

land as *idaiyādu* to the *bhaṭṭārakar* of Tiruchcheṅṅūr:—¹ I, Dēvam-²Pavittiraṇ of Muruṇṇaiyūr, also know;³

- (Ll. 22). I, Śaṇṇaran Kaṇḍaṇ of Idaiyāmaṇam, also know;
 (Ll. 22 to 23). I, Kaṇḍaṇ Dāmōdaraṇ of Maṇalmūḱku, also know;
 (Ll. 23 to 24). I, Iravi-Parandavaṇ⁴ of Puṇalūr, the *adhikārin* of Vēṇādu, also know;
 (Ll. 24 to 25). I, Parandavan-Kaṇḍaṇ of Kuḍagōṭṭūr, also know.
 (Ll. 25 to 26). This is the writing of Śāṭṭaṇ-Śaḍaiyaṇ, the *poduvāl* of Tiruchcheṅṅūr.

No. 33.—THREE EARLY BRAHMI INSCRIPTIONS.

By PROFESSOR H. LÜDERS, PH.D., ROSTOCK.

I.—BRITISH MUSEUM STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF KANISHKA.

On the occasion of a visit to the British Museum in the autumn of 1906, I discovered in one of the cases of the Northern Gallery the stone bearing the subjoined inscription, which, as far as I know, has never been published before. At my request impressions were taken, from which I have prepared the transcript. Subsequently Dr. Fleet kindly sent me the photograph of the stone reproduced in the accompanying plate.

Nothing seems to be known about the origin of the stone, but the characters, the language and the date of the inscription prove that it comes from Northern India.

The sculpture at the top of the stone represents a man and a woman sitting on a bench. The woman to the left, wearing a loin-cloth and a girdle and the usual ornaments round the neck, the wrists, the ankles and in the lobes of the ear, rests her left elbow on the knee of her left leg which she has placed on the top of the bench, and turns her laughing face to the spectator. The male person also is wearing a necklace, bracelets, ear-drops, and a *dhoti* covering the knees. He is sitting astride, and with the right hand he touches, or points to, a sort of stand placed between the two persons on the bench and bearing what would seem to be a cushion adorned by three small square marks and supporting some bell-shaped object. Right over the head of the man there appears something which at first sight looks almost like a club, but which in my opinion probably is the mutilated head of a cobra. As the stone is broken off immediately above the head of the female person, it is quite possible that her head also was overshadowed by a similar representation of a serpent's head, and it seems to me very probable therefore that the sculpture represents a Nāga and his wife.

The writing is Brāhmī of the earlier Kushāṇa type. The subscript *ya* is expressed by the full sign, and the *sha* shows the old form with the small cross-bar. The language is the usual mixed dialect. The inscription, which is dated in the tenth year of mahārāja dēvaputra Kanishka, records the gift of a temple. Details will be discussed below.

¹ [In the original the name Ādichchaṇ-Umaiyaṁmai is not repeated as it is represented in the translation. It looks as if Śrīvallaṅgōḍai was seated with the members of the assembly of Tiruchcheṅṅūr in the palace at Kollam (ll. 4-5) while making the gift to Ādichchaṇ-Umaiyaṁmai. Accordingly I would translate this sentence as follows:—“(The following are) the *sādhus* who know (the transaction entered into) at the place at which (Ādichchaṇ-Umaiyaṁmai)—while Śrīvallaṅgōḍai was sitting with (the assembly?)—granted the *kiḷḷu* (of the land?) to the lord (bhaṭṭāraka) of Tiruchcheṅṅūr.” The same fact is referred to in lines 8 and 9.—V. V.]

² [The name of the man was apparently Dēvaṇ-Pavittiraṇ.—V. V.]

³ I.e. the terms of this transaction and bear witness to the same.

⁴ [Parandavaṇ is apparently a *tadbhava* of the Sanskrit *Parantapa*.—V. V.]

TEXT.

- 1 Siddha[r̥n]¹ maharājasya dēva[putrasya]²
 2 Kāṇishkasya savatsarē [10]³
 3 gri 2 di 9 ētayē purvay[ē]⁴
 4 [u]tarāyam⁵ na[va]rikāyam⁶ [h]ā-
 5 [r̥mya]n=[d]ata[r̥n]⁷ priyatām dēvi⁸ grā[masya].⁹

REMARKS.

1 The *anusvāra* is indistinct because it is crossed by the line forming the base of the sculpture. — 2 The reading of the bracketed characters is certain, though the surface of the stone has peeled off at the corner. — 3 This figure also has suffered from the peeling off of the surface, but the reading is beyond doubt. — 4 The *ē* is very indistinct, and the correct reading may possibly be *purvaya* or *purvayam*. — 5 At first sight one might feel inclined to read *natarāyam*, but the base-line of the first letter is quite straight, whereas *na* has a distinctly curved base. I feel therefore sure that what appears to be the continuation of the base-line to the left, is merely due to a flaw in the stone. — 6 The two convergent side-lines of the *va* are not very distinct, just as in the same letter in line 3, and there appears a vertical in the middle which makes the letter look almost like *na*. But this line is far too thin to really form part of the letter and must be accidental. — 7 The bracketed letters of these two words are more or less damaged, but the reading seems to be sure. — 8 The *ē*-stroke is added to the top of the letter, whereas in *dē* in the first line it is added in the middle. — 9 The last two letters are damaged, but only the *ya* can be said to be conjectural.

TRANSLATION.

Success! In the year 10 of the *mahārāja dēva*putra Kāṇishka, in the second (month of) summer, on the ninth day,—on that (date specified as) above a temple was given in the northern *navamikā* (?). May the goddess of the village be pleased!

NOTES.

The orthography of the inscription is very irregular, double consonants, long vowels and the *anusvāra* being frequently not expressed in writing. A long *ā* appears in the word *hārmya*. According to the *St. Petersburg Dictionary* the same form is found also in the *Taitt. Ār.* VI, 6, 2 instead of the ordinary *harmya* occurring in the corresponding verse in *Atharvav.* XVIII, 4, 55. In *hārmyan=datam* the final *m* is converted into the nasal before the following mute, which is rare in inscriptions in this dialect. Another instance is found in the concluding words of the Mathurā inscription, above Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8: *priyatām=bhagavān=Rishabhaśrīḥ*, which at the same time help us to understand the phrase found at the end of the present record: *priyatām dēvi grāmasya*.

Of greater interest is the spelling of the king's name, *Kāṇishka*, with a long vowel in the first syllable and a lingual *ṇ*. With regard to the latter point, the seven Brāhmī inscriptions that have preserved the name are in perfect agreement.¹ In the Kharōshthī inscriptions of Suē Vihār² and Zeda³ the name is read as *Kanishka*, in that of Manikyāla as *Kaneshka*,⁴ but I am by no means sure whether in the two last mentioned inscriptions the readings *Kanishka* and

¹ Mathurā inser. of S. 5, *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 34 ff., No. 4; Mathurā inser. of S. 7, above Vol. I. p. 391, No. 19; Mathurā inser. of S. 9, *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. I. p. 173, No. 2, and *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 37, No. 6; Mathurā inser., *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 149, No. 25; Sarnāth inser. of S. 3, above Vol. VIII. p. 176, No. 3; Sarnāth inser. of S. 3, above Vol. III. p. 179, No. 34.

² *Ind. Ant.* Vol. X. p. 326.

³ *Journ. As. Ser.* VIII. Vol. XV. p. 137.

⁴ *Journ. As. Ser.* IX. Vol. VII. p. 8.



1

2

3

4

5

Scale .9

E. Hultsch.

From an inked estampage.

Collotype by Gebr. Plettner, Halle-Saale.

Kaṇeshka would not be preferable. On the whole, contemporary records certainly are in favour of the spelling with the lingual *n*, and I would therefore propose to use *Kaṇishka* as the common form of the name. The spelling with the long vowel in the first syllable as in the present inscription is unusual, but it does not stand quite alone. In the Sārnāth inscription, No. 3^a, the editor, it is true, reads *Kaṇishkasya*, but the photo-lithograph¹ distinctly shows *Kāṇishkasya*.

Turning to the special object of the inscription, we may infer from the concluding words that the temple was dedicated to a goddess, and the representation of the two Nāgas above the inscription makes it not unlikely, I think, that the goddess intended was a Nāgi. That during the Kushāṇa period there existed temples for the worship of serpents in Northern India, is well attested by the two Mathurā inscriptions² which mention the temple (*st[h]āna*) of the *nāgēndra* Dadhikarṇa and a servant at the temple of the same Dadhikarṇa (*Dadhikarṇadēvikulika*).

The most difficult words of the inscription are *utarāyaṃ navamikāyaṃ*. I have thought for some time that they might be part of the date and mean 'on the following (i.e. intercalated) ninth (lunar day)', but for two reasons this idea must be given up. Firstly, such a statement would be in the wrong place after *ētayē purvayē*, and secondly, as Professor Kielhorn informs me, *uttara* is never used in the sense of *adhika* or *dvitīya*.³ The words must therefore be connected with *hārmyan=datam*, and as a form ending in *-āyaṃ* can hardly be anything else but the locative singular of a stem in *ā*; *utarā navamikā* would seem to denote either the locality where the temple was erected or, possibly, the goddess to whom it was dedicated. However, these explanations are far from satisfactory. Neither has *navamikā* the appearance of being the name of a locality, nor does *utarā navamikā* in the least sound like the name of a goddess or a Nāgi. I am at present unable to solve this difficulty.

II.—MATHURĀ STONE INSCRIPTION, DATED SĀMVAT 74.

This inscription is engraved on a stone-slab discovered by Sir Alexander Cunningham in the Jail Mound at Mathurā. It was first edited in 1870, together with facsimiles, by Rajendralala Mitra in the *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 129, No. 15, and by Dowson in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc. New Ser.* Vol. V. p. 183, No. 4. In 1873 Cunningham published it again with a facsimile in the *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 32, No. 8, and in 1904 I have treated it myself in the *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 106, No. 20. I edit it here again for a special reason. When I was in Oxford in 1905, Professor Hoernle kindly made over to me the collection of impressions, rubbings and drawings of inscriptions formed by him when preparing the second volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, which was to contain the 'Indo-Scythic' inscriptions. In this collection there is also the impression which I have used for the present edition. It cannot be said to be first-rate and, as unfortunately most of the impressions of this collection, it has been tampered with in some places by pencilling out parts of letters that in the impression itself are more or less effaced. Nevertheless the impression is of the greatest value as shown by the following note written on the margin, probably by General Cunningham himself: 'The only impression now available.—The stone has been lost at Agra.' Under these circumstances it seemed to me desirable to publish the accompanying reproduction of the impression, which in spite of its shortcomings naturally is far superior to the drawings published hitherto. Professor Hoernle's collection contains besides two facsimiles. The one is an eye-copy in red and blue pencil on a slightly reduced scale, made according to a marginal note by Captain Watts, Royal Engineers, the other is a pencil-tracing on transparent paper, perhaps made from the stone itself, but afterwards gone over with China-ink, blue and red pencil, and practically of no value.

¹ [I have some weeks ago examined the original and the *ā* is quite certain.—S. K.]

² *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 390, No. 18; *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 102, No. 13.

³ Professor Hultzsch writes to me that he is nevertheless inclined to connect *utarāyaṃ navamikāyaṃ* with the date, but he would take *uttara* in the sense of *uchyamāna*, *upari-likhita*, 'above-mentioned.'

The inscription is divided by a blank space into two parts. The upper portion, containing eight lines, is complete with the exception of some letters at the end of the first two lines, which have disappeared by the breaking off of the right corner of the stone. Of the lower portion which in Dowson's and Cunningham's facsimiles has been omitted altogether, nothing is left but faint traces of some characters in the first line. The characters are Brāhmī of the Kushāṇa type. The *sha* appears in the older form with the small cross-bar, but the subscript *ya* shows the cursive form. The language is the mixed dialect. The inscription is dated in the year 74 of a mahārāja rājātīrāja dēvaputra whose name began with Vāsu, but owing to its fragmentary state its real purport cannot be made out.

TEXT.

- 1 Mahārajasya¹ r[ā].....²
- 2 sya dēvaputrasya Vāsu....³
- 3 savatsarē⁴ 70⁵ 4 varsham[ā]-⁶
- 4 sē prathamē divasē
- 5 tris[ē]⁷ 30 asyam⁸ purvvyam⁹
- 6 Talakiy[ē]¹⁰ mahadāṇḍa-
- 7 nāyakasya¹¹ Vā-
- 8 linas[y]a¹² k[shē]t[rē]¹³ Mihi-
- 9 [mahadāṇḍa]¹⁴.

REMARKS.

1 The *ā*-stroke is distinctly visible in the impression, although it does not appear in Capt. Watts' eye-copy.—2 The *ā*-stroke is uncertain. Restore *rājātīrāja*.—3 The *ā*-stroke is quite distinct, though here again it is omitted in Capt. Watts' eye-copy. As regards the restoring of the line, I refer to the remarks below.—4 The *ē*-stroke, omitted in Capt. Watts' eye-copy, is quite distinct.—5 Owing to a flaw in the stone, a small portion of the lower left cross-bar of the symbol has disappeared. In the impression somebody has tried to restore the missing portion by adding in pencil a hook turning upwards, but there is nothing to warrant this restoration. There can be no doubt that the symbol had the shape of a plain St. Andrew's cross, just as in other inscriptions. The lower right cross-bar also has been pencilled over in the impression, but this is of no consequence as it is perfectly distinct. The meaning of the symbol will be discussed below.—6 The upper portion of the *m* and the *ā* are not quite distinct.—7 The *ē*-stroke is indistinct, and the *śa* has suffered from a hole in the paper.—8 The apparent curving of the tail of the *a* has been caused by pencilling. In Capt. Watts' eye-copy the tail is quite straight.—9 Above the *pu* there is a distinct stroke which must be accidental.—10 There are some strokes behind and below the *ta*, but they are not noticed in Capt. Watts' eye-copy and may be accidental. The *ē*-stroke is not very distinct, and the reading *Talakiyam* would be possible.—11 Capt. Watts expressly states that there are no traces of letters before the *nā* of line 7 and the *li* of line 8. The *nā* has been pencilled over so as to look almost like *sā*, but there can be no doubt that it is *nā*, and as such it appears also in Capt. Watts' eye-copy.—12 The *ya* is damaged, but certain.—13 The *ksh* of the first and the *r* of the second syllable are damaged, but certain. The *ē* of *kshē* is very faint and not given in Capt. Watts' eye-copy. The last syllable may also be *trō* as in Capt. Watts' eye-copy.—14 Of this word only faint traces are visible in the impression, and the reading rests almost entirely on Capt. Watts' eye-copy. Instead of *da* Capt. Watts gives *dē*.

TRANSLATION.

In the year 74 of the mahārāja rājātīrāja dēvaputra Vāsu....., in the first month of the rainy season, on the thirtieth day, 30,—on that (date specified as) above, in the field (?) of the great general Vāliṇa at Talakiya (or Talaki?) Mihi.....

2

4

6

8



NOTES.

The orthography shows the usual features. The lengthening of the vowel in *dāṇḍa* appears again in the same word in the Set-Mahet inscription, above Vol. VIII, p. 181, and we may further compare such forms as *āntēvāsisa* and *āntēvāsiniye* in the Mathurā inscriptions, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 198 f., Nos. 1 and 4.

As regards the date, the first symbol of the date of the year requires a fuller consideration, as it has been differently interpreted. As already stated above, it has the shape of a St. Andrew's cross. Cunningham¹ originally read it as 40, and he was followed by Dowson, who in editing the Mathurā inscriptions everywhere adopted Cunningham's readings of the dates.² In 1891 Bühler expressed his belief that the sign really represented 70,³ and this opinion was endorsed in the following year by Cunningham in his paper on the coins of the Kushāṇas in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, Ser. III. Vol. XII. p. 50, note 6.

I accordingly read the symbol as 70 when I published the inscription in the *Indian Antiquary*, and I am still convinced that Bühler was right, but in order to settle this question definitely, it will be necessary to examine the other Northern Brāhmī inscriptions where the same sign occurs. They are the following seven, all of which come from Mathurā or its neighbourhood:—

(1) Mathurā inscription of the time of *svāmin mahākshatrapa Śoḍāsa*, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 199, No. 2, and Plate. In the *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. V. p. 177, Bühler read the symbol as 40, adding 70 in brackets. In the *Ep. Ind.*, *loc. cit.*, Bühler again gave 40 in the text, but added in a note that the symbol might possibly be 70. And lastly in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. IV. p. 55, note 2, he stated that he would now remove the alternative reading 42, which he had thought admissible at first.

(2) Kāman inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 212, No. 42, and Plate. Here Bühler rendered the sign by 70 in the text, but added in a footnote that it might also be read as 40.

(3) Mathurā inscription, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 130, No. 17, and Plate; *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 5, and Plate; *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 33, No. 11, and Plate. Cunningham and Dowson read the sign as 40, and I have followed them in *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 102.

(4) Mathurā inscription, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 127, No. 1, and Plate; *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 182, No. 1, and Plate; *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 33, No. 12, and Plate. Cunningham and Dowson read the sign as 40, and I have adopted this reading in *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 101, No. 11.

(5) Mathurā inscription, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 127, No. 2, and Plate; *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 183, No. 2, and Plate; *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 13, and Plate. Cunningham and Dowson read the sign as 40, and I have followed them in *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 102, No. 13.

(6) Mathurā inscription, *Journ. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 130, No. 18, and Plate. The facsimile is very poor. In the *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 101, No. 12, I have read the sign as 40, but I have pointed out also that the inscription is possibly identical with that referred to under No. 3.

(7) Mathurā inscription, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 184, No. 7, and Plate; *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 14, and Plate. Cunningham and Dowson read the sign as 40.

¹ The absurd opinions of Rajendralala Mitra may be passed over in silence.

² Compare Cunningham's remarks, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 194.

³ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 373, note 7.

It thus appears that the symbol has hitherto been treated sometimes as 40 and sometimes as 70, but it will be readily conceded, I think, that it is impossible to assign two different values to the same sign in inscriptions of the same locality and the same period. But before we can decide which of the two interpretations is the correct one, we shall have to examine also the other symbols supposed to represent either 40 or 70 in the early Brâhmî inscriptions of Northern India. The following inscriptions, which for convenience sake I number in continuation of the list given above, must be taken into consideration :—

(8) Mathurâ inscription of the time of *mahârāja* Huviksha, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 9, and Plate. The symbol resembles the ligature *pta* and was read by Bühler as 40.

(9) Mathurâ inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 10, and Plate. The general appearance of the symbol is the same as in No. 8, but its lower part is not quite distinct in the photo-lithograph. Bühler read the sign as 40.

(10) Mathurâ inscription, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 33, No. 10, and Plate; *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 396, No. 30, and Plate. The symbol generally has the same form as that in No. 8, but its lower part is a little more cursive. Cunningham and Bühler read it as 40.

(11) Mathurâ inscription of the time of *mahârāja* Huvishka, *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 34, No. 15, and Plate. The symbol is the same as in No. 8. Cunningham read it as 40, and I have followed him in my treatment of the record in the *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 103, No. 14.

(12) Mathurâ inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, No. 20, and Plate; p. 321, and Plate. The upper part of the symbol is the same as in Nos. 8—11, but its lower part is a distinct loop. Bühler read the sign as 70.

(13) Mathurâ inscription, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 387, No. 11, and Plate. As Bühler expressly states in a footnote that the symbol is a plain *pta*, it may have been so in the impression before him. In the photo-lithograph, however, it does not bear the slightest resemblance to that sign, but looks exactly like the letter *bra*. Bühler read the symbol as 40.

(14) Sâũchi inscription of the time of *mahârāja rājâtirāja devaputra* Shâhi Vâsashka, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 369 f., and Plate. The symbol found here has quite a peculiar shape. Provided that the vertical standing behind it does not belong to it, but is part of the following sign for 8, it resembles the usual sign for 20. As such it was read also at first by Bühler, but at Cunningham's suggestion he afterwards took it to be 70. The reading of the sign was then discussed at length by Dr. Fleet in a paper in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1903, p. 326 ff., and he came to the conclusion that it was 20. But later on, when Mr. Vincent Smith in his *Early History of India*, p. 238, had suggested that the symbol might be read as 60, Dr. Fleet admitted the possibility of this interpretation; see *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1905, p. 357.¹

Leaving aside for the present the symbols found in the last three inscriptions, it appears that there are two symbols, the St. Andrew's cross and the *pta*, one of which must represent 70 and the other 40. Now in the inscription which forms the subject of this paper the St. Andrew's cross cannot represent 40, as in that case the inscription would be dated in the year 44 in the reign of a king whose name begins with Vâsu, whereas we know that from 33–60 Huvishka was the reigning monarch in this part of the country. Here, therefore, the St. Andrew's cross must represent 70, and we must accordingly assign the same value to the symbol also in the inscriptions enumerated above under Nos. 1–7. We thus get the dates S. 72 for No. 1, S. 74 for

¹ Another sign that originally was read 40 by Bühler, is found in the Mathurâ inscription of the time of *mahârāja rājâtirāja devaputra* Huvashka, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8, and Plate. Later on Bühler declared that on further consideration he read the symbol as 60, and as such it has been treated since then everywhere; see *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 204, note 61.

No. 2, and S. 77 for Nos. 3-7. The inscriptions themselves contain nothing to contradict this result. No. 4, it is true, mentions the *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputrā Hūvishka*, but not in connection with the date, the inscription simply recording a gift to the *vihāra* of that king. As to the date S. 72 for the *mahākshatrapa Śoḍāsa*, I refer to the remarks of Dr. Fleet in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1907, p. 1024 ff.

If the St. Andrew's cross represents 70, the sign resembling *pta* must be 40. The inscription No. 8, therefore, would be dated in S. 44, No. 9 in S. 45, No. 10 in S. 47, and No. 11 in S. 48, which is in accordance with the statements of Nos. 8 and 11 that their dates fall into the reign of Huviksha or Huvishka.

The symbol occurring in No. 12 undoubtedly differs from either of the two symbols found in Nos. 1-11, but whereas it bears no resemblance whatever to the cross-shaped sign, it is easily intelligible as a cursive development of the *pta* sign.¹ In my opinion therefore this sign also must be taken as 40, and the inscription as being dated in S. 49, not S. 79. There is another point in favour of this interpretation. The inscription records a gift made at the request of the venerable *Vṛiddhahasti* (*Vṛiddhahastin*), a preacher in the *Koṭṭiya* (*Koṭṭika*) *gana*, the *Vairā* (*Vajri*) *śākhā*. There is another Mathurā inscription dated in S. 60,² recording a gift made at the request of the *ganin*, the venerable *Kharuṇa*, a pupil of this same *Vṛiddhahastin*. If *Vṛiddhahastin* in S. 60 had a pupil who had acquired the dignity of *ganin*, he must have been a man advanced in years at that time, and although, of course, it is not impossible that he was still alive in S. 79, it would certainly seem more natural to find him as a spiritual adviser in S. 49 and his pupil in the same capacity eleven years later on, in S. 60.

Little can be said about the symbol occurring in No. 13. The form appearing in the photo-lithograph is quite peculiar and unlike any other symbol in the inscriptions from Mathurā or elsewhere, but in accordance with Bühler's statement, it may be provisionally taken as 40.

As regards the symbol in No. 14, I agree with Dr. Fleet that there is no reason whatever why it should be 70, as even the sign in No. 12, which Bühler cited in support of this interpretation, is to be read not 70, but 40. On the other hand, I feel sure that it is not 20. I have lately received through Dr. Konow impressions of an inscription running round the base of a pillar preserved in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription, which is in Brāhmī characters of the Kushapa type, is partly worn, but the date is quite distinct. Now the sign for the tens in the date of the year is the same as that in the Sāñchi inscription, showing again the vertical, which is thus proved to be an integrant part of it and not to belong to the following sign. And although unfortunately the text of the inscription contains nothing that would enable us to form a positive opinion on the value of the symbol, we may safely assert that it cannot be 20, as we find this number expressed by the usual sign in the date of the day. Lastly also the proposal to treat the symbol as 60 cannot be said to be convincing, the sign that has hitherto been read as 60 in the inscriptions of the Kushapa period³ certainly being entirely different. I do not want to offer a new hypothesis. In my opinion we shall have to wait for fresh materials before we can hope to arrive at a satisfactory result in this question. In how far the restoring of the king's name in our inscription of S. 74 is influenced by this uncertainty, will be shown below.

I know that the results arrived at above are partly not in harmony with those deduced from the coins of the Western Kshatrapas. The numeral signs occurring in the legends of those coins are given in table IX, col. V, of Bühler's *Indische Paläographie* from Professor Rapson's table in

¹ Perhaps the symbol found in No. 9 forms the intermediate stage between the *pta* and the looped sign. As I have stated above, its lower part is not quite distinct in the photo-lithograph, but it does not seem to me impossible that here also it consists not of the usual fork, but of a loop, though a much smaller one than in No. 12.

² *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8, and Plate.

³ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 386, No. 8, and Plate; Vol. II. p. 204, No. 19, and Plate; *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. XX. p. 37, and Plate V, fig. 6.

the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1890, Plate to p. 639. Here the St. Andrew's cross has been entered as 40, and a sign much resembling the *pta* and another looped sign almost exactly like that of No. 12 as 70. I do not wish to throw any doubts on the correctness of these readings, but I contend that for such questions inscriptions must be treated separately according to time and locality.

Rajendralala Mitra, Dowson and Cunningham agreed in restoring the name of the king as *Vāsu[dēvasya]*. When I edited the inscription from the facsimiles published by my predecessors, I drew attention to the circumstance that the available space is hardly sufficient for the three *aksharas dēvasya*, and I proposed to restore the name as *Vāsushkasya*, as this name of the king seemed to be attested by two other inscriptions of S. 76 and S. 78,¹ whereas the first undoubted record of Vāsudēva's reign was dated in S. 80. What I said about the difficulty of supplying three syllables is confirmed by the impression now before me, although owing to the frequent irregularity of the writing in these inscriptions it is impossible to speak on this point with absolute certainty. But the evidence for the existence of a king Vāsushka in S. 76 and S. 78 is not so strong as it seemed to be formerly. As I have tried to show above, the date of the Sāñchi inscription mentioning a king Vāsashka² is quite uncertain, and the Mathurā inscription mentioned by Führer as being dated in S. 76 and recording repairs in the reign of Vāsushka has not yet been published. As Dr. Konow informs me, it cannot even be found now, Führer's trenches having been filled up again a long time ago and the exact spot where the inscription was found being no more known. Under these circumstances a decision is, of course, impossible for the present. If Führer's statement after all should prove correct, I should unhesitatingly restore *Vāsu* to *Vāsushkasya*, otherwise the reading *Vāsudēvasya* will have to be accepted.

The rest of the inscription calls for few remarks. *Talakiya* or *Talaki* seems to be the name of a locality, but I am unable to identify it. The title *mahādandānyaka* is frequent in the inscriptions of the Gupta period and later times. In the Kushana inscriptions it has not yet been found before, but the subordinate title of *dandānyaka* occurs in the Manikyāla inscription,³ where the correct reading in l. 2 is, not *Laladoḍa-nayago*, but *Lala-daḍanayago*.

III.—MATHURĀ STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF ŚONḌĀSA.

This inscription was first published, together with a facsimile, in 1870 by Professor Dowson in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* New Ser. Vol. V. p. 188, No. 29. In 1873 it was published again with a facsimile by Cunningham in the *Arch. Surv. Rep.* Vol. III. p. 30, No. 1. And in 1904 I have tried to edit the text from those two facsimiles in the *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 149, No. 24. For the present edition of the record I have made use of an impression found in Professor Hoernle's collection described above.

Cunningham states that the stone bearing the inscription was found in the Jail Mound at Mathurā. According to Dowson, it has been cut through and the first part of it has been carried off. On the other hand, the facsimiles distinctly showed that something was missing at the right end, and thus I was led to suppose that the stone was damaged on both sides. This, however, is not the case. Nothing is missing at the beginning of the writing on the left, and on the right also only one letter has been cut off at the end of the first two lines. With this exception the inscription is in an excellent state of preservation.

¹ Mathurā inscription of S. 76, mentioned by Führer, *Progress Report* for 1895-96; Sāñchi inscription of S. 78, edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 369 f.

² This is the reading suggested by Dr. Fleet, *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1903, p. 326, but he is himself inclined to look upon this form as a mere variant of Vāsushka, if the existence of such a name should be proved; see *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1905, p. 357 f.

³ *Journ. As. Ser.* IX. Vol. VII. p. 8 f.

The characters are of the so-called archaic type of the Mathurâ inscriptions; see especially the letters *da*, *śa* and *sha*, and the subscript *ya*. The language is the mixed dialect. The inscription is not dated. It records various gifts of a Brahman of the Śēgrava (Śaigraṇa) gôtra, the treasurer of *svāmin mahākshatrapa* Śomḍāsa. For details I refer to the remarks below.

TEXT.

1 Svāmisya mahākshatrapasya Śomḍāsasya¹ gaṁjavarēṇa brāhmaṇēna Śēgrava-sagôtrēṇa [p]...²

2 rapī imāshām yamaḍa-pushkaraṇīnam paśchimā pushkaraṇī udapānō ārāmō³ stambhō i...

3 [śilā]paṭṭō⁴ cha-

REMARKS.

1 As to the reading of this name see the remarks below.—2 Little is left of the *pa*, but the reading is certain. Restore *pushka*-. —3 The outlines of the letters *ṇī udapānō ārāmō* are more or less touched up with pencil, but the reading is perfectly certain.—4 The reading *śilā* is certain, although the letters are entirely spoiled by being gone over with pencil.

TRANSLATION.

By the treasurer of the lord, the *mahākshatrapa* Śomḍāsa, a Brāhmaṇ of the Śēgrava (Śaigraṇa) gôtra, a tank, the western tank of these twin tanks, a reservoir, a grove, a pillar and this stone-slab (*was caused to be made*).

NOTES.

As regards the language, the most interesting form is *imāshām*. Apparently in the dialect of Mathurâ the genitives plur. of the pronoun were, as in Pāli, *imēsaṁ* and *imāsaṁ*, and the author of the inscription translated the latter form into *imāshām* as he was wont to render *imēsaṁ* by *imēshām*. The nominative sing. masc. of the same pronoun is found at the end of line 2, but unfortunately nothing is left of it but the initial *i*. The word *pushkaraṇī* shows in the third syllable the vocalisation of the Pāli *poḍḍharāṇī*. *Yamaḍa* corresponds to Skt. *yamala* or *yamaḷa*, as the word would be written in Southern manuscripts. The construction of the inscription is rather peculiar, the verb or participle on which the instrumentals *brāhmaṇēna*, etc., depend, being omitted.

The first point to command attention is the name of the *mahākshatrapa*, which is generally supposed to be Śoḍāsa. In the present inscription there is a distinct sign above the *śo*. It must have been found also in the impressions used by Dowson and Cunningham, as the former reads *Śāṇḍāsasya* (for *Śāṇḍāsasya*) and the latter *Sauḍāsasya* (for *Śauḍāsasya*), although the facsimiles show no trace whatever of *anusvāra* or *au*. The sign cannot be the stroke denoting *au*, as it does not touch the upper line of the *śo*, but is separated from it by a distinct blank space. It can only be an *anusvāra* of the same bulky shape as that in *gaṁjavarēṇa* and in *pushkaraṇīnam*.

The form Śomḍāsa has not yet been recognised anywhere else. In the second Brāhmī inscription at Mathurâ mentioning this *mahākshatrapa*¹ Bühler read *Śoḍāsasa*, but the photolithograph by no means excludes the reading *Śomḍāsasa*. Right above the *śo* there is a white spot scarcely less distinct than that above the *ma* of *hēmaṁtamāśē* which Bühler read as *anusvāra*. In the Mathurâ lion-capital inscription² Mr. Thomas reads the name as *Śudāsa* and *Śudisa*, and with regard to coins, Professor Rapson has stated in the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1903, p. 289, note 3, that whenever the name is legible, the first *akshara* seems to be *śo*, and that the alternative forms *Su*^o and *Sau*^o, given by Bhagvanlal and Cunningham respectively, cannot be

¹ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II. p. 199, No. 2.

² *Above*, Vol. IX. pp. 143, 144.

certainly read on any of the specimens of the British Museum. But even if a re-examination should prove the readings *Śoḍāsa* and *Śudāsa* to be correct, this would not invalidate the reading of the present inscription. Everybody familiar with the records of this period knows how often an *anusvāra* is omitted in writing, and that on that account the reading *Śomḍāsa*, even if found once only, carries more weight than the reading *Śoḍāsa* occurring ten times. In my opinion therefore *Śomḍāsa* must be accepted as the general form of the name.

Scarcely less interesting is the designation of the donor. Dowson and Cunningham read *gaḷavarēna*, and Bühler, *Vienna Or. Journ.* Vol. V. p. 177, proposed to alter the unintelligible syllables *gaḷa* into *rajē*, 'during the reign.' The new reading *gaṃjavarēna* shows that *gaṃjavara*, 'treasurer,' which hitherto was known only from the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* V, 177 and Kshēmendra's *Lōkaprakāśa*, was an official title in India already in much earlier times. As recognised by Benfey,¹ *gaṃjavara* is the Persian *ganjwar*, and the use of this title is a new proof of the strong Parthian influence that made itself felt in Northern India from the time of Aśoka to the beginning of the Gupta empire.²

The donor calls himself by his *gōtra* name Śaigraḇa, which in correct Sanskrit would be Śaigraḇa. According to the *Gaṇapāṭha* the Śaigraḇa *gōtra* is referred to by Pāṇini in II, 4, 67 and IV, 1, 104. I have also no doubt that Professor Kern is right in identifying Śaigraḇa with Pāli *Siggava*,³ the name of the patriarch who conferred the *upasampadā* ordination on the great Tissa Moggaliputta.⁴

No. 34.—PATHARI PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF PARABALA;

[VIKRAMA-] SAMVAT 917.

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.⁵

Pathārī in Long. 78° 15' and Lat. 23° 56', is the chief town of the Native State of the same name in the Bhopāl Agency of Central India.⁶ Its antiquities were first described, in 1848, by Captain J. D. Cunningham, in the *Journal As. Soc. Bengal*, Vol. XVII, Part I, p. 305 ff. After stating that the locality of which he is treating includes two good-sized reservoirs or lakes, and that the present town of Pathārī and the smaller lake are distinguished by a single pillar and a solitary temple, Captain Cunningham on page 310 proceeds thus:— 'Near to the western edge of the smaller lake stands the wand or pillar, now called of Bheem Sen. It is composed of a single block about 36 feet in height and 2½ thick. The shaft is square in section for a height of 8 feet, and it then becomes circular On one side of the square portion of the shaft there is a long inscription, much obliterated, and of which I failed to make even a tolerable impression.'

The pillar and its inscription were again noticed in 1880, by General Sir A. Cunningham, in his *Archæol. Survey of India*, Vol. X, p. 70, thus:— 'Inside the town, on the top of the slope, there is a tall monolith with a bell-shaped capital. The shaft is circular, rising from a base 8 feet

¹ See the *St. Petersburg Dictionary s. v.*

² In the *Journ. Roy. As. Soc.* 1903, p. 289 ff., Professor Rapson has described a coin that shows a general similarity to those of Śoḍāsa. With the exception of the first three *akṣaras* the inscription is not quite certain. Professor Rapson reads: *brahmanā[na go(?)da ra(?)tha(?) na]*. Would it be too bold to conjecture that the *brāhmaṇa* mentioned here may have some connection with the *brāhmaṇa* Śaigraḇa, the *gaṃjavara* of Śoḍāsa, and that the reading must be altered accordingly?

³ *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië*, Vol. II. p. 266.

⁴ See *Dīpav.* V, 57; 69, etc.

⁵ [The proofs of this and all subsequent papers by the late Professor Kielhorn have been read by me.—S. K.]

⁶ Constable's *Hand Atlas of India* Plate 27 D d.