

XIV

THE MANIKIALA INSCRIPTION

By H. LÜDERS, Ph.D.

THIS inscription has been known for a long time. The stone on which it is engraved was discovered by General Court in one of the smaller Stūpas surrounding the large Stūpa at Maṇikiāla in the Rāwal Piṇḍi District, and was afterwards sent to Paris, where it is kept now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. It closed the upper opening of the relic-chamber, the incised face being turned to the interior.

In 1834 James Prinsep published a lithograph of the inscription in the Journ. Beng. As. Soc., vol. 3, p. 563, plate 33. More than twenty years afterwards a few names were deciphered by Cunningham, *ibid.*, vol. 23 (1854), p. 703, but no further progress was made until 1863, when Dowson published a tentative reading and translation in this Journal, vol. 20, p. 250 ff. The lithograph accompanying Dowson's paper was reproduced again in 1871 by Cunningham in the Arch. Surv. Rep., vol. 2, p. 160, plate 63, but his remarks on Dowson's readings (p. 163) are of little value. In 1896 the inscription was edited by M. Senart in the Journ. As., sér. 9, vol. 7, p. 1 ff. It is almost unnecessary to say that the careful and penetrating researches of the author of the *Notes d'Épigraphie Indienne* greatly advanced our understanding of the record; still, as acknowledged by M. Senart himself, a good number of difficulties and obscurities remained. Some of them I hope to be able now to remove; for others I venture at any rate to offer some suggestions which, though perhaps wrong in themselves, may lead others to a final solution. It is only by steps that we can advance in this field of

knowledge, and he who fears to put his foot occasionally on less safe ground will never reach the goal at all.

As I have had no opportunity of inspecting the original stone and do not possess an impression of it, my remarks are entirely based on the two photolithographs published with M. Senart's paper. Unfortunately the plate showing the complete inscription, though excellently done, is on a greatly reduced scale, and how much the reading is impaired thereby is clearly shown by the second plate, which represents the last two lines and the beginning of the first seven lines in about double the size, and on that account is far more distinct than the first plate. If anyone would publish a larger reproduction of this important inscription, he would earn the gratitude of all scholars interested in Indian epigraphy.

In 1907 the inscription formed the subject of a correspondence between Dr. Fleet and myself, and with Dr. Fleet's permission I have included some of his observations in the present paper. A few times I have also taken the opportunity of referring to a transcript of the inscription prepared many years ago by Professor Hoernle for the intended second volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, and made over to me in 1905: this transcript is only a tentative one, and for the most part, of course, is superseded by M. Senart's edition, but there are some passages where I believe Professor Hoernle to have hit already the right reading.

For the sake of clearness I give first the text as read by M. Senart:¹—

- 1 bhatarā Svarabudhisa agrapatiaśae
- 2 saṁ 18 spatrapurvaspa maharajasa Kane-
- 3 śkasa Guṣanavaśasaṁvardhaka Lala-
- 4 doḍanayago Vespaśisa chatrapasa

¹ I have altered the transliteration in accordance with that used in this Journal, and have given capitals in the case of the words taken by M. Senart as proper names.

- 5 horamurtasatasa Apanagavihare
- 6 horamurto atra nanabhagavabudhathuvaṃ
- 7 patithavayati saha taṇṇa Vespaṣiēna Khudaciēna
- 8 Buritēna ca viharakaraphaēna
- 9 saṃvena ca parivarena sadha etēna ku-
- 10 śalamulēna budhehi ca spavaspahi ca
- 11 saca sada bhavatu
- 12 Saṃdhabudhilēna savakarmigēna
- 13 Kartiyasa masa divase 20.

(Line 1.) The reasons why I differ from M. Senart with regard to the arrangement of this line will be given below.

(Line 2.) M. Senart reads the syllables after the figures of the date *spatrapurvaspa*. Several years ago it occurred to me that the correct reading was *etra purvae*, and I may add that Professor Hoernle and Dr. Fleet have arrived quite independently at the same, or nearly the same, reading. Dr. Fleet proposed to take the syllables as *atra purvae* or *ae purvae*, and in Professor Hoernle's transcript they are rendered first by *spa . purvaspa*, then by *asya(?) purvae(?)*, and lastly by *etaye purvae*. Professor Hoernle thus was probably the first to recognize the true value of the character read *spa* by M. Senart, though he did not make use of his discovery for the reading of the rest of the inscription. In my opinion the reading *etra purvae* is self-evident. The words correspond to the phrase *etasyāṃ purvāyāṃ* or *asyāṃ pūrvāyāṃ*, so frequently found in various spellings in the Mathurā inscriptions during the reign of the Kuṣāns. All the difficulties raised by M. Senart's reading thus fall to the ground. *Etra* is the equivalent of Pāli *ettha*. The sign with the hook to the right is apparently nothing but a variety of the ordinary sign due to current writing. Practice shows that a small hook will easily appear when the letter is written with one stroke of the pen beginning

at the top, and the engraver seems to have scrupulously followed the written draught before him.

The new reading implies a different construction of the words *maharajasa Kaneṣkasa*. Standing after *etra purvae* they can no longer be looked upon as part of the date, as was done by M. Senart, but must be construed with the following word *Guṣanavaśasanivardhaka*. The donor thus appears to be called "a propagator of the Guṣan race of the great king Kaneṣka", and I quite agree with M. Senart, if, on the strength of such terms as *Raghuvamśasanivardhana* for Rāma, he takes this to mean that the donor was a scion of the royal race.

(Line 4.) M. Senart reads the first word of this line *doḍanayago*, and combining it with the preceding word *Lala*, arrives at a compound *Laladoḍanayago*, which he considers to mean "the general Laladoḍa". In the *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 246, I have already pointed out that the correct reading undoubtedly is *Lala daḍanayago*, the photolithograph showing distinctly that what M. Senart took for the *o*-sign is simply a flaw in the stone. That the title *daḍanāyaka* was known in the time of the Kusans appears from the Mathurā inscription of Samvat 74 edited by me, loc. cit.

The next word, the name of the Chatrapa, is read *Vespaśisa* by M. Senart. At first sight the second letter of the word seems to be quite different from any known sign, but as the name occurs again in l. 7, and as there can be no doubt that there the second letter is the same as the *e* in *etra purvae*, we have to read here also *Veeśisa*. And now it will be easily recognized that what gives the *e* in *Veeśisa* its strange appearance and makes it look different from that used in *Veeśiena* and *etra purvae*, is the large loop at the bottom. That this loop again owes its origin to current handwriting is proved by the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins, where we find the looped sign, e.g. in A³, l. 3; C^{ro}, l. 16; etc.

(Lines 5, 6.) These lines present considerable difficulties. M. Senart takes *horamurtasatasa* in l. 5 as one word qualifying the Chatrapa Veeśi, and *horamurto* in the next line as applying to the general Lala. *Satasya* at the end of the first word he takes to be Sk. *satvasya*. In *murta* he recognizes Sk. *mūrta*, "qui a pris la forme de . . . , incarné, réalisé"; *hora* he connects with the Iranian *Ahura*; and he thus arrives at the translation "l'image d'Ahura". Ingenious as it is, this interpretation does not satisfy. It appears to me quite improbable that such merely ornamental epithets should have been used in a dry and short record like the present one, and even if that should be the case, it would seem strange that the same epithet was given to Veeśi as well as to Lala. But there are more and even graver difficulties. The last word of l. 5 is read by M. Senart *Apanagavihare*, and explained as meaning "le *vihāra* du petit *nāga*". The whole passage then, according to him, would mean: "Lala . . . fonde ici dans le *Vihāra* *Alpanāga* du satrape Veeśi, cette image d'Ahura, lui-même une image d'Ahura, ce *Stūpa*, etc." It will be seen at once that, if this translation should be correct, the order of the words would be quite perplexing. *Horamurto* would be quite out of place between *Apanagavihare* and *atra*. It ought to come immediately after *Lala daḍanayago*, and *atra* also we should expect to find, not after *Apanagavihare*, but before *Veeśisa*. For all these reasons I cannot accept M. Senart's explanation of the passage, and I would offer quite a different one.

I would propose to divide *horamurtasatasa* into three words, *horamurta sa tasa*, and to read *apanage vihare* instead of *Apanagavihara*.¹ The whole sentence up to l. 7 then would run:—maharajasa Kaneṣkasa Guṣana-vaśasaṁvardhaka Lala daḍanayago Veeśisa chatrapasa

¹ There are some minor points where I differ from M. Senart's reading, but they do not affect the sense.

horamurta sa tasa apanage vihare horamurto etra nana-bhagavabuddhaṭṭhuvanṃ pratistavayati. This would be in English:—"The scion of the Guṣana race of the Mahārāja Kaneśka, the general Lala, the *horamurta* of the Chatrapa Veeśi—he is the *horamurta* in his (i.e. Veeśi's) own Vihāra—erects here a Stūpa for different holy Buddhas." The sentence *sa tasa apanage vihare horamurto* is one of those inserted parenthetical sentences that are found in Pali prose texts,¹ and, which is more important in the present case, occur also in the Taxila Plate of Patika:² there we read:—Chahara[sa] Cukhsasa ca chatrapasa — Liako Kusuluko nama — tasa putro Pati[ko] — Takhaśīlaye nagare utareṇa pracu deśo Chema nama — atra [de*]śe Patiko apratiṭṭhaviṭa bhagavata - Śakamuṇisa śariraṃ [pra*]tiṭṭhaviṭi saṅgharamaṃ ca.³

Assuming my division of the words to be correct, we are compelled to look upon *horamurta* in l. 5 as a nominative by the side of *horamurto* in l. 6. But I do not think that this will in any way invalidate my interpretation, as nominatives of masculine *a*-stems in *a* are very numerous in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, and occur in the present record itself in °*saṃvārdhaka* and *Lala* in l. 3.

As regards the meaning of *horamurta*, it follows from the context that it is a term denoting some lay official in connection with the administration of the Vihāra, and this conclusion can be corroborated by evidence from another source. In the inscription A, II, of the Mathurā lion-capital, the chief queen of the Great Satrap Rājula is said to have deposited a relic, together with her mother, her paternal grandmother, her brother, her daughter, her *atra(te)ṇa* (*antahpura*), and the *horakaparivara*. There

¹ See, e.g., Jāt. I, 278: bodhisatto nāgabalo thāmasampanno nadiyā orimatirato uppatitvā — dipakassa orato nadimajjhe eko piṭṭhipāsāṇo atthi — tasmīṃ nipatati.

² *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 4, p. 55.

³ Mr. Thomas is inclined to look upon these phrases as derived from Persian models; see *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 139.

can be little doubt, I think, that the first part of the word *horamurta* is identical with the *horaka* mentioned here. Mr. Thomas¹ takes *horakaparivāra* as *horakā-parivāra* and renders it by "retinue of princesses or ladies";² but this appears to me unlikely, because the court of ladies is indicated already by the word *ateura*. Judging from the enumeration of the *horakaparivāra* in the last place, after the ladies of the harem, the word would rather seem to denote a certain class of officials of the royal household; and further, considering that we find them mentioned as assisting at the ceremony of the depositing of Buddhist relics in a Stūpa, it becomes highly probable that they had to carry out some functions in relation to Buddhist worship. We thus arrive independently at the same result with regard to the meaning of *horaka*, as before with regard to that of *horamurta*. The *horaka* and the *horamurta* are officials of the same class, *horaka* being probably only an abbreviated form of *horamurta*, like *rajjuka* for *rajjugāhaka*, etc.

We next turn to the word *apanage*. M. Senart reads *apanaga*, but he has observed that there is a distinct stroke at the top of the letter. However, he refrains from reading it as *e*, as it does not go from the right to the left as usual, but in the opposite direction. I am, nevertheless, inclined to look at this stroke as denoting *e*, and I would draw attention to the word *ekasitimaye* in the Muchai inscription,³ where the *e* is added to the *mātrkā ya* in exactly the same way as here. As regards the meaning of *apanage*, I cannot help coming back to Dowson's opinion, although I am aware of certain difficulties involved by it. Dowson thought of taking *apanaga* as an adjective

¹ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 140.

² In his translation of the word Mr. Thomas is guided by etymological reasons. He traces *hora* to the Iranian *ahura*. But even if this etymology should be correct, it is hardly necessary to say that it is always unsafe to assign a certain meaning to a word on etymological grounds alone.

³ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 37 (1908), p. 64 and plate.

connected with Sk. *ātman* and denoting "own". In that case *apanaga*, which may stand for *appanaga* or *appānaga*, would be derived from a stem *appana* or *appāna*, which actually appears in Prakrit dialects,¹ with the suffix *ka* in the sense of "belonging to", as in Sk. *ātmaka*, "belonging to the self," *Balhika*, "belonging to Balhi;" Pali *kulaka*, "belonging to a family," *abhijātika*, "belonging to a race," etc. It is true I know of no other instance of the transition of *tm* into *pp* in the dialect of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇ time,² but there are at least two instances of the phonetically nearly related transition of *tv* into *pp*. In the Ara inscription published by Mr. Banerji, *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 37 (1908), p. 58 and plate, the editor reads the date of the year as *samvatsaraē ekacatari(śe) sam xx, xx, i*, whereas from the photolithograph it is quite clear that the correct reading is *sambatsarae ekacapariśae sam 20 20 1*. *Ekacapariśae* would be *ekacatvārimśe* in Sanskrit. Again, in the Kaldarra inscription we read that a tank was caused to be made *sarvasapana puyae*. Both Bühler, *Vienna Orient. Journ.*, vol. 10, p. 57, and Senart, *Journ. As.*, sér. 9, vol. 13, p. 533, translated this "in honour of all serpents" (*sarvasarpānām*); but it is very improbable that in the dialect of the inscription the *r* in *sarpa* should have been dropped if it was preserved in *sarva*, and I have therefore not the slightest doubt that Mr. Thomas is right³ in rendering it "in honour of all beings", i.e. *sarvasattvānām*. However, there remains the difficulty of assuming that *apanaga* should have been used here in the wider and secondary meaning of "own", instead of the etymological sense of

¹ See Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, § 401.

² On the other hand, also, no counter-instance is known to me. The dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhī and Mansehra inscriptions, where *tm* is represented by *t* (i.e. *tt*) and *tm* respectively (see Edict XII), of course, cannot prove anything in this respect, as the Aśoka edicts are more than two hundred years older than the present inscription.

³ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 147.

"belonging to oneself". I cannot prove at present that such a development of meaning has taken place, and all I can say is that it does not seem improbable to me. At any rate, as long as no better explanation is offered, the one given by Dowson appears to me more plausible than the supposition that there existed a Vihāra "of the little Nāga".

With regard to some minor points where I differ from the readings of M. Senart, I labour under the disadvantage of not having an impression at my disposal. M. Senart reads *atra*, but it seems to me that there is a distinct hook attached to the right of the *a*. M. Senart takes the down stroke of the hook to be the prolongation of the right bar of the *ya*, but he states himself "qu'il ne fait pas rigoureusement suite à la partie inférieure". In my opinion the character is nothing but a rather ill-formed *e* of the same type as in *etra purvae*, *Veesisa*, etc.; similar forms occur in the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins in C^{ro} 16, *yaea*; C^{ro} 12, *eki*; 13, *ekada*. Besides, the reading *etra* is favoured by the fact that we have undoubtedly *etra* and not *atra* in l. 2.

The word corresponding to Sk. °*stūpam* is read °*thuvam* by M. Senart. The first character, as observed already by M. Senart, has a peculiar form, but to judge from the photolithograph, it resembles far more the ordinary *tha* than *thā*, and I should therefore prefer to read °*thuvam*.

(Line 7.) Instead of *patithavayati* I would read *prati-stavayati*, but I do so with a certain reserve. M. Senart declares that it is impossible to decide whether the engraver wrote *pa* or *pra*, but in the larger plate the latter reading seems to me more probable. The third character certainly is not *thā*, but closely resembles the *sta* occurring several times in the inscriptions on the Mathurā lion-capital.¹ However, I think that the reading

¹ See *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 146, pl. 4, Table of Aksharas. I may mention that also Professor Hoernle transcribed the character as *sta*.

stha also would not be impossible. The reading *ya* for the last but one letter is, of course, beyond doubt, and the character seems to me to be of the ordinary type. As shown above, there is no prolongation of the right bar, and the apparent stroke to the left may easily be a flaw in the stone, as pointed out already by M. Senart. Whether we have to read *taeṇa* or *taena* I do not venture to decide at present.

As regards the proper names in this line, I have noted already that instead of *Vespaśiena* we have to read *Veesiena*. The second name is transcribed as *Khudaciena* by M. Senart, but he himself states that he has read the second character as *ḍa* only for want of something better. The photolithograph seems to me to be rather in favour of *Khujaciena*.

(Line 8.) The only difficult word in this line is the epithet of Burita, read by M. Senart either *viharakara-phaena*, or, taking the fourth letter as a variant of the supposed *spa*, *viharasparaphaena*. The photolithograph, however, leaves little doubt that the fourth letter is *ka*. As regards the meaning of the word, M. Senart was inclined to consider it as equivalent to the well-known title of *vihārasvāmin*, although he was unable to offer an etymology of the second part of the compound. Later on, Professor Franke proposed¹ to read *viharakarafaena*, and to connect *karafaa* with a causative *karaveti* (Pāli *kārāpeti*), the existence of which is proved by the participle *karavita* found in the Kaldarra inscription. According to Professor Franke the word would mean "the founder or builder of a Vihāra or Vihāras". Professor Franke's derivation is proved by the use of the word *kārāpaka* in later Sanskrit inscriptions. In the Vasant-gaḍh inscription of Varmalāta (A.D. 625)² we are told that the *goṣṭhī* at Vaṭākarasthāna erected a temple of the

¹ *Pāli und Sanskrit*, p. 112.

² *Gött. Nachr.*, 1906, p. 145; *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 192.

goddess Kṣemāryā, entrusting the actual building to the *kārāpaka* Satyadeva, the son of Pitāmaha, who was a merchant by birth. In line 15 of the stone inscription at Kaṇaswa (A.D. 738),¹ recording the building of a temple of Śiva by prince Śivagaṇa, a certain Śabdagaṇa is named as the *kārāpaka*. And in the Eklingji stone inscription (A.D. 971),² which records the erection of a temple to Laṅkuliśa, we find at the end a list of persons characterized as *kārāpakas*. From these passages it becomes quite clear, as was first pointed out by Professor Kielhorn, that *kārāpaka* denotes an agent employed by a prince or a company in superintending the construction of a temple, and we can hardly be far from truth if we assign the meaning of "superintendent of the building of Vihāras" or "Vihāra architect" to the epithet given to Burita in the present inscription.

But, though the meaning of the term would seem to be settled by the reference to *kārāpaka*, the phonetical difficulties are by no means removed. The sixth letter of the word is usually transcribed by *pha*. Against this transliteration it has been rightly urged³ that there is another and quite different sign undoubtedly representing *pha*, and that both signs are found side by side, e.g. in the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins. The same objection holds good in the case of M. Senart's suggestion to read the sign as *bha*.⁴ There is no reason why two different signs should have been used for the same sound in the same document. These difficulties, it is true, are avoided by Professor Franke in reading *fa* instead of *pha* or *bha*, but there are other reasons why I cannot follow him. The words in which the supposed *fa* occurs are, according to Professor Franke—

1. *afai* (= Pali *ābhāti*), MS. Dutreuil de Rhins B7 ; *salafu* (= *salābham*), *ibid.* B20 ; 21 ; d . l . f . (= *dullabho*),

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 19, p. 59.

² *Journ. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc.*, vol. 22, p. 152 f.

³ Franke, *loc. cit.*, p. 111.

⁴ *Journ. As.*, sér. 9, vol. 12, p. 206.

ibid. C^{ro} 35; *prafaguno* (= *pabhaṃgunam*), ibid. C^{ro} 3; *prafaguni*, ibid. C^{ro} 16. In all these cases the sign in question corresponds to a Sk.-Pali *bha*. Now, in itself a transition of *bh* into *f* certainly cannot be called impossible. But it is most unfavourable to Professor Franke's theory that also *bh* is written in the same words in *apalabho* (= *appalābho*) in B21 and *samadhilabhena* (= *samādhilābhena*) in B24. The voiced aspirated mute *bh* and the voiceless spirant *f* are so widely different in sound that it is quite improbable that the same word should have been written indiscriminately in either way. If we accept the *f*, we are compelled to read also the sign for *bha* as *fa*, but I think that this would not even meet the approval of Professor Franke himself. Moreover, in B 13 we have *lahati* (= *labhati*). It seems to me impossible that *bh* should have developed, in forms of the same root, sometimes to *f* and sometimes to *h*. In my opinion *lahati* shows clearly that the sign in question represents an aspirate.

2. *makafa* (= *maghavā*), MS. Dutreuil de Rhins A² 1. This word also seems to me irreconcilable with Professor Franke's view. Professor Franke has overlooked the important fact that the preceding letter has lost its aspiration. There is, therefore, every probability that a real metathesis of the *h* has taken place, and that the last letter represents an aspirate and not a spirant.

3. *viharakarafaena* in the present inscription. All that can be said for certain in this case is that the sign in question represents an original *p*, and I therefore do not see in how far the word can be used for proving the value of the letter.

4. *ṣefa* (= Sk. *śreyaḥ*), MS. Dutreuil de Rhins C^{ro} 7; 17; 18; 21. By the side of this form there occurs, as pointed out by Professor Franke, *ṣebha*¹ in C^{ro} 10 and, as not mentioned by him, *ṣehu* in C^{ro} 8; 19; 40, and *ṣeho* in

¹ M. Senart's reading *ṣeho* is a mistake.

C^{ro} 9. According to Professor Franke, the transition of *y* into *f* is probably due to assimilation to the labial vowel *o* or *u* which properly stood in the neighbourhood of the *y*. But the facts hardly agree with this explanation, as the supposed *f* is found only before *a*, while before *o* and *u* we have *h* instead of it. Apart from that, the difficulty of reconciling the occurrence of *f*, *bh*, and *h* in the same word would be the same as in the case quoted above.

5. *fasuna* (= Sk. *svasṛṇām*), Mansehra Edict, v, 24, and *famikena* (= Sk. *svāminā*), ibid. ix, 5; xi, 13, read by Bühler *spasuna* and *spamikena*. These words may be left out of consideration, as the initial sign is totally different from the sign in question, but I may remark in passing that I do not see the slightest reason why it should be *fa* or even *pfa*. At any rate, I hope that an appeal to the laws of German children's language will not be considered sufficient to prove the transition of *sv* into *f* in an Indian dialect.

6. *Gomdofarnasa* in coin legends and *Gudufarasa* in the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription. These forms, again, cannot prove anything with regard to the true value of the sign, as foreign names would naturally be written with approximative signs in an Indian alphabet.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot accept Professor Franke's proposal, in spite of the rather violent reproach which he has lately addressed to all unbelievers (ZDMG., 60. 510 f.). I venture to suggest that the sign in question represents *vha*. The strongest argument in favour of this transliteration seems to me the word *makavha*, where, as stated above, a real metathesis of the aspirate appears to have taken place. Also the forms *avhai*, *salavhu*, *d. l. vh.*, *pravhaguno*, *pravhaguni*, will be easily intelligible if we keep in mind the frequent change between *v* and *b* in the language of the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins.¹ The transition

¹ Thus Sk. *iva* is generally represented by *va*, but by *ba* in A¹⁶; A²⁴; B 28; C^{ro} 14. Medial *p* frequently becomes *v*, and accordingly the

of *bh* into *vh* is further shown by the form *abhivuyu* (= Sk. *abhibhūya*), B 30, 31, which can be accounted for only by assuming an intermediate stage **abhivhuyu*. I think that even the strange forms corresponding to Sk. *śreyas* receive some light by reading *ṣevha*. We have, then, side by side, *ṣevha*, *ṣebha*, *ṣehu*, *ṣeho*. The first two forms apparently are to be traced back to **ṣehva*. In the same way *hv* becomes *vh* in Pali, and further, in the middle of a word, *bbh* in Prakrit; e.g., Sk. *jihvā*, Pali *jivhā*, Pr. *jibbhā*; Sk. *vihvala*, Pr. *vibbhala*, etc. The forms *ṣehu* and *ṣeho* are variants of **ṣehva* showing *samprasāraṇa*. It is therefore not due to a mere chance that in this word *h* appears before *u* and *o*, but *vh* and *bh* before *a*. In the name *Guduvhara*, *vh* was used as the sound nearest to the Iranian *f*. As regards the word *viḥarakaravhaena*, I would draw attention to an observation made by Professor Rapson: in vol. i of the *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Orientalistes*, p. 218, he has pointed out that in the Stein documents a peculiar sign, transcribed by him as *v'a*, is regularly used in the *ve* = *paya* of the causal stem; e.g. *vin'nav'eti*. It must be left to future researches to determine the exact phonetical value of this character, but it seems to me highly probable that in *viḥarakaravhaena*, *vh* was used to express this sound. Finally, I would not omit to mention that the form of the sign also is not unfavourable to the reading *vh*, as it can be easily explained as a modification of the common sign for *va*.

(Line 10.) Here the only word that requires any comment is the mysterious *spavaspahi*. It is unnecessary to discuss the ingenious suggestions proposed by M. Senart,

enclitical *api* appears as *vi* in C^o 2; 37; but in A³ 10; C^o 7; 9; C^o 21; 32; 33, we find *bi*. The combination *rv* has become *v* in *nivana* B 35, *nivinati* A³ 1-3, but *b* in *babaka* C^o 31. Original *b* is replaced by *v* in *avalāsa* A³ 15, and the form *supraudhu* A⁴ 4-9 goes back to **supravudhu* = Sk. *suprabuddham*.

as there can be no doubt that his reading was wrong, and that the last but one letter is not *spa*, but again the *e* found in *etra purvae*. As regards the first character, M. Senart has justly remarked that it is not the same as the last but one, but consists of a vertical bar with a downward hook on each side. For the discovery of the value of this character I am partly indebted to Dr. Fleet, who asked me whether it might not be possible to read *śravakehi* instead of *spavaspahi*. I saw at once that, although the reading *śravakehi* itself was not possible, Dr. Fleet was nevertheless essentially right and that the true reading was *śavaehi*. This word, corresponding to Sk. *śrāvakaiḥ*, is satisfactory with regard to both meaning and grammar. The transition of *śr* into *ś* is perfectly regular in this dialect,¹ and the dropping of the *k* in the suffix is quite common. The reading *śavaehi* therefore seems to me beyond doubt, and provided that the peculiar shape of the letter is not merely caused by a flaw in the stone, which from the photolithograph would not seem impossible, we have here a new variant of the letter, probably due again to cursive writing with ink and faithfully copied by the mason.

(Line 11.) M. Senart reads this short line *saca sada bhavatu*, but Dowson, Professor Hoernle in his transcript, and Dr. Fleet, agree in reading *sachasana bhavatu*, and the photolithograph certainly does not seem to admit of a different reading. As far as I see, *sachasana* can be nothing but Sk. *sacchāsanam*, and considering that in Buddhist Pali scriptures *sāsana* is frequently used in the sense of religion or dispensation in such terms as *Jina-sāsana*, *Buddhasāsana*, *Satthu sāsana*, we might feel inclined to assume the meaning of "true religion" for *sachasana*. The word thus would be a synonym of *saddharma*, which is a common term for the religion preached by the Buddha. The translation then would

¹ See my remarks, Arch. Surv. Ind. Annual Report, 1903-4, p. 290.

be literally :—"Through this root of bliss,¹ and through the Buddhas and Śrāvakas, let the true religion be." But this cannot be correct. It appears to me impossible that *bhavatu* should have been used in the sense of "let it endure" or "let it prevail". In my opinion something is required to complete the sentence, and I would propose to seek for this missing piece in the supposed first line of the record. For two reasons this line seems to be quite out of place in the arrangement accepted by M. Senart. Firstly, grammatically as well as in sense, the words *bhatara Svarabudhisa agrapatiaśae* are wholly unconnected with the following text, and secondly, on the analogy of numerous similar inscriptions, we should expect the record to begin with the date. These difficulties are avoided if we suppose the engraver to have commenced with Senart's l. 2. After S. l. 7, he turned to the left and incised the next three lines. Then finding no more room, he intended to put the rest of the text (S. ll. 1, 11) on the top, but here again the space did not quite suffice; so he wrote the last two words on the very edge of the stone and topsy-turvy. But, that they are to be inserted after S. l. 1, is indicated, I think, by the thick dash between °*āśae* and *bhavatu*. In order to judge rightly of this apparently slovenly manner of working, it must be borne in mind that the inscription, being engraved on the inner side of the ceiling of the relic-chamber, was not destined to be read by anybody. It is certainly for the same reason that so little care was taken to polish the stone. Inscriptions of this kind are much the same as the charters which at the present time are often enclosed in the walls of public buildings.

If my arrangement should be correct, the whole phrase

¹ The exact meaning of *kuśalamūla* in this phrase appears from several Buddhist inscriptions at Mathurā, where, instead of *etena kuśalamūlena* we find *anena* (or *imena*) *deyadharmaparityāgena*, "through this liberality in religious gifts;" see *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 33 (1904), p. 154 f.

would run:—etena kuśalamulena budhehi ca śavaehi ca bhātara Svarabudhisa agrapatiaśae sachasana bhavatu. This would closely agree with the benedictory phrases used in the Wardak inscription: ¹—imena kuśalamulena maharaja-rajatiraja-Hoveśkasya agabhagae bhavatu madapidara me puyae bhavatu bhradara me Haṣṭunamaregasya puyae bhavatu śoca me bhuya ² natigamitrasambhatigana puyae bhavatu mahiya ³ ca Vagamaregasya agabhagapatriyaṁśae bhavatu sarvasatvana arogadachinae bhavatu. ⁴ Similar phrases are:—(1) imena kuśalāmūlenā mātāpitūṇaṁ pūjāye bhavatu, in the Buddhist Gayā inscription of Saṁ. 64; ⁵ (2) anena deyadharmmaparityāgena sarvveṣaṁ prahaṇikānaṁ ārogyadakṣiṇāye bhavatu, in a Buddhist inscription from Mathurā; ⁶ (3) mātāpitṛṇaṁ agrapratyaśatāye bhavatu, in another Mathurā inscription; ⁷ and (4) yad atra puṇyaṁ tad bhavatu mātāpitro āpāyaka-poṣakacitrasya Jambudvīpasya darśayitāro agrebhāva-pratyamśatāyāstu tathā vihārasvāmīno Roṭasiddhavṛddhi sarveṣaṁ bhrātārāṇaṁ . . . anuttarajñānāvāptaye, in the Kura inscription of Toramaṇa Śāha. ⁸ However, there is one difference. There is no subject at all in the phrases of the Wardak, Gayā, Mathurā, and Kura inscriptions, although in the last passage we may easily supply *puṇyam* from the principal sentence. In the phrase of our inscription, on

¹ JRAS., vol. 20 (1863), p. 255 ff. and plate. The passage was read also by M. Senart, Journ. As., sér. 8, vol. 15 (1890), p. 121, but I differ from him in several points.

² These three words are doubtful.

³ *Mahiya* corresponds to Sk. *mahyam*, used in the sense of a genitive.

⁴ Similar phrases are found in the rest of the inscription, but the context is partly obscure.

⁵ Cunningham, *Mahābodhi*, pl. xxv.

⁶ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 33 (1904), p. 155.

⁷ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 1, p. 390, No. 18; cf. Senart, loc. cit., p. 9.

⁸ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 1, p. 240. The words *agrebhāvapratyamśatāyāstu* are a parenthetical phrase. Bühler separated the words °*pratyamśatāyās tu*. I prefer to take them as °*pratyamśatāya astu*, °*pratyamśatāya* being the Prakrit form for either °*pratyamśatvāya* or °*pratyamśatāyai*. That *agrebhāva* corresponds to *agrabhāva* in the Wardak inscription, has been pointed out already by M. Senart, loc. cit., p. 10.

the other hand, the subject would be *sachasana*. But I do not see how this might have a meaning similar to *punya*. Nor would the meaning of "true religion", suggested above, seem appropriate here. I would therefore propose to take *sachasana* in the sense of "the pious order", i.e. the order to erect the Stūpa. Perhaps we may compare a verse in the Divyāvadāna, p. 381, where the Maurya Aśoka is said to have made 80,000 Stūpas in one day by his orders :—*cakre stūpānām śāradābhraṇprabhānām loke sāsīti śāsad*¹ *ahnā sahasram*. But I readily admit that this interpretation of *sachasana* can by no means be called certain, and it must therefore be taken for what it is worth. Before venturing on other explanations, it would be desirable that somebody who has access to the stone itself should tell us, first of all, whether the reading *sachasana* can be relied upon.

(Lines 12 and 13.) Before commenting on the two lines to the right, I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Fleet for having drawn my attention to the fact that those two lines have not been engraved by the same hand as the rest of the record. A look at the photolithograph will be sufficient to show that they are written with far less care and present more cursive forms. The recognizing of this fact is of importance also for the understanding of the two lines. They have apparently been added after the proper record had been finished, and must be taken as a supplement to the statements of the continuous text. This is easily intelligible as far as the last line is concerned. The words *Kartiyasa masa divase 20* are certainly intended to supplement the date and must be read between *saṁ 18* and *etra purvae*. And I think it can be proved that the last line also is of a similar nature.

M. Senart reads it: *Samdhabudhileṇa savakarmigena*, and, supposing that *saṁdha*^o stands for *saṁdhi*^o, translates "(gravé) par Saṁdhibuddhila, ouvrier en tout genre".

¹ The MSS., however, have *sāsad*, and the metre of the line is wrong.

But against the admission of such a name as *Samdhibuddhila* there are serious objections. As pointed out by M. Senart himself, *Samdhi* is found as a proper name in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 2, p. 208, No. 34; and, I may add, also in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 1, p. 384, No. 5; and *Buddhila* occurs, e.g., in the Sāñci inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 2, p. 111, No. 2; p. 371, No. 136, and in the inscriptions F and N of the Mathurā lion-capital. But I doubt whether *Buddhila* was ever used at the end of a compound name. Being clearly a hypocoristic form, abbreviated from such names as *Svarabuddhi*, it naturally cannot be compounded again. And it must not be forgotten that the whole name of *Samdhibuddhila* rests only on a conjecture, the second syllable being distinctly *dha*, not *dhi*.

The reading and interpretation of the second word also does not satisfy. As far as I know, *sārvakarmika*, *sārvakārmika*, and similar terms, are used only in the general sense of "fit for every work", but not to denote a certain class of artisans. Secondly, the form *sava*° for *sarva*° or *sārva*° would be unusual. In l. 9, at any rate, we have *saṁvena*, and in most cases the *r* is left unchanged before consonants (*purvae*, °*saṁvardhaka*, *horamurta*, °*murto*, °*karmigena*, *kartiyasa*), the only counter-example being *sadha* in l. 9. But what is the most important point is that the first letter cannot possibly be *sa*, as it does not show the characteristic vertical line at the top found in *sa* everywhere else. I feel quite sure that it is *na*,¹ and I may add that the reading *navakarmigena* was adopted also quite independently by Professor Hoernle and again by Dr. Fleet. Now, *saṁdha Buddhilena navakarmigena* can only mean "together with Buddhila, the superintendent of buildings", and these words are apparently intended to supplement the list of the

¹ Perhaps of the same type as in *taena* or *taena* in l. 7, but I do not venture to decide this from the photolithograph alone.

persons that assisted at the erection of the Stūpa :—saha taṇa Veesīena Khujaciēna Buritēna ca viharakaravhaēna saṁvēna ca parivarena sadha. According to Cullavagga, vi, 5, 2, when a layman wanted to erect a building for the use of the Order, a monk was to be appointed as *navakammika* to superintend the work, and it is quite natural, therefore, to find the *navakarmika* mentioned as assisting at the ceremony of the inauguration of the Stūpa.

There is, moreover, another similar inscription which mentions the *navakarmika*, the Taxila plate of Patika.¹ M. Senart and Bühler are of opinion that the name of the *navakarmika* has been quoted here as that of the writer of the record. According to Bühler the phrase runs :—mahadanapati-Patikasa jau va[ñae] Rohiṇimitreṇa ya imahi saṁgharame navakamika ; “the victory of the great gift-lord Patika is described by Rohiṇimitra, who is the overseer of the works in this monastery”. Although Bühler states that the two bracketed *akṣaras* *ñae*, which are perfectly illegible in the photolithograph, are distinctly recognisable on the original plate, I doubt very much the correctness of the reading *jau vañae*. To say nothing of the supposed elision of *t* in *vañae*, which is by no means likely,² I cannot bring myself to believe that *jayo varṇyate*, literally “the victory is described”, could ever

¹ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 4, p. 54 ff.

² For the elision of the *t*, Bühler compares the elision of *k* in *saṁvat-saraye* and *aḥasatātimae*, which is not the same. There would be another epigraphical example for the elision of a *t* if Mr. Banerji were right in reading *kae* (=Sk. *kṛtam*) in the Muchai inscription, *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 37 (1908), p. 64. But according to an impression and a photograph before me the true reading is undoubtedly *kue*, which stands for **kuve* = Sk. *kūpaḥ* ; compare the Paja inscription, *ibid.*, p. 65, where, by the way, we have to read *Anandaputrena Saṁgamitrena kue karite*, not *katite*, as Mr. Banerji thinks, *karite* corresponding to Sk. *kāritaḥ*. Also, the words before and after *kue* I do not read as *sahayateṇa* and *vaṣiṣugena*, but as *sahayarana* and *vaṣiṣugana*. However, the meaning of these words would require a fuller treatment than can be given in a note. A third example would be *saṣpae* in the Mathurā lion-capital inscription A, ii, if this should really correspond to Sk. *śaṣvate*, but it is hardly necessary to say that the explanation of the word is quite uncertain.

mean "the record of the great gift was drawn up". I would rather suggest to read *jauvaraye* or some other equivalent of Sk. *yauvarāṇḍye* instead of *jau vaṇae*. "During the time when the great gift-lord Patika was heir apparent" would be quite unobjectionable, as we know from the inscription A on the Mathurā lion-capital that the title of *yuvarāja* was used for the sons of Kṣatrapas. But, however that may be,¹ Bühler's reading certainly is very doubtful and cannot prove that the *navakarmika* was ever charged with the drawing up of the record. On the other hand, if, as already suggested, there is no verbal form on which the instrumental *Rohiṇi-mitreṇa* might depend, it does not follow that we have to supply *likhitam*, "written by," or a synonym of it, as done by M. Senart. We may just as well supply a term denoting "made by" or "erected by", as in the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 9, p. 247 :—*svāmisya mahākṣatrapasya Śomḍāsasya gaṃjavareṇa brāhmaṇena Śegravasagotreṇa p[uṣka]raṇi imāśāṃ yamaḍa - puṣkaraṇinaṃ paścimā puṣkaraṇi udapāno ārāmo stambho i . . śilāpatṭo ca*.

The last word to be discussed here is the form *masa* in the date in l. 13. M. Senart calls it irregular, and seems to look upon it as a mere clerical error for *masasa*. However, we find the same shortened form, but probably with the *y* of the genitive ending, in the date of the very carefully engraved Wardak inscription :—*saṃ 20 20 10 1 masya Arthamisiyasa stehi (?) 10 4 1*; and we must therefore conclude that it was intentionally used. As regards the explanation of the form, I would draw attention to the date of the Ohind inscription read by M. Senart, *Journ. As.*, sér. 8, vol. 15 (1890), p. 130, note :—*Cetrasa masasa divase aṭhame di 8*. But from the facsimiles² there can be hardly any doubt that the

¹ The question, of course, cannot be decided without inspecting the plate itself.

² *Arch. Surv. Rep.*, vol. 5, pl. 16; *JRAS.*, vol. 20, pl. 10.

correct reading is:—sañ 20 20 20 1 Cetrasa mahasa divasa aṭhami di 4 4 iśa chunami. It seems, therefore, that the stem *māsa* became *māha*, gen. *māhasya* or *māhassa*, and further, with elision of the *h* and contraction of the two *a*-sounds, *māsyā* or *māssa*, written *masyā* and *masa* in the Wardak and the present inscription.

In conclusion I give my reading and translation of the record:—

Text.

- 1 Sañ 10 4 4 etra purvae maharajasa Kane-
- 2 ṣkasa Guṣanavaśasañvardhaka Lala
- 3 daḍanayago Veeśisa chatrapasa
- 4 horamurta sa tasa apanage vihare
- 5 horamurto etra nanabhagavabudhaṭhuvañ
- 6 pratistavayati saha taena Veeśiena Khujaciena
- 7 Buritena ca viharakaravhaena
- 8 sañvena ca parivarena sadha etena ku-
- 9 śalamulena budhehi ca śavaehi ca
- 10 bhataṛa Svarabudhisa agrapatiaśae
- 11 sachasana bhavatu
- 12 sañdha Budhilena navakarmigena ¹
- 13 Kartiyasa masa divase 20 ²

Translation.

In the year 18, on the twentieth day of the month Kārttika, on this date specified as above, the scion of the Guṣana race of the great king Kaṇeṣka, the general Lala, the *hōramurta* of the Satrap Veeśi, —he is the *hōramurta* in his (i.e. Veeśi's) own Vihāra,— erects here a Stūpa for several holy Buddhas, together with three persons, Veeśi, Khujaci, and Burita, the architect of Vihāras, together with Buddhila, the superintendent of buildings, and together with the whole retinue. Through this root of bliss and the Buddhas and Śrāvakas, let the pious order (?) be for the principal share of (*my*) brother Svarabuddhi.

¹ This line is properly to be inserted after l. 7.

² This line is properly to be inserted after *sañ 10 4 4* in l. 1.