

## VII

ON SOME BRAHMI INSCRIPTIONS IN THE LUCKNOW  
PROVINCIAL MUSEUM

BY PROFESSOR H. LÜDERS

IN a recent number of the *Ep. Ind.*, vol. x, p. 106 ff., Mr. R. D. Banerji has edited twenty-one Brāhmī inscriptions of the "Scythian" period, of which nine had been already published by him, under the name of R. D. Bandhyopadhyaya, in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, N.S., vol. v, pp. 243 f., 271 ff. We certainly owe a great debt of gratitude to him for making these records accessible, although the way in which he has acquitted himself of his task cannot meet with unreserved praise. I do not undervalue the difficulties which beset these inscriptions. I know that it cannot be expected that the first reading and interpretation of an inscription of this class should be always final. But what may be reasonably expected, and what, I am sorry to say, is wanting in Mr. Banerji's paper, is that carefulness and accuracy that have hitherto been a characteristic feature of the publications in the *Epigraphia Indica*. It would be a tedious and wearisome business to correct almost line for line mistakes that might have been easily avoided with a little more attention. The following pages will show that this complaint is not unjustified.

All the twenty-one inscriptions are in the Provincial Museum of Lucknow. Of eight of them the find-place is unknown; nine are, or are said to be, from Mathurā; while four are assigned by Mr. Banerji with more or less confidence to Rāmnagar. Among the Mathurā inscriptions there are three, No. 7 = B, 42;<sup>1</sup> No. 10 = B, 66;

<sup>1</sup> B refers to my "List of Brāhmī Inscriptions" in *Ep. Ind.*, vol. x, appendix, where the full bibliography is given.

No. 11 = B, 75, which were previously edited by Bühler. As far as the dates are concerned, Mr. Banerji's readings are undoubtedly an improvement on those of his predecessor (*aṣṭapana* instead of 40 4 *hana* in No. 7, *hamava* 1 instead of *hana va* 1 in No. 10, *saṁ* 90 9 and *di* 10 6 instead of *saṁ* 90 5 and *di* 10 8 in No. 11). But the rest of his new readings seems to me only partly correct. I will quote here only one point which is linguistically interesting. In No. 11 the name of the nun at whose request the gift was made, read *Dhāma*[*thā*]*ye* by Bühler, is read *Dhama*[*śi*]*r*[*i*]*ye* by Mr. Banerji, who adds that the reading of the third syllable is certain though the crossbar of the *śa* is not distinct in the impression. Mr. Venkayya has already remarked in a note that in the plate the reading appears to be *Dhāmadharaye*. The impression before me leaves no doubt that it really is *Dhārmadharāye*. This is a new instance of the lengthening of an *a* before *r* + consonant in the Mathurā dialect, on which I have commented, *Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Dramen*, p. 31.

Of the rest of the Mathurā inscriptions, No. 2 = B, 88, and No. 6 = B, 52, were brought to notice by Growse, and No. 13 = B, 140, by Dowson; No. 14 = B, 109, was read by Mr. V. A. Smith; No. 18 was mentioned by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 311. I will pass over Nos. 2, 6, and 18, as I have no impressions of them. But of the very interesting inscription No. 13, which is engraved on a large slab of red sandstone, there is an impression among the materials collected by Dr. Hoernle for the intended second volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*. It is not a very good one, but it is nevertheless very valuable as it was taken at a time when the inscription was in a more complete state than at present. I read it:—

1. . . . āpavane<sup>1</sup> Śrīkuṇḍe<sup>2</sup> svake<sup>3</sup> vihāre Kakatīkānaṁ  
pacanaḥ niyatakaḥ<sup>4</sup> nānātra vastussi<sup>5</sup> saṁskā-



layitavyah saṅghaprakitehi vyavahārihi upaṭhapito  
yeṣaṃ ni[pa] <sup>6</sup>.

2. . . [ya] <sup>7</sup>—Sthāvarajātra—B[u]d[dh]araksita—Jivaśiri  
—Buddhadāsa—Saṅgharaksita

3. —Dhārmavarmma <sup>8</sup>—Buddhadeva—Akhila <sup>9</sup>

1. Bn. *navan[e]*. As to the first letters, the impression entirely differs from the colotype. The impression reads as above, but the vowel of the lost *akṣara* may have been an *o* of which only the right half is preserved. Above the last *akṣara* there is a short stroke which I should take to be meant for the *anusvāra* if this were not grammatically impossible.

2. Bn. reads *Śrikanḍe*, adding that "the word may be taken to be *kanṭhe*". This, of course, is impossible as the *ṇḍe* is just as distinct as the *u* of *ku*.

3. Bn. reads *stake*, adding that the word may be read as *svaka*. The reading *svake* is beyond doubt.

4. On this word Bn. makes a note which really seems to apply to the *ya*. However, it is superfluous as there is no *e*-stroke at the top of the *ya*. The two large horizontal strokes left unnoticed by Bn. I take to be the *anusvāra*, though they are rather below the line.

5. Bn. has wrongly separated these words. Perhaps the true reading is *vāstussi*.

6. The last *akṣara* is uncertain. It may have been also *ha* or *la*.

7. The *ya* is mutilated and uncertain.

8. Bn. *Dharmma* <sup>o</sup>, but the *ā*-stroke is distinct; cf. above, p. 154.

9. Bn. *su[khā]la*. The vowel-sign of the *kha* undoubtedly is *i*.

Mr. Banerji has not translated this inscription, because "it contains some peculiar words". I venture to offer a translation, although owing to the mutilated state of the inscription the connexion between the first and the second line is not clear, and moreover the exact meaning of some terms cannot yet be settled—

"The fixed cooking-place of the Kakatikas, not to be put up in any other house, . . . in the grove . . . at

Śrīkuṇḍa (*Śrīkuṇḍa*), in their own Vihāra, has been set up by the merchants entrusted with (taking care of) the Order, whose . . . Sthāvarajātra, Buddharakṣita, Jivaśīri (*Jīvaśrī*), Buddhadāsa, Saṅgharakṣita, Dhārmavarmma (*Dharmavarman*), Buddhadeva, Akhila . . .”

The *pacana* which forms the object of the donation apparently is the slab itself, and I do not see how the word can have any other meaning but “cooking-place”, although the Sanskrit dictionaries assign that meaning only to *pacana* as a neuter. The words *nāṇatra vastussi saṃkkālayitavyaḥ*, which apparently stand in contrast to *niyatakāḥ*, seem to represent Sanskrit *nāṇyatra vāstuni saṃkalayitavyaḥ*, but I am by no means sure that in translating them I have hit the right meaning. The term *saṅghaprakṛta* occurs several times in the Buddhist inscriptions of Mathurā edited by Dr. Vogel in the Catalogue of the Archæological Museum at Mathurā.

Probably the names in lines 2 and 3 are the names of these *saṅghaprakṛtas*. It is more difficult to say who is meant by *Kakaṭikānaṃ*. I take this to be a proper name, and as a cooking-place in a Vihāra can hardly be intended for anybody but the monks living there, *Kakaṭika* would seem to be the name of those monks, though I cannot say why they were called so. Śrīkuṇḍa, where the Vihāra was situated, is mentioned as the name of a *tīrtha* in the Mahābhārata (iii, 5028), but, of course, it does not follow that the two localities are identical.

No. 14, incised on the waistband of a female figure, was read by Mr. Banerji :—

1. Puśabalāye dāne Dhama-
2. vadhakasa [bha]yāye

But in the impression as well as in the plate the first word is clearly *Pūśabalāye* (= *Puṣyabalāyāḥ*) and the last *bharyāyā*.



We next turn to the inscriptions of unknown origin, Nos. 3, 5, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21. In No. 3, incised on the base of a Jaina image, the arrangement of the lines is irregular. It seems that it was intended at first to record only the gift and that the statement about the *nivartana* was added afterwards to the left. I read the inscription from an impression :—

1. siddham saṃ 9 he 3 di 10 Grahamitrasya dhitu  
Avaśirisyā<sup>1</sup> vadhue Kaḷalasya<sup>2</sup>
2. kuṭubiniye<sup>3</sup>
3. Grahapalāye<sup>4</sup> dati —<sup>5</sup>
4. Koḷeyāto<sup>6</sup> gaṇato<sup>7</sup>
5. Ṭhanīyato kulato Vairato<sup>8</sup> [śākha]to
6. Arya-Taraka[s]ya<sup>9</sup>
7. [n]iva[r]tanā

1. Bn. reads *Śivaśirisyā* and adds that “the first syllable of the word *Śivaśiri* may also be read as *Avaśiri*” [*sic* !]. The first syllable of the word is undoubtedly *a*.

2. Bn. reads *vadhū Ekraḍalasya* and remarks that the last word may also be *Ekrāḍalasya*. There is certainly no subscript *ra*, but there is a small horizontal stroke which makes the *ka* almost look like *kka*. As, however, the word cannot begin with a double consonant, it is apparently accidental. The second letter of the word is *ḷa*; see my paper on the lingual *ḷa* in the Northern Brāhmī script, above 1911, pp. 1081 ff.

3. Bn. *kuṭu[m]biniye*, but there is no trace of the *anusvāra*.

4. Bn. *Gahapālāye*. The subscript *ra* is quite distinct, but there is no *ā*-stroke attached to the *la*.

5. Bn. does not take any notice of the sign of punctuation.

6. Bn. *Koṭṭiyāto*. Cf. note 2 above.

7. Bn. *gaṇāto*. There is no trace of the *ā*-stroke.

8. Bn. *Ṭhanīyāto kulāto Vair[ā]to*. There is not the slightest trace of an *ā*-stroke in the three words.

9. Bn. *Tar[i]ka[s]ya*. The *i*-sign is not visible in the impression.

“Hail! In the year 9, in the 3rd month of winter, on the 10th day, the gift of Grahapālā (*Grahapālā*), the

daughter of Grahamitra, the daughter-in-law of Avaśiri (*Avaśrī*), the wife of Kaḷala, at the request of the venerable Taraka out of the Koḷeya *gaṇa*, the Ṭhaniya (*Sthānīya*) *kula*, the Vairā (*Vajrā*) *śākhā*.”

Of the short inscription between the feet of the statue I have no impression. It seems to refer to Grahapalā and to characterize her as the pupil of some Jaina monk.

No. 5 is engraved on the pedestal of a Jaina statue. I read it from an impression :—

1. mahārājasya Huvekṣasya <sup>1</sup> savacarā <sup>2</sup> 40 8 va 2 d[i] 10 7  
etasya puvāyaṃ K[o][i]ye gaṇā <sup>3</sup> Bama <sup>4</sup> . .
2. [si]ye k[u]le <sup>5</sup> Pacanāgariya <sup>6</sup> śākhāya <sup>7</sup> Dhañāvalasya <sup>8</sup>  
śiśiniya <sup>9</sup> Dhañāśiriya <sup>10</sup> nivatana
3. Budhikasya <sup>11</sup> vādhuye <sup>12</sup> Śavatrātāpotriya <sup>13</sup> Yaśāya <sup>14</sup>  
dāna <sup>15</sup> Sa[m]bhavasya prodima <sup>16</sup> pra-
4. t[i]stapita <sup>17</sup>

1. Bn. *Huvakṣasya*, but the *e*-stroke is quite distinct.

2. Bn. *sa[m]vacar[e]*. There is no trace of the *anusvāra* in the impression, and the last letter is distinctly *rā*.

3. Bn. *K[oṭṭi]ye [gaṇe]*. Regarding the first word see note 2 on p. 157. The last letter is clearly *ṇā*, not *ṇe*, though *gaṇe*, of course, would be the correct form. Above the line, between the *ye* and the *ga*, there is a small *ta*. Perhaps the engraver intended to correct *Koḷiye gaṇā* into the ordinary *Koḷiyāto gaṇāto*, but gave the task up again.

4. The *ma* is missing in the impression, but distinct on the plate. Read *Bamadā*.

5. The *ku* is very small and has been inserted afterwards.

6. Bn. *°nagariye*, but there is no trace whatever of the *e*-stroke. Read *Ucanāgariya*.

7. Bn. *śākāya*. This certainly was the original reading, but the *kā* has been altered afterwards to *khā*.

8. Bn. *Dhujhavalas[ya]*. The second letter is as clearly as possible *ṇa*, and there can be only a doubt whether the small stroke at the top is to be read as *ā* or not. The first letter may be *dhu*, but as the prolongation of the vertical line in the *dha* occurs again in *Budhikasya*, where it cannot denote *u*, and as



*Dhañāvalasya* would be an etymologically unaccountable form, I am convinced that it is *dha*.

9. Bn. *śiśin[i]y[e]*, but the *e*-stroke is quite improbable.

10. Bn. *Dh[ujhaśiriy[e]*. The remarks on the first two *akṣaras* of *Dhañāvalasya* apply also to the first two *akṣaras* of this word. There is no *ē*-stroke on the *ya*.

11. Bn. *[Bu]dhukasya*. See note 8; the *i*-stroke is distinct.

12. Bn. *vadhuye*. The *ā*-stroke of *vā* is perfectly clear.

13. Bn. *Śavatrana(?)potr[i]y[e]*. The *ā*-stroke of *trā* is distinct. The fourth *akṣara* is clearly *tā*; cf. e.g. the word *nivatana*. There is no *e*-stroke on the *ya*.

14. Bn. *Yaśāy[e]*. There is no *e*-stroke on the *ya*.

15. Bn. *dana*. The *ā*-stroke is distinct.

16. Bn. *proṭima*, but the second *akṣara* is undoubtedly *di*; *pro*, of course, is a mistake for *pra*.

17. Bn. *°ta(ti)stape(pi)ta*. The *i*-stroke of *ti* is rather indistinct.

“In the year 48, in the 2nd month of the rainy season, on the 17th day, of *mahārāja* Huveṣa, on that (date specified as) above, at the request of *Dhañāśiri* (*Dhanyāśrī*), the female pupil of *Dhañāvala* (*Dhanyāvala*) in the *Koliya gaṇa*, the *Bama[dā\*]siya* (*Brahmadāsika*) *kula*, the *Pacanāgarī* (*Uccānāgarī*) *śākhā*, an image of *Sambhava* was set up as the gift of *Yaśā*, the daughter-in-law of *Budhika*, the granddaughter of *Śavatrātā* (*Śivatrātā*?).”

Mr. Banerji takes *Pacanāgarī* as a *Prakṛit* form of *Vajranagarī*. Leaving aside the phonetical difficulties, this interpretation is impossible as the *Vajranāgarī*, or rather *Vārjanāgarī*, *śākhā* is a subdivision of the *Vāraṇa gaṇa*, not of the *Koliya gaṇa*. There can be no doubt that *Pacanāgarīya* is a mistake of the engraver for *Ucanāgarīya*.

The remaining inscriptions of unknown origin are but small fragments. No. 12, which consists of but two words and a half, is correctly read. No. 15, incised on the fragment of a slab, is read by Mr. Banerji:—

Gośālasyā dhītā Mitrāye [danam\*]

Linguistically and palæographically the form *Gośālasya* is striking. In *śā*, *tā*, *trā*, the *ā* is expressed by a long slanting line, whereas in *syā* the sign would seem to consist of a short and perfectly vertical stroke. Now, on the reverse of the two impressions before me just this stroke is entirely invisible, whereas the rest of the inscription is quite distinct. I have therefore no doubt that it is only an accidental scratch. Why, at the end, *danam* should be supplied instead of *dānam*, is unintelligible to me. I read:—

Gośālasya dhītā Mitrāye . . .

“[The gift] of Mitrā, the daughter of Gośāla.”

Of Nos. 17, 19, 20, and 21, I have no impressions. But in the case of No. 19 even the collotype is sufficient to show that Mr. Banerji's readings are incorrect. He reads:—

1. . . . sya [v]ṛta Ku[ṭu]kasya ku[ṭu][ṛbini\*] . . .

2. . . . na putrehi dhītihi natti pau[ttrehi\*] . . .

The collotype shows:—

1. . . . sya . ṛtakunḍakasya kuṭu . . .

2. . . . na putrehi dhītihi nattipau . . .

“ . . . of the wife of [Gh]ṛtakunḍaka, . . . sons, daughters, daughter's sons (*or* great-grandsons?) and son's sons . . . ”

It is extremely unlikely that the second *akṣara* of the first line should have been *vṛ*, as the base of the letter is far too long for a *va*. Nor will it appear likely to anybody familiar with these inscriptions that the husband of the donatrix should bear the epithet “the chosen” as supposed by Mr. Banerji. I would restore the name to Ghṛtakunḍaka.

On No. 20 Mr. Banerji remarks—“The inscription is of some interest as it contains the number 800 expressed both in words and by numerical symbols, viz. by the symbols for 8 and 100 [*sic!*].” This statement refers to the second line of the fragment, which runs—



... m = aṣṭaśata 100 8 gandhi ...

The two symbols are not joined in any way, and it therefore appears to me impossible that they should represent 800. The term *aṣṭaśata* is ambiguous. It certainly may mean 800, but just as well it may mean 108, as proved by the passages quoted in the PW. *sub voce aṣṭan*. Under these circumstances I cannot admit that we have here an instance of the symbol for 800.

The most important inscriptions, from an historical point of view, would seem to be that group which is supposed to come from Rāmnagar. Before we can discuss them, it will be necessary to enter into the history of the Rāmnagar excavations, though I do so reluctantly. It certainly is an unpleasant task, but it must be performed as we cannot allow science to be led astray by statements which apparently are not true.

In the Progress Report of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for 1891-2, Epigraphical Section, Dr. Führer gives a short account of the excavations at Rāmnagar in the Bareilly District. He first describes the remains of two Śaiva temples. With these we are not concerned here, as no inscriptions were found in them. He then speaks of the excavation of a mound which "brought to light the foundation of a brick temple, dedicated to Pârśvanâtha, . . . dating from the Indo-Scythic period". These statements rest on epigraphical finds about which Führer says—"During the course of the excavations a great number of fragments of naked Jaina statues were exhumed, of which several are inscribed, bearing dates ranging from Samvat 18 to Samvat 74, or A.D. 96 to 152. An inscription on the base of a sitting statue of Neminâtha records the following:—'Success! The year 50, second month of winter, first day, at that moment, a statue of divine Neminâtha was set up in the temple of the divine

lord Pârśvanâtha as a gift of the illustrious Indrapâla for the worship of the Arhats and for the welfare and happiness of the donor's parents and of all creatures.'"

In my opinion there can be no doubt that this inscription has been invented by the author of the Report. The date has been copied from the Mathurâ inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 209, No. 36, which is dated [sam] 50 he 2 di 1 asya purvvaaya. The name of the donor and the phrase "for the worship of the Arhats" have been taken from the Mathurâ inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 201, No. 9, which records the gift of Îdrapâla (*Indrapâla*), the son of a Gotî (*Gauptî*), for the worship of the Arhats. And the phrase "for the welfare and happiness of the donor's parents and of all creatures" has probably been taken from the Buddhist Kāman inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 212, No. 42, which ends: *mātapitṛṇām sarvvasa[ta]ṇā ca hitasukhārttha*, "for the welfare and happiness of (the donor's) parents and of all creatures" (Bühler's translation).

The account of the excavation of the Jaina mound is followed by the description of "another extensive mound, . . . which on exploration was found to hide the remains of a very large Buddhist monastery, called Mihiravihâra, and dating from the middle of the first century A.D. . . . Externally the temple was decorated with elaborate brick carvings and numerous figures of terra-cotta, representing scenes from the life of Buddha, some of which bear short inscriptions and masons' marks. . . . An inscription on the base of a terra-cotta statue of Buddha records the following:—'Success! In the year 31 (A.D. 109), in the first month of the rainy season, on the tenth day, at that moment, a statue of divine Sâkyamuni was set up within the precincts of the Mihiravihâra as a gift of the monk Nâgadatta, for the acceptance of the Sarvâstivâdin teachers, for the welfare and happiness of the donor's parents and of all creatures.'"



In this case, also, the document supposed to give evidence for the name and the date of the building has been manufactured by Führer. The date comes from the Mathurā inscription, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, pp. 202 f., No. 15, which is dated *sa 30 1 va 1 di 10*. The rest, with the exception of the name of the donor, is an almost literal copy of the Kāman inscription just mentioned, or rather of Bühler's translation of that inscription: "... at that moment, a statue of divine Śākyamuni (*Śākyamuni*, *was set up as*) the gift of the monk Nandika in the Mihiravihāra, for the acceptance of the Sarvastivādi (*Sarvastivādin*) teachers, for the welfare and happiness of (*the donor's*) parents and of all creatures."

Führer next announces the discovery of another Buddhist monastery:—"The carved bricks found on the spot are of the same period as those of the Mihiravihāra, as they show the same patterns and bear short donative inscriptions." And he reports that "during these excavations 1,930 relics of antiquities have been exhumed and deposited in the Lucknow Provincial Museum", and again he states that the collection comprises among other things "numerous carved bricks and terra-cotta statuettes of Buddha and Śiva, inscribed", and "inscribed Jaina images of red sandstone".

To the inscriptions on the carved bricks and terra-cottas he devotes a special paragraph, where the audacity of the author emulates the clumsiness of his fabrication. The whole paragraph is nothing but an abstract of Bühler's introduction to his edition of the Sāñci inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, pp. 91 ff., with a few alterations necessary to serve the new purpose. In order to show that this is not saying too much I put the two accounts side by side—

#### Führer

The inscriptions on the carved bricks and terra-cottas offer, in spite of their brevity, a good

#### Bühler

Turning to the contents of the inscriptions, the latter offer, in spite of their extreme brevity,

many points of interest. Some record donations by corporate bodies or families, others give the names of individual donors, as monks, nuns, or laymen.

As the Buddhist ascetics could not possess any property, they must have obtained by begging the money required for constructing the large temples and monasteries of Adhichhatrâ. This was, no doubt, permissible, as the purpose was a pious one. But it is interesting to note the different proceedings adopted by the Jaina ascetics of Mathurâ and Adhichhatrâ, who as a rule were content to exhort the laymen to make donations, and to take care that this fact was mentioned in the votive inscriptions.

Among the individual monks named there are none who can be identified with any of the great men in Buddhist scriptures. As regards the persons who are not marked as monks, and presumably were laymen, the specifications of their position, which are sometimes added, possess some interest. To the highest rank

a good many points of interest . . . there are ten, recording donations by corporate bodies or families. The remainder give the names of individual donors . . . we find among them fifty-four monks and thirty-seven nuns, as well as ninety-one males and forty-five or forty-seven females, who probably were lay-members of the Buddhist sect . . . As the Buddhist ascetics could not possess any property, they must have obtained by begging the money required for making the rails and pillars. This was no doubt permissible, as the purpose was a pious one. But it is interesting to note the different proceedings of the Jaina ascetics, who, according to the Mathurâ and other inscriptions, as a rule, were content to exhort the laymen to make donations and to take care that this fact was mentioned in the votive inscriptions . . . Among the individual monks named in the inscriptions there are none who can be identified with any of the great men in the Buddhist scriptures . . . As regards the persons who are not marked as monks, and presumably were laymen, the specifications of their social position, which are sometimes added, possess some interest.



belongs Indrapāla<sup>1</sup>; descending lower in the social scale, we have a village landholder, *gahapati*; next we find numerous persons bearing the title *seṭhi* or alderman; simple traders, *vānika*; a royal scribe, *rājālipikara*; a professional writer, *lekhaka*; a royal foreman of artisans, *āvesani*; a trooper, *aśavārika*; and a humble workman, *kamika*, are mentioned.

The prevalence of merchants and traders seems to indicate, what indeed may be gathered also from the sacred books of the Buddhists, that this class was the chief stronghold of Buddhism. The mention of professional writers is of some importance on account of the great age of the inscriptions. Among the epithets given to females the repeated occurrence of the old Pali title *pajāvatī*, literally "a mother of children", is not without interest, and the fact that some females are named merely "the mother of N.N.", and that others proudly associate the names of their sons with their own, is worthy

To the highest rank belongs the Vākalādevī . . . Descending lower in the social scale, we have a *gahapati* or village landholder . . . Next we find numerous persons bearing the title *seṭhi*, *sheṭh*, or alderman . . . Simple traders, *vānija* or *vānika*, are mentioned . . . A royal scribe, *rājālipikara*, occurs . . a professional writer, *lekhaka* . . . , a (*royal*) foreman of artisans, *āvesani*, . . . a trooper, *aśavārika*, . . . and a humble workman, *kamika* . . .

The prevalence of merchants and traders seems to indicate, what indeed may be gathered also from the sacred books of the Buddhists, that this class was the chief stronghold of Buddhism. The mention of professional writers is of some importance on account of the great age of the inscriptions. Among the epithets given to females the repeated occurrence of the old Pali title *pajāvatī*, literally "a mother of children", . . . is not without interest, and the fact that some females are named merely "the mother of N.N.", and that others proudly associate the names of their sons with their own, is worthy of note . . . The

<sup>1</sup> Indrapāla apparently refers to the donor of the inscription of Sāmivāt 50. The author has entirely forgotten that he has represented this man as a Jaina layman.

of note. The names of various lay donors and of a few monks furnish also some valuable information regarding the existence of the Paurāṇik worship during the second and first centuries B.C.

There are some names, such as Agni-sarmā, Brahmadata, Visvadeva, Yamarakshitā, etc., which are closely connected with the ancient Vedic worship; and some, as Nāgā, Nāgadatta, and so forth, bear witness for the existence of the snake-worship, which was common to the Brāhmanists and the heterodox sects. Finally, names like Vishnudattā, Balamitra, furnish evidence for the development of Vaishnavism, while Nandigupta, Kumāradatta, Sivanandin, do the same service to Śaivism. The occurrence amongst the Buddhists of Adhichhatrā of names connected with the ancient Vedic religion, as well as of such as are connected with Vaishnavism and Śaivism, has, no doubt, to be explained by the assumption that their bearers or their ancestors adhered to these creeds before their conversion, and that they received their names in accordance with the established custom of their families.

names of various lay donors and, I may add, of a few monks, furnish also some valuable information regarding the existence of the Paurāṇik worship during the third and second centuries B.C. . . .

There are further some names, such as Agisimā (*Agniśarmā*), . . . Bahadata (*Brahmadatta*), . . . Visvadeva, Yamarakhitā, which are closely connected with the ancient Vedic worship; and some, Nāgā, . . . Nāgadatta, and so forth, bear witness for the existence of the snake-worship, which was common to the Brahmanists and the heterodox sects. Finally, the names Vinhukā, an abbreviation for Vishnudattā . . . Balamitra . . . furnish evidence for the development of Vaishnavism, while Nadiguta (*Nandigupta*), . . . Sāmidata (*Svāmi*-, i.e. *Kumāra-datta*), . . . Sivanadi (*Śivanandi*) do the same service to Śaivism. The occurrence among the Buddhists of names connected with the ancient Vedic religion, as well as of such as are connected with Vaishnavism and Śaivism, in these early inscriptions, has no doubt to be explained by the assumption that their bearers or their ancestors adhered to these creeds before their conversion, and that they received



The rules regarding the giving of names were probably then as lax amongst the Buddhists as they are in the present day among the heterodox sects of India, which by no means restrict themselves to the lists of their particular saints or deities. Their historical value consists therein that they form a link in the chain of evidence which enables us to trace the existence, nay, the prevalence of Vaishnavism and Saivism, not only during the second and first centuries B.C., but during much earlier times, and to give a firm support to the view now held by a number of Orientalists, according to which Vaishnavism and Saivism are older than Buddhism and Jainism.

their names in accordance with the established custom of their families. The rules regarding the giving of names were probably then as lax among the Buddhists as they are in the present day among the heterodox sects of India, which by no means restrict themselves to the lists of their particular saints or deities. Their historical value consists therein that they form a link in the chain of evidence which enables us to trace the existence, nay the prevalence of Vaishnavism and Śaivism, not only during the third century B.C., but during much earlier times, and to give a firm support to the view now held by a number of Orientalists, according to which Vaishnavism and Śaivism are older than Buddhism and Jainism.

I have quoted this paragraph at full length in order to establish clearly the nature of this Report.<sup>1</sup> It is highly desirable that some competent person should give us an account of the real results of the excavations of Rāmānagar. Meanwhile, as all statements about epigraphical finds that admit of verification have proved to be false, it is very probable that no inscriptions at all have turned up at that

<sup>1</sup> At first sight my assertion would seem to be in conflict with the fact that Führer's Report is dated July 16, 1892, whereas parts x and xii of *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, containing Bühler's papers on the Sāñci and Mathurā inscriptions, were issued in August and December, 1892, respectively. But it must be borne in mind that Führer was assistant editor of the first two volumes of the *Ep. Ind.*, and in this capacity knew Bühler's papers before they were published.

place. At any rate, it seems to me impossible to make this Report the base of any identification as Mr. Banerji does. On p. 107 he says:—"None of the inscriptions from Rāmnagar have ever been properly edited. Translations of three of them have appeared in Dr. Führer's Report of the Epigraphical Section for 1901-2, out of which only one has been found. The rest could not be traced either in the galleries or the *Taḥkhana* of the Lucknow Provincial Museum." These remarks are full of inaccuracies. In 1902 Führer could write no reports, because he was no longer in the Government's service. So Mr. Banerji apparently refers to the Report for 1891-2. This Report, however, contains translations of only two inscriptions, and that the originals of these cannot be traced will cause no surprise after what has been said above. Now from the introductory remarks on No. 9, dated in Samvat 74, it appears that this is the inscription that Mr. Banerji supposes "to have been found". He says:—"The discovery of this inscription was announced by Dr. Führer in his Progress Report for the year 1891-2. But all the details have been omitted." As there is no particular reference to this inscription in the Report, Mr. Banerji's statement can refer only to the general phrase quoted above, that "a great number of fragments of naked Jaina statues were exhumed, of which several are inscribed, bearing dates ranging from Samvat 18 to Samvat 74". I need not repeat why this identification carries no weight. There is, moreover, an internal reason that makes it almost impossible that the inscription should come from Rāmnagar. The inscription, which is engraved on the four sides of a pedestal of a *sarvatobhadrikā*<sup>1</sup> image of a Tirthaṅkara, runs according to an impression:—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Banerji calls it a *caturmukha* image, referring to Bühler as his authority. Bühler, it is true, occasionally used this term (e.g. *Ep. Ind.*, vol. i, p. 382, n. 51), but as far as I know it is not warranted by the inscriptions.



- “In the year 74, in the first month of summer, on the fifth day, [at the request] of Arhadāsī (*Arhaddāsī*), the female pupil of the *paṇatidharī* Grahavilā . . . venerable . . . the female pupil of the preacher . . . nadhana out of the venerable Varāṇa (*Vāraṇa*) gaṇa, the . . . kula, the Vajanākari (*Vārjanāgarī*) śākhā, the venerable Śirika

(Śrīka) [*sambhoga*]. . . the gift of Dharāvalā, the wife of . . . the mother-in-law (?) . . .”

The style of this inscription is exactly the same as that of the Jaina inscriptions from Mathurā. The inscription closely agrees in particular with *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 209, No. 36, where Bühler's reading of the third line . . . *va-sya Dinarasya śiśini ayya-Jinadasi-panatidharitaya śiśinia* . . . has to be corrected to . . . *vasya Dinarasya śiśini ayya-Jinadasi panatidhari tāya śiśini a[yya]*<sup>1</sup> . . . Of greater importance and almost decisive is the mentioning of the Śrīka *sambhoga*. The Śrigr̥ha or Śrīka *sambhoga* has hitherto been found only in Mathurā inscriptions, and as it is probably the name of a territorial division it is extremely unlikely that it should ever be found outside of that territory. If, in the absence of all outward testimony, internal evidence may claim any credit, the inscription has to be assigned, not to Rāmnagar, but to Mathurā.

A second inscription that Mr. Banerji supposes to come from Rāmnagar is No. 4 of his paper. He says:—“Nothing is known about the provenance of this image. It is now standing on a masonry pedestal without a label close to the entrance of the Jaina section. In his report for the month of April, 1892, Dr. Führer, as the Curator of the Lucknow Museum, reports the presentation of ‘1 pedestal [*sic*] of a statue of a Tirthamkara, inscribed Śaka-Saṃvat 10, excavated from the ancient site of a Digambara temple at Ramnagar in Rohilkhand.’<sup>2</sup> It is possible that our image is referred to by these words of Dr. Führer.” I am quite at a loss to understand how it is possible to arrive at such a conclusion. The report speaks of a pedestal with an inscription of Saṃvat 10. Here we have the statue of a seated Jina

<sup>1</sup> This passage shows that also in the inscription above *panatidhariye* is the epithet of *Grahaviḷaye* and not of *śiśiniye Arhadāsiye*. The real meaning of *panatidhari* has not yet been found.

<sup>2</sup> N.W.P. and Oudh Provincial Museum Minutes, vol. v, p. 6, Appendix A. This book is not accessible to me.



completely preserved with the exception of the left arm, and the inscription which is engraved on the upper and lower rim of the throne is dated in Samvat 12.<sup>1</sup> I may add, perhaps, that I should consider it a waste of time to search for that inscription of Samvat 10. We may rest assured that it existed just as little as the inscriptions mentioned in the Progress Report. Mr. Banerji's inscription itself is interesting as being of an unusual type. I read it from an impression :—

1. . . . sa[m]<sup>1</sup> 10 2 va 4 d[i] 10 1<sup>2</sup> eta[s]ya purvv[ā]yam<sup>3</sup>  
Koḷiyāto<sup>4</sup> gaṇāto<sup>5</sup> Ba[m]bha[d]āsiyāto kulāto  
U[ce]-<sup>6</sup>
2. nagarito<sup>7</sup> śā[kh]āto gaṇi[s]ya Aryya-Puśilasya śīsini  
De[vā] paṇatihari Nānd[i]sya<sup>8</sup> bhaginiye<sup>9</sup> ni[va]-<sup>10</sup>
3. rtanā sāvikāṇaṃ<sup>11</sup> vaddhaddhininaṃ<sup>12</sup> Jinadāsi Rudra-  
deva<sup>13</sup> Dāttāgāli<sup>14</sup> Rudradevasāmini<sup>15</sup> Rud[r]ad. . .<sup>16</sup>  
dātā<sup>17</sup> Gahamitr[ā]<sup>18</sup> [Rud]ra . . . nā<sup>19</sup>
4. Kumāraśiri Vamadāsi Hastisenā Grahaśiri Rudradatā  
Jayadāsi Mit[r]aśiri . . .<sup>20</sup>

1. There is an indistinct symbol before *saṃ*, not noticed by Bn.
2. The last figure is possibly 2.
3. Bn. *purvvāyām*. There is no *ā*-stroke on the *ya* in the impression.

4. Bn. *Koṭṭiyāto*. Regarding my reading see note 2 on p. 157.

5. Bn. *[ga]ṇato*. The *ā*-stroke is visible in the impression.

6. Bn. *U[cena]*-; but the *na* stands clearly at the beginning of line 2.

7. Possibly °*nāgarito*.

8. Bn. *Datila . ti Harinan[dī]sya*. There is a distinct vowel-stroke on the first *da*, but it may be *i*. The *vā* is not certain. In the *rī* the length of the vowel is not quite certain, but probable. The *ā*-stroke of *nā* is pretty clear, but the *i*-stroke of *ndi* is indistinct.

9. Bn. *bhaginiye*. The length of the vowel of the third syllable is very probable.

<sup>1</sup> The symbol for 2 is quite distinct.

10. Bn. *ni[va<sup>r\*</sup>]*-. The *va* is not visible, but the *r* is quite distinct at the top of the *ta* of the following line.

11. Bn. *sāvikānām*. There is no *ā*-stroke in the last *akṣara*.

12. Bn. reads *vaddha[ki]ninām*, assuming that the *ki* was corrected from *ku* by the engraver himself. The second *akṣara* shows at the top a long stroke to the left which may be accidental. The third *akṣara* bears no resemblance whatever to *ki*, although the reading *ddhi* cannot be called absolutely certain.

13. Properly *Rudradova*, but the second stroke of the *da* may be accidental.

14. Bn. *Dāttāgālā*. The vowel-sign of the last letter is clearly *i* or possibly *ī*. The third *akṣara* may be *rgā*.

15. Bn. *°sāmi[nā]*. The reading *nī* is certain.

16. About four *akṣaras* are missing.

17. Bn. omits these two *akṣaras*, which are distinct in the impression.

18. Bn. *[Gahami]tra*. The *ā*-stroke is not quite certain.

19. Bn. omits this word. Only the lower portion of the first two *akṣaras* is preserved.

20. Bn. reads *Kumāraśiri*, *Grahaśiri*, *Jayadāsi*, *Mi[r]aśiri*, but in all these cases the length of the final vowel is distinct in the impression. Bn. besides *Vamadāsi*. The *ā*-stroke is distinct.

“In the year 12, in the fourth month of the rainy season, on the eleventh day, on that (date specified as) above, at the request of Devā, the *paṇatihari*, the sister of Nāndi (*Nandin*), the female pupil of the venerable Puśila (*Puṣyala*), the *gaṇin* out of the Koliya *gaṇa*, the Bāmbhadāsiya (*Brahmadāsika*) *kula*, the Ucenagari (*Uccairnagarī*) *śākhā*, [a gift] of the female lay-hearers, the *vaddhaddhinīs*(?), Jinadāsī, Rudradevā(?), Dāttāgālī(?), Rudradevasāminī (*°svāminī*), Rudrad. . . . . dātā (*°dattā*), Gahamitrā (*Grahamitrā*), Rudra . . . n.ā, Kumāraśiri (*°śrī*), Vamadāsi, Hastisenā, Grahaśiri (*°śrī*), Rudradatā (*°dattā*), Jayadāsi, Mitraśiri (*°śrī*) . . .”

For *paṇatihari* = *paṇatidhari* cf. *paṇatihara* in *Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 209, No. 36, line 4, and the remarks



above. The term *vaddhaddhinī* I cannot explain. It may be a family name or the designation of a caste or profession or a geographical name. I have remarked already that Mr. Banerji's reading *vaddhakininam* cannot be upheld, and even the supposition that *vaddhaddhininam* is a clerical error for *vaddhakininam* is quite improbable as the word in the Prakrit dialects always shows a lingual *ḍḍh*. In the list of the *śrāvikās* the names from *Rudradeva* to *Rudradevasāmini* present some difficulties.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps *Rudradeva* and *Dāttāgālī* form one word, and *dāttāgālī* has some meaning unknown to me. At any rate, if *Rudradeva* was the name of a *śrāvikā*, we ought to expect *Rudradevā*, and *Dāttāgālī* sounds rather strange as a proper name. Mr. Banerji's translation "*Rudradevasāmi (Rudradevasvāmin) of Dāttāgāla*", partly based on wrong readings, of course is impossible. The name of a male person would be quite out of place in this list of female lay-hearers. *Rudradevasāmini* possibly belongs to the following name, now lost, and means "the wife of Rudradeva."

The third inscription that Mr. Banerji assigns to Rāmnagar is his No. 16. In the heading he speaks of a "fragment from the lower part of an image from Rāmnagar", but on p. 107 he says with regard to the inscription: "while another inscription (No. xvi) *evidently from the same place* refers to the name of the capital city [Adhi]chchhattra. The identity of Rāmnagar with Adhichchhattra seems to be certain." From these words it appears that the find-place is by no means warranted by any original document, but is merely conjectural. And the only reason why the inscription is held to

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Banerji thinks it possible that the two names Jinadāsi and Rudradevā have to be taken as one name, Jinadāsi-Rudradevā. He says: "The mother's name might have been prefixed to distinguish her from others bearing the name Rudradevā." I am not aware that anything of this kind ever occurs in the inscriptions, and it is therefore hardly necessary to discuss this opinion.





6. The *sa* is not certain.

7. The vowel-signs are destroyed and the original reading may therefore have been *Adhicchatrikāye*.

8. The *r* and the *anusvāra* is not certain, but the last *akṣara* is certainly not *nā*. The sign of punctuation has been omitted by Bn.

The translation would be — “The request of the venerable . . . t.sī, the native from Adhicchatra, out of the [Petivā]mika (*Praitivarmika*) *kula*, the Vajranāgari *śākhā* . . . ”

In my opinion the mentioning of Adhicchatra in this case by no means proves that the inscription comes from Adhicchatra. On the contrary, if any conclusion is to be drawn from the fact, it is rather apt to show that the inscription is not from Adhicchatra, as the characterizing of a person as the native of a certain place would certainly seem superfluous in that place itself.

The fourth and last inscription which, according to Mr. Banerji “most probably” came from Rāmnagar, is No. 1, found on the top of a split coping-stone. Here, also, Mr. Banerji’s arguments do not convince me. He refers again to the Curator’s (i.e. Führer’s) Report for the month of April, 1892, which mentions “1 coping stone with inscription of the Saka era (dated Samvat 5) . . . Excavated from the old site of a large Buddhist temple at Ramnagar, Rohilkhand”. Even apart from the fact shown above that the statements of that Report are liable to grave suspicion, I do not see how that description can be said to suit the stone bearing the present inscription. The inscription contains nothing to indicate that it belonged to a “Buddhist temple”, and it is certainly not dated in Samvat 5. In order to remove this latter objection Mr. Banerji assumes that “Dr. Führer most probably took the word *Pāṁchālīye*, ‘of Pāṁchāla,’ in line 8 for a date”. To me it seems incredible that anyone able to read that script at all should not have recognized

that the date stands in ll. 3 and 4. In these circumstances I think that, until fresh evidence has been brought forward, this inscription also has to be classed as being of unknown origin, which is to be regretted all the more because, in spite of its mutilated state, it has some historical interest. Not being in possession of an impression, I do not wish to enter into details, but I think it quite possible that it records the donation of some *rājan* of Pañcāla.

For reasons that will appear later on I have reserved the inscription No. 8. It is engraved on a Jaina image which is supposed to come from Mathurā. According to Mr. Banerji the discovery of this image was announced by Führer in his Annual Progress Report for the year 1890-1 (p. 17), and in his Annual Report of the Provincial Museum for the year 1891-2. As neither of these reports is accessible to me,<sup>1</sup> I cannot decide whether the identity of the inscription is established. Palæographically this is a most remarkable inscription.<sup>2</sup> The whole writing is extremely clumsy, showing that the engraver certainly was not accustomed to such work, and there are a number of peculiar signs. In the beginning of l. 2 we find an *e*, of which Mr. Banerji says that it is unlike any Brāhmī letter, but resembles the Kharoṣṭhī *va*. I cannot discover any resemblance to the Kharoṣṭhī *va*, but the letter is nevertheless peculiar, as it is a common *e* with the base line omitted. The same line contains an ordinary *pu* with a large hook placed below the letter. This seems to be meant to represent *ū*, though it can hardly be paralleled in the Mathurā inscriptions of this time. At the end of the line we find a *ha* with an abnormal downstroke and what appears to be the left half of a *ya*, the right half of which

<sup>1</sup> According to the list printed at the end of the Annual Reports, a special Progress Report for the year 1890-1 does not exist. The list mentions only a Progress Report from October, 1889, till 30th June, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> My remarks are based on two impressions.



can never have existed. The second letter of the third line, which puzzled Mr. Banerji, may be taken as a *ya* with the left curve touching the middle vertical, but it differs from the same letter as it appears twice in l. 2. The strangest sign is the fourth one of the third line. Mr. Banerji transcribes it by the guttural *na*, without adding any remark. How the sign can ever be thought to represent *na* I am unable to see. I do not believe that any similar sign can be found in a Brāhmī inscription, though it is just possible that the engraver intended to write a ligature, the first part of which was *na*. The last sign of the third line seems to be again the left half of a *ya*. In the fourth line we find a *ṣā* with the right horizontal prolonged. Mr. Banerji thinks we ought to read *ṣo*, the *o* being formed by the combination of *a* and *u*, but I am afraid there will not be many palæographers able to follow him in his bold flight of fancy. The last sign of l. 4, read *tu* by Mr. Banerji, seems to be meant for *ttṛ*, but the ligature is formed in an extraordinary way, a small *ta* with the *serif* being placed inside a *ta* of the ordinary size. The first letter of the last line is read *he* by Mr. Banerji, which is possible only on the assumption that the *e*-stroke may be turned also in the opposite direction, and that we have here an entirely new type of *ha* not found hitherto in any other inscription. To me it seems that instead of *he* we have before us two signs, the second of which bears a certain resemblance to *da*, whereas of the first it can only be said that it shows an *ā*-stroke at the top. The last two signs, read *saya* by Mr. Banerji, may just as well be anything else.

As far as it can be read at all the inscription runs :—<sup>1</sup>

1. sa<sup>1</sup> 70 1 va 1 di 10 5

2. etaya<sup>2</sup> pūvāyā<sup>3</sup> gaha[ya]<sup>4</sup>

3. ṭiyamu . . . śiminā[ya]<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the notes I have not repeated those of Mr. Banerji's different readings which I have discussed above.

4. maniravasusātīdhitṭr<sup>6</sup>

5. . ādamadāva<sup>7</sup> . . .

1. Bn. *sa[m]*, adding that the *anusvāra* is indistinct. In the impression there is no *anusvāra* at all.

2. Bn. *etaye*, but there is no *e*-stroke at the top of the *ya*.

3. Bn. *puvaye*, but the *ā*-strokes of the two last letters are quite distinct.

4. Bn. reads only *ha*, but there is a distinct letter, which I take to be *ga*, before the *ha*.

5. Bn. <sup>o</sup>*tāye*. There is no *e*-stroke on the last letter.

6. Bn. *mi*<sup>o</sup>, which is possible.

7. Bn. <sup>o</sup>*deva*<sup>o</sup>, but the vowel stroke goes to the right.

Mr. Banerji has attempted to translate this text. He does not shrink from explaining *susōti*, with the help of modern Bengali, as “an *apabhraṃśa* of the Sanskrit *svasrīyā*”. I am not sure whether the pages of the *Epigraphia Indica* are really the proper place for such linguistic jokes. I confess my inability to extract any sense out of that portion of the inscription which follows the date. Of course, it is possible that *dhitr̥ . ādamadāva* was meant for something like *dhitrā patimā datā*, but I think that we shall never advance beyond such guesses. Considering the state of the script and the text, I distinctly doubt the genuineness of this inscription. And there are some more facts that point to the same conclusion. The inscription is engraved on a piece of sculpture which is undoubtedly genuine. It is a fragment of a standing naked figure of a Jaina. The preserved portion reaches from the loins to the knees. At the back there is a piece of a pilaster or of the shaft of an umbrella. The inscription is engraved at the lower end of this extant portion of the pilaster, with a roughly cut arch at the top. As far as I know, there is no other instance—at any rate not for that time—of a votive inscription being placed at the back of a statue. And if really, out of modesty or for some other reason, the donor



selected that side for his inscription, why did he not have it engraved as usual on the pedestal, but rather on the statue itself? This certainly looks suspicious, and our suspicion will increase if we examine the condition of that portion of the stone that bears the inscription. From the photograph and the impression it appears that a good deal of the surface, especially on the right side, has peeled off. In these places the inscription ought to be indistinct; but that is not the case, the letters standing out here just as clear as in the rest of the inscription. In these circumstances I cannot help declaring this inscription to be a forgery. The decision of the question who is responsible for it I leave to the readers of this paper.