom. sing. corresponding to Sk. *ārhatān devakulam*.⁹² With the feminine *devikulā* compare the term *devakulikā* frequently found in the meaning of 'shrine' in later Jaina inscriptions.⁹³ As to *āyagasabhā*, which the Pandit renders by *āyakasabhā* in Sanskrit and by 'seats for āchāryas' in English, I am inclined to adopt Bühler's view,⁹⁴ who thought the first member of the compound to be possibly identical with *āyoga* occurring several times in the term *āydgapaṭa* in the Jaina inscriptions at Mathurā.⁹⁵ As *āydgapaṭa* means 'a tablet of homage,' a slab put up in honour of the Arhats, *āy[ā]gasabhā* also would be an appropriate term for some hall erected in honour of the Arhats. The *āydgapaṭas* themselves are mentioned here in the list of gifts under the name of *śilāpaṭa*.⁹⁶

The drawing again suggests some minor corrections. In line 1 it reads *ārahatō Vadhāmānasa*; compare *ārahāto Mahāvīrasya*, Vienna Or. Journ. Vol. X. p. 172; *ārhatō Parivāsya*, Ep. Ind. Vol. II. p. 207, No. 29; *ārahantapujāyē*, *ibid.* No. 30, and, according to the photo-lithograph, also *ārahantapratimā*, *ibid.* p. 203, No. 16. In line 4 the drawing shows *patīṣṭhāpitān*, and in line 5 *sa[h]ā*, which form is found also above, p. 39, No. 9; Ep. Ind. Vol. II. p. 199, No. 2; p. 201, No. 11; Journ. As. S. VIII. Vol. XV. p. 119, &c.

With these emendations the text reads:—

- 1 Namō ārahatō Vadhāmānasa Daṁdāyē gaṇikā-
- 2 yē Lēṇasāśbhikāyē dhita śamaṇasāvīkāyē
- 3 Nādāyē gaṇikāyē Vāsāyē ārahatā devikulā
- 4 āyagasabhā prapā śilāpaṭā patīṣṭhāpitān⁹⁷ nigamā-
- 5 nā arahatāyatanē sa[h]ā mātārē bhaginiyē dhitarē putrēṇa
- 6 savina cha pariṇaṇa arahatapujāyē.

"Adoration to the Arhat Vadhāmāna (*Vardhamāna*)! By the lay-pupil of the ascetics, the courtesan Nādā, the Vāsā, the daughter of the courtesan Daṁdā, the Lēṇasāśbhikā (*or* the adorer of caves), a shrine for the Arhats, a hall of homage, a reservoir, and stone-slabs⁹⁸ were set up in the Arhat temple of the merchants, together with her mother, her sister, her daughter, her son, and all her retinue, for the worship of the Arhats."

No. 31. — Mathurā Jaina inscription on sculptured tōraṇa;
edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind. Vol. I. p. 390, No. 17, and Plate.

At the end of the second line of this inscription Bühler read *prati[śṭhāpi]*. The photo-lithograph, however, has very distinctly *pratiṣṭhā[pi]*, which is to be restored to *pratiṣṭhāpitān*. This is not the only instance in the Mathurā inscriptions of the occurrence of the dental sibilant in combination with a lingual mute. I have already pointed out above, p. 105, that in the inscription, Ep. Ind. Vol. II. p. 203, No. 18, we have to read *Stānikiydō* instead of *Sthānikiydō* as transcribed by Bühler, and in another inscription edited above, No. 30, we find *patīṣṭhāpitān*.⁹⁹

⁹² The Pandit translated it by *ārhatō devakulē* in his Sanskrit version and by 'a small Arhat temple' in English, so that it is impossible to say what he really meant.

⁹³ See, e. g., the Satruṇjaya inscriptions, Ep. Ind. Vol. II. p. 48 ff., Nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, &c.

⁹⁴ Ep. Ind. Vol. II. p. 314, note 7.

⁹⁵ Ep. Ind. Vol. I. p. 396, No. 33 (*āydgapaṭa*); p. 397, No. 35; Vol. II. p. 200, Nos. 5 and 8; p. 207, Nos. 30 (*āydgapaṭa*) and 32.

⁹⁶ Perhaps *śilāpaṭā* is the nom. sg. of a feminine noun; comp. the remarks above, p. 149, note 81.

⁹⁷ Read *patīṣṭhāpitā*.

⁹⁸ Or, possibly, 'a stone-slab.'

⁹⁹ Compare also the forms quoted from the Gīrnār Aśoka edicts, above, p. 105, note 45.

In the third line Bühler twice read *saha*, whereas the photograph leaves no doubt that in both cases the correct reading is *sahā*. This spelling of the word is not uncommon in the Mathurā inscriptions; see above, p. 153.

No. 32. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription;

edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 389, No. 15, and Plate.

This inscription is only a short fragment transcribed by Bühler as:—

... śé éta[syām] pūrvvāyām Kotṭiyātō gapātō ...

The reading *śé* is badly warranted by the photo-lithograph, the *é*-stroke and the cross-bar of the *mātrikā* being hardly discernible, while the right down-stroke of the *mātrikā* is much longer than it ought to be. In a note Bühler adds that *śé* must be the remnant of either *vinśé* or *trinśé*, but this again is not supported by the photo-lithograph. What is still visible of the sign preceding the supposed *śé* cannot possibly have formed part of either *vi* or *tri*, but looks exactly like the right half of the figure 10. In that case the next sign also must be a figure, and I think, there can be little doubt that it is 7; compare this figure in the Mathurā inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 4; p. 387, No. 10; p. 391, No. 19; p. 396, No. 30, and especially p. 391, No. 20. I therefore read the fragment:—

... 10 7 éta[syām] pūrvvāyām Kotṭiyātō gapātō ...

and take the 17 to be the number of the day.

No. 33. — Mathurā Jaina image inscription;

edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 219, No. 8, and Plate.

According to Rajendralala Mitra, on whose authority Mr. Growse relied, this short fragment reads:—

Siddhajivikasya datta-bhikshusya vihārasya

and means: "Of the monastery of Dattabhikshu, who had accomplished the object of existence." The real purport of the record has been recognised long ago by Bühler, who referred to it, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, note 60, but his transcript is not quite accurate. The inscription reads:—

Siddha[m] || Vāchakasya Dattaśishyasya Sihasya ni ...

The last word is to be restored to *nivartanā*, and the meaning of the words is: "Success! At the request of the preacher Siha (*Sinḥa*), the pupil of Datta." Bühler has already noticed that this Siha is mentioned again as the spiritual adviser of a lay-woman in a Mathurā inscription probably dated in Sam. 20 (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 383, No. 4). The present inscription therefore is to be referred to about the same time.

Nos. 34, 35, and 36. — Mathurā pillar inscriptions;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I.

p. 128, Nos. 5^a, 5^b, 6, and Plate; and by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*

New Ser. Vol. V. p. 186, Nos. 12 and 13.

The first and second of these inscriptions are on the base and plinth of a pillar, and the third is on the base of another pillar. If any trust can be put in Rajendralala Mitra's facsimiles, they are, for palaeographical reasons, to be placed in the time of the Kushaṇa rule at Mathurā. As Rajendralala Mitra's and Dowson's transcripts differ in many respects, and the facsimiles are very poor, all that can be said is that the first inscription refers to the son of a certain Vasumihira, while the second and third mention a person who was the son of Siṃha, and whose own name ended in *-mihira* and probably was Vasumihira as given by Dowson. At the end of the second inscription Rajendralala Mitra read *mēna dēvidharmāya ri trinē*, Dowson *imēna deviddharma parityā*, and at the end of the third Rajendralala Mitra *dharmabhikshuda*, Dowson *deva dharma pu*. There cannot be the slightest doubt that in both cases the correct reading is *imēna dēyadharmā-parityāgēna*, and that these words are to be completed in analogy to a phrase used in another Buddhist inscription from Mathurā:

*anēna dēyadharmma-parityāgēna sarvēśhaṃ prahaṇikānaṃ ārōgyadakṣhiṇḍyē bhavatu.*¹⁰⁰ The facsimile, as far as it goes, conforms with the reading suggested.

Nos. 37, 38, and 39. — Mathurā Buddhist inscriptions on bases of pillars;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I.

p. 128, Nos. 8 and 9, and Plate; and by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*

New Ser. Vol. V. pp. 186, 187, Nos. 15, 16, and 21.

Of these three inscriptions only the beginnings seem to be legible. Dowson's No. 21 is transcribed by him as *dānam Sangha-sthāvirasya Bhadatta*, which, of course, is to be corrected to *dānaṃ saṅgha-sthāvirasya bhadanta* . . . , "The gift of the elder of the congregation, the venerable . . ."

Dowson's No. 16 corresponds to Rajendralala Mitra's No. 9. According to the former it reads *dānam Sanghapravirasya pu* . . . , while Rajendralala Mitra renders it by *dānaṃ Saṅghapravirasya*¹ . . . I have no doubt that here again the correct reading is *dānaṃ saṅgha-sthāvirasya*² . . . , and that the *pra* in the facsimile results from leaving out the small curve to the left of the *sa* and not closing the circle and omitting the dot of the *tha*.

Very little has been left of the third inscription. Dowson (No. 15) reads *dānam Sangha* . . . , Rajendralala Mitra (No. 8) *dānaṃ Sagha*³ *putra*, but *putra* is not warranted by the facsimile, and I think it highly probable that this inscription also began with the words *dānaṃ saṅgha-sthāvirasya*.

Owing to the paucity of the distinct *aksharas* and the miserable condition of the facsimiles, it is difficult to pronounce a judgment on the characters of the inscriptions, but it seems that they are of the Kushāṇa type.

No. 40. — Mathurā Buddhist inscription on base of pillar;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 130, No. 19, and Plate.

Rajendralala Mitra read this fragment: *dānaṃ bhikṣusya Buddhabhīmasya mabhikṣusya* . . . , but there exists neither such a name as *Buddhabhīma* nor such a designation as *mabhikṣu*, 'the unworthy *bhikṣu*.' From the facsimile it appears that the inscription commenced:—

d[ā]na[m] bhikṣusya Buddha[ra]k[ṣh]itasya cha bh[i]kṣusya Saṅgha

The monk Buddharakṣita mentioned here is undoubtedly identical with the person of the same name and title referred to as the donor of pillars in two other fragments from Mathurā, the first⁴ of which begins like the present one: *dānaṃ bhikṣusya Buddharakṣitasya*⁵ *cha*⁶ *bhikṣusya* . . . , while the second⁷ reads: *dānaṃ bhikṣusya*⁸ *Buddharakṣitasya Sakyabhikṣusya Sa* The characters of the three inscriptions are of the Kushāṇa type.

No. 41. — Mathurā Buddhist image inscription;

edited by Growse, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI. p. 219, No. 7, and Plate.

This inscription is engraved on the base of a seated Buddha, and is much worn, because the stone has long been used by the *dhōbis* as a washing-stone. Mr. Growse read the words *daya-*

¹⁰⁰ *Journ. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc.* Vol. XX. p. 269, note 2. Mr. Bhandarkar reads "parityāgēna and sarvēśhaṃ, but the long *ē* in the former word is just as distinct as in *Sūriyasya* and *prahaṇikānaṃ*, and though the reading *sarvēśhaṃ* perhaps is not impossible, I should prefer *sarvēśhaṃ* which is in accordance with the spellings *bhikṣuanaṃ* and *prahaṇikānaṃ*. The words *anēna dēyadharmma-parityāgēna* are found also in the Mathurā Buddhist pillar inscription, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 130, No. 20, where Rajendralala Mitra reads . . . *dēvadharmma parata satata*.

¹ Or, properly, *Sandha*, which, however, is a misprint.

² The facsimile distinctly has *saṅgha*, not *saṅgha*.

³ Properly *Sadha*.

⁴ Rajendralala Mitra, *ibid.* p. 128, No. 10, and Plate; Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 187, No. 10.

⁵ According to the facsimile the reading is perhaps *bhikṣusya Buddharakṣitasya*.

This is Dowson's reading, which certainly is correct, though the facsimile has *ma*.

⁷ Rajendralala Mitra, *ibid.* No. 7; Dowson, *ibid.* p. 186, No. 14.

⁸ Here also the facsimile seems to read *bhikṣusya*.

dharmma and *Buddha* in the first line, and *sarvva* and again *Buddha* at the end of the second. A few more syllables can be made out with the help of the photo-lithograph, though a deciphering of the whole seems to be out of the question. I read :—

- 1 Dēyadhar[m]ô=yam Sa kuṭum[bi]nyâ Buddha va[sri]yâyâ
- 2 dâ(?)va [sa]rva-satvânâ[m] Buddha-
tvâya |

To judge from these fragments, the inscription appears to have been entirely in Sanskrit and to have recorded the gift of a Buddhist lay-woman. From the analogy of numerous similar Buddhist inscriptions the last sentence may be restored with tolerable certainty: [*yad=atra puṇyaṁ tad-bhavatu sa[rva-satvānā[m] Buddhatvāya*; 'whatever religious merit (*there is*) in this (*act*), let it be for (*the attainment of*) the condition of a Buddha by all sentient beings.' The few traces of letters which are still visible on the plate, would conform to this reading. The alphabet is of a later type than that used in the majority of the Mathurâ inscriptions. The characters closely resemble those found in a Buddhist image inscription from Mathurâ dated in 135,⁹ which date by common consent is referred to the Gupta era; compare especially the *ma*.¹⁰ In my opinion the present inscription must belong to approximately the same time.

Nos. 42, 43, and 44. — Mathurâ Buddhist inscriptions on the pedestals of statues;

edited by Rajendralala Mitra, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. pp. 128, 129,

Nos. 11 and 12, and Plate; and by Dowson, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc. New Ser.*

Vol. V. pp. 187, 188, Nos. 18, 19, and 24, and Plate.

The general purport of these three inscriptions, all of which are in pure Sanskrit, has been recognised by the two editors, but with the help of the facsimiles and in analogy to the dedicatory phrases of similar inscriptions their transcripts can be considerably corrected. I read and translate these inscriptions as follows :—

Dowson, No. 24 :

- 1 Dēyadharmô=yam Sâkyabhikshôḥ Saṁgharakashi-
- 2 tasya [||*] Yad=atra puṇya[m] tat=sarva-[sa]t[t*]v[ānām] [||*]

"This (*is*) the votive offering of the Sâkya mendicant Saṁgharakshita. Whatever religious merit (*there is*) in this (*act*), it (*belongs*) to all sentient beings."

Rajendralala Mitra, No. 12; Dowson, No. 19 :—

- 1 Dēyadharmô=yam Sâkyabhikshôr=Dharmadāsasya [||*] Ya-
- 2 d=atra puṇya[m] ta[n]n-mâtâ-[pi]trô[h] sarva-sat[t*]vânâ[m] cha [||*]

"This (*is*) the votive offering of the Sâkya mendicant Dharmadāsa. Whatever religious merit (*there is*) in this (*act*), it (*belongs*) to (*his*) parents and all sentient beings."

Rajendralala Mitra, No. 11; Dowson, No. 18 :—

- Dēyadharmô=yam Sâkyabhikshôr=bhadanta-Brahmasômasya [||*] Yad=atra puṇyaṁ
- tad-bhavatu sarva-sat[t*]vânām anuttara-jñân-âvâptayê ||

"This (*is*) the votive offering of the Sâkya mendicant, the venerable Brahmasôma. Whatever religious merit (*there is*) in this (*act*), let it be for the attainment of supreme knowledge by all sentient beings."

The form of the letters, especially of the *ma* and *na*, point to the period of the Gupta rule at Mathurâ as the time of the engraving of these inscriptions.

⁹ Gupta Inscriptions, Corp. Inscr. Ind. Vol. III., p. 263, No. 63.

¹⁰ I admit, however, that a similar *ma*, by the side of an older *ma*, is found already in a Mathurâ inscription dated in Sam. 33 of mahārāja Dēvaputra Huvishka; see above, p. 39, No. 9.