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PREFACE

As can be seen from the preface to Prof. Sten Konow's edition of the Kharos̄hi\̄ Inscriptions, more than thirty years ago arrangements were concluded for the preparation of a volume of early Brāhmī and Kharos̄hi\̄ Inscriptions in CII. The joint editorship of this volume was entrusted to Professors Lüders (Brāhmī inscriptions) and Rapson (Kharos̄hi\̄ inscriptions). In 1922, however, Prof. Rapson relinquished his post on account of other engagements, and Prof. Konow took over the charge and succeeded in bringing out the volume referred to above on Kharos̄hi\̄ inscriptions in about six years.

The task of Prof. Lüders was more comprehensive, as the number of early Brāhmī inscriptions was comparatively greater than the number of Kharos̄hi\̄ inscriptions. Moreover Prof. Lüders could not devote his whole time to this work as he was preoccupied with many other problems of Indology, though for the last twenty years of his life he tried his best to fulfil the responsibility he undertook. Shortly before his lamented death on 7th May 1943, when he was already seriously ill, he requested Prof. E. Waldschmidt to continue his work on Brāhmī inscriptions and bring his unfinished task to an end. After the death of Prof. Lüders, Mrs. Lüders handed over the unfinished manuscript of the work on Brāhmī inscriptions and other similar manuscripts on different subjects to Prof. Waldschmidt. As Prof. Waldschmidt was then in the military service, all this manuscript-material was put into trunks and kept securely in a safe in the Berlin Academy, of which Prof. Lüders was a prominent member and head of the Oriental Commission. Later, these trunks, together with other precious material in the Berlin Academy, were brought for security purposes into a mine at Bernburg. After the war, in the summer of 1945\(^*\) the trunks were plundered and their contents scattered, with the result that some of this valuable material was lost in the confusion. What remained was collected by an official of the Berlin Academy and was again entrusted to the charge of Prof. Waldschmidt.

After putting this material into proper order and on inspecting it, Prof. Waldschmidt noticed that in the material before him there was nearly nothing from the second group of Brāhmī inscriptions which is styled as "Southern Inscriptions" in Prof. Lüders' List and which begins with the number 962. Evidently Prof. Lüders intended to publish the Northern and Southern Brāhmī Inscriptions separately in two volumes, and it was obvious that he first worked only on the northern inscriptions. Even the manuscript of Prof. Lüders on Northern inscriptions was not complete when it came to the hands of Prof. Waldschmidt, and there were many lacunae which needed to be filled in. It is difficult to decide whether these lacunae were already there as Prof. Lüders had not worked out these parts or whether they were results of the plundering and mishandling of the trunks. It seems, however, certain that Prof. Lüders had not written the introduction to his intended volume treating the questions relating to the different eras and other points of general interest. Similarly the treatment on language of the different groups of inscriptions as also the various indices were missing in the manuscript. The bulk of the manuscript as it then existed dealt with the Mathurā and Bhārhat inscriptions besides some other smaller groups and separate inscriptions of major importance. Hence Prof. Waldschmidt proposed in 1947 to the then Director General of Archaeology to publish the material in different fascicles, beginning with the Bhārhat

\(^{1}\) CII, Vol. 2, Part I, Calcutta 1929.
\(^{2}\) Shortly before the end of the war Mrs. Lüders had suddenly died on 13th of March 1945.
inscriptions as this was the most complete group in the manuscript of Prof. Lüders. The present work was undertaken after Prof. Waldschmidt's proposal was accepted in a letter No. 21 A/12/49-4886 dated 11th April 1949 of the Superintendent of Publications, Department of Archaeology, Government of India, New Delhi.

The year 1941 saw the publication of Prof. Lüders' book on "Bhārhat und die buddhistische Literatur" (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXVI, 3, Leipzig 1941), and in this book the author discussed many of the Bhārhat inscriptions. On comparing the treatment of certain inscriptions as contained in the unpublished manuscript intended for the CHI, and in the published work on Bhārhat, it was found, that in some respects the latter showed an advance over the former. The published work contained in certain cases a more detailed discussion, besides a treatment of some general topics like the relation of Bhārhat sculptures to the Pāli texts, and a criticism of B. M. Barua's work on Bhārhat. Hence it seemed necessary to include this material in the present work at proper places, all the more so because copies of Lüders' book on Bhārhat are no more available.

The recovered material of Prof. Lüders as far as Bhārhat is concerned comprised the treatment of most of the individual inscriptions. It has been supplemented with an introduction headed by Lüders' criticism of Barua's Barhut, and continued by a treatment of general topics, like a discussion of the language, of the age of the inscriptions, and of the nature of the personal and place names. The index of the words has as well been added. In completing the manuscript of individual inscriptions, the originality of Lüders' text has been retained as far as possible. Minor changes and additions were often necessary, but have not been indicated at all places. Similarly the supplementing of the text made with the help of the published work of Lüders on Bhārhat has not been distinguished as such. The inscriptions, however, on which any treatment whatsoever was missing in the manuscript have been so indicated in the foot notes.

In the present text it was thought advisable to divide the inscriptions into two main groups: A: donative inscriptions, and B: inscriptions describing the sculptural representations, and so to arrange them anew. Consequently it was not possible to maintain the sequence of the numbers found in the List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, but these numbers from the List have been mentioned in brackets by the side of new numbers, and in addition a concordance of the old and new numbers has been attached.

In the year 1952, Dr. M. A. Mehendale of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona (India), arrived at Göttingen and joined Prof. Waldschmidt in his work on Bhārhat inscriptions.

GÖTTINGEN:
August 1954

E. WALDSCHMIDT
M. A. MEHENDALE

Postscript 1958: When our manuscript was completed in 1954 we had not heard of the removal of as many as fifty-four pieces of the railing of the Stūpa of Bhārhat, discovered at Pataora and other villages near the modern village of Bhārhat, to the Allahabad Municipal Museum. These sculptures have been treated by Dr. Satish Chandra Kala, Curator, Municipal Museum Allahabad, in his book on 'Bharhat Vedikā', Allahabad 1951. Some six or seven pieces are provided with inscriptions, read by Dr. Kala. One inscription hanisajātakaś (below B 41) was already known to the public from Cunningham's drawing. The new inscriptions have been re-edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, Government Epigraphist for India, in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 57-60. They have been included in our volume at proper places.
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(A) ADDITIONS

1. Since the writing of our “Postscript 1958” (p. VI), mentioning the removal of fifty-four pieces of the railing of the Stūpa of Bhārhatu to the Allahabad Municipal Museum, some more information regarding the whereabouts of the Bhārhatu sculptures and inscriptions has come to our notice.

Two reliefs, one of them with the inscription No. A 112 which, according to Cunningham ([StBh, Pl. LVI, 63] came “from Uchchala”, and another with a representation of the Bodh Tree ([StBh, Pl. XXXI, 3]), are now in the Freer Gallery, U.S.A.; see A. K. Coomaraswamy, The Two Reliefs from Bharhatu in the Freer Gallery, Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, Vol. VI (1958), pp. 149-162. The sculptures are also reproduced in Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, La Sculpture de Bharhatu, traduction de Jean Balot, Paris 1956, Plate XXV. This book does not contain much regarding the inscriptions; however, it presents Bhārhatu sculptures in fifty-one places in a quality superior to ours. As the book is easily available, it will be useful to state where our inscriptions are to be found in the illustrations of the book and vice versa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25, 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35, 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 15: A 34 Fig. 26: B 24-26 Fig. 38: B 20
17: A 95, B 6 27: B 23-25 40: A 123
18: B 4 28: B 38-39 41: B 7
9: B 5 29: B 36-37, 62 42: A 80, B 9
20: A 38, B 1 30: B 18, B 21, B 40, A 59 43: A 65
21: B 2 32: B 21-22 44: B 8
22: B 3 33: B 40 45: A 94
24: B 61 36: B 66 47: A 124
2. Recent acquisitions of the Bharat Kala Bhavan, Banaras, include some sculptures from Bhārāhut having inscriptions which hitherto were known only from the eye-copies published by General Cunningham in *StBh* as "from Uchchhara" (these have been reproduced in this volume). At the request of Dr. G. S. Gai, Ph.D., Government Epigraphist for India (Ceylon), Shri Rai Krishnadasa, Hon. Director of Bharat Kala Bhavan, recently sent us exact copies of five inscriptions (A 36, A 47, A 48, A 104 and B 62) for being included in the Corpus. See additional Plate No. XLVIII. We have to thank both the gentlemen for their kind help. Dr. Gai also contacted Professor K. K. Dabjai of Sagar University, Madhya Pradesh, who some time ago paid a visit to Bhārāhut and inspected the archaeological collection of the Ramnath Museum (near Satna, some miles distant from Bhārāhut). He found there about twenty dozen sculptures from Bhārāhut, some with fragmentary inscriptions which he read as follows:


Professor Bajpai states in a paper on *New Bharhat Sculptures*, to be published shortly, that he came across three Bhārāhut railing pillars "in the locality" (Ramnath or SatnaT). One (No. 3 in this paper) is a fragmentary pillar with an inscription. It is our No. A 7. Another pillar (No. 2 in the paper) has the inscription No. A 26. Both inscriptions were known through Cunningham's eye-copies as "pillars in Batanāmā". Prof. Bajpai has been kind enough to send us impressions of A 7 and A 26, and a copy of the manuscript of his paper. For this generosity we are very grateful to him. Prof. Bajpai's description of the third pillar, "representing the complete figure of a standing Yakshi", applies exactly to the Yakshi on a "pillar at Batanāma" reproduced in Cunningham's *StBh*, Pl. XXI, and in Coomaraswamy's book on Bhārāhut, i.e. Fig. 47. Prof. Bajpai found an inscription on the pillar "which can be read as *Sorinya thahbo dāna*". But if the two Yakshis are identical, the reading should be a little different, see below, postscript on A 124. Cunningham, *StBh*, Pl. LV, gives seven inscriptions as found on "pillars at Batanāmā". His Nos. 90-96 correspond to our Nos. A 124, A 54, B 33, A 43, B 39, A 26 and A 7. Of these, B 33 and B 39 are in the Indian Museum, Calcutta; A 7, A 26, and probably A 124 are on the pillars discovered by Prof. Bajpai. It therefore remains for the future to find out the whereabouts of only A 43 and A 54. *thahbo dāna*, read by Prof. Bajpai on a sculpture, possibly constitutes the end of the inscription A 54. Luckily the whereabouts of the inscriptions "from Uchchhara" (Cunningham, *StBh*, Pl. LV, 61-67), which correspond to our Nos. A 47, A 36, A 48, A 104, A 112, B 62, and A 4, are today perfectly clear; A 4 is in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, A 112 in the Freer Gallery, U.S.A., and the rest in the Bharat Kala Bhavan in Banaras.

We now add special postscripts to the inscriptions mentioned above.

A 7 (609); Plate XLVIII

On a fragmentary railing pillar No. 3 recovered by Prof. K. K. Bajpai, who reads the inscription as *Karakahātasa Utara gadhikadaka thahbo dāna* and explains Utara as "personal name of the donor, who was a dealer in perfumes" (gadhika). The impression of the inscription now available seems indeed to give *ga* instead of *gi*, whereas it is clearly to be read in Cunningham's eye-copy on which every one had to rely until now. No wonder that, in Prof. Bajpai's words, "the second word has been read by all scholars as *utaragadhika*". The present editors regard Utara-gadhika (Utaragadhika?) as a name derived from the constellation Utara like Utarah-dāsaka, Utarah-duṭa, Utarah-miṭṭa and similar names mentioned by Hiśa. Even if gadhika is the correct reading, it should be interpreted in the same way, i.e. as the personal name Utara-gadhika (Utaragadhika). It would be necessary to have Utaraasa to enable us to separate Utara from gadhikadaka, cf. A 55 etc. The *sa* of Karakahātasa in the reading of Prof. Bajpai is missing in the impression and has been added in mistake.

1. Cf. Indian Archaeology, A review, ed. by A. Ghose, 1939-40, p. 82, and ibid. 1940-61, New Delhi 1961, p. 74, Plate LXXVII.

2. The bulk of the Bhārāhut sculptures is in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

A good number is nowadays also kept in (1) the Allahabad Municipal Museum, Allahabad; (2) the Bharat Kala Bhavan, Banaras, and (3) the Ramnath Museum, District Satna); a few pieces are kept in (4) the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, as well as (5) the Freer Gallery, U.S.A. A number of sculptures is apparently still in the possession of private persons in places not far from the present village of Bhārāhut.

3. This is not absolutely certain as traces of an i-hook seem to come out if the rubbing is held against light. The letters on the whole are not very clear in this impression.
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A 26 (806); Plate XLVIII

On a fragmentary railing pillar No. 2 recovered by Prof. K. D. Rajpoot. The reading taken from Cunningham’s eye-copy is confirmed by the impression. It may be possible to read जातोलसान, but the 5-stroke of ओ is rather underdeveloped. To read जातममास is (as Prof. Rajpoot does) is unwarranted and against grammar.

A 36 (877); Plate XLVIII

Cunningham’s eye-copy of this inscription is described as coming from Uchahara’s. The sculpture is now in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, Banaras. The impression now available confirms our reading. Only the anuvāra of दातान does not come out clearly in the impression (दातान on p. 27 is a misprint for दातान).

A 47 (876); Plate XLVIII

The reading from Cunningham’s eye-copy, described as “from Uchahara” and now in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, Banaras, is confirmed by the impression.

A 48 (876); Plate XLVIII

The remark on A 47 applies also to A 48; we should, however, read यां instead of यान in [पारकाति]काया.

A 104 (879); Plate XLVIII

The remark on A 47 applies to A 104 too.

A 124 (803)

The inscription is not a fragmentary one as explained by Lüders; there is also no possibility of combining it with A 43 or with any other inscription as suggested by Barua-Sinha and rejected by Lüders. The inscription is clearly legible as दसानय ठाबाद दातान in the photograph published by Coomaraswamy, i.e. Fig. 47, and can be made out also in the photograph in Stāhla, Pl. XXI, “Pillar at Bātanārā”, near the left hip of the Yakshī. If this Yakshī is the same as the one discovered by Prof. Rajpoot, his reading should not be Soriga ठाबो दातान but Sākalya as given above. It is likely that the inscription is somewhat mutilated at present, but the old photographs are quite clear. We have to translate: The pillar (are) the gift of Sakā (Śakā)².

B 62 (881); Plate XLVIII

The reading is:

तिमिरिमिरिलादालकुक्क्हिन्हि Vasu[?][u]t[o] म्यौर्जा महादेवेनानि

Cf. note 1 on p. 155.

(B) CORRECTIONS

Page XI, f. n. 1, line 1—क्रित्वा instead of क्रित्वा

XIII, line 4—द instead of द

XX, lines 11-12 from below, read—“for Gāgiptu- and Vāchhipita- in A 1 cf. §6(1) and p. XXI, f. n. 1", instead of “cf. also Gāgiptu- and Vāchhipita- in A 1”.

XXI, line 19—तिंदा instead of तिंदा

XXV line 12—(६)to instead of (६)तo

XXVI, line 8—(५)ye instead of (५)े

XXX, f. n. 1, line 2—‘with the exception ‘instead of ‘with exception’

XXXI, line 16—‘were later on ‘instead of ‘became later on’

XXXIII, line 12—‘doubtless ‘instead of ‘doubless’

XXXVIII, line 3—(अष्टलेष) instead of (अष्टलेष)

f. n., line 3—‘in Lüders ‘instead of ‘on Lüders’

6, line 2 from below—‘(five times) ‘instead of ‘(five times)

7, line 21—Mahā-mora-giri instead of Mihē-mora-giri

line 14 from below—(vadhana instead of -vadhana

line 12 from below—Paṇi-vadhana instead of Paṇi-vadhana

7, line 7 from below—vāda or vāda instead of -vāda or -vāda

10, f. n. 12, line 1—‘derivative ‘instead of ‘derivation’

11, line 4—‘Eastern gateway ‘instead of ‘eastern gateway’

line 8—Chandra ‘instead of ‘Chandra ‘

f. n. 2, line 2—‘the more so ‘instead of ‘the more’

f. n. 4, line 2—‘as usual ‘instead of ‘as usually’

12, f. n. 5—sāl instead of sāl

21, line 7—Setaka instead of Setaka

23, f. n. 8—Rāmpurāṇad ‘instead of ‘Rāmpurāṇad ‘

24, f. n. 1, add—possibly we can take Jāttamitra as ‘one to whom a friend has been born’. This name would be in a way parallel to Ajñenāstra

f. n. 7, add—If the name Ġhāṭila is derived from Ghata, and not Ghata, then it may refer to the sign Aquarius.

² Or “the Śūkyā”?
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page 27, line 10—'only once', add f. n.—twice in the case of Chikilana (A 39, A 40) and Nagara (A 43, A 44).

51, f. n. 4, add—Or Varu may refer to the name of the god.

52, line 2—(Śemati) instead of (Śimati).

f. n. 5—Or (Varu) see classification 1, 2, A, b (names derived from stars).

53, f. n. 6—Or (Varu) see classification 1, 2, a, b (names derived from spirits and animal deities).

57, line 8 from below—p. 47, line 1 from below—recurs instead of 'recurs'

58, f. n. 5—Isirakkita occurs perhaps also in A 87a.

57, f. n. 6—Or Koḍā may stand for *Koḍā (Kṛṣṇa) (cf. p. 163, lines 6-7).

59, line 17—[SIT] instead of [SIT].

70, line 9 from below—was translated instead of 'is translated'

f. n. 5—'by the side of' instead of 'at the side of'.

71, f. n. 6, real—'exclusion' instead of 'juxtaposition'.

72, line 1—JATAKAS instead of JATAKAS

73, f. n. 1—whose sovereign is Kuvera instead of 'whose sovereign Kavera is'.

75, line 14—'Ajakalāpaka is 'some one' instead of 'Ajakalāpaka 'some one'

line 1 from below—figures instead of 'figure'

79, f. n., line 2—'unbelievable' instead of 'Unbelievable'

80, line 2 from below—Keka instead of 'Keka'

87, line 7 from below—Bodhināvata instead of 'Bodhināvata'

88, line 10—'Holy One' instead of 'Holy one'

93, line 13—'beating' instead of 'bearing'

line 8 from below—'The hall of gods' instead of 'The hall of the gods'

94, line 22—'the hall of gods' instead of 'the hall of the gods'

95, line 10 from below—p. 53ff. instead of '53ff.'

101, line 7—on the seven-colored viṅga instead of 'on the seven-stringed viṅga'

103, line 3 from below—Holy One instead of 'Holy one'

109, line 25—away on both sides instead of 'away both sides'

112, line 7 from below—erakā was substituted instead of 'so erakā was substituted'

113, line 2—'he was reborn' instead of 'he is reborn'

line 8 from below—under No. B 23 instead of 'No. B 23'

115, line 5 from below—restraint instead of 'restricted'

117, f. n. 2, line 17—'a place for walking' instead of 'a place of walking'

119, line 2—'female-attendant' instead of 'female-attendant'

122, line 12—'at present kept in' instead of 'at present in'

line 15—'Jātaka instead of 'Jātaka

line 1 from below—infested instead of 'infected'

124, line 20—'mocking by' instead of 'mocking of'

127, line 26—'can only be' instead of 'can only'

135, line 1 from below—'there' instead of 'three'

140, line 5—ayam instead of ayān

141, line 9—veḷḷugumbamasin; line 6 from below—'slaughterer' instead of 'slaugtherer'

line 1 from below—'interference' instead of 'interference'

f. n. 2—avēkkhipani instead of 'avēkkhipani'

145, line 22—'an example of' instead of 'an example for'

line 3 from below—whether it is 'instead of' easy it be'

146, line 4—'Northern gate' instead of 'northern gate'

148, f. n. 1, line 2—'Kālabandha; see instead of 'Kālabandha (see'

150, line 16—'on the Himavat' instead of 'in the Himavat'

153, line 5—Jītayandhā instead of 'Jītayandhā.

159, line 2 from below—'refused' instead of 'rejected'

168, line 1 from below—'is arāmika' instead of 'is arāmika'

175, line 10—'As known' instead of 'As we know'

176, line 22, line 24—'Evil One' and 'Holy One' instead of 'Evil one' and 'Holy one'.

180, line 56—'a role' instead of 'also a role'.


184, read—JPSB. before JPTS.

185, line 9—'thabho' instead of 'tiabo'

186, line 8—A 46 instead of '46 A'.

191, line 12—'Anādhiṣṭhāpita; instead of 'Anādhiṣṭhāpita;

line 5 from below—'vaya; instead of 'vada'.

192, line 11—Isirakkhitā instead of Isirakkhitā

195, line 1 from below—'Chittoppadāsālaka; instead of 'Chittoppadāsālaka.

197, line 11—'petakā; instead of 'paltakā'.

199, line 1 from below—'Chittoppadāsālaka; instead of 'Chittoppadāsālaka.'
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

(C) MISPRINTS

OMISSION OF PUNCTUATION—SIGNS

Page XVIII, line 23—B 55,
XX, f. n. 9, line 3—a sibilant,
XXIX, line 7 from below—A 8.

2, line 5 from below—(Gṛgiputra),
4, line 6 from below—A 75.
7, line 13—Morajībhīkṣa,
line 29—(Tārāpadā),
22, line 15—No. 36; Banat-Sinha,
55, f. n. 2, line 1—editors.
73, line 10 from below—three,
line 10 from below—Chāṇikā,
93, f. n. 2, line 3—p. 89
96, f. n. 2, line 1—32f.
97, line 25—A 82.
102, f. n. 2—1, 27.
110, line 23—No. 60,
112, line 5 from below—(36 ff.).
118, f. n. 2, line 5—beyond,
120, line 9—Sūrya,
121, lines 17, 19—coping-stone
line 5 from below—star-shaped
124, line 2—Pi.
125, line 6—coping-stone
128, line 11—No. 74,
131, line 5—p. 120 ff.,
133, line 3 from below—speaking.
149, line 2—coping-stone
150, line 11—Bhāsajñātaka,
159, line 8—p. 103 ff.,
160, line 11—p. 97 ff.,
165, line 24—p. 135 ff.,
167, line 15, line 6 from below—of many elephants
172, line 6 from below—Cunningham,
180, line 5 from below—p. 171,
181, lines 7-8—'that the men are sleeping...decorative purpose'.
184—PISD: SBE.

INCORRECT PUNCTUATION—SIGNS

VII, f. n., line 1—1886, (p. 59),
XXVIII, line 13— S.
4, line 18—(Buddharakṣita) A 76
7, line 13—Morajībhīkṣa (hi) kṣa
27, line 2 from below—(P 12)
33, f. n. 1—1, 1, a
130 lines 4-5 from below—according
138, line 3 from below—stories the (insert, however, comma after speaking),
147, line 13—head while
165, line 29—(124 a),

MISSING ITALICS

194, line 3— f13
195, line 16— f6
line 19— f46
197, line 7—IV
198, line 12—III
line 11 from below—I
201, line 15 from below—Io
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

(D) REMARKS ON SOME REPRODUCTIONS

A 4 (682); Plate II:
In the impression on Plate II the word संधि is obliterated.

A 54 (804); Plate XXIV:
The first akṣara of line 2 in the reproduction on Plate XXIV should read sa, not pa.

B 58 (709); Plate XXI, XLV;
The akṣaras स्रज, visible in Cunningham's photography, are obliterated in the reproductions on plate XXI.

B 91 (902); Plate XXIII:
The akṣara त्त of ब्रह्माणि is by mistake written ge in our copy.
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I. LÜDERS' CRITICISM OF BARUA'S WORK ON BHÄRHUT

The work published by Sir Alexander Cunningham on his excavations at Bhärhut was at his time an important achievement, because the reproduction of the sculptures was done in original photographs and not in sketches as usual up to that date. Cunningham, helped by Subhūti, also began the interpretation of the sculptures, to which work in later time Andersen, Chavannes, Coomaraswamy, Foucher, Hultzsch, Minaya, Oldenburg, Rhys Davids, Rouse, Waldschmidt, and Warren contributed with merit. The great progress which has been made in Indian Archaeology and Epigraphy and in the investigation of Buddhist literature since the publication of Cunningham's book made the re-edition of the finds urgently desirable. The first step in this direction was undertaken by Barua and Sinha in 1926, when they published a new edition of the inscriptions at Bhärhut. Later on Barua endeavoured to give in a work of three volumes an exhaustive account of all questions regarding the stūpa.

One has to admit thankfully that the material offered for investigation in Barua's latest work is quite large and improved. The 97 plates in part III show a row of sculptures never published before, and some reproductions are more complete or appear on a bigger scale. The technical make-up of his plates is generally very good; but in spite of this one has to refer here and there to the old photographs of Cunningham which are more clear.

The kernel of Barua's publication is the second Book which contains the description and the identification of sculptures and bears the title "Jātaka-Scenes". Vogel already opposed the designation of the sculptures as Jātaka-Scenes, JRAS. 1927, p. 593 ff., but Barua neglected this fully justified criticism. The number of real Jātakas up to then identified at Bhärhut was 32; according to the list given in Barhut I, p. 86 ff., Barua has enlarged it to double that number. But unfortunately this apparently great rise in identifications proves to be an illusion. Barua indeed has the merit to have explained convincingly a number of representations for the first time. He identified rightly, as I believe, the figures on pillars represented on Cunningham's plate XIV and XV (see B 60 and B 61) with the main persons of the Kāṇḍāraj. (341) and of the Samuggaj. (436). Besides, he succeeded in identifying the 'fragment' on plate XXVII with the Sammodamānaj. (33), plate XXXIII, 7 with the Kapij. (250), and the scene of the medallion in Barhut III, Pl. XCHII

1 The Stūpa of Bhärhut: a Buddhist Monument ornamented with numerous sculptures illustrative of Buddhist Legend and History in the third century B.C., London 1879.
2 Barhut Inscriptions: Edited and translated with critical notes by Benimadhab Barua and Kumar Gangananda Sinha. Published by the University of Calcutta 1926.
4 In the following text unless something is specifically mentioned the plate numbers refer to Cunningham's publication. When the sculptures bear inscriptions reference has been made to our number and classification in this publication, e.g. B 60. Sculptures bearing no such numbers do not have inscriptions.
5 Barh. II, p. 117 f.; 132 f.
6 Ibid. II, p. 91 f.
7 Ibid. II, p. 109 f. In Barua's list we find instead Makkatāj. (173), although Barua himself had decided in favour of the Kapij. and denied the Makkatāj.
(141a) with the Gāthapāṇḍaj. (227)¹. Not quite sure, but not improbable, is the identification of reliefs on Pl. XLI 5 with the Sūchij. (387)² and the reliefs in Barhut III, Pl. LXXI (92) with the Kanahaj. (29)³. With this, the number of identifications which are acceptable, comes to an end. The identification of the relief on Pl. XXXIV 1 with the Vañnapathaj. (2)⁴ is not convincing. The same has to be said of the identification of the relief on Pl. XXXII 4 with the Saṅgāmāvachaj. (182)⁵ and of the reliefs on Pl. XLVIII 4 (see B 63) with the Mūlapariyājaj. (245)⁶. His endeavour to bring together at all cost every sculpture with some text, and as far as possible with some Jātaka, very often led Barua to completely unjustifiable and sometimes even impossible combinations.⁷

On Pl. XLVII 9 (see B 64), we have a relief in which a woman—she is according to the inscription the young wife Asādhā—sits on the branches of a tree in a cemetery and tells something to three jackals. I ask myself in vain what that has to do with the Asilakkhanaj. (126)⁸, as in the Jātaka the king’s daughter does not climb up a tree, and also has no reason to do so, and the jackals do not play any role. Likewise I do not understand, how it is possible to explain the horse in the half-medallion represented in Barhut III, Pl. XXVI as the famous horse Valāhā, which, according to the Jātaka (196), brings home 250 merchants, whereas, according to the Divy. p. 120, only the merchant Supriyaj⁹ is brought home. In the medallion a horse is to be seen, being led by a man with a rein, while another man with a spear in hand follows him. The horse is certainly not, as Barua maintains, represented as flying. Besides, the man with the spear, whom nobody would suppose to be a merchant, does not hold fast to the tail of the horse, as told in the story. Barua’s opinion that the artist intended to suggest through the man before the horse, that the horse was having a human voice, will not find common consent. Probably the half medallion is purely decorative, and the representation is chosen with regard to the profession of the donor of the pillar, viz. the horseman (asavaṇika) Suladha (Suladbha), cf. A 22. It seems to me also in no way reasonable to identify the relief on Pl. XLII 9 with the Chullakaseṭṭhij. (4), or even with the Gaṇḍatinduj. (520)¹⁰, or to combine the relief on Pl. XLII 7 with the Madhupiṇḍika-Apadāna (Ap. 97)¹¹. The relief on Pl. XLVI 4 is being explained by Barua as the illustration of the Kisa Vaccha episode (J.V. 134, 3 ff.) in the Sarabhaṅgaj. (522). In that case we are asked to believe, that the man who in the relief stands with folded hands before an ascetic is the king who, according to the story, is deeply offended by him because of his spitting. I also consider the interpretation of the relief on the Pl. XLIV 4 and its identification with the Gahapatij. (199)¹² as totally wrong. In any case the man to the left does not lie on the earth, being caught in a noose. On the contrary, he sits in a position called in

¹ Ibid. III, p. 3 f. ² Ibid. II, p. 126 f. ³ Ibid. II, p. 90 f. Barua himself seems to have given up the identification of the fragment on Pl. XXXIII 6 with the Sūnasmaraj. (208) proposed in the 7PASE, New Ser. XIX, p. 348 f. because it is not again mentioned in his list. The monkey represented in the fragment seems in fact only to be decorative, as well as the squirrels in Barh. III, Pl. X. ⁴ Ibid. II, p. 81 f. ⁵ Ibid. II, p. 103 f. The bridge on which the great elephant walks, and the curious basis on which the small elephant stands remain unexplained. ⁶ BL. p. 84; Barh. II, p. 108 f.—Digaladakṣina cannot mean ‘the venerable ascetic’ but is obviously a proper name. ⁷ Some of these false interpretations, not mentioned here, have been discussed in the text. ⁸ Ibid. II, p. 104 f. ⁹ Ibid. II, p. 170 f. ¹⁰ Ibid. II, p. 167 f. ¹¹ Ibid. II, p. 144 f. ¹² Ibid. II, p. 103 f.
Sanskrit avasakthikā, in Pāli sanghāṭi- or dussapallāthikā and which, as the name indicates, consists in binding the garment round the knees and hips for support. The ascetic in the relief on Pl. XLVI 4 is also sitting in the position of sanghāṭipallāthikā, his right arm, however, being free, while the man in our relief has put the arm in the supporting tie made from his garment.

The treatment by Barua of our inscription No. B 80 (for particulars cf. below) is a further example to show on what unfounded suppositions his identifications are sometimes based. It is also characteristic of the method of Barua, to see how he deals with a small fragment of a coping stone, that is preserved in the Indian Museum and has been reproduced for the first time in Barhut III, Pl. LXXV (98). Barua completes the sculpture which bears our inscription B 65 (cf. our treatment) by the photograph of another which, however, as everybody will see at first sight, does not fit in with the former. In this way he finds it possible to identify the relief with the Indasamānagottaj, (161) or with the Mittāmittāj, (197). Barua’s lack of knowledge and feeling for the language has also become a rich source of errors. Barua and Sinha show often in their interpretations of labels a disregard for even the most simple rules of phonology. The inscription B 45 reads Sechkajataka. It is probably not to be expected of the authors to know that sechha is the western form of Sanskrit śākṣha and that seka, the eastern form, has been taken over into Pāli, but the identification of seka with sīkṣha, seka, under express rejection of the right etymology, and the translation based thereon as ‘a Jātaka-episode of water-drawing’ is more than can be forgiven even to a beginner. One may judge the Kodāya in our inscription B 72 as one likes, but that it cannot go back to Kudri-rāja or kuṭṭarāja and that it cannot mean ‘fort-keeper’ need scarcely be pointed out. On the name of the mountain Naḍoda occurring at different times in the labels (cf. B 70-76) it is said in BI. p. 98: ”Naḍoda seems to equate with Naḷada or Nārada, and is obviously used as a synonym for Gandhāmadana, nala or nalada meaning a scented plant or mineral’’. In the translations of the labels in Barhut II, p. 162, 165, 169, Naḍoda is accordingly simply substituted by ‘Mt. Nārada’. Any comment seems to me to be superfluous. The inscription B 66 Bramhadevo mānavako is translated as ‘the young [Ṛṣa]-Brahma deity Subrahmā’ or ‘the youthful Rūpabrahma deity’; the scene has been explained as a greeting of the Buddha by the Brahmākīya goddesses after he had attained Bodhi. That in fact would be a very curious representation of the event. But it is not necessary to deal with it any further, for the inscription can only mean ‘the young Brahmin Brahmadeva’, and that any relation of the relief to the Rūpabrahma goddesses is missing is obvious.

Finally even representations rightly explained for a long time have been wrongly interpreted by Barua. The story of the bullock and the jackal forming the basis of the relief on

1 Vaij., 95, 299; Trik., 532; Hem. Abb., 679; Gau., 2, 14; Manu 4, 112; kriyā chaiva avasakthikāṁ nādāyaṁ, rightly translated by Bühler as ‘while he sits on his hams with a cloth tied round his knees, let him not study’. In the Buddhist Sanskrit the word has been distorted to utsakthikā; Mlp., 263, 29 notesatsavaṁ, 263, 85 notesakthikāṁ tiṣayāldiyā dharmam daśayānaṁ.
2 In Chullav., 5, 98, 19 it is said of the chhabbagya monks: sanghāṭipallāthikāṁ nīṣṭānti sanghāṭiyāṇa paṭṭaṁ (so to be read) lajanī, which in SBE XX is translated: ‘sat down lolling up against their waist-cloths (arranged as a cushion) and the edges of the waist-cloths wore out’. In Satav., 26 it is forbidden to sit in the house pallāthikāṁ on which the old commentary remarks yo asubhijanam paṭṭaṁ kuttapallāthikāṁ vā adantaragha nīṣṭāti paṭṭaṁ dukkha-jānaṁ. Instead of the garment it was of course possible to support the knees also with the arms. A special cloth has also been used for support—āyogapaṭṭa. See Ve. 33, 41; Vism., 1, 79.
3 Barh. II., p. 99 f.
4 BI., p. 84.
5 Ibid., p. 92 f.
6 BI., p. 96.
7 Barh. II., p. 23.
Cunningham’s plate XXVII 10 was found years ago by Chavannes, _Contes et Apologies_ I, p. XI in some Buddhist text. Barua does not know of it and wants to combine the relief and the Vakaj. (300) which has quite different contents\(^1\). The scene represented on the pillar of the South-West quadrant having the inscription _Jasamajhakiyam jātakaṁ_ (Pl. XXV 3) has already been explained rightly by Cunningham (p. 53 ff.) in its main features, although he had access only to the later versions of the story in the _Bṛhatkathāmaṇḍari_ and in the _Kathāsaritsaṅgara_. Minayeff later on hinted at the story of the prudent _Amarādevī_ and the four ministers in the _Mahāummagga_. (546)\(^2\) as the model of the artist\(^3\). The representation exactly follows the text. Barua\(^4\) manages to identify the relief with two different episodes of the _Mahāummagga-jātaka_ on the basis of some unbelievable misinterpretations of the details.

But I may stop here. If I wanted to mention all the unjustified conclusions, all the contradictions, inexact and unclear matters found throughout the work of Barua I should have to fill many pages. They are as numerous as the many misprints and false citations.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Barh. II, p. 114 f.
\(^2\) J., VI, 368, 14 ff.
\(^3\) _Recherches sur le Bouddhisme_, p. 148 ff.
\(^4\) Barh. II, p. 158 ff.
\(^5\) Thus far the introduction is a rendering of the essentials of Lüders’ preliminary remarks in _Bhārhat und die buddhistische Literatur_, pp. 1-9.
II. THE LANGUAGE

The Bhārhat inscriptions, which belong to the central group of early Brāhmī inscriptions, are written in a Prakrit showing predominantly Western dialectical characteristics, e.g. the nom. sg. mas. in -a (§ 25) and the preservation of r, initially and medially, as opposed to the eastern -e and -l. Barua, Bara. I, p. 48, calls the language “a monumental Prakrit with a marked tendency to conform to Pāli diction”. Regarding the inscriptions describing the sculptural representations he is of the opinion “that the scriptural source of the Barhat artists was not in all cases the Pāli but of mixed character, with the predominance of the Pāli elements”.

The following inventory brings out some dialectal mixture, for instance in the representation of the Sk. cluster kṣh (§ 13), which is sometimes assimilated to (k)kh and sometimes palatalised to (ch)khh, and in the cerebralisation of n, occurring in the Toranā inscriptions A1 and A2 only, whereas all other inscriptions avoid the cerebralisation of n, and even show the cerebral nasal u changed to dental u [cf. § 12(c)]. The latter fact is rightly observed by Barua I.e.; but it is a distortion, when he notes such an essential difference between the orthography of the inscriptions on the gateway pillars and the main bulk of inscriptions, as to say “in the former the nasal nasal (n) is replaced by the cerebral (y), and in the latter the cerebral is replaced by the dental.” As a glance at the inscriptions will show, A1 and A2 contain dental nasals; the point of difference is no more than that cerebralisation takes place in the two Toranā inscriptions.

a. Phonology

§ 1. Treatment of the Sk. vowel ū: The vowel, as usual, shows the threefold treatment viz.: that it is changed to a, i, and u. However, it is possible to say that the change to a is predominant, for the change to i occurs only in the illustration isi, and in animal names like sigāla and miga, while the change to u is restricted to the words of human relationship.

(I) Change Sk. ū>i:
  Sk. kṣita->kata- A 112, A 129.
  Sk. kṛṣṇa->kāniśka- A 63.
  Sk. gṛhāpati->gahapati- A 21.
  Sk. Suprāqśita->Supāvaśa- B 7. (Here ordinarily we should have expected Supāvusa- in combination with v).

(II) Change Sk. ū>a:
  Sk. mīga->miga- B 47, B 48, B 68.
  Sk. śīgāla->sigāla- B 64. Perhaps also in

1 A 129, the very fragmentary third Toranā inscription, has again only the dental n.
2 According to H. Berger, Zwei Probleme der mittelländischen Lautlehre, München, 1955, p. 30 ū becomes i as a rule, when the following syllable contains i; cf. kīmi < trīmi, kīki < krīki, vīchaka-<vīṛīchaka.
3 The change ū>i in this case is explained by H. Berger (p. 40) as due to the influence of the oft-occurring fem. mīgi->mīti.
4 According to H. Berger (p. 25 ff.) sigāla belongs to the class of words which denote specific Indian things and are therefore most probably of non-Aryan origin. This is supported by the occurrence of the suffix —āla-āra which is frequent in words which are etymologically unclear.
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(III) Change Sk. ri->u:
Sk. nātpī-> nātu- A 50.
Sk. mātāpītri-> mā[t]ā pītu-na A 108.*

§ 2. Treatment of Sk. ayi and aea:—As is to be expected they become e and o respectively.

(I) Change ayi->e:
Sk. *kraiyātā-> kettā B 32. (But it is also possible to explain the form as coming from kraītā>* kettā. Such a change, however, is not frequent in Bhār hut inscriptions.)

(II) Change aea->o:
Sk. Śraunā->Sonā- A 123. (Perhaps this personal name may also be derived from Swarnā-.)
Sk. vyavakrānta-> yokata- B 18. (Is it not possible to derive yokata- from Sk. avakrānta-? The initial v--may be a phonetic tendency to pronounce u before o.)
Sk. ämrava(a)-> Aboda- B 69.
Sk. avakrānti-> ukrainti- (i.e. okrainti-) B 19. This is according to Hultzsch, who considers the form as a mistake for okrainti-. Lüders, however, would like to derive it from Sk. upakrānti-. In view of the fact that we do not get any long ā vowel before a cluster, it is better to regard ā as a mistake for o, the usual left horizontal stroke being put to the right by mistake. If, however, the reading ā is the correct one, then we better read the following letter as k and not kr. This k then will not stand for kk as the preceding vowel is lengthened; cf. Mahādasa- A 13.

§ 3. Treatment of Sk. diphthongs ai and au:—As usual they become e and o, except that au is supposed to have been preserved only in a solitary instance (see however below).

(I) Change ai->e:
Sk. Veijayantā-> Vejayantā- B 22.
Sk. Veidas--> Vedas- A 30, A 33, A 34.
Sk. saiksha-> seksha- B 45.
Sk. -naikāyika-> nekāyika- A 57.
Once Sk. chaitya-> chātya- B 69. This is obviously a mistake, the top horizontal mark being put to the right by mistake instead of to the left. See above the probable mistake in ukrainti- for okrainti-.

(II) Change au->o:
Sk. kausāla-> kosala- B 39.

(III) au is supposed to have been preserved in:
Sk. pautā-> pauta- A 1. But this is highly improbable. The change au->o is found in the very same inscription in the instance Gotiputa-. It is

1The change ri->i in śriṅga-> śīṅga is explained by H. Berger p. 30 to be due to the existence of the old palatal ī.

2For the change of ri->u in words of relationship as result of the influence of the gen. sg. forms like pītuh, mātuh etc. see Ch. Barholomae, Ausgleicherscheinungen bei den Zahlworten 2, 3 und 4 im Mittelindischen. Mit einem Anhang: über ściunnaḥ, Sitzungsber. Heidelberger Akademie 1916, V, and H. Berger p. 60 ff.
therefore reasonable to suppose that the word really has to be read potena, see the remark on the akshara po in note 1 of A 1.

§4. Treatment of e and o: These sounds are normally preserved. The following incidental changes, however, may be noted:

(I) Change e→i: Sk. kubera→kupara-B 1. Perhaps this betrays a tendency to pronounce the second syllable short, especially when a long syllable follows (the actual from used is kupiro).

(II) o occurs for e obviously by mistake in Sk. Misrakesi→Misakosi- B 28.

(III) Change o→u before a cluster is attested in Sk. Nandottara→Nadutara- A 119.

(IV) māchito B 62 for mochito is obviously a mistake in the eye-copy, the putting in of the upper left horizontal mark having been forgotten.

§5. Treatment of the vowel a: Though this vowel is fairly well preserved, it is possibly sometimes lengthened before a consonant cluster, and in a few cases it changes to i and u under the influence of y and m respectively.

(I) Change a→ā before a consonant cluster.—It must be stated that clear cases of this type of change are really very few. Most of them seem to be hypothetical. (Note also that changes i→i and u→ā in similar circumstances are rarely found.)

Sk. Punarvasu→Punāvasu- A 72. It is, however, possible that we get here a combination of punā- and eva, punā itself being the form for punar-. Thus the change of a→ā in Punāvasu may not have anything to do with the cluster rv; cf. similar combinations in Araha-guto B 18, B 20, and yāhā-putiya B 49.

Sk. Aṅgāradyut→Āgaraju- A 1. Here also the right horizontal mark in the middle supposed to be for ā is not very clear and seems accidental, exactly as in the case of paurṇa. Note also that in the inscription A 2 line 2 we get Āgaraju— with short a.

Sk. Gāṃgāmitra→Gāgāmita- A 89.

Sk. sāṭika→sāṭika- B 27. But sāṭika— may go back to sāṭikā.

The next are the three instances where a→ā occurs in the genitive singular term.-assa→āsa; cf. asavārikāsa A 22, Thutapāsasa A 25, bhudahnīsa A 38. Similarly we get a long vowel before a simplified cluster of rājāh→rañño→rāño A 4; cf. also Gāgāpita- and Vākhipita in A 1.

(II) Writing of a as ā by mistake is found in toranāh A 1 (cf. § 12, c), dān[a] A 49 a, gaujañika B 42 a, Bhāranideva- A 100, Dhamārakhiṭītī A 52, and Bhutārakhitā- A 38.

(III) Change a→i due to the influence of palatal y:

Sk. nyagrodha→nigodha- B 70.

Sk. Rishyamrīga→Rishimag- B 49. (This is according to Lüders, all other editors derive it from Rūkṣimag-)

Sk. Rishyāmīga→Rishimag- B 53.

(IV) Change a→u due to the influence of labial m:

Sk. smāñāna→smāñāna- B 64.1

1The change a→u in susāna— is explained by H. Berger as a result of saṁprasāraṇa. For this the author presupposes (18, 6. n. 13; also cf. p. 61, 66) a hypothetical form *savañāna— for smāñāna—. But elsewhere the rounding of lips due to m is shown by Berger himself.
§6. Treatment of the vowel ā: This vowel suffers most changes, though it is not infrequent to find it well preserved. It is principally changed to a before a consonant cluster, before the gen. sg. fem. term., at the end of the word mostly in nom. sg. fem. and abl. sg. mas., and lastly it is represented as a short vowel in some cases mostly due to the negligence of the scribe and should in fact be taken to stand for a long vowel in such cases.

(1) Change ā→a before a consonant cluster:
Sk. ārāya→ārāya- A 38, A 51, A 56 etc.
Sk. ṛājya→ṛājya- A 1, A 2. (It may be observed that in the inscription A 1 long ā is preserved in Gāiputa- and Vāchhiputa-.)
Sk. bhāryā→bhāryā-ye A 4.
Sk. Kāśyapa→Kāśyapa- B 17.
This change is also observed before clusters with nasals:
Sk. sūtrāntika→sūtrāntika- A 51.
Sk. upakrānti→(?)<ūkraunti- B 19 [cf. § 2 (II)].
Sk. evakrānta→ (?)<vokata- B 18.
Sk. brāhmaṇa→brāhmaṇa- B 51.
Sk. rājaka→raño A 1. (But cf. raśi A 4. We also get long ā in rājana A 3 and short a in raśana A 130, where we have to suppose that the gen. sg. forms are formed on the analogy of such forms as attano etc.)
Sk. atmanā→atamā A 112.
Sk. amravat(a)→Aboḍa- B 69.

(II) Change ā→a before the gen. (abl.) sg. fem. termination. It is observed before the term. -ya and sometimes before -ye, but never before -ya.
Sk. Pushyadevā→Pushadevya- A 120.
Sk. bhāryā→bhāryā-ya A 46. Also cf. Purikāya A 17, Purikāya' A 19 (in these two cases abl. sg. term.), Badhikāya A 42, Nudataraya A 119, and Nagarikāya A 43.
Sk. Pushyadattā→Pushyadatta-ye A 43, A 44.

As against these instances we have numerous instances where ā is preserved before -ya and -ye; cf. the following: Nagarasyā A 14, Purikāya A 16 (abl. sg.), Idatevyā A 19, A 45, Sāmāya A 20, Bhujakatakāya A 24, Benākātikāya A 49 a, bhāryāya A 115, Sonaśāya A 123 etc. etc.; before -ye cf. Nagarakhītāye A 4, Nagarikāye A 44, Phagudevēye A 75, Ujñihāye A 114, Ghoṣāye A 117 etc.

As mentioned above ā is never shown as a before the ending -ya; cf. Kuṣārayā A 10, Nagardevēya A 11, samuṇāya A 12, Purikāya (abl. sg.) A 18, A 20, Pushāya A 27, Nagilāya A 29, Sirimāya A 48 etc. etc.

(III) Change -ā→-a at the end of a word:
(a) At the end of nom. sg. fem. words; cf. deva B 8, B 12, Sudassana B 10, Mahakoka B 12, Idaśālagaha B 35, Sivala B 56, Chittupādasila B 67.
(b) Also in the acc. sg. fem. with or without the loss of final anuvāra; cf. disa B 26, katha (<kanthā acc. to Lüders) B 73, dakkhina B 26.

* Perhaps this is a mistake for Purikāya (cf. A 16) or Purikāya (cf. A 18, A 20), as we do not get any other instance of the shortening of -ā before -ya.

* In A 24 we get Digamagayē. It will be seen that the final vowel stroke is not quite clear. At other places in this inscription we get the gen. sg. term. -ya in Bhujakatakāya and bhāryāya and not-ye. Nagarikāya A 45 may be a mistake for -āya, because in the same inscription we get Idatevyā; and bhāryā A 4 may be a mistake for bhāryā, as we have Nagarakhītāye in the same inscription.
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(c) At the end of the abl. sg. mas. forms: Karahakata A 6, A 7, Chekulana A 40, Nāsika A 46.

(d) The final ā of gen. pl. mas. is also sometimes shortened to a (which is shown with or without anusvāra); cf. Sugana A 1, dāyakana A 16, Sagāna (for Sugāna) A 2 and devānāma B 27. (Note that in the first two instances ā is changed to a also before the gen. pl. term.)

(e) The final ā of instrumental sg. is shortened in Dhanabhātīna A 1.

(IV) In the end we may note that ā is sometimes represented as a just by way of a mistake in such cases as:

Sk. dāna->dana– A 81, A 127.
Sk. jātaka->jataka– B 42 (the actual form here being jatara–), B 45, B 48, B 51 etc.
Sk. Šhāna->*Thāna-> Tana– A 127.
Sk. rājan->[nā]garejā B 36.
Sk. ārāmakā–>ārāmakā– B 72. Also in the following instances maīu A 28, A 120, Sauṃdātā– A 122, Samīka– or Samaka– A 6, A 41, A 66, bhanaka– A 39, A 61, Ananda– A 50, and Bībikanadikāta A 21, A 22. (Perhaps in this last instance ā in Bimbikā becomes short as at the end of the first member of a compound.)

One wonders whether these instances suggest a slightly appreciable tendency to-pronounce the first syllable short, as the following instances perhaps show a tendency to-pronounce the second syllable short: Agaraju A 1, Agaraju A 2, Bīdala B 42, Sauța B 50, avayesi B 51, Asađa B 64. In the instances vijādha– B 61, Mahamukhi– A 42, and Mahakoka B 12 the change has occurred in compound.

(V) The change of ā>i in Venuvagimiyā (Sk. Venukagrāma–) is not certain, as Lüders is inclined to read Venuvāgimiyā.

§ 7. Treatment of the Sk. vowel i: The vowel is fairly well preserved. The changes that occur are rather sporadic and have no general application.

(I) Change i>i before a cluster. The only illustrations are: Bībikanadikāta A 22 (if its derivation from Bimbikānadikāta is correct). Mahendrasena–>Mahiddasena–> Mahidasena– A 13. But we find that the short vowel is preserved in such cases as Idadevā A 19, A 45.

(II) Change i>e before a cluster, observed only in Vesāhu– (Visvabhū–) B 14 and Anādhapedika– (–pindika–) B 22. The same change, but not before a cluster, is perhaps to be seen in Kosabeyekā– (Kauśambeyikā–) A 52 (but Lüders is inclined to read kosabeyikaya), and in śri–>seri– A 100 (see, however, f.n. 3 to A 100, p. 52).

(III) Writing of i as a, obviously due to the negligence on the part of the scribe to-attach i vowel mark, is seen in chetaya (for cheitya<cheitya) B 68, Samaka– (vsāmi–) A 66, Moragrimi (giri–) A 26, and timijiga B 62 (but Lüders proposes to read timijigila).

(IV) Change i>u due to assimilation in u[su](kāro) (ishu–) B 56, and Susūpālo (Śūpālo–) A 72.

§ 8. Treatment of the long vowel i: This vowel is mostly shortened before the gen. sg. term., in the compound formation, in suffixes and occasionally before a consonant

*Perhaps an instance of metathesis. But we may also read Agaraju; see § 5 (I), p. XV.
cluster; it is also sometimes shortened by mistake. In all these cases it is interesting to compare these changes with those of the long vowel ā.

(I) Change *i>i before a cluster is not at all frequent. The only instance observable
   is Dīghatapasi (dīrgha-) B 63.

(II) Change *i>i before gen. sg. term. This change is universal and is observed before all the three terminations, viz. -ya, -yā, and -ye; cf. some of the following instances: -bhūchumiyā A 24 etc., Vāśiṭṭhiya A 35, Kākāndiya (abl. sg.) A 37, bhūchumiyā A 12 etc., Koṭiyānya A 14, A 15, yakhiyā A 116, bhūchumiyā A 44, bhūchumiyā A 43, A 74 etc.

(III) Change *i>i is observed at the end of the nom. sg. of stems ending in iy and in:

(IV) Change *i>i is observed in the compound formations in Vāṭhhipata- A 1, Gotipata-
   A 1, Revatimāla- A 34, Bhājunidaya- A 100. But long i is kept in Gāgipata- A1.

(V) Change *i>i is observed in suffixes in all cases; cf. chhadoṃiyā B 49, yavamajāhiyā
   B 52, Mughādevyā B 57, Bhogavadhanya A 51 etc.
   This change is also found before the possessive suffix -mat, cf. Sirimā B 8, Sirimasa A 110.

(VI) In the following instances the shortening occurs due to mistake or as a result
   of occasionally pronouncing first or second syllable short.
   Isāna- (īśāna-) A 84 a, A 85 b, tiṣ- (tiṣa-) B 62 (but Lüders proposes to regard
   the sign for ra as a chance stroke and to read timi instead of tirami and combine
   timi with the following timingila, Sirisapada- (Sirishapada-?) A 53.

§ 9. The short vowel u is well preserved. It is shown, obviously by mistake, as a
   in Sago- (for Sugā-<Śugīga-) A 2 and in kamāra- (kumāra-?) A 3.

§10. The long vowel ā is not preserved.

(I) It is changed to ā before a cluster in Punakya- (Pūnakāya) B 55; sutaṃtiṃka-
       (sūtāṃtiṃka-) A 51, Dhāla- (Dhārta-) A 96, and tura- (tūra-) B 27.

(II) It is changed before the gen. sg. mas. term. in Vesahunā B 14 (or rather Vesabhuna,
     cf. § 12 (c)).

(III) It is shortened in the first syllable in the following instances: Bhuta- or Bhutaka-
       (Bhūta-) A 8, A 31, A 38, Trupadāsa (Tṛpadāsa-) A 25, rupakāra- (rūpa-)
       A 55, suci- (suci-) A 23, B 9 etc., muga- (mūga-) B 59, Dusa- (Dūsita-
       B 75, and once in the second syllable in Vīrudaka- (Vīridūkaka-) B 4.

§11. Treatment of simple consonants: The simple consonants are in a very large
      majority of cases well preserved. The cases of palatalisation and cerebralisation
      have been separately dealt with below (§ 13, § 14). The change of surds to sonants occurs in a few cases
      with k, t, t, and ṭ. The opposite tendency of changing sonants to surds occurs in only two
      illustrations with d and b. This latter tendency may show the hand of a north-western scribe
      in the writing of these inscriptions.

§12. Treatment of Sanskrit stops:

(a) In the case of gutturals, the only change of note that has occurred is of -k->-g-3
     in only one instance
     Sk. muka->muga- B 59 (see the change of -t->-d-, -t->-d- and -ṭh->-ṭh- below).
     The change of kh>k as a result of loss of aspiration is found in Dṛḍhanishkrāma-

---

1 The only case where i is shown as ending of the nom. sg. is deat B 56.
2 Perhaps also in Bhūkanadikaya (Bhūukanadikaya) A 21, A 22.
3 The opposite change of -g->-k- in dājakāla B 3 is not noticed, as Lüders himself seems to have
given up his suggestion to equate this word with Ajagālaka-. He is inclined to take Kālaka from the
root kal.
THE LANGUAGE: PHONOLOGY

> *Duṇānikham–» Duṇānikam– B 77.

Once -k- seems to have become -γ-, due to assimilation, cf. Venukagrāma–
> Venuvagima– A 52. jataka B 42 for jataka is obviously a mistake.

(b) The palatals are equally well preserved. The change of -j–>γ– is to be noticed
in Mahāśāmājika–» Mahāśāmājika– B 18. (For palatalisation see below §13.)

(c) The cerebrals, with the exception of ą, are well preserved. The change of -t–>q–
is found once in sāṅkika (or saṅkika)>sāṅkika– B 27. The change of th–>t– is
perhaps to be noticed in Sthāna–» *Thāna– A 127, Śrēṣṭhāka–
> Sethāka– A 18, srīṣṭopadāna– (?) > saṅthopadāna–» setopadāna– A 58,
and the change of -dh–>d– is noticed thrice:

Sk. Ashāḍhā>asaṭā B 64, Sk. Virūdhaka–»Virūḍha– B 4, Sk. Dṛḍhanishkrama–
> Duṇānikama–1 B 77.

The cerebral nasal ą is, however, in all cases changed to n, except in the inscriptions
A 1 and A 2:

Sk. bhānaka–» bhānaka– or bhānaka– A 39, A 59, A 54a, A 61, A 62, Sk. śramanā–
saman A 12, Sk. brāhmaṇe–» braman– B 51.

Even in term. we have n for ą, cf. m[d]īśituma A 108. In B 14 we have Vesabhūvā.
But as the gen. sg. term. is no, this is obviously a mistake for Vesabhūno.

Now in A 1 and A 2 we find ą preserved in the body of the word and in terminations,

In A 1 we have toranān. The nā, as has been noted in Lüders’ treatment of the
inscription, is obviously a mistake for nā.

Similarly Vāchhiputena in A 1 may be considered as a mistake for Vāchhiputena.
(For cerebralisisation see below § 14.)

(d) The dentals show only the following few instances of certain changes:

Change of a surd to sonant is found in two cases:
→ t–>d– in Sk. āmarat(a)–» Aboda– B 69,
→ th–>dh– in Anāśkipiṅgikā–» Anāśkipiṅgikā– B 32.

The contrary change of a sonant to surd is found in – d–> t– in Sk. Vidura–
> Vitura– B 55. (See the change of – b–> p– below.)

– d–>γ– in Sk. avādesi> avayesi B 51. Lüders notes that this change is an
eastern peculiarity and shows that the original text of the Gāthās was com-
posed in a dialect of eastern India. On the other hand we get braman in
the same inscription, and the preservation of the cluster br as well as the
nom. sg. in o are western characteristics.

(e) The labials also show only instances of sporadic changes: – b–> p– in Kubera–
> Kupira– B 1 (see above the change of – d–> t–), b> bh in Sk. bisa–» bhisa–
B 58.

§ 13. Palatalisation: The instances of palatalisation are not frequent, cf. vidyādhara–
> vijādhara– B 61, Aṅgāradyn–> Āgaraju– A 1, A 2 and yavaṃadhyakiyo>yavamajhakiyo B 52.
Perhaps we find palatalisation also in Vāṭisiputra–» Vāṭhiputa– in A 1, dhenačhaka B 76<
dhenūtsaka–. The cluster ps is palatalised to ckh in Sk. aśpras–» ačhara– B 28, B 30, B 31.

More important is the treatment of the cluster ksh which is sometimes assimilated to
(k)kh, but sometimes palatalised to (ch)kh. The word that shows both the treatments

1Hultsch derives it from Dṛḍhanishkrama.
*But we have torana– in A 129.
simultaneously is *bhikṣhuni*. According to T. Michelson\(^1\) and Lüders\(^2\), the -kh- forms are the eastern and the -cchh- forms are the western ones, because this distinction is clearly shown by the Eastern and Western inscriptions of Asoka\(^3\). Recently H. Berger has put forward this view in a modified form. He states that *kṣh>*cchh is not found in the East, in Maṇḍhāra. The change of *kṣh>*cchh in the central and western dialects in a number of instances is explained by him not as the result of a spontaneous dialectic tendency but is taken as the result of 'certain phonetic conditions'; accordingly in all such cases where *kṣh* becomes *cchh*, he tries to find out the phonetic conditions which govern the change (see Berger l.c. p. 71 ff. and p. 86). So while in the opinion of S. K. Chatterji, *kṣh* becomes *cchh* in *bhikṣuṇī* because of the habit to pronounce this word as *bhikṣyuṇī*, according to H. Berger the *cchh* is the result of dissimilation of the two gutturals in the form *bhikṣhuka>* *bhikṣhuka*. But this seems unlikely, as the word *bhikṣhuka* does not occur in Buddhist literature and in Prakrit inscriptions, and even in Sanskrit literature it is not very old. It is more reasonable to suppose that the double treatment shows the different speech habits of the regions from which the monks (or nuns) came, or of the scribes who were responsible for recording the donations. The Eastern form *bhikṣhuka* gradually must have gone over to the other regions as it was an ecclesiastical term, cf. also Lüders, Bhār. p. 174.

(I) Instances for *kṣh>*kh are *dakṣaḥpa>-dakṣi-* B 26, *yakṣa>-yakṣa- B 1, B 3 etc.\(^4\); *Rishiaraṇakṣhii̲>-Isirahkṣi̲ A 50, A 53, A 87, A 88\(^5\); *bhikṣuṇi>-bhikṣhuni A 11, A 12, A 29 etc.

(II) Instances of the Western change of *kṣh>*chh are found mostly in the parallels for the Sk. word *bhikṣhuni*; cf. *bhikṣhuni* A 24, A 37, A 42, A 43, A 74, etc. It may be interesting to observe that this change takes place when the (ab. or gen. suffix) is *-ye* or *-ya*. It never shows this form with the suffix *-yā*.

Words other than *bhikṣhuni* in which palatalisation of *kṣh* is found are *Chula- (Kshudra-)* B 11, *sechha- (saiksha-)* B 45\(^6\) and *kučchh- (kuksa-)* B 62.\(^7\)

Perhaps the word for 'six' *čha* B 26, and B 49, is to be equated with *kṣhat.\(^8\)*

§14. Cerebratisation: Not many instances of cerebratisation are witnessed in these inscriptions. The only instances available are *paṭāsaṅkhi (prati-)* B 18, *aṭha (artha)* A 108, *pātha (pratama)* A 34, *Bhogadhaṇa (avardha)* A 51, *Śhēna>* *Thēna>* *Tama* A 127 (for cerebratisation of *n* see §12 c above).

§15. Sibilants: As in the case of the Prakrits of the midland all the three sibilants are reduced to the single dental sibilant without any exception; cf. *Ajātāsatu (sātṛa)* B 40, *sisa*

---

\(^1\) T. Michelson, *Prakrit Language and Literature*, p. 47.


\(^3\) *Mehendale*, *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*, Poona 1948, §37 (iii) and f. n. 42.

\(^4\) We have also *yakṣha* A 105, *yakṣi* B 2, A 116, *yakṣiṇi* B 10.

\(^5\) We have also *Agirakṣha* A 23; *Gorakṣhī* A 46; A 68, *Devarakṣhī* A 93; *Dhamarakṣhī* A 95, A 118, *Nēgarakṣhī* A 4, *Nēgarakṣhī* A 54 b, *Buddharakṣhī* A 53, A 57, A 58, A 76; *Buddarakṣhī* A 31; *Saharakhṣhī* A 108.

\(^6\) A. Ages, *Sechha* is the western form, whereas *sekkha* is the eastern one. See Bhār., p. 174 and below p. 124. H. Berger (p. 86) says that the palatal in *sechha* does not conform to his theory, which demands *sekkha* and that the word is therefore an exception which cannot be explained.

\(^7\) Acc. to Lüders *sechha* is the western form, whereas *sekkha* is the eastern one. See Bhār., p. 174 and below p. 124. H. Berger (p. 86) says that the palatal in *sechha* does not conform to his theory, which demands *sekkha* and that the word is therefore an exception which cannot be explained.

\(^8\) In the opinion of H. Berger the palatal in *kuchh* is due to dissimilation to avoid the second guttural (*kukh*), p. 72.
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(śisyā) B 63, sīlā (sīlā) A 1, Ghosā (Goshā) A 117, Asadā (Ashadhā) B 64, Alambusā (Alambushā) B 31 etc. etc.

§16. Final consonants of Sanskrit words are usually dropped and we get the base with a vowel ending, cf. Suchāloma B 9, Pāsenājī B 39, Sirimā B 8, Sirimasa A 110.

But in a few cases the final consonant is preserved and we get the inflected forms directly from their Sanskrit equivalents, cf. bhagavato B 13, B 15, and Vipasīno B 13. In Abode (loc. sg.) the base is Aboda which Lüders derives from Amravatī with an addition of the vowel at the end.

§17. Clustered consonants: The consonant clusters are as a rule assimilated, the single letters, where the cluster occurs medially, serving the purpose of the double one.

It is only in a few cases that clusters with r are preserved; the cases of anaptyxis are also equally rare.

§18. Clusters with stops:
(a) The so-called double consonants are always represented as single ones. Thus kukuṭa- (kukkūṭa-) B 42, Ujjhikā (Ujjiḥikā) A 114, Isidata- (Rishidatta-) A 86, Budhi– (Buddhi-) A 21, Sudhāṅgāsa– (Suddhāṅgāsa-) B 24 etc. etc.
(b) Clusters with g like rg and ḍg > ḍg (i.e. ḍg); cf. Gāgupata- (Gāgarūṭa-) A 1, Phagudevā- (Phalgudevā-) A 30, A 75; similarly ṛgh > ṛgh (gger) in Dīghatapasi (Dīghatapasein-) B 63.
(c) Clusters with th like sth (or sht) > th (or t) (i.e. ṭth or ṭt). Thus Vāsīthi– (Vāsīṣṭhi-) A 35, Jēthhadra– (Jesṭhadra-) A 92. In Setaka– (Śesṭhaka-) A 18, and satapadāna– (śrīṣṭopadāna–?) A 58 we have t and not th.
(d) Clusters with t like kt, pt and rt > t (i.e. tt); cf. Atimuta– (Atimukta-) A 81, Vasuguta– (Vasuguta-) B 62, Dhamuguta– (Dharmuguta-) A 94, A 120, nata– (naṭṭa–) A 50, Dhuta– (Dhūṛta–) A 96.

The cluster st is always assimilated to th, where medially it stands for tth;

cf. thabha– (stambha–) A 6, A 7 etc.; Bahuḥsthika– (Bahuḥastika–) B 70, B 71, B 81; Thupadāsa– (Śtupaḍāsa–) A 25.

(e) The cluster bṛh > dh (dṛhi); Suladha– (Sulaḥḍha–) A 22.
(f) Clusters with p like ṭp, ṭp, and ṭp > ṭ (ṭṭ); cf. uṭpanta– (uṭpanta–) A 1, chitropāta– (chitroṭpāta–?) B 67, Sopagutā– (Saragupātā) A 78, Vijāpi (Vijāpī?) B 61.

§19. Clusters with the semivowel y: Almost in all cases the clusters are assimilated.

Only in the case of ṭy and sometimes in ṛy we find an instance of anaptyxis.

(a) Clusters ṭy and ṭy > k (kk) and j (jj); ṭy > ṭy.
Sk. Śakṣama– > Sākṣamā– B 23.
Sk. rājya– > raja– A 1, A 2.
Sk. chaṭṭiya– > chaṭṭiya– B 69.

(b) The cluster ṭy becomes mostly y (y), but in a few cases ṛy.
Sk. ṛīya– > aya– A 33, A 38 etc. etc.
Sk. bhāryā– > bhāya– A 4; but bhāriya– A 34, A 115.

(c) The cluster ṛy > ṛ in yokata– (uyasakrāntā–?) B 18.

(d) The clusters ṭy, ṭy, and ṛhya– (ṣṣ) medially.
Sk. Śyāmakā– > Sāmakā– A 66, A 73.
Sk. śisyā– > sisa– B 63.

1 In a few cases where we have a long vowel before the assimilated cluster, the single consonant perhaps does not stand for the double one; cf. above the remarks under the treatment of the vowel a.

2 As already mentioned (§14) cerebralisation has no great scope in these inscriptions.
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Sk. Pushyaka → Pusaka → A 47 etc.

For the change of s̄r→s we have the instances of gen. sg. of mas. nouns in -a.

(In a few cases where the preceding vowel is lengthened before this ending s̄r does not stand for s̄s. See above under the treatment of vowel a § 5 (i).)

(For palatalisation of dental clusters with y, viz. dȳ and dhȳ, see § 13.)

§20. Clusters with the semivowel r: In a large majority of cases these clusters are assimilated. In a few instances clusters kr, dr, and br are preserved1, and in a few cases anaptyxis steps in with the cluster ār.

(a) The Cluster kr>‑k (kk) (or kr).

Sk. Chakrawāka → Chakavāka → B 6; also dharmachaka → B 38, Bodhičaka → A 106.

In the case of chaṅkrama → chaṅkama → B 77, B 78, A 127 we do not find the representation of the anusvāra.

In Dadanikama → (Dṛṣṭhamānākrama) → B 77 the aspiration due to sh is lost.

The cluster kr is preserved only in uṣkrami (upakrami?) → B 19.

(b) The cluster gr>‑g (gg) : nigrdha → (nirgrodha) → B 70.

(c) The cluster tr>‑t (tt medially) in all cases; cf.

Sk. Mitrā → Mitā → A 101.

Sk. putra → putra → A 1; also devaputa → B 18, B 20 etc.

Sk. trikoṭika → tikoṭika → B 78.

(d) The cluster dr>‑d (dd when not accompanied by anusvāra and when not preceded by the long vowel) (or dr) or l (ll).

Sk. Sambhadrā → Subhadrā → B 29.

In the case of ndr>‑d we do not get anusvāra in Sk. Chandrā → Chāḍā → B 2, but the anusvāra is represented in Chandā → A 128.

Sk. Indrādevā → Idādevā → A 19, A 45; also Idasālaguhā → B 35, Mahidasena → A 13.

The cluster dr is preserved in feṣṭhābhādra → (īŚeṣṭhābhādra) → A 92.

The cluster dr>‑l in the case of Sk. kṣudra → ; cf. Chulakokā → B 11, aya-Chula → A 51, Chulana → A 91.

(e) The cluster pr>‑p (pp medially) in all cases.

Sk. prāṣāda → pāṣāda → B 22.

Sk. Suprāṣāda → Subpāṣāda → B 7.

(f) The cluster br is preserved in bramana → (brāhmaṇa) → B 51, Brāhmadeva → (Brahmadeva) → B 66.

(g) The clusters śr and sr>‑s (ss medially) generally.

Skt śrāmanā → samanā → A 12.

Sk. Misrakeśi → Misakoti → B 28.

Sk. śahasra → sahasa → B 26.

The cluster śr>‑śr (or sr) in Sk. Śrīnati → Śrīrama → A 110, or fem. noun Śrīmā → B 8, A 48.

Sk. Śrī-patra → śrīpatra → A 100.

§21. Clusters with the semivowel r: Mostly the clusters are assimilated, but we get two instances of anaptyxis.

(a) Cluster tr>‑t (tt) in ketā (kṛṣitvā) → B 32.

Cluster fe, however, becomes tvā in lātvā (lātvā) → B 44.

1Such clusters with r are also retained in Pāli in words like chitra, bhada, tatra, brāhmaṇa etc. Cf. H. Berger (Lc. p. 196) and inscriptionsal Prakrits (see Mehendale Lc. § 410). In Bhāhruta, the tendency to preserve clusters is found only with regard to r, whereas in the Aśoka inscriptions it is found also with other semivowels like r and l (Mehendale Lc. § 43, § 45.)
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(b) Cluster \( r^c v \) in Panāvasu- (Punarvasu-) A 72 (see, however, article §5 (i)).

(c) Clusters \( sv \) and \( sw \) are assimilated to \( s \) (\( ss \) medially).

Sk. Visvadeva- \( \rightarrow \) Visadeva- A 1.

Sk. Viśvabhi- \( \rightarrow \) Vesubha- B 14 (the \( e \) in the first syllable is short, as \( o \) in the case of okrahtī B 19, if that reading is the correct one).

Sk. Snāmika- \( \rightarrow \) Samika- A 6, A 41.

Sk. Diśghatapasi- \( \rightarrow \) Dighatapasi B 63.

§22. Clusters with sibilants: The most important cluster under this head is \( kṣh \) which shows double treatment viz. \( kh \) (\( kkh \)) and \( chh \) (\( chchh \)). This has been already dealt with above under palatalisation §13. The other cluster met with is \( r ṇ \) which becomes \( s \) (\( sr \)), cf. Sudasana (Sudarsana) B 10.

§23. Clusters with \( h \): The only cluster to be found is \( rh \) which is represented as \( rah \) in Arābhagūta- (arhat-) B 18, B 20.

§24. Clusters with nasals: These clusters are assimilated, and the anusvāra is mostly not shown in the case of clusters with \( n \), \( ṅ \), \( ñ \), and \( m \). In the case of clusters with \( n \), however, the anusvāra is mostly represented in writing. The absence of anusvāra is to be attributed to the negligence of the scribe and not to the phonetic tendency; otherwise we have to regard the simple letter as standing for the double one.

(a) Clusters with the nasal \( ñ \): The two clusters to be observed are \( ñg \) and \( ñgh \), and they are very often represented without the anusvāra. Cf. Suga- (Śūga- ) A 1 (Śega- A 2), Āgaraja- (Añgāradya- ) A 1, A 2, Sogha- (Śengha- ) A 40, A 108, A 109. The anusvāra is shown in Gaṅgīta- (Gaṅgīta- ) B 5, timiṅgīla- (timiṅgīla- ) B 62, as read by Lüders, (other editors have read timigala- ), and perhaps in Sa[n]gāma- A 106, and īṣī[im]ja[ya] (Rishyastīngā- ) B 53. For the cluster niña see §20 (a).

(b) Clusters with the nasal \( n \): The cluster \( nc \) is perhaps represented with anusvāra in po[n]cānēkañika- A 57. But \( ṅn \) is without anusvāra: Kujarā- (kuñjarā- ) A 10. The cluster jī is in all cases assimilated to \( ķ \). Cf. rāṇo (rāṇah) A 1, A 4, sugaññati (śrīgaññapti) B 64.

(c) Clusters with the nasal \( s \): In the case of this cluster too it is not customary to mark the anusvāra; thus Anāḍharaṇika- (Anāḍharaṇika- ) B 32, Kaḍarika (Kāḍarikā) B 60, and Mūda- (Mūdā- ) A 102.

The cluster \( ns \) is assimilated to dental \( n \) in Punakiya- (Pūrakīya- ) B 55. Similarly \( sn \) is assimilated to dental \( n \) in Avisana- (Avisāna- ) A 82.

In \( nh \) coming from \( n \)h also we find the dental: Kriṣhvīla- *Kauhīla- Kauhīla- A 63.

(d) Clusters with the nasal \( n \): In a majority of cases the anusvāra is not represented in the parallels for bhadanta; thus bhadata- A 39, A 58, A 59, A 64, A 65, A 66, but bhadanta- only in A 38 and A 61. In all other cases, except one, we find anusvāra represented in the case of cluster \( nt \); ukrahtī B 19, vejayahta B 22, chhadanītya B 49, silēkaṁmaṁtī A 1, atierāsino A 73, satanātiṁka A 51. The anusvāra is, however, not found in vokata- (vyakatīnta- ) B 18.

In the case of \( n \)h anusvāra is seen in Painthaka- A 71, but not in katha (kañthā) B 73. The cluster \( n \)d also is more often shown with the anusvāra: Kākanādi- A 37, Na[n]d[i]nagarikā- A 45, Anaṅdā- A 50, Naṅda- A 69, [Na]ṇḍagiri- A 97.

1 Derivation according to Lüders. Bühler would connect it with kuṭha, and Hultsch with kūṣṭha (katha being mistake for kaṭha).
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vanîdate B 40. But anusvāra is not seen in Nadagiri- A 54, Nadutara- A 119, Muchikido- B 31 a, and vadate B 57. For the cluster ubh see § 20(d). In the case of ndh we find anusvāra in paṭisacchī B 18, but not in Kakusandha- B 15, and gadhakūti B 34. The cluster m>n in kimara- B 54. It has become mn in upāna- (utpanna-) A 1. The cluster ny initially becomes n in niguddha- (nyagrodha-) B 70. The cluster gn>g (gg) in Agirikha- A 23.

(c) Clusters with the nasal m: In the case of this nasal the anusvāra is mostly not represented. For the cluster mb we have the following illustrations: Bibikanadikāta (Bimbikā-) A 21, A 22, Kosabeveka- (Kausūmbevikā-) A 52, Kosabakṣi (Kausāmbi-) B 33, jamb (jambū) B 74. The anusvāra is shown only in the case of Alānhusā B 31. In the case of cluster mbh we find that in a large number of instances the parallels for stambha do not show anusvāra. Thus we have thabba- A 6, A 7, A 25, A 27 etc. etc., while anusvāra is shown only in two cases: thanbha- A 71, A 98. Of these two A 71 seems to show anusvāra carefully in all words; cf. aya-Tagathakah zosta, thanbhū, dāna. Subhadā (Sambhadā) B 29 also does not have anusvāra.

The cluster mm is once shown with and once without anusvāra: -saṃmada- (saṃmada-) B 27, but samadaka- B 68. The cluster m>b in Sk. āmrvad(a)-->Aboda- B 69. The cluster tm>t (ut) in atanā (atana) A 112. The cluster dnu shows anaptyxis in Padum[d]a[i] (Padmavati) B 30. The cluster rm is assimilated to m, mostly shown without anusvāra; cf. dhama- (dharma-) B 38, A 94, A 95, etc., navakamika- (navakarmika-) A 59. The anusvāra is shown in two instances: silākāhuma- (silākaruma-) A 1, and Sudhamā (Sudhamā) B 21. The cluster sm initially becomes s in susāna- (smaśāna-) B 64. But in the abl. sg. term. it becomes -mh- (<-smāt); cf. Moragirimā A 25. Lastly the cluster hm is once shown as mh and once as m (mm?): Brāhmadeva- (Brāhmadeva-) B 66 and bramanā- (brāhmana-) B 51.

b. Morphology

§25. Masculine and Neuter Nouns ending in -a.

(i) Nom. sg. mas. -o: Ksāpi B 1, yākho B 1, B 3 etc., thabho A 6, A 7 etc., saso B 42 a, dāma (used as mas.) A 96.

-a: only once chakama B 77; but we have the regular form chakamo B 78.

-e: pāsāde' B 22. As this is the only form with -e ending it is obviously a mistake for -o ending.

(ii) Nom. sg. neut. -an: The anusvāra at the end is preserved in a large majority of instances; cf. dānā A 4, A 7 etc., jātaka B 47, B 49 etc., toraṇā A 2, kārīlā A 1, turāṇ B 27, dharmachakäm B 38, yavamajōkaiyaṇ B 52.

*Barua-Sinha regard it as loc. sg. and change Vejasalito to Vejasalita.
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-ə: When the final anusvāra is sometimes not represented; cf. dāna A 5, A 6 etc., jātaka B 41, B 42 etc., Jatava (acc. sg.) B 32, kāta A 112, A 129, taraṇa A 129; dān[a] A 49a is probably mistake for dāna(n).

    -ena: Vācchātāna A 1 (as already remarked this is perhaps a mistake for -pute[n]a), koṭiśāntahatena B 32.


(v) Abl. sg. -a: This and the -ā endings are more common. Karahakata A 6, A 7, A 8, Nāsīka A 46, Vedasa A 33.
    -ato: This is not very frequent. Vedasāto A 31, Baha[da]to A 50, and perhaps in . . . . . . to A 80 where the place name is missing.

(vi) Gen. sg. -sa: Visadevasa A 1, Mitasa A 101 etc., Kasapasa B 17, Mahādevasa B 81. It is clear that in the large majority of cases in which this ending occurs it stands for -(a)sā. But in three or four instances we find the preceding vowel a lengthened, and if these readings are correct then we may assume here a slightly developed tendency to pronounce the gen. sg. ending as a single consonant with the compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. aṣavārikāsa A 22, Thupadāsā A 25, bhudāniśāsa A 38, Bhutārakhiśāsa A 38.

(vii) Loc. sg. -re: This is more frequent. rāje A 1, Naṭode B 70 etc., pavana B 73, B 74, jātaka B 42a.
    -mi(?) : Moragirima A 26 (with the change of the base in girî- to gira-). But Lüders regards the form as a mistake for Moragirima or Moragirinma, the abl. sg. form. tirama B 62. But Lüders regards ra a mistake in the eye-copy and reads it along with the following word as timiśimigīla-.


(ix) Nom. pl. neut.-āni: kāṁcācharasubhāni B 26. For dānā A 49a cf. §3, II.

(x) Acc. pl. mas. -e: sise B 63.

    -āna: Sagāna A 2, āyakana A 16.


    -n: When the length of the final vowel is not marked. devata B 8, B 12, Mahakoka B 12, Sudasana B 10, Idasālaguha B 35, Sivala B 56, chitupādasāla B 67.

    -a: With the absence of final anusvāra. disa B 24, B 25, B 26, katha B 73 (Sk. kanthā).

    -ājya: Purikāya A 16, A 17, Asitamasāya A 36.

* Hultsch and Barua-Sinha read Thupadāsāsa.
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(v) Loc. sg. -ya: Mahāsāmāyikāyā A 18.

§27. Mas. Nouns ending in -i.
(i) Nom. sg. -i: bodhi B 13, B 14 etc., Kadārika B 60.
(ii) Acc. sg. -i: The final anusvāra being not shown. giri B 75, paṭisamdhī B 18.
(iv) Abl. sg. -mha: Moragirimha A 25, A 27 etc.

-śa: We have only one illustration: Dhanabhātīsa A 3.


§29. Fem. Nouns ending in -i.

-i: Only one instance with long ending. devi B 56. But all earlier editors read devi.
(ii) Abl. sg. -ya: Kākagniṭya A 37.

-ya: With the shortening of final -u: bhikkunīya A 24, A 37, A 42, A 79, bhikkunīya A’52 (but perhaps we should read -yā here, because in all instances where kṣ>kh, we get -yā ending), Vāsīṭhiya A 35.

-ye: bhikkunīye A 43, A 74, A 75, A 76, A 77, A 78, bhikkunīye A 44 (this is again doubtful. In view of kṣ being represented by (k)kh perhaps we have to read bhikkuniyā, ko .. dalākiye A 127.

(-yī: bhikkuniyī A 11: but we are asked to read bhikkuniyā.)

(ii) Gen. sg. -no: Punānasuno A 72. Vesabhūsa B 14; but this is a mistake for Vesabhuno.

(i) Nom. sg. -ū: jopū B 74.

-ū: vadlu B 64.
§32. Mas. Nouns ending in -ti.
-ū(?): bāṭatu. A 54a.
(i) Gen. sg. -u: mātu A 18, A 28, mātu A 54b, A 120 (māta A 90b perhaps a mistake for mātu), dhiu A 42.
§34. Mas. and Fem. Nouns ending in consonants.
We find both the tendencies to derive the forms from their Sanskrit parallels or to change these bases to those ending in vowels.
(a) Mas. nouns in -ut.
(i) Gen. sg. -o: bhagyato B 13, B 14, B 15 etc.
-sa: With the transference to -a declension, only in Sirimasa A 110.
(ii) Loc. sg. -e: Himavate B 79.
(b) Mas. nouns in -un.
(i) Nom. sg.: The forms of rājan are directly derived from Sanskrit. rājā B 39, B 56, Nāgarājā B 6, B 36, B 37. Once Nāgarājā B 31a. But we have the ending -o in Suchilomo B 9.
(ii) Inst. sg.: atanā A 112 comes from Sk. atmanā.
(iii) Gen. sg.: The forms of rājan are again derived from Sanskrit. rāno A 1, A 4.
But the ending -(n)ō is witnessed in rājano A 3, A 190.
(c) Mas. noun in -it.
(d) Mas. nouns in -in.
(ii) Gen. sg. -(n)ō: Viṣapayo B 13, peṭakino A 56, aniveśino A 73.
-sa: With the change to vowel base. Mahamukhisa A 42.
(e) Mas. noun in -ut.
(f) Fem. noun in -as.
§35. Pronouns: We have only the forms of the relative pronoun ya: Nom. sg. mas. yo A 127, nom. sg. neut. yath B 51.
§36. Numerals: Perhaps we have the nom. pl. neut. form of tri in (t)ini B 25. The other numerals are cīha “six” B 26 and saha “thousand” B 26.
§37. Verb forms: We only get some forms of the present indicative, one form of Aorist, one form of absolutive, and some past passive participles.
(a) Present 3rd sg. indicative.
(i) active -ti: deti B 32, dohati B 73, amusāsati B 63, dadati B 75, sāsani (for sāsati) B 18.
(ii) middle -te: vadate B 37, vandate B 40.
(b) Aorist 3rd sg. -si: aśvayesi B 51.
(c) Absolutive -tā: keta (<kṛayitvā) B 32.
(d) Past passive participles:
All these, except dīna (i.e. dinna) for data (i.e. datta), are derived from their corresponding Sanskrit equivalents. uparīna- (or uparīna-?) A 1, kata- A 112,

1From Viṣapayo. Barua-Sinha derive it from Viṣapcho-.. But in that case the form should be Viṣapayo.
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A 129, vokata– B 18, sanāthata– (<sanāstrīta–?) B 32, gahuta– (<grihīta–?) B 50, māchita– (for nochita–) B 62, kārita– (causal) A 1. Besides these, we get various participle forms in the proper names of persons, e.g. guta (<gupta) in Aragahuta– B 18, B 20, Vasaguta– B 62, Sataguta– A 78, Dhamaguta– A 94, A 120; rakhita– (<rakhist–) in Nāgarakhita– A 4, A 54b, Gorokhitā– A 46, Agirakhita– A 23 etc. etc.; data– (<datta–) in Pasadatta– A 43, A 44, Isidatta– A 86, but dina– only in Isidīna– A 62; bhuta– (<bhūta–) in Bhutaka– A 8, Bhuta– A 77; jāta– in Jāta– A 56 and Sayuta– B 50; viruṣa– (<vīraḥ–) in Viruṣaka– B 4; ladha– (<labdha–) in Suladha– A 22; pālita– in Isipālita– A 59; dusita– (<dūṣita–) B 75; muta– (<mukt–) in Atimuta– A 81; visana– (<vīṣana–?) in Avisana– A 82, A 83.

c. Some important Suffixes


(2) ~ī: Kākāvīti A 37, kuchhī B 62, kuṭī B 33, B 34, devī B 56, Misakosī B 28, yakhi B 2, A 116, Vāsīthi A 35, sīgālānti B 64.

(3) ~ī<-vīn: Dīghatapasi B 63.

(4) ~ī<-īt: Pasenjī B 39.


(6) ~ikā:

(a) in place names:
(b) in personal names:
- Anādhapeṭika B 32, Vasāsika B 126, Ujjhikā (?) A 114, Badhikā (?) A 42.
(c) in ecclesiastical designations:
- navakamikā A 59, A 60 (?), Panchaheṇkāyika B 57, Mahāṣāṃkṣeṣikā A 18, suṣaṃṭika A 51.
(d) in professional designation:
- asavārīka B 22.


(8) ~yā:

(a) in jātaka titles:
(b) in place names:
- ko...dakīyā A 127, Khujatidukiyā A 38, Chikulaniyā A 39, Therakūṭa A 41, Bha-gacqēnāyā A 51, Venacagāmiyā A 52.

(10) -kā:
(a) in personal names:
   Ajokālaka B 3, Apikinaka A 67, Jamaka B 56, Panithaka A 71, Pusaka A 47, Bhataka
   A 8, Valaka A 61, Vasuka A 46, Vijitaka A 104, Virudaka B 4, Veduka B 72,
(b) in place names:
   Ularagidhika A 7, Chuladlaka A 17, Pađelaka A 47, Bhoskatakā A 23, A 24,
   Selapuraka A 54, Kamuchuka B 54b.
(c) as diminutives or possessives:
   adhiraśaka A 130, arāmaka B 72, jāoka (passim), tikotika B 78, dāyaka A 16,
   bahuththika B 70, B 71, bhatudesaka A 17, mānavaka B 66, mīgasamadaka B 68.
   Agirakhiṭā A 23, Alumāla A 81, Isidata A 86, katu A 112, kārita A 1, Jāta A 56,
   Dusita B 75, samithata B 32, Sañjata B 50, Suladha B 22.
(12) -ū: skrañti B 19, Dhanabhūti A 1, A 3,
(13) -na (§ 37, d): Arisana (?) A 82, A 83, Isidina A 62, upaśina A 14, dāna (passim).
(14) -na (?): Chulana A 91, Chekulana A 40.
(15) -ni: Koḍyandi A 14, A 15, Pāriṇiti (?) A 49, bhikhuni and bhīchhuni (passim), yakhini B 10.
(16) -mat>ma (−mā): Ayamā A 33, Sirima A 110, Sirimā B 8, A 49.
(17) -vati(a): bhagavat (for references see index), Himavata B 79.
   -vati: Padumāvati B 30.
III. DATE AND PALAEOGRAPHY

The inscription A 1 on a pillar of the eastern gateway (torana) records that this gateway with its carvings was caused to be made by Dhanabhūti, son of Āgaraju (Āṅgāradyut) and grandson of king Visādeva (Viśādeva) during the reign of the Sugas (Śūngas). Moreover, from the inscription A 3, mentioning a gift of prince Vādhapāla (Vādadhapāla), the son of ‘king’ Dhanabhūti, it results that the donor Dhanabhūti was a king (rājan) like his grandfather (and probably also his father). The text of the fragmentary inscription A 2 on a Batanmāra Torana pillar was probably the same as that of A 1, and a third Torana pillar inscription (A 129) of somewhat similar wording is in existence; but the aksharas hena in line 1 do not fit in with one of the names in A 1, and it remains very doubtful whether king Dhanabhūti also erected this gateway. Two of the gateways were evidently his donation.

King Dhanabhūti, dating his inscriptions in the Śūṅga reign, is supposed by Bühl and others to have been a feudatory of that dynasty. His connection with some donor of the name Dhanabhūti in a Mathurā inscription (List No. 125), maintained by Cunningham, is, however, rejected by Lüders in his revision of the Mathurā inscription given below; see supplement to our Bhārhat inscription No. A 1. So the location of king Dhanabhūti’s possessions remains invident, and the contents of our inscriptions yield no more than a somewhat vague date for the erection of two of the Bhārhat gateways in the Śūṅga reign, i.e. between circa 184 to 72 B.C.

For further elucidation on the chronological position of the Bhārhat inscriptions we have to consider their palaeography. To the experts of old their similarity with the inscriptions of Aśoka from the middle of the 3rd century B.C. was striking. Cunningham says: “The alphabetical characters of the inscriptions are precisely the same as those of Aśoka’s time on the Sānciśti Stūpa, and of the other undoubted records of Aśoka on rocks and pillars” and elsewhere: “I do not wish to fix upon any exact date, and I am content with recording my opinion that the alphabetical characters of the Bhārhat inscriptions are certainly not later than B.C. 200”. Bühl’s book on Indian Palaeography displays great advance in the classification of the oldest Brāhmi inscriptions. He distinguishes an old Maurya type from a younger Maurya and from a Śūṅga type. To the Śūṅga type he attributes the Bhārhat Torana inscriptions, found by him to be apparently younger than the bulk of the rail inscriptions. The latter he considers to represent the old Maurya type. On the whole he gives 150 B.C. as date for Bhārhat in his table.

Some differences even in workmanship between the sculptures of the Toranās on the one hand and of the pillars and bars of the railing (vedikā) on the other hand had already been observed by Cunningham. According to him the sculptured statues on the balusters of the eastern gateway were “much superior in artistic design and execution to those of the railing pillars”. These balusters of the Torana he found further remarkable as having

---

1The donor in the inscription A 4 is Nāgarakhitā (Nāgarakshitā), the wife of a king whose name with exception of the last akshara ka is lost. Hultsch was of the opinion that the name should be reconstructed as Dhanabhūti. This suggestion is tempting, but against the reading of the last akshara.
2In the fragmentary inscription A 130 a king occurs who seems to be designated as uñhīraja.
3Sīhā, pp. 15 ff.; Barua, Barh., I, p. 29 says: “Dhanabhūti seems to have been a king of the Mathurā region.”
4Sīhā, p. 127.
5Ibid., p. 15.
6Indische Palaeographie (1896), p. 32.
single Kharoshthi letters—called "Arian letters" by him—engraved on their bases or capitals as marks of the sculptors. "The letters found", he says, "are p, s, a and b, of which the first three occur twice. I think it probable that these letters may be numerals, the initials of the words pañch = 5, sāt = 7, 3ṭh = 8, and ba = 2". 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
p \ a \ b \ a \ s \\
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand not less than 27 marks, discovered on any portions of the railing, were all in Brāhmi letters. Cunningham came to the conclusion that Western artists were employed by king Dhanabhūti at the gateways, "while the smaller gifts of pillars and rails were executed by the local artists". 

It is now generally believed that the Bhārhat stūpa with its railing and gateways was built in successive stages, and that its history extends over more than a century. The mound will have existed in the third century B.C., as it was built of large size bricks (12 x 12 x 3.5 inches) which are typical for the Maurya age. For some time it may have been surrounded by a wooden fence and decorated with wooden gateways. The old wooden models of the railing and gateways, however, became later on, towards the end of the second century B.C., replaced by stone work. Barua imagines three stages in the execution of stone work: 1. In the first stage "the mound was enclosed by a railing of rough-hewn stone, with four quadrants, four entrances, a square coping with certain ornamentation on its outer face, and some statues of demigods and demigoddesses on terminus pillars". 2. "In the second stage, when the eastern terminus pillar of S. E. Quadrant was recorded to be the Barhat first pillar, . . . . . some alterations were made . . . . resulting in the replacement of the right terminus pillar in each quadrant by one connected with a return, added at the time, and bearing a lion-statue guarding the approach . . . . . . In this stage a few other statues of demigods and demigoddesses were carved on three out of four right terminus pillars in the quadrants. . . . . . The artists employed hailed all from localities where Brāhmi was the current script". 3. "The third stage was reached . . . . when king Dhanabhūti erected the gateways. He employed some artists, who hailed from a north-western region where Kharoshthi was the current script, to do the work . . . . . These artists must have also worked on the great railing, either fashioning some of the pillars and rail-bars, or carving new sculptures, or inserting new pillars and rails, in short, giving a finishing touch to the work of repair or decoration". Barua dates the three stages as follows: "The first stage is Mauryan but not necessarily Asokan; it is probably post-Asokan. The second or middle stage must be dated as early as 150 B.C. and the third or final as late as 100 B.C., half a century being sufficient, upon the whole, for the development of the Barhat plastic art from the first to the Prasenajit pillar". Giving these dates, Barua keeps in line with Foucher who wrote: "we feel certain that towards the end of the second century the final touch must have been given to the decoration of the stūpa, commenced, no doubt, during the third".

---

1. L.c., p. 8, and note 2.
2. It may be recalled that, as stated above p. XI (§ 12, c.), the cerebral nasal (ŋ) appears only in the gateway inscriptions A 1 and A 2.
5. Cf. No. A 34.
8. L.c., p. 34.
INTRODUCTION

To the discussion, how to arrange the early Brāhmi inscriptions chronologically, an impetus was given at his time by Ramaprasad Chanda in ‘Dates of the Votive Inscriptions on the Stūpas of Sanchi’. Chanda proposed the following order of inscriptions:

1. Edicts of Asoka.
2. Nāgārjuni Hill cave inscriptions of Asoka’s grandson Daśaratha.
4. (a) Inscriptions on the railings of Stūpa I at Sāñchī.
   (b) Inscriptions on the railings of Stūpa II at Sāñchī.
   (c) Bhārhatu railing inscriptions.
   (d) Inscriptions on the remnants of the old Bodh-Gayā railing.
5. (a) Besnagar Garuḍa pillar inscription of the year 12 after the inscription of mahārāja Bhāgavata.
   (b) Inscription of Nāyanikā, widow of the Andhra king Sattakâṇi I in the Nānāghāt cave.
   (c) Bhārhatu toraṇa (gateway) inscription.
6. Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga.
7. Sāñchī toraṇa inscriptions.
8. Inscriptions of the time of Śoḍāsa.

Chanda’s researches form the basis of later inquiries in Bhārhatu inscriptions by Barua and Sinha and by N. G. Majumdar.*

Barua and Sinha print and discuss three lists of letters: A. gateway inscriptions “engraved . . . . by Western artists whose script was Kharosthī”, B. coping inscriptions “engraved . . . . by different sculptors apparently of the same period”, and C. rail-pillar, rail-bar, rail-panel and rail-medallion inscriptions, engraved at different times . . . . by different artists (masons and sculptors) of different localities, where the Brāhmi was or was not the prevalent script”. Obviously list A contains the younger type of letters and B the older, while in C both types are mixed. N. G. Majumdar, inquiring into the chronology of early Brāhmi inscriptions, again distinguishes two layers of Bhārhatu inscriptions. In his edition of Sāñchī inscriptions, contributed to the monumental, but somewhat bulky work of Marshall and Foucher on Sāñchī in three volumes, he gives a clear survey of the palaeographical position and a revised, and in our opinion more correct, date for the Bhārhatu inscriptions, viz. circa 125-75 B.C. instead of 150-100 B.C. His results with respect to the older Bhārhatu inscriptions he states (Vol. I, pp. 270f.), after having fixed the last quarter of the second century B.C. as the date of the railing of Stūpa 2 at Sāñchī, in the following words: “Judging from palaeography, the major portion of the balustrade of the stūpa of Bhārhatu would also appear to belong to this period”, and again: “The inscriptions of Stūpa 2, together with those on the Bharhatu railing and the Bhilsa pillar, represent therefore the concluding phase of group 2 of our table of alphabets (circa 125-100 B.C.)”. The younger inscriptions engraved on a gateway pillar “and some portions of its railing . . . . which appear to have been later additions” he attributes to a different cate-

---

1 *MASI*, I, 1919.
3 BL, pp. 103-112.
5 Refers to the Besnagar Garuḍa pillar. Dr. D. C. Sircar is of the opinion that the Besnagar epitaph of Heliodorus “cannot be much earlier than the end of the second century B. C.” [The History and Culture of the Indian People, ed. by R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker, Vol. II (1951), p. 195].
gory and has them classed "with certain epigraphs on the Bodh-Gaya railing, e.g. those of the time of Brahmaputra and Indragnimitra and with the Mathura inscriptions of Utradaśaka and king Vishnupātra." This group, according to him, belongs to about 100-75 B.C.

We look with some reserve at the attempts to classify individual Bhārhat inscriptions as earlier, and others as later, resting upon the shape of one or two test letters only. Certainly, a process of gradual transformation of aksharas in early Brāhmī can be stated, and the general trend is clear enough. However, as Barua says', "certain forms became stereotyped at a particular period of time as an outcome of a very complex process, of the action and reaction of various factors. The shape of letters depends on the local style, the personal habit and temperament, the nature of space and material, the position of the scribe, the nature of the tool, and the rest". Sometimes we find slightly different forms of test letters side by side in the same inscription, or in inscriptions doubtless belonging to the same time. In other cases advanced types of one letter occur together with conservative ones of another. So in the inscription B 26 (Plate XVIII) an advanced chha of nearly 'butterfly' type stands by the side of an old shaped ka, and in B 28-31 (Plate XVIII), in the words aśāṅbusā and aṣṭhāru, the letter a is written each time in a somewhat different shape, although the inscriptions are found on one and the same sculpture and refer to the same representation. Majumdar says, after discussing the palaeographically late features of some letters of the

\[ \text{B26} \quad \text{B28} \quad \text{B29} \quad \text{B30} \quad \text{B31} \quad \text{B31} \]

ground balustrade inscriptions of stupa I in Sāñchi: "The parts of the balustrade where these inscriptions occur must undoubtedly have been later insertions, due to subsequent additions and repairs, and they have no bearing on the date of the balustrade as a whole."

It seems wise, not to decide in such cases without allowing some margin for the habits of the individual scribes, and to take into consideration, besides palaeography, any other evidence that might be available.

The gradual change in the form of some test letters in Bhārhat is shown in the following synopsis:

Regarding letter a: In the inscriptions of Aśoka the two left arms of the letter a generally meet at a point. Another type, more rare, has a gap between the arms, and this type is a characteristic of the post-Aśokan writing.

Letter ka: The old type is a cross of which the horizontal and the vertical intercross each other in the middle. The later type has a shorter horizontal, crossing higher up, and looks like a hanging sword, or a dagger.

Letter ga: In the old type the arms form a sharp angle at the top; the later type has a markedly rounded top instead of the angle.

Letter chha: The old types show nearly a circle bisected by a vertical. Then the corpus becomes more elliptical, and finally it looks like a butterfly with two loops.

Letter dha: In the inscriptions of Aśoka this letter is of the shape of the Roman D, the vertical stroke appearing to the left. In the post-Aśokan writing the vertical stroke is found to the right, and the form of the letter is a reversed one.

Letter pa: In later times the right vertical is heightened, and the left and right verticals are nearly equalized.

\(^{1}\)Br., p. 110.
Letter bha: In the old type the right vertical of the letter is of equal length with the left one; later on the lower part of the right vertical is elongated.

Letter ma: In later times a tendency towards angularization is obvious.

Letter ya: The old type is that of a vertical standing upon a horizontal crescent, sometimes high-curved. Later on the letter resembles an anchor.

Letter ra: The old type is a straight vertical stroke with equally thick ends; later on the upper end gains in the thickness, and the letter looks like the blade of a sword. An old variation has the vertical stroke curved like a corkscrew.

Letter va: As in the letter ma a tendency towards angularization is obvious in later times.

Letter sa: In the younger type, as with the letter pa, the right vertical stroke is lengthened and nearly equalized to the left one.

Letters pu and su: In the earlier type the u—mark is applied towards the middle part of the letter, in the later type in continuation of the right vertical.
# REFERENCES OF INSCRIPTIONS TO PLATES

The inscriptions are reproduced from estampages with the exception of those marked * or †.

*—means: from eye-copy, †—photographed from the stone, ‡—from estampage and photographed from stone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A 45</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>XXIII*</td>
<td>A 46</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>XXIII*</td>
<td>A 47</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 48</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 49</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 49a</td>
<td>XXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>XXIII*</td>
<td>A 50</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 51</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 52</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 53</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>A 54</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 12</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 54a</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 13</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 54b</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 14</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 55</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 15</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 56</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 16</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 57</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 17</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 58</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 18</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 19</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 60</td>
<td>IX†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 20</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 61</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 21</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 62</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 22</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 63</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 23</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 64</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 24</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A 65</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 25</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 66</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 26</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 67</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 27</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 68</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 28</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 69</td>
<td>XXV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 29</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 70</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 30</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 71</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 31</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A 72</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 32</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A 73</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 33</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 74</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 34</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A 75</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 35</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 76</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 36</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 77</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 37</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A 78</td>
<td>XXV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 38</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A 79</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 39</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A 80</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 40</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>A 81</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 41</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>A 82</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 42</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>A 83</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 43</td>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>A 84</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 44</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>A 85</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 35</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 47</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 36</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 48</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 37</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 49</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 38</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 50</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 39</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 51</td>
<td>XX†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 40</td>
<td>XIX*</td>
<td>B 52</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 41</td>
<td>XIX*, XL</td>
<td>B 53</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 42</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>B 54</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 42a</td>
<td>XLI</td>
<td>B 55</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 43</td>
<td>XIX‡</td>
<td>B 56</td>
<td>XXI‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 44</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>B 57</td>
<td>XXI‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 45</td>
<td>XX†</td>
<td>B 58</td>
<td>XXI†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 46</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>B 59</td>
<td>XXI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCATION OF BHĀRHub INSCRIPTIONS

as described by General Cunningham

I. Inscriptions on pillars of gateways (toraṇa).
A1 (587), A 2 (688), A 129 (689).

II. Inscriptions on coping stones (usṇīṣa).
(I) A 70 (690)
(II) B 57 (691), B 63 (692), B 69 (693), B 50 (694), B 42 (695), B 77 (696),
(III) B 64 (697),
(IV) B 48 (698), B 68 (699),
(V) B 41 (700), B 54 (701), B 65 (702),
(VI) B 46 (703), B 45 (704),
(VII) A 5 (705), B 58 (706), B 73 (707), B 74 (708),
(VIII) B 56 (709), B 67 (710), B 75 (711).

III. Inscriptions on pillars (stambha) of railing and returns (gates).
(a) S. E. Quadrant
(P 11) A 34 (712), (P 12) A 38 (713), B 14 (714),
(P 13) A 68 (715), (P 17) A 71 (716), B 11 (717),
(P 15) A 42 (718), (P 18) A 14 (719),
(P 19) A 12 (720), (M 5) A 50 (721), B 16 (722),
(P 21, M 2) A 24 (723), B 43 (724), (P 6) A 21 (725),
(P 10) B 7 (726), A 94 (727), (P 26) A 22 (728),
(P 14) A 98 (729), B 47 (730), B 32 (731), B 33 (732), B 34 (733),
(P 1) A 95 (734), B 6 (735), B 4 (736), B 5 (737).

(b) S. Return
(P 29) A 62 (738), B 23 (739), B 24 (740), B 25 (741), B 26 (742), B 27 (743), B 28 (744), B 29 (745), B 30 (746), B 31 (747), B 60 (748), B 61 (749),
B 38 (750), B 39 (751), B 36 (752), B 37 (753), B 71 (754), B 70 (755), B 72 (756), A 136 (757).

(c) S. W. Quadrant
(P 2) A 123 (758), (P 9) A 74 (761), (M 7) A 40 (759), B 17 (760),
(P 27) A 6 (763), (P 23) A 61 (762),
(M 10) B 78 (765), (P 27) A 52 (764),
(P 25) A 6 (767), (P 30) A 65 (766),
(P 16) B 8 (770), B 9 (771), A 80 (772), (P 2) A 66 (768), B 52 (769),
(P 3) A 59 (773), B 40 (774), B 21 (775), B 22 (776), B 18 (777).

(d) W. Return
(P 3) A 59 (773), B 40 (774), B 21 (775), B 22 (776), B 18 (777).

(e) N. W. Quadrant
(P 8) A 29 (778), B 13 (779), (P 20) A 30 (780),

"A l, B 1 etc. refer to our treatment of the inscriptions below. Group A consists of donative inscriptions, group B of inscriptions describing the sculptural representations. The numbers given in brackets are the corresponding ones on Lüders' "List of Brahmi Inscriptions". The arrangement in the List follows the order given by Cunningham in Sībh."
displaced B 76 (781–791), (M ?) A 16 (782), B 15 (783),
(M 9) A 32 (784), B 49 (785), (P 31) A 39 (789), B 10 (790),
(P 5) A 58 (792), B 2 (793), B 1 (794), B 3 (795).

(f) N. Return
(P 28) B 55 (786), A 60 (787), B 66 (788).

(g) N. E. Quadrant
(P 22) A 27 (796), (P 19) A 51 (797),
(P 4) A 25 (798), (P 7) A 73 (800), B 19 (801), B 53 (802).

(h) Displaced Batamāra
A 124 (803), A 54 (804), B 35 (805), A 43 (806), B 59 (807), A 26 (808),
A 7 (809).

(i) Displaced Pataora
B 51 (810), B 12 (811), A 17 (812), A 33 (813), B 20 (814).

IV. Inscriptions on rail-bars (sūcī).

(a) S. E. Quadrant
A 78 (815), A 15 (816), A 37 (817), A 13 (818), A 11 (819), A 10 (820),
A 120 (821), A 114 (822), A 118 (823), A 81 (824), B 44 (825), A 119 (826).

(b) S. Return
A 102 (827), A 84 (828), A 85 (829), A 86 (830), A 72 (831), A 89 (832),
A 63 (833).

(c) S. W. Quadrant
A 93 (834), A 31 (835), A 49 (836).

(d) Inscriptions on displaced rail-bars and on fragments
A 19 (837), A 18 (838), A 20 (839), A 76 (840), A 77 (841), A 67 (842),
A 109 (843), A 108 (844), A 96 (845), A 105 (846), A 101 (847), A 88 (848),
A 110 (849), A 64 (850), A 79 (851), A 45 (852), A 90 (853), A 115 (854),
A 92 (855), A 56 (856), A 55 (857), A 41 (858), A 53 (859), A 28 (860),
A 22 (861), A 122 (862), A 91 (863), A 82 (864), A 83 (865), A 106 (866),
A 57 (867), A 87 (868), A 3 (869), A 75 (870), A 116 (871), A 117 (872),
A 103 (873), A 100 (874), A 121 (875), A 47 (876), A 36 (877), A 48 (878),
A 104 (879), A 112 (880), B 62 (881), A 4 (882), A 99 (883), B 79 (884),
A 35 (885), A 69 (886), A 126 (887), A 131 (888), A 128 (889), A 132 (890),
A 9 (891), A 130 (892), A 113 (893), A 134 (894), A 107 (895), A 135 (896),
B 80 (897), A 97 (898), A 125 (899), A 133 (900), B 75 (901), B 81 (902),
A 127 (903), B 82 (903a).
TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

PART A

DONATIVE INSCRIPTIONS

(a) FORMAL ASPECT

In comparison with the later donative inscriptions, the wording of the Bhārhat inscriptions is simple. In its shortest and very common form the inscription mentions only the name of the donor, put in the genitive, followed by the word dānaṁ "gift". In about forty cases the object of the donation is specified as thabho (thabhho), thabhā, suchi, bodhisattva (A 106), thānapārami [rejo] (A 127). Usually the word dānaṁ comes after the object of gift, but the reverse order of words is found in not less than twelve cases. In one inscription (A 50) the word dānaṁ is obviously to be understood, but the writer did not think it necessary to inscribe it. Whereas in most cases particulars regarding the native place, profession etc. of the donors are given before the word dānaṁ, in four inscriptions we find a word or two added after it, referring to the native place (A 39) or the personal relationship (A 46, A 90) of the donor. In A 76 the female donor is characterised as a nun (bhārhati) after the word dānaṁ. Normally the donations are made by individuals obviously for their own spiritual welfare. In one case (A 108), however, it is specially mentioned that the gift was made for the benefit of the parents of the donor (matāpiṇa aṭṭhāyā). In A 5, the donation does not come from an individual donor but from the community of the town Karahakaṭa. It was probably collected by subscription. Similarly in A 16 the gift is attributed to a group of donors from Purikā. Normally it is to be presupposed that only the cost of the objects given was borne by the various donors; but in one case (A 112), if the interpretation given below is correct, the inscription would mean that the donor himself had carved the relief besides paying the cost of the stone. In A 1, special reference is made to the stone-work (carving) added to the torana as decoration.

(b) CONTENTS

The donors mentioned in the 136 Bhārhat inscriptions of our group A include both the men and women who lead the worldly life and those that have renounced it. Thus on the one hand we have about 58 gifts from laymen and about 36 from laywomen, whereas

1 In about eight cases the anusvāra is omitted. Once, in A 96, the word is used in the masculine form dāna which, according to Lüders, is probably a clerical error (as well as dān[a]), A 49a.
2 A 6, A 7, A 8, A 39, A 40, A 46, A 50, A 54, A 58, A 61, A 65, A 66, A 68, A 71, A 73, A 80, A 87a, A 94, A 98. In A 34 it is mentioned that the pillar donated is the first one (pattamakhaṁ).
on the other hand there are 25 donations by monks' and 16 by nuns." It is perhaps striking to find monks and nuns making donations, as they were forbidden to own any personal property besides some ordinary requisites. Probably we have to suppose that they collected the money required for some pious purpose by begging it from their relatives or acquaintances. It is, however, never stated in Bhräh. as in Jain inscriptions from Mathurā, that the dedication was made by a layman at the request of some clergyman. The wording of the Bhräh. inscriptions refers to the Buddhist clergyman in such a way, as if he himself had made the donation.

In some inscriptions only the names of the donors are mentioned, while in the others we find details regarding:

(I) the places they come from,
(II) the family (gotra) or tribe they belong to, or the relationship they have to some other person,
(III) the professions they follow, and
(IV) the ecclesiastical titles they bear (in case of monks).

The places from where the donors come are mentioned in 52 cases. Several of these place-names occur more than once, for instance, Vedisa (six times), Karahakata (five times), Purikā (five times), Moragiri (five times), Chudathita (thrice), Pātaliputra (thrice), Bibikānakadikata (twice), Bhogakata (twice), Chikulana (=Chekulana, twice), Nagara (twice). The other place-names occur only once, see the treatment of place-names below p. 6 f.

The donors mentioned in A 1-4 and in A 130(?) are members of the royal family of king Dhanabhūti who apparently was a feudatory of the Śungas. In A 1, Dhanabhūti is called the grandson of 'king' Visadeva. In A 3, he himself is called king (rāja) and his son Vādhipāla is styled 'prince' (kumāra). In A 4, a female donor of the name Nāgarakhitā is mentioned as the wife of a 'king' whose name is lost. A 130 refers to a 'king' and a 'supreme king' (adhirāja) whose name again has not been preserved. The historical bearing of these inscriptions is discussed under A 1.

The family (gotra) of a female donor is given in A 35 as Vāsithi (Vāsimthi), and the name of a tribe to which two female donors from Pātaliputra and another lady from some unknown place belong, occurs as Kōdiya (A 14, A 15) and Koḍa (A 116)4. In a few inscriptions the donor's relationship to his mother is mentioned as 'the son of so and so'. Such is the case in A 1 where king Dhanabhūti and his ancestors appear. Here the name of the respective mother refers to her gotra, e.g. Gāgiputra (Gāgiṭputra) Gālīputra (Gālīṭputra), Vāchhiputra (Vāchitputra)5. In A 100, however, the donor is mentioned simply as the son of Śri (Śṛiṣī ṣuta).

Once the relationship of the donor to his grandfather and father is expressed as Jahiranatā Isirakhitaputra (Jahiranapṛti Rishirakshita putra) A 50.

The female donor Pasadeva (Pushtadeva) is referred to as 'the mother of so and so', e.g. Dhamagudamāti (Dharmagudapati) in A 120. In three other cases the name of the

---

1 A 8, A 17, A 38, A 39, A 41, A 51, A 54, A 56-A 73. The titles upāsaka for male and upāsikā for female lay-worshippers, as well as bhikṣu or bhikṣhu (bhikṣu) for monks are never used in Bhräh. inscriptions. We find only bhikṣuṁ or bhikṣuṁ (bhikṣuṁ) for nuns. The monks in Bhräh. inscriptions are to be recognized only from their ecclesiastical titles given below. In Sāṃśīl inscriptions, however, upāsaka and upāsikā occur 4 and 15 times respectively, and bhikṣu or bhikṣhu as also bhikṣuṁ or bhikṣuṁ occur very often.


3 Cf. Kōdiya for Kōdiya in A 116 and B 72.

4 Cf. Hultsch, IA Vol. XXI (1892), p. 227, note 11: "The custom, in accordance with which each of the three kings bears a secondary name derived from the gotra of his mother, has descended through the Andhras to the Kadambas and Chalukyas; see Dr. Fleet's Kanarese Dynasties, p. 5, note 2 ."
female donor is not mentioned, but she is called ‘the mother of so and so’ cf. Señaka-mātu (Śreṣṭhaka-mātrī) A 18, Ghāṭila-mātu A 23, and Toslāsa mātā = Gosālasa matu (Gośālasya mātuh) A 90. In A 54b, a man named Nagarakbha (Nāgarakbha) occurs as a donor in the company of his mother.

A female donor is referred to as ‘the wife of so and so’ in Raneśmitabhārīyā (Ravenimtra-bhārīyā) A 34, in Vasukasa bhārīyā A 46, or ‘the daughter of so and so’ in Mahamukhsa dhītu (Mahāmukhīna duhituḥ) A 42.

The professions of lay-donors are mentioned only in two cases. One of the donors (A 22) is styled as ‘horseman’ (asadūrika = asavārika), and the other (A 55) as ‘sculptor’ (rupakāraka = rupakāraka). In A 21, the donor is characterized as ‘householder’ (gahapati = gṛihapati).’

A great variety is to be found in ecclesiastical titles: aya (ārya) ‘the venerable’ A 8, A 67-A 72; bhadaṇṭa (bhadanta) ‘the reverend’ A 41, A 64-A 66; bhāṇaka (bhāṇaka) ‘the reciter’ A 54, A 54a, A 63; combination of bhadanta with aya A 38; combination of aya with bhāṇaka A 62; combination of bhadanta with bhāṇaka A 39, A 61; combination of aya with sutaṁika (sūtraṁika) ‘the student of the sūtrāntas’ A 51; combination of aya with petači (petakī) ‘who knows the pitaṇkas’ A 56; combination of aya with anīveśa (anīvesa) ‘the pupil’ A 73; combination of bhadanta with satupadāna (sruṣṭopadāna) ‘who has abandoned attachment’ A 58; combination of bhadanta with aya, bhāṇaka, and navakamika (navakarmika) ‘superintendent of the works’ A 59; bhadudesa (bhakṣaṇadesa) ‘superintendent of meals’ A 17; paṇḍhanakāyika (paṇḍhanaikāyika) ‘who knows the five Nikāyas’ A 57; bhikhunī (bhikṣunī) ‘a nun’ A 11, A 12, A 29, A 44, A 52, A 80; bhikhunī A 24, A 37, A 42, A 43, A 74 - A 79.

Personal Names

As the following classification points out, there is a great variety in the names given to persons. A large number of these names is religious (theophoric). Apparently we are in a period when the worship of old vedic deities still existed and when the rule of some Grihyasūtras recommending to name a person after some nakshatra was in vogue. But the cult of minor deities and spirits like Yakshas, Bhūtas and Nāgas and of saints seems to have

---

1 In Śāṅkhi inscriptions there is a great variety of professional epithets like sethi (a banker), vonja (a merchant), ṛṣeṣa (a foreman of artisans), rājputkara (a royal scribe), rajuka (a high District officer), lekhaka (a writer), vaghaki (a mason), pāṭārika (a cloak-seller), sotika (a weaver), and kamika (an artisan). The epithets ‘horseman’ (asadūrika, Bhārī, A 22) and ‘householder’ (gahapati, Bhārī, A 21) occur as well (Rhy's Davids SBE XI, p. 257, note, sees in gahapati a ‘village landholder’).
2 In Sāṅkhi we get some more ecclesiastical titles like ther (Senior), dharmakathaka (preacher of the law), śrīgukha (guide, instructor) and satpurisa (a holy man). On the general importance of some of the church titles see below p. 48 and notes.
3 The donor is not specially said to be a monk. But the office he holds is known from the Pāli texts to be that of a clergyman.
4 The corresponding designation for monks: bhikku or bhikkhu (bhikṣu) is not to be found, as mentioned above p. 1, note 11.
5 'Theophore Namen”, see Hilka, Alons, Die altindischen Personennamen, Breslau, 1910, pp. 78-112.
been very popular. Besides, names derived from the Vaishnavite and Śaivite deities prove also the existence of these sects in that period. Often the person is called 'protected' (gutā = gupta, rakhita = rakshitā, pālita) or 'given' (data = dātā),' by some deity or star; or the person is said to have some deity as his 'friend' (mitā = mitra) or 'god' (deva), or is said to be the deity's servant (dāsa). In the case of such names as may be called Buddhist, however, words as saṅgha, dhamma = dharma, buddha = buddhi, bodhi, and thūpa = śūpa appear in place of the deity's name. It is surprising that such Buddhist names are relatively few, and that there is no marked difference in naming laymen and clergymen. The non-religious names referring to the appearance of the body, mental dispositions, plants or animals are comparatively seldom met with.

I. Religious Names

1. Buddhist: (a) Male names: Thūpadāsa (Śīpadāsa) A 95; Dhamagutta (Dharmagutta) A 94, A 120; Dharmarakṣita (Dharmarakṣita) A 95; Budharakṣita (Buddharakṣita) A 55, *A 57, *A 58; Budhi (Buddhi) A 21; Bodhiyutta (Bodhiyutta) A 99; Saṅghamīla (Saṅghamīla) A 40; Saṅghamīla (Saṅghamīla) A 106, (A 107); Saṅgharaksita (Saṅgharaksita) A 108; Saṅghila (Saṅghila) A 109.

(b) Female names: Dharmarakṣita (Dharmarakṣita) * A 52, A 118; *Budharakṣita (Buddharakṣita) * A 76; *Samālā (Śramañā) A 12.

2. Names derived from stars:


B. Planet (gaha)—(a) Male names: Āgaraju (Āgaraju) A 1, A 2.

C. Sign of Zodiac (ṛāli)—(a) Male name: Śīla (Śīla) A 111.

(b) Female name: Chāpadevā A 34.


---

1 Hilka l.c.p. 49 ff.
2 Hilka l.c.p. 47.
3 Hilka l.c.p. 104 f.
4 In the following list the names of monks and nuns are shown with an asterisk mark.
5 Hilka refers to them under the heading 'Natürgeschichtliche Benennungen' l.c.p. 113-152.
6 The name Budharakṣita could be also equivalent to Sk. Budharakṣita and refer to the planet Budha. But as 'dhana' and 'śagna' are found compounded with 'rakhita' or similar expressions for 'protected' they are more likely to be Buddhist names.
7 Hilka l.c.p. 33-38 (Gestirnennamen).
8 In Sāñchi the name Rohanadeva, read by Majumdar as Rohanidesa, is attested (cf. List No. 467, Majumdar 466). Other names with Roha as first member of a compound are Rohaśānti (List No. 996, 1053) and Rohanāsura (List No. 1327).
9 Hilka l.c.p. 103; cf. note 4 about the possibility of Budharakṣita also being a name derived from a planet (Budha).
10 Hilka l.c.p. 38.
11 Perhaps this may be a name derived from an animal, cf. Hilka p. 119, Śīha-ghosha, etc.
12 Chēpa is taken to be the same as dhamma, the sign of the zodiac Sagittarius. Hilka, l.c.p 138 gives a list of names containing some word for 'bow' as the second member of a compound. But as in our case the name is that of a woman, it is not likely that it refers to the weapon.
13 Hilka l.c.p. 80 f.
14 Hilka l.c.p. 82 (Indra as Mahendra).
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(b) Female names: Ayamā (Aryamā)3 A 33, Idadeva (Indradeva)4 A 19, A 45, Mitadeva (Mitradēva)1 A 127, Somā3 A 37.

4. Purānic: (a) Male names:

(I) Deities in general—Devarakhita (Devarakšita)6 A 93, Devasena6 A 64.

(II) Spirits and animal deities—*Bhutaka (Bhūttaka)7 A 8, Bhūtarakhita (Bhūtarakshita)7 A 31, *A 38, Yakhila (Yakṣhila)6 A 105, *Gorakhita (Gorakshita)9 A 68, *Nāgadeva10 A 70.


(IV) Minor deities—Śirima (Śrimā)15 A 110, *Mahila15 (Mahipālita?) A 65, Gāgamita (Gāgāmītra)14 A 89.

(V) Śāivite—Isāna (Isāna)13 A 84, A 85, Vādhapāla (Vijāḍhapāla)16 A 3, Samika (Śamika)17 A 6, *A 41.

(VI) Vaishnavite—*Kanaka (Krīṣaṇaka)18 A 39, Kanhita (Krīṣṇalā) A 63, *Valaka (Balaka)10 A 61, Valamita (Balamitra) A 36.

(b) Female names—


(II) Rishi worship—Isirakhita (Risharakshita) A 53.

(III) Minor deities—Śīrīmā (Śrimatī) A 48, Serī (Śrī) A 100, Chaṇḍā (Chandrā)19 A 128.

(IV) Śāivite—Samidatā (Śvāmidattā) A 122.

---

1 Hilka l.c.p. 87.
2 Hilka l.c.p. 88.
3 Hilka l.c.p. 81.
4 Hilka l.c.p. 81 f.
5 Hilka l.c.p. 102 f.
6 Hilka l.c.p. 79-80.
7 Hilka l.c.p. 87.
8 Hilka l.c.p. 88.
9 Hilka l.c.p. 89.
10 Hilka l.c.p. 120.
11 Hilka l.c.p. 84 f.
12 Hilka l.c.p. 104.
13 Hilka l.c.p. 94.
14 On suffix -(i)ē in names, see Hilka, l.c.p. 68 f.
15 Hilka l.c.p. 84.
16 Hilka l.c.p. 96.
17 The name has been classified as Śāivite under the assumption that vādha corresponds to Sk. vṛddha 'hunter' and that the protector of hunters' is a designation of Rudra-Śiva.
18 Hilka l.c.p. 104.
19 According to Lüders Kanaka is the defective writing for Kanaka (Kṛṣṇaka). For names referring to Kṛṣṇa see Hilka l.c.p. 93. Hilka, however, takes Kanaka as 'gold' and classifies the name as referring to minerals (cf. p. 121). It is also possible to relate it to the appearance and parts of the body (II, 1) as it could correspond to 'karna'.
20 Hilka l.c.p. 94.
21 For references to Hilka see under male names.
22 Hilka l.c.p. 101 f.
II. Non-religious Names

1. Appearance—colour, size, dress, voice, and parts of the body:
   (a) Male names—*Śūmakā* (Śyāmakā) A 66, *Chula* (Kṣudra)² A 51, *Chuladahaka* (Kṣudra?) A 17, Chulana (Kṣudra?) A 91, Mahamukhi (Mahāmukhi)² A 42, Mudā (Mundā) A 102, Graṭīla (Graṭīla ‘nape or back of the neck’) A 28.
   (b) Female names—Śāmā (Śyāmā)⁴ A 20, Gola A 49, Ghosā (Ghosha)⁶ A 117, Kachulā (Kachulā ‘a bodice’)⁵ A 115.

2. Mental disposition and temperament:
   (b) Female names—Ujjhikā (Ujjhihkā ‘one who has abandoned (?)’) A 114, Nandutarā (Nandottarā) A 119, *Badhikā (Buddhikā ‘one who is bound’) A 42.

3. Wealth, fame, and birth:
   (b) Female name—Avāśikā (Avāśikā ‘one who has a residence (?)’).

4. Plants and animals:
   (a) Male names—Atimuta (Atimukta)¹⁶ A 81, Suga, Saga (Śuṅga) A 1, A 2.
   (b) Female names—Valimiti (Vellimitra) A 35, Kujarā (Kuṭjarā)¹⁷ A 10.

5. Unclassified male names:
   Jaṅkara A 50, Yamiṭa A 103.

Place-Names

Besides the place-names which occur more than once (cf. p. 2)—viz. Veda (six times), Karahakaṭa (five times), Purṭa (five times), Margiritana (five times), Chudathila (thrice), Paṭaṭiputa (thrice), Bibikānaddikaṭa (twice), Bhujakata (twice), Chikulana (=Chekulana, twice),

¹ Hīkā l.c.p. 127.
³ Hīkā l.c.p. 128.
⁴ Hīkā l.c.p. 127.
⁵ Gōla ‘a ball’ may refer to the round form of the body. But it could also be derived from the river Gōla (Gōladvar) or from the country of the name ‘Gōla’.
⁶ For names compounded with gosha see Hīka l.c.p. 130.
⁷ A list of names referring to dress and ornament but not including Kachulā is given by Hīkā l.c.p. 126.
⁸ Hīkā l.c.p. 134.
⁹ Nanda, Nando-parava and Nandi-giri occur also as the names of a mountain.
¹⁰ Hīkā l.c.p. 133.
¹¹ For compounds with nam see Hīkā l.c.p. 133. For other names derived from the deities called Vāsu see Hīkā l.c.p. 88.
¹² Hīkā l.c.p. 131.
¹³ For names referring to fame see Hīkā l.c.p. 142.
¹⁴ For names referring to birth see Hīkā l.c.p. 123.
¹⁵ Cf. Pāṇini, IV, 3,29.
¹⁶ Hīkā l.c.p. 115.
¹⁷ For names referring to animals, including other names for elephant but not kuṭjarā, see Hīkā l.c.p. 117 ff.
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 Nagara (twice)—a number of places, in which the donors originated, is mentioned only once, for instance Asitamasā, Kamchehu(?), Kākañdhī, Kosambi, Kīnjarīḍika, Therāk其他国家, Dabhina, Nāndinagara, Nāsika, Pādī, Paraketa, Purīkina, Bahaṣa, Benākata, Bhogavādana, Venuvagama, Sirisaṇaṭa and Selaṇaṭa.

A. Formation

If we compare these names with such place-names as are found in Sāṃkhi inscriptions, certain formative elements of that time are conspicuous. We find:


The ending -kaṭa probably goes back to Sanskrit kaṭaka (modern kaṭa) in the sense of 'circle, valley or camp'. It occurs also very often in Prakrit inscriptions as -kaṭa or -kaḍa, for instance in Sāṃkhi in Beda-kaḍa, Bhadana-kaṭa (Bhadana-kadā), Madalākhi-kaṭa (Madalākhi-kadā), Morajāhi-kaṭa (Morajāhi-kadā), Sida-kaḍa (Sida-kaḍa), Vīrākaṭa (Vērākaṭa).

(b) Names ending in -gama (Skt. grāma ‘village’): Venuva-gama A 52.

In Sāṃkhi we get a few more names with this ending, which is frequently used in the formation of place-names: Kanāndi-gama, Nava-gama, Śāmika-gama.

(c) Names ending in -kāṭa ‘peak’ or -giri ‘mountain’: Thērā-kāṭa A 41, Mora-giri A 25, A 29.

In Sāṃkhi the names ending in some word for mountain are: Chuda-giri, Chuda-mora-giri, Mahā-mora-giri, Boṭa-Sriparvata.

(d) Names ending in -nagara ‘town’: Nāndi-nagara A 45.

In Sāṃkhi Nadi-nagara or Nāndi-nagara and its derivatives occur very often. We also get Athakha-nagara.

(e) Names ending in -pada (Skt. pādra ‘a village’, cf. above the ending -gama): Sīrissa-pada A 53.

In Sāṃkhi this ending is found in Kuthu-pada (Kuthuka-pada), Tākāra-pada (Tākāra-pada) Tīrīḍa-pada; Pluṣjeṣṭa-pada, Rehaṇi-pada.

(f) Names ending in -pura ‘town’: Sēla-pura A 54.

In Sāṃkhi we find Adha-pura or its derivative.

(g) Names ending in -vadhana (Sk. varṇadhana ‘growth’, ‘increase’): Bhoga-vadhana A 51.

In Sāṃkhi we often have Bhoga-vadhana (or -vadhana), besides Dhama-vadhana and Puṇa-vadhana.

(h) Other endings which are found in Sāṃkhi inscriptions, but which are not met with in Brāhmat inscriptions are:

-ghara (Udabara-ghara, Kura-ghara, Kora-ghara, Kosa-ghara), -pātha (Kachu-pātha, Subhago-pātha, Seta-pātha, Seta-pātha), -vāṣa or -vada or -vīda (Skt. vyāta ‘enclosed, enclosure’ ?) in Aćhā-vāṣa or -vada, Puru-vīda, Poda-vīda, -vāna (Tuba-vāna, Madhu-vāna).

B. Identification

Some of the place-names in Brāhmat inscriptions are to be identified with certainty, others only conjecturally; the location of quite a number of towns or villages remains unknown.

1 Cf. the name of the town Dhān̄āka (List No. 1271) by the side of Dhān̄aka (List No. 1225), and Dhān̄aka (List No. 1205), and Dhenuka (List No. 1092) by the side of Deuṇkā (List No. 1090, 1093, 1096, 1097), and Dhenukā (List No. 1121).
(1) The first group comprehends a vast renowned localities extending over a vast area from Pātaliputra (Patna) in the north-east of India to Nasik and Karhāḍ, places in the former Bombay State, in the West. Therefore it is obvious that Bhārhat attracted visitors not only from its vicinity but that pilgrims even from distant places flocked to the shrine or supported subscriptions to contribute to the embellishment and ornamentation of the monument. Important localities to be identified are:

Karhahaṇa, probably the modern Karhāḍ, in the district of Sātārā, Bombay State, about forty miles north of Kolhapur. The name reappears in the Kuḍā Buddhist cave inscription (List No. 1053) as Karahakaṇa, and seems to be the ancient form of the later Karahaṇaka, Karāḍ, the capital of one of the branches of the Śilāhāra family.¹

Kosambi (Sk. Kaustambhi), modern Kosam, on the left bank of the Jumna, about thirty miles to the west of Allahabad; according to the Mahāparinibbānasutta it was one of the great Indian cities at the time of the Buddha, famous as capital of the Vatsas or Vārānas.² To Kosambi our inscriptions refer only once (A 52). The nun Dhamarakhīṭā, inhabitant of Venuvagāma, is called Kosabeyikā (Kauśa-meyikā) "native of Kosambi".

Nāsika,³ the modern Nasik on the Godāvari, 117 miles by train to the north-east of Bombay, a celebrated place of pilgrimage, known to archaeologists on account of some old cave-temples.

Pātaliputra (Pātaliputra), modern Patna, the capital of Magadha in Maurya and Gupta times, founded by Ajātasastra of Magadha as Pātaligāma in cr. 483 B.C., the last year of Buddha’s life. A description of the town as the residence of the Maurya Chandragupta has been given at the end of the fourth century B.C. by the Greek ambassador Megasthenes. For excavations see L. A. Wadell, Report on Excavations at Pātaliputra Calcutta 1903; D. B. Spooner, Mr. Ratan Tatta’s Excavations at Pātaliputra ASIAR., 1913-14, pp. 53-86.⁴

Purikā, according to the Khila-Harivamśa (Viṣṇuparvan XXXVIII, 20-22) a town between two ranges of the Vindhya mountains. The Paurikās or Paulikas are enumerated by different Purāṇas in the list of people in the Deccan after the Dāṇḍakas and before the Mauvikas and Aśmakas.⁵

Bhojakāta, second capital of Vidarbha (Berar),⁶ probably to be identified with Bhopur in Bhopal, six miles to the east-south-east of Bhilasa. The Bhojpur topes have been described by Cunningham (’Bhilasa Topes’) and some relic bowls with inscriptions have been found there (List No. 676-678).

³Cf. Bimala Churn Law, Geography of Early Buddhism, London 1932, p. 57; Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 139, and p. 147, under Pañchavati; BI. p. 128; Nāsika is found in the enumeration of people of the west of India in the Purāṇas, see W. Kiefer, Die K skirmist des Indes, 1920, p. 75.
⁴For further references see Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 151 ff.; Malalasekera l.c. Vol. II, pp. 178 ff.; BI. p. 129.
⁵Cf. Kiefer, l.c.p. 75; Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 162; Law l.c.p. 65; BI. p. 130; Hultsch, IA., Vol. XXI, p. 234, note 55, remarks: "On a town of this name,which is referred to in the great epic, see Böhtlingk and Roth's Sanskrit - Wörterbuch, s.v. At the time of the Śilāhāras, Puri was, the capital of the Koṅkan; IA., Vol. XIII, p. 134. Another Puri in Orissa is well-known by its shrine of Jagannātha, IA., Vol. XX, p. 590."
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Vedisa (Sk. Vaidisia, P. Vedisa, Vedisegiri), modern Besnagar, 2\frac{1}{2} miles to the north of Bhilsa in Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh), at the fork of the Bes (Bias) and the Betwa rivers; known from the pillar inscription of Heliodorus, the Greek ambassador from Taxila, sent to the king Kāśīputa Bhāgabhādra (Cf. List No. 669). The name is derived from the river Viḍāsā (Bes, Bias), mentioned in the Purāṇas as one of the rivers originating in the Parīyātra mountain together with the Vetravati (Betwa); the Vaidīsas appear ibid. in the lists of the Vindhyā population.

Suggestions can be made regarding the following places:

Asitamāsa, supposed by Cunningham to have been situated on the bank of the Tamasā or Tonse river in Rewa, Central India.

Kākanī, known from grammatical Sanskrit literature as well as from Buddhist and Jain sources. The Kāśikā on Pāṇini IV, 2, 123 cites the name as that of a place in the East, quoting the derivation kākandaka “inhabitant of Kākanī”. In the SnA, p. 300 Sāvatthi (śrāvasa) is said to have originally been the residence of the Rishi Savattha, “just as Kosambi was the abode of Kusuma and Kākanī that of Kākandana” (yathā Kusubhasa niśāsa Kosambi Kākandassa Kākanī). Hultzsch referred to the mention of Kākanī in Jain literature (Paṭākāvī of the Kharataragachha, I.A. Vol. XI, p. 247). The exact location of the town is not known.

Nandīnagarā has been identified with Nandigrama=Nandgaon in Oudh, eight or nine miles to the south of Fyzabad, or with Nandner (near Tonk); but these identifications are not very probable, as the town is more often quoted in early Brāhmī inscriptions than any other, besides Ujênī (Ujjayinī). Is it a second name for some important place in central India? According to the dictionaries nandinigeri means a particular kind of writing, and nandinagarak a particular written character.

-A town Nandipura occurs in a Jain cosmographical list after Kaśāmbi.


Bhogavaḍhāna (Sk. Bhogavardhāna), a place met with in several early Brāhmī inscriptions, and known from Sanskrit literature. The exact location is unknown. The Purāṇas place the country between Asmaka and Koṇkaṭa. Majumdar summing up what is known says: “From some of the Purāṇas it seems that this place has to

---

1 Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 29 (Bessanagara), p. 35 (Bidisa); Law, l.c.p. 35; BL, p. 132; Malalasekera, l.c. Vol. II, p. 922. For a sketch of Besnagar by Cunningham see Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, ed. by Sir A. Cunningham, Vol. X, Pl. XII; for a description of the remains, ibid., pp. 36-46. In the ‘Monuments of Sānti’, Vol. I, p. 2, the following note is given: “The city was not confined to the fork between the two rivers but extended at last two-thirds of a mile to the river Be”. Cf. ASIAR., 1913-14, p. 186.

2 Kirfel, l.c.p. 65.

3 Kirfel, l.c.p. 76.

4 Law, l.c.p. 56; Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 202 (Tamasā); BL, p. 125; Kirfel, l.c.p. 65 (Tamasā).


6 Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v.


8 BL, p. 128; Law, l.c.p. 31; Nunda Lal Dey, l.c.p. 131. Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dict., gives Nandigrāma as name of a village near Daulatabad.


11 Kirfel, l.c.p. 226.

12 Cf. List s.v. Bhogavaḍhāna, Bhogavaḍhanaka and Bhogavaḍhaniya.

13 BL, p. 130 f.

14 Kirfel, l.c.p. 75.

be located somewhere in the direction of Aśmaka and Muḷaka, that is, in the Godāvari valley."

Moragiri (Sk. Mayurāgiri) is represented in Sāñchi inscriptions by the village (gāma) Chuḍa-moragiri and by Mahā-moragiri. Hultsch contributed the following note: "With Mayurāgiri compare Mayūraparvata, a locality which is referred to in a quotation of the Charaṇagṛhābhāṣyā; see Dr. Bühler's translation of Āpastamba, p. XXXI note, and Dr. von Schroeder's Maitrāyaṇi-Saṁhitā, p. XXIV".

Venugrāma (Sk. Veṇukrāma), dwelling-place of the nun Dhamarakhitā, the "native of Kosambi" (A 52), is stated to be a suburb of Kosambi and to have been identified by Cunningham with the modern village of Ben-Purwa to the north-east of Kosam. But the name seems more akin to Beluṅāgama (also called Beluṅagamaka and Beluṅgama), a village near Vesāli (Vatāsī), where the Buddha spent his last rainy season, according to the Mahāparinibbānasutta. In the corresponding Sk. text (Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra § 13.2) the name of the village is Venugrāma. The modern Belgaum in the Deccan also represents Veṇugrāma.

Sirisapada. The location of the place is unknown. Hultsch refers to a village called Sirishapadraka mentioned in two inscriptions of the Gurjara dynasty.

(3) The list of place-names not identified as yet comprehends:

Kamuchu (?), Khujatičiku, Chikulana (Chekulana), Chuḍaṭhila, Therākūta, Dabhīna, Nagarā, Paḍela, Parakaṭa, Parīkṣa, Bāhaḍa, Bībikanaḍikaṭa, Selapura.

[Epithets designating somebody with regard to his domicile are formed from place-names with the suffixes -ikā, -iyā or -kā; see the treatment of important suffixes (under 6, a, 8, b, and 10, b) above pp. XXVIII f.]

1 List No. 625, as read by Majumdar.
2 List Nos. 189, 319, as read by Majumdar.
4 BL. p. 127; Law, l.c.p. 35.
6 Waldschmidt, Die Überlieferung vom Lebenszweig des Buddha I, Göttingen 1944, pp. 88 ff.
9 IA., Vol. XIII, pp. 82 and 88. Barua-Sinha's (BL. p. 27) equation with Sirisavatthu, a city of the Yakkhas in Ceylon (Mahalasekera, l.c. Vol. II, p. 1149), does not need to be discussed.
10 BL. p. 128; "The Purāṇas mention Kukṣika and Kukṣīrṇa among the holy places of India."
11 Barua-Sinha (BL. p. 128), wrongly taking Chikula as name of the place, try to combine it with Chaul, near Bombay, by way of "Chikula, Chekula = Chena").
12 Occurring only in the derivation nāgarika A 43 (A 44). Kirfel, l.c.p. 80, mentions Nāgarakā as designation only of the residents of Pātaliputra according to Vātsyāyaṇa's Kāmasūtra with Yaśodhara's commentary. Could nāgarikā appear in the Bhārhat inscription as a short form for Nāhādīnāgarikā met with in A 45 and other early Brahmī inscriptions?
13 Barua-Sinha, BL. p. 129: "But Paḍela is evidently the ancient name of Panjërī in Bilaspur District, Central Provinces."
14 Barua-Sinha, BL. p. 130: "This, as its name implies, was a place in the region of the Bimbikā river."

TEXT:
1 Suganaṁ raje raño Gāgīputasa Visadevasa
2 pautena Goti putasa Āgarajusa putena
3 Vāchhiputena Dhanabhūtina kāritāṁ toranāṁ
4 silākanimanto cha upariño

TRANSLATION:

During the reign of the Sugas (Śūṅgas) the gateway was caused to be made and the stone-work (i.e. carving) presented by Dhanabhūti, the son of a Vāchhi (Vātī), son of Āgaraju (Āṅgāradyut), the son of a Goti (Goti) and grandson of King Visadeva (Visadeva), the son of Gāgi (Gāgi).

That the Śūṅgas are meant by the Sugas was first recognised by Bühlcr. Raje was translated by Rajendralala Mitra in the kingdom, by Barua-Sinha within the dominion, but the term rājyasahwatsare in No. 22 and 33, rājyasah in No. 51 of my List is in favour of the meaning during the reign assigned to the word by Hultzsch. Silākānimanto was first correctly explained by Rajendralala Mitra; it refers no doubt to the sculptures on the gateway. Bühlcr was the first to derive upariño from Sk. upanāhaḥ, but his translation was wrong. Hultzsch rendered silākānimanto cha upariño at first and the masonry was finished and later on and the stone-work arose.

Barua-Sinha take upariño in the sense of the causative and translate and the workmanship

1 Another donation by a member of the royal family is probably to be found in the fragmentary donative inscription No. À 130.
2 This word has been read by all editors as pautena. But as the diphthong au never occurs in the Bhārhat inscriptions and as it is linguistically untenable we suggest to read potena, the more as the middle horizontal mark to the left, which is supposed to give the mātra for au, is very slight and hence it is very likely that it is just an accidental prolongation of the middle horizontal mark to the right.
3 Read toranāṁ. The engraver has forgotten to incise the left upper bar of na.
4 The last oṣka looks like na, but there can be little doubt that it is to be read na, the right portion of the e-sign being attached to the top of the na and not as usually to the middle of the letter.
5 The name appears in the classification given above II, 4, a (names derived from plants). Śūṅga is a name for the Indian fig tree (=vāta).
6 See classification II, 3, a (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth).
7 Regarding gotra-names cf. p.2.
8 See classification 1, 2, B, a (names derived from planets). Hultzsch, IA., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 227, note 11; "As suggested by Dr. Bühlcr, this name has to be explained by Āṅgāradyuta itva Āṅgāradyut, shining like (the planet) Mars."
9 See classification I, 3, a (names referring to vedic deities).
10 Barua, temporarily having changed his opinion, translates during the reign of the Śūṅgas in Barh. I, p. 29, but within the dominion of the Śūṅgas again ibid., p. 41.
in stone has been produced, but all these renderings are unsatisfactory. In my opinion the term uppana is used here in the same meaning as in the language of the Buddhist Pali Canon. Innumerable times it is stated in the Vinaya that such and such object was sanighassa uppana; cf. e.g. Cullava, V, 23, 1 f.: sanighassa mahasara\'jani uppana\' hoti; chamara\'jani uppana\' hoti; sanighassa chhata\'am uppana\' hoti. The words are generally translated 'a mosquito fan, or a chamara fan, or a sun-shade,' had come into the possession of the Sarigha'. This is quite true, but it is only by donations that the Sarigha acquired these things, and so uppana seems to have assumed the meaning of 'presented', which would suit admirably well also in our inscription.

From the inscription A 3 (mentioning Dhanabhuti's son, prince Vadhapala) it results that Dhanabhuti—to his grandfather the title 'king' is given in our inscription—was a king himself. Cunningham found the name Dhanabhuti as that of a donor again in an inscription from Mathurā (List No. 125), and tried to link this donor to king Dhanabhuti of our Bharhut inscriptions. The revision of the inscription List No. 125 given here as a supplement shows that his assumption is an ill-founded one.

SUPPLEMENT: MATHURĀ INSCRIPTION OF DHANABHUTI

List No. 125; Plate I

Fragmentary inscription on a railing pillar from Mathurā. According to Cunningham the inscription was cut on a corner pillar with sockets for rails on two adjacent faces, and sculptures on the other two faces. Afterwards another railing was attached, and fresh holes of a much larger size were then cut in the face bearing the inscription. Cunningham, moreover, states that the pillar was in the Alishgarh Institute, but when Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda visited the Institute in September 1921, he was unable to trace the stone. So our knowledge of the inscription is restricted to the reading and the facsimile which Cunningham published first Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. III (1873), p. 36, No. 21, and Plate XVI, and again Stūpa of Bharhut (1879), p. 130, and Plate LIII. The facsimile in the Stūpa of Bharhut is less trustworthy, being evidently altered, not from the stone itself, but in accordance with preconceived ideas about the reading of the text. From this revised facsimile Senart edited the whole inscription in 'Inscriptions de Payodasī', Vol. II (1886), p. 476, note 1—Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 246, note 62 (English translation), and the second part only in J. As. Sér. VIII, Vol. XV (1890), p. 119 f.

Text:

1 ka[p].  
2 bhūti[sa].  
3 putrasa. 

1 Cf. the discussion on the date of our Bharhut inscriptions above p. XXX.
3 The second akṣara may have been ha, but it can hardly have been la as assumed by Senart. After kap. about six akṣaras are completely destroyed. As regards the restoration of this and the next two lines see the remarks below.
4 Of sa only a minute particle is preserved, but the reading is certain. Between bhūtisa and ts about four akṣaras are missing.
5 In the first facsimile the sign is only tsa, in the revised facsimile it has been changed to tsā, but certainly only because Cunningham thought that Viśāputrasa was the original reading.
6 Before sa the facsimile shows a sign which Cunningham transcribed by la, but in this he cannot be right, as la never shows a slanting bottom line as the letter in the facsimile. Considering that Cunningham was unable to decipher the last but one letter in the second line, it is very probable that the corresponding letter in the third line also was defaced and that the sign given in the facsimile is imaginary.
4 Dhanabhūtiśa dāna[rū]ṇā vedikā
5 toraṇāni cha ratanagrih[e] sa-
6 rvabudhapujayeš sahā māṭāpi-
7 tīhiṃ sahā [cha] chatu[hī] parishāhī

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Dhanabhūti, the... the son of a (Vā)ṭu[tī]... bhūtī...
(consisting in) a railing and gateways at the jewel-house in honour of all Buddhas, together
with (his) parents and together with the four assemblies.

Whereas the second part of the record is absolutely clear, the restoration of the sadly
mutilated first three lines presents considerable difficulties. On the Eastern gateway at
the Stūpa of Bhārhatu there is an inscription (A 1) which records that the gateway was caused
to be made and the stone work presented by Vāchhiputa Dhanabhūti, the son of Gotiputa
Agaraju and grandson of rājan Gāgiputa Visadeva. And there is at Bhārhatu another
inscription on a rail (A 3) to the effect that the rail was the gift of the Kumāra Vādhapāla,
the son of rājan Dhanabhūti. When Cunningham became acquainted with these inscriptions,
he tried to establish a connection between the Dhanabhūti of the Bhārhatu inscriptions
and his namesake at Mathurā by supplying in the Mathurā inscription dhanā at the end of
the first line, restoring vāstū at the end of the second line and vādhapā between putrasa
and the supposed lasa in the third line. In his revised facsimile, where the restored letters have
been entered, the first four lines appear therefore as follows:

kapa... (Dhana)–
bhūtis[sa]... (Vā)ṭi–
putrasa (Vādhapā) lasa
Dhanabhūtisā dānamī vedikā.

Cunningham was of the opinion that from the record as restored by him we obtain an-
other name of the royal family mentioned in the Bhārhatu inscription in Dhanabhūti II,
the son of Vādhapāla, and grandson of Dhanabhūti I, and he used this arrangement of the
pedigree for deriving important conclusions with regard to the date of the Bhārhatu Stūpa.
But a glance at the text of the inscription as established by Cunningham will be sufficient
to show that it can never convey the sense that Cunningham gathered from it. Neither is Vādhapāla
called the son of Dhanabhūti I, nor Dhanabhūti II the son of Vādhapāla. I doubt very
much that there was any relation between the Dhanabhūti of Bhārhatu and the Dhanabhūti
of our inscription. Judging from the palaeography of the inscriptions, the latter must be at
least fifty years younger. There is nothing to prove that he was a rājan or the son of a rājan.
On the contrary, the assignment of a share in the gift simply to his father and mother tends to
show that he was a private person. The restoration of... putrasa as Vāstuputrasa is prob-
able, but it cannot be decided whether it is to be joined with the preceding name or with

1 The anuṣṭāra appears only in Cunningham’s revised facsimile, but as the inscription is carefully
engraved, we may assume that it was overlooked in the first facsimile.
2 The e-sign is missing in the facsimiles, but probably only by oversight.
3 The t-sign is distinct in the first facsimile, but omitted in the second.
4 Here and in the next line the word is clearly sahā.
5 Cunningham read māta pūrohi, Senart mātapūṭā (?) and later on vātāpūṭā. For grammatical
reasons the reading -pūṭā would seem to be the correct one. The e-sign of kī is distinct.
6 The aṭkara which according to the facsimile was blurred and omitted in their transcriptions by
Cunningham and Senart was evidently eka.
7 According to the facsimiles the last aṭkara was blurred. It was either kī or kī as read by Senart.
8 Cunningham and Senart read parishāhi, but here again the e-sign is distinct in the facsimiles.
Dhanabhūtisa. In the latter case, we should, of course, have to assume that it was due to mere chance that he had a mother of the same gotra as the Dhanabhūti of Bārhut, their identity being precluded by the script of their records. There is absolutely no reason why bhūtisa should be restored as Dhanabhūtisa, names ending in bhūti being very frequent in this time.

The term ratnagriha seems to denote a Stūpa. The term P. parisā, Sk. parishad is used also in the Pāli Canon and in the scriptures of the Sarvāstivādins with reference to the division of the Buddhist Order into bhikkhus, bhikkhunis, upāsakas and upāsikās.

A 2 (868); Plate XXIII

FRAGMENTARY inscription on a pillar of a gateway, now at Batanmāra. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 128, No. 2 and Pl. LIII; Barua-Sinha, Bl. (1926), p. 3, No. 2.

TEXT:

1 Sagāna rāja ...
2 Agaraju ...
3 toraṇamī ...

TRANSLATION:

During the reign of the Sugas (śuṅgas)*, Āgaraju (Anāgaradyut?)*, the gateway......

The text of the inscription was probably the same as that of No. A 1. Another fragmentary toraṇa-inscription is No. A 129.

A 3 (869)*; Plate XXIII


TEXT:

Dhanabhūtisa rājano putasa kamārasa Vādhapālāsa [dānaṁ]

TRANSLATION:

(Gift) of prince Vādhapāla (Vṛddhapāla)*, the son of king Dhanabhūti.

Dhanabhūti is already known as the donor of the ‘toraṇa’ mentioned in A 1. There he is not referred to as ‘king’ as he is in our inscription; in A 1, however, his grandfather bears that title.

---

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copy. The transcript on p. 128 has Saganam and Aga Rajna. The true readings are apparently Saguṇam raja and Āgaraju.
2 For the names see notes in A 1.
3 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
4 kamārasa is obviously a scribe’s mistake for kamārāsa.
5 This derivation is not quite certain, but more probable than that of Barua and Sinha who suggest Vṛddhapāla. For vādhpa—vṛddha they refer to ‘vādhapāja’ in the Hathigumpha inscription (List No. 1343), but there vādhapājam appears. The name Vādhapāla (=Vṛddhapāla) has been classified above (1, 4, a, 3) as Vālīte.
A 4 (882)\(^1\); **Plate II**


**Text:**

\[\ldots\ldots kasa rāño bhayaye Nāgarakhitāye dānam\]

**Translation:**

Gift of Nāgarakhitā (*Nāgarakshtā*)\(^2\), the wife of king \ldots\ldots ka.

Hultzsch proposed to read *tisa* instead of *kasa* in the beginning of the inscription and was of the opinion that the name of the king should be reconstructed as Dhanabhūu, the king mentioned in A 1 and A 3. In this he was followed by Lüders (*Lisi*) and Barua-Sinha. The impression on the estampage, however, does not bear out that reading. As no king’s name ending in –ka appears in the Bhārhatu inscriptions it is difficult to make any suggestion about the name of the king whose wife Nāgarakshtā was.

---

\(^1\) Lüders’ treatment of this inscription has not been recovered.

\(^2\) See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
2. A 5 - 54 DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

(a) A 5 - 9 Inhabitants of Karahakaṭa

A 5 (705); PLATE II


TEXT:

1 Karahakaṭa-n[i]gamasa
2 dāna

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the town of Karahakaṭa.

A 6 (767); PLATE II


TEXT:

Karahakaṭa Samikasa dāna thabho

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is) the gift of Samika (Śvānika) from Karahakaṭa.

A 7 (809); PLATE XXIII


TEXT:

Karahakaṭa Utaragidhikasa thabho dānaṁ

---

1 This is the reading of Hultsch. In the impression before me the word is obliterated.
2 Hultsch: -kaṭ[d]; Barua-Sinha: -kaṭā, but the abl. sg. in -a is quite common in Bhārhat inscriptions.
3 The ⟨a⟩ has been inserted afterwards.
4 See classification 1, 4, a, 5 (Saivism names).
5 From Cunningham's eye-copy which agrees with his transcript. The nam has been written above the line.
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is) the gift of Utaragidhika (Utaragidhyaka ?) from Karahakata.

A 8 (763); PLATE II

TEXT:

1 Karahakata
2 aya-Bhutakasa thabho danaṁ

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is) the gift of the venerable Bhutaka (Bhūtaka) from Karahakata.

A 9 (891)²; PLATE XXIV
Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 8, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 36, No. 126.

TEXT:

.........rakā[ã]yāyā²

TRANSLATION:
(The gift) of a female inhabitant of (Ka)ra(ha)kaṭa (?)

Cunningham read the inscription as ...rakatayāḥa, but the third letter in his eye-copy is clearly [ã] or [ɒ]. Lüders in his List proposed to restore [Karaha]kaṭiyāyā, gen. of Karahaṭiyā i.e. a female inhabitant of Karahakata. This explanation has also been adopted by Barua-Sinha, but as there is no ha between ra and ka it remains doubtful.

(b) A 10-12 Inhabitants of Chudathila

A 10 (820); PLATE II

TEXT:

Chudathilīkāyā Kujaraṁ danaṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Kujaṛa (Kuñjarā), the Chudathilīkā (inhabitant of Chudathila).

¹See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
²See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
³Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
⁴From Cunningham's eye-copy.
⁵See classification II, 4, b (names derived from animals).
A 11 (819); Plate II


Text:
Chudaṭhili[kā]yā Nāgadevāyā bhikhuniyiś (dānam)

Translation:
(The gift) of the nun Nāgadevā, the Chudaṭhili[kā] (inhabitant of Chudaṭhila).

A 12 (720); Plates III, XLVI


Text:
1 Samanāyā bhikhuniyā Chudaṭhili[kā]yā
2 dānam

Translation:
The gift of the nun Samanā (Śramaṇā), the Chudaṭhili[kā] (inhabitant of Chudaṭhila).

Barua-Sinha’s correction of Samanāya to Sumanāya is superfluous. For the male name Samaṇa see the Sānchi inscriptions Nos. 336 and 530 in my List, the Nāsik inscr. No. 1144 and the Bhāṭiprulā inscrs. Nos. 1332 and 1337 and the female name Šamanikā in No. 43. The spelling of the name with the dental na conforms to the rule observed in the Bhārhatu inscriptions, where, with the exception of the torana inscription, na is everywhere replaced by na. The derivation of Chudaṭhili[kā] from Sk. Chundasthali proposed by Barua-Sinha need not be discussed.

(c) A 13-15 Inhabitants of Pāṭaliputra

A 13 (818); Plate III


Text:
Pāṭal[i]putā Mahīḍasenasa dānam

1Read bhikhuniyā.
2See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
3See classification I, 1, b (Buddhist names).
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Mahidasena (Mahendrasena) from Pātaliputa (Pātaliputra).

A 14 (719); PLATES III, XXVIII


TEXT:
1 Pātal[i]putā Nāgasenāya Koḍi-
2 yāniyā dānāni

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Nāgasenā, the Koḍiyānī (belonging to the Koḍiṣa tribe), from Pātaliputa (Pātaliputra).

Hultzsch mentioned as a possibility that Koḍiyāni, which occurs again as the surname of a lady from Pātaliputra in No. A 15, might be the equivalent of Kauṇḍinīyāṇi, and Barua-Sinhs have accepted this explanation which in my opinion is phonetically untenable. Hultzsch himself preferred to take Koḍiyāni as the feminine derivation of Koḍiya formed like aryāṇī from aryā, kṣatriyāṇī, from kṣatriya, etc. There can be little doubt that this is the right view, and that Koḍiyāni has the same meaning as Koḍiyadhiṭā, the epithet of the lay-sister Suppāvāsā in A. I, 26. Koḍiya occurs as a surname of the therā Suṭṭhatīya, the founder of the Koḍiṣa gana, in the Staviravall of the Kalpaśūtra of the Jains 4; 10: therā Suṭṭhatīya-Suṇuddhisuddha Koḍiya-Kākaṇḍadāgī Vagghāvaccasagottā.4 Koḍiya becomes Koḍiya in Pāli and Koḍiya in the later language. The Koḷiyas or Koḷiyas are frequently mentioned in Buddhist literature as a tribe that was intimately related to the Sākyas, although there were quarrels between them about the water of the Rohiṇī river which divided their territories; see J. V, 412, 14 ff.; DhA. transl. III, 70; SnA. 352, 7 ff.; MEU. I, 348, 8 ff.; II, 76, 7; III, 93, 20. That the surname of the Jaina there is nothing else but the name of that tribe is proved by the second designation as Vagghāvaccas, which agrees with the statement that the Koḷiyas were known also by the name of Vyāghrapadayas (MEU. I, 355, 13 kālana rishiṇi jātā tāt koḍiya tī samājītā vyāghrapathe vyāghrapadāya samājītā cha) and their town as Koḷanagara or Vyaghrapajja (SnA. 356, 17 f.). The legends about the origin of these names are, of course, later inventions. I am therefore convinced that Koḍiyāni is a surname of the same meaning as Koḍiya in the Jaina text. The exact counterpart of Koḍiyāni is Śākyāni, ‘belonging to the Śākya tribe’, used of the mother of the Buddha in MEU. II, 12, 15. Cf. A 15, B 72 and Koḍiya in A 116.

1 See classification I, 3, a (names referring to vedic deities).
2 The second line is engraved above the first line.
3 See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
4 On Koḍiya (Koḍiya)–Gana see Bühl in ‘Further Proofs of the Authenticity of the Jaina Tradition’, WVZKM., IV (1890), p. 318.
TEXT-TRANSLATION-NOTES: A 1-136

A 15 (816); PLATE III


TEXT:

Paṭaliputra Koṭiyāniyā Sakaṭadevāyā dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Sakaṭadevā (Sakaṭadeva), 1 the Koṭiyāni (belonging to the Koṭiya tribe) from Paṭaliputra (Paṭaliputra).

For Koṭiyāni cf. note on No. A 14.

(d) A 16-20 Inhabitants of Purikā

A 16 (782); PLATE III


TEXT:

Purikāya dāyaikana dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the donors from Purikā.

A 17 (812); PLATE XXIV

On a pillar, now at Patara. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 139, No. 99, and Pl. LV, and Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 17, No. 47.

TEXT:

Chuladhakasa Purikaya bhatudesakasa dānāṁ 2

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Chuladhaka (?) 3 from Purikā, the superintendent of meals. 4

A 18 (838); PLATE III

On a rail-bar, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879),

1 See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
2 From Cunningham’s eye-copy. The transcript has Purikāya.
3 Chula occurs as the first part of the name of the goddess Chulakokā ‘Little Kokā’ (B 11), cf. also Chulana in A 91. Chula has been derived from khaḍra in the translation of our inscription by Lüders in his List. Regarding different personal names beginning with Chula see List p.186. In our classification the name has been grouped as referring to the size of the body, see II, 1, a.
4 The expression bhatta-uddeśaka occurs in Pāli texts and is translated in PTSD, as ‘thera (an elder) who supervises the distribution of food, a superintendent of meals’.

**Text:**

Purikāya Setaka-[māj]tu dānāṁ

**Translation:**

The gift of the mother of Setaka (*Śrēṣṭhākā)* from Purikā.

Setaka cannot be equated with Pāli *Śetaka* or Sk. *Śvetaka*, as considered possible by Barua-Sinha, but was correctly derived by Hultsch from Sk. *Śrēṣṭhākā*. In case of the latter equation to which Barua-Sinha do not categorically object they propose that the name 'may be taken to mean a dignitary, a man of substance, or a banker, it being= Bengalī *Set* or *Śeth*.'

A 19 (837); Plate IV


**Text:**

Purikayā Idadevāya dānāṁ

**Translation:**

The gift of Idadevā (*Indradevā*) from Purikā.

A 20 (839); Plate IV


**Text:**

Purikāya Śāmāya dānāṁ

**Translation:**

The gift of Śāmā (*Śyāmā*) from Purikā.

(e) A 21-22 *Inhabitants of Bibikanadikaṭa*

A 21 (725); Plate IV

On a pillar of the South-Eastern quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 6).

---

*See classification II, 3 a (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth).

*It seems that the heading '8. W. Quadrant' Cunningham, *StBh.*., p. 140, and Plate LV does not apply to the rest of the rail-bar inscriptions Nos. 837-884 in my List. (Regarding the numbers in this edition see the concordance on p. 182.)

*Or C. B. 41 ?

*The name Idadevā—cf. classification I, 3, b (names referring to vedic deities)—reoccurs (A 45) as an inhabitant of Nandinagara.

*See classification II, 1, b (names derived from appearance of the body).

**TEXT:**

1 Bibikanadikaṭa' Buddhino gahapatino
2 dānam

**TRANSLATION:**

The gift of the householder Buddhī from Bibikanadikaṭa (Bibikānadikeṭa ?).

Buddhi, spelt both Buddhi and Budhi, is a common name at this time, and Barua-Sinha's correction to Bodhi is quite unnecessary. The name of the place is probably correctly explained by Barua-Sinha as containing the name of a river Bibikānadi, not yet identified.

A 22 (728); PLATE IV


**TEXT:**

1 Bibikanadikaṭa Suladhasa asavārikā-
2 sa dānam

**TRANSLATION:**

The gift of the horseman Suladha (Suladbha) from Bibikanadikaṭa (Bibikānadikeṭa ?).

The upper half medallion of the pillar dedicated by Suladdha shows a fully accoutered riding horse led by the bridle by a man whose clothing consists only in a short garment tied round his waist, while another man clad in the same fashion and holding a spear in his right hand appears at the horse's tail. It is quite possible that Suladdha had the pillar decorated with a horse attended by a groom and a soldier with regard to his own profession, but I cannot agree with Barua’s opinion that the medallion illustrates the story of the Valāha horse either in the version of the Jātaka (No. 196) or in that of the Divy. (p. 120). The horse is certainly not represented as flying, the man behind does not seem to be tied to the horse's tail, and the strange idea that the artist has represented the horse's gift of human speech by the human figure in front will probably meet with little approval.

(f) A 23—24 Inhabitants of Bhojakāṭa

A 23 (861)*; PLATE IV

Rail inscription, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Edited by Cunningham, StBh.

---

1 Both Hultzsch and Barua-Sinha read Bibikānadikeṭa, but the ka has no ṝ-sign.
2 See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names). The name could also correspond to Budhi and refer to the planet Budha.
3 See classification II, 3, a (names derived from birth).
4 Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES


TEXT:

Agirakhitasa" Bhojakatakasa suchi danaṁ

TRANSLATION:

A rail, the gift of Agirakhit (Agirakshita) ; the Bhojakataka (inhabitant of Bhojakata).

Ramprasad Chanda first read the name of the donor correctly. Before him it was read Atankhata (Cunningham), Atantata (Hultsch, Lüders) or Atanata (Barua-Sinha).

A 24 (723); Plate IV


TEXT:

Bhojakatakāya Diganagay[e] bhichhuniya danaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the nun Diganaga (Dīnāgā), the Bhojakatākā (inhabitant of Bhojakata).

(g) A 25—29 Inhabitants of Moragiri

A 25 (798); Plate V


TEXT:

Moragirinmā Thupadasāsa danaṁ thabhā

TRANSLATION:

Pillars, the gift of Thupadāsa (Stūpadāsa) from Moragiri (Mayāragiri).

Thabhā may be a clerical error for "thabho", but it occurs again in No. A 27 and A 29, and as all three inscriptions record gifts of persons from Moragiri, it is not improbable that

1 kāi has been inserted underneath the akshara ra.
2 See classification I, 3, a (names referring to vedic deities).
3 The -sign is not quite distinct, but probable.
4 Barua-Sinha wrongly: bhichhuniā.
5 See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
6 Hultsch and Barua-Sinha: Thupadāsa, but the fifth akshara is distinctly sē.
7 See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).
the three donors had joined to bear the expenses of several pillars and that for this reason the plural is used in the inscription.

A 26 (808); PLATE XXIV


TEXT:

Moragirani Jātāmitasa dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Jātāmita (¿ Jitāmitra?) from Moragiri (Mayūragiri).

A 27 (796); PLATE V


TEXT:

Moragirimā Pusāyā dānaṁ thabhā

TRANSLATION:

Pillars, the gift of Pusā (Pushyā) from Moragiri (Mayūragiri).

A 28 (860); PLATE V


TEXT:

Moragirima Ghaṭila-matu dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

Gift of the mother of Ghaṭila from Moragiri (Mayūragiri).

---

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copy. The transcript has Moragiri and Jitāmitasa. Moragirani is evidently a mistake for Moragirima or Moragirimā. Jitāmitasa may be a mistake for Jitāmitasa (‘one who subdued his friend’) or better Jātāmitasa (‘one who defeated his enemy’), but in the eye-copy the first okshara is distinctly jū.

2 Under the assumption that Jitāmitra has to be understood, the name has been classified II, 3, a (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth).

3 For thabhā see the remark on A 25.

4 See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).

5 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.

6 This is probably a clerical mistake for Moragirimā to be found in A 23, A 27, A 29. The defective spelling also appears in Moragirami (A 26).

7 See classification II, 1, a (names derived from appearance of the body). It has been assumed, that ghāṭa and ghāṭaka are used in the meaning of “nape or back of the neck”.
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

A 29 (778); PLATE V


TEXT:

Moragirimha Nāgilāyā bhikkhuniyā dānam thabhā'

TRANSLATION:

Pillars, the gift of the nun Nāgilā from Moragiri (Mayāragiri).

(h) A 30-35 Inhabitants of Vedisa

A 30 (780); PLATE V


TEXT:

Vedis[a] Phagudevasa dānam

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Phagudeva (Phalgudeva) from Vedisa (Vaidiśa).

A 31 (835); PLATE V


TEXT:

Vedisāto Bhutarakhita dānam

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Bhutarakhita (Bhūtarakhita) from Vedisa (Vaidiśa).

---

1 For thabhā see the remark on A 25. From the stampage it appears that the word thabhā is inscribed on a surface different from that of the rest of the inscription.

2 See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities), and p. XXVIII (suffix -iñā). For the formation of this name Hultzsch refers to Paññiśi 5, 3, 84, and ZDMG., Vol. XXXVII, p. 551, No. 5, note 2.

3 The fragmentary inscription No. A 135 refers possibly also to some inhabitant from Vedisa.

4 See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).

5 See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
A 32 (784); PLATES VI, XLI


TEXT:

Vedisa Anurādhāya dānam

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Anurādhā' from Vedisa (Vaidīṣa).

A 33 (813); PLATE XXIV


TEXT:

Vedisa Ayamāyā dānam

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Ayamā (Aryamā) from Vedisa (Vaidīṣa).

A 34 (712); PLATES VI, XXVII


TEXT:

Vedisā Chāpadēvāyā Revatimitabhāriyāya paṭhamathabhō dānam

TRANSLATION:

The first pillar (is) the gift of Chāpadēvā, the wife of Revatimita (Revatimitra), from Vedisa (Vaidīṣa).

A 35 (885)*; PLATE XXIV


*See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
*From Cunningham’s eye-copy.
*See classification I, 3, b (names referring to Vedic deities).
*Barua-Sinha wrongly read -devāya.
*Barua-Sinha wrongly read paṭhamo.
*See classification I, 2, C, b (names derived from sign of zodiac).
*See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
*Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

Text:

Vèdisā Vāsiṭhiya Velimī[tāyā].

Translation:

[Gift] of Velimī[tā] (Vellimirā), the Vāsiṭhi (Vāsiṣṭhī), from Vediṣa (Vaidīsa).

As Cunningham’s eye-copy shows, the right portion of the inscription, containing at least the word dānam, has broken away. Barua-Sinha give a restoration adding Velimī(ta-bhāriyāya dānam). Accordingly their translation is: The gift of Vāsiṣṭhī, the wife of Veṣṣimitra (sic), from Vediṣa. It is, however, more probable that Vāsiṣṭhī is a surname indicating the gotra of the woman mentioned as donor, cf. Pāli Ṭāḷăṭṭha, Vāsīṭha, Vāsiṭṭha.

(i) A 36-54 Inhabitants of various places mentioned only once

A 36 (877); Plate XXIV

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 142, No. 62, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 32, No. 111.

Text:

Asitamasāya Valamitasa dānam.

Translation:

Gift of Valamita (Valamitra) from Asitamasā.

A 37 (817); Plate VI


Text:

Kākaṃdiya Somāya bhichhuniya dānam

Translation:

The gift of the nun Somā from Kākaṃdi (Kākandi).

A 38 (713); Plates VI, XXXIII

On a pillar of the South-Eastern quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P. 12). The inscription is engraved over a medallion. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879),

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copy.
2 See classification II, 4, b (names derived from plants).
3 For the completion of our inscription by adding a fragment see No. A 125.
4 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
5 From Cunningham’s eye-copy. The inscription has recently been recovered and is now in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, Banaras.
6 See classification I, 4, a, 6 (Vaishnavite names).
7 See classification I, 5, b (names referring to vedic deities).
TEXT:

bhadaṭṭāsā' aya-Bhūtārakhiṭā̤jaśa' Khujatidukiyasa dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the bhadanta, the venerable Bhūtārakhiṭa (Blūtarakshita),3 the Khujatidukiya (inhabitant of Kuḥjetinduka ?).

A 39 (789); PLATES VI, XXXII


TEXT:

bhadaṭṭa-Kanakasa bhanakasa thabho dānaṁ Chikulaniyasa

TRANSLATION:

The pillar (ś) the gift of the reverend Kanaka (Krīṣṇaka?),4 the reciter, the Chikulaniya (inhabitant of Chikulana).


A 40 (759); PLATES VII, XXXIII


TEXT:

Chekulana Saghamitasa5 thabho dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The adjective Chikulaniya in No. A 39 proves that the name of the place was Chekulana or Chikulana, not Chikula as supposed by Barua-Sinha.

---

1The third akṣara is distinctly tā.
2The e-sign of the first tā is distinct, of the second tā only probable.
3See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
4See classification I, 4, a, 6 (Vaishnavite names) and special note.
5It is not impossible that there was an amśaśāra after the first sa.
6See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

A 41 (858); Plate VII


Text:

bhadata-Samikasa Therāk[ǔ]ṭiyaśa dānam

Translation:

Gift of the reverend Samika (Śvāmika), the inhabitant of Therākūṭa (Sthavirākūṭa).

Hultsch took Samika and Therākūṭa as names of two donors, and Lüders in his List was the first to explain the word Therākūṭiya as ‘inhabitant of Therākūṭa’. Lüders, however, followed Hultsch at that time, when taking Samika as the equivalent of Sk. Śyāmaka, apparently regarding Samika as an error for Samaka recurring in A 66 in bhadata-Samaka. In A 6 where Samika is the name of a lay-donor Lüders explains it by Śvāmika (as already List No. 244), and in view of the fact that there is no marked difference in naming laymen and Buddhist clergymen there is no reason why Śvāmika should not be the name of a bhadanta. The explanation of Samika by Śvāmika (Barua-Sinha) needs no discussion.

A 42 (718); Plate VII


Text:

1 Dabhinikāya Mahamukhisa dhitu Badhika-
2 ya bhichhuniya dānam

Translation:

The gift of the nun Badhikā (Baddhikā), the daughter of Mahamukhi (Mahāmukhī), the Dabhinikā (inhabitant of Darbhāna?).

Hultsch’s suggestion accepted by Barua-Sinha that Badhikāya might be a clerical mistake for Badhikāya is wrong. Badhikā is the female name corresponding to Badhaka occurring as the name of two different monks in the Sāṃchī inscriptions, List Nos. 484 and 633. The Sanskrit equivalent of Mahamukhīsa is hardly Mahāmukhyasya as assumed by Barua-Sinha. Female adjectives are frequently formed from names of places with the suffix -ikā. The name of the place must therefore be Dabhinā, in Sanskrit perhaps Darbhīṇa, but not Darbhā as stated by Barua-Sinha. A parallel place-name is Dharakina in the Sāṃchī inscription, List No. 259.

1 Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
2 The ś in the akṣara kā is not quite distinct; it could also be read n.
3 See classification I, 4, a, 5 (Śaivite names).
4 See classification II, 2, b (names derived from mental disposition and temperament). We take Badhikā characterising a female 'bound to' worldly desires.
5 See classification II, 1, a (names derived from parts of the body).
6 According to Barua-Sinha, in the Brahmapura- and a few other Purāṇas Darva or Darbha is mentioned as a country on the hills.
TEXT-TRANSLATION-NOTES: A 1-136

A 43 (806); PLATE XXIV

FRAGMENTARY inscription on a pillar, now at Batanmāra. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 138, No. 93, and Pl. LV; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 16, No. 43.

TEXT:

Pusadataye Nagarikaya bhīkhuniye† . . . .

TRANSLATION:

(The gift) of the nun Pusadatā (Pusyadattā), the Nagarikā (inhabitant of Nagarā).

As regards the restoration suggested by Barua-Sinha, see the note on No. A 124.

A 44 (806 a); PLATE XXVIII


TEXT:

Pusadataye Nāgarikāye bhīkhuniye

TRANSLATION:

(The gift) of the nun Pusadatā (Pusyadattā), the Nāgarikā (inhabitant of Nagarā).

This inscription first published by Mr. Sircar in 1948 is very similar to A 43. The differences are that in A 43 we read Nāgarikāya bhīkhuniye whereas the present inscription, according to Mr. Sircar, has Nāgarikāye bhīkhuniye. Mr. Sircar first read a doubtful sa at the end of the inscription, perhaps because he accepted the combination of A 43 and A 124, following a suggestion made by Barua-Sinha but rejected by Lüders under A 124. In his second article Dr. Sircar came to the conclusion that the epigraph ends with the word bhīkhuniye and translated the record: “(The gift of Pushyadattā, the nun of the city.”

A 45 (852); PLATE VII


† From Cunningham’s eye-copy. His transcript has Nagarikaya. Supply dānath at the end.
See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
Lüders, of course, had no knowledge of this new discovery. A 43 and A 44, both mentioning the place name Nagarā, were for a time rubbing not being available—considered to be identical, otherwise they would have been inserted after A 12.
As read by Mr. Sircar in his second article. Possibly the inscription has Nagarikaya as in A 43.
Note, however, that in our inscriptions the genitive sg.-ye is found elsewhere with the base bhīkhunti and not with bhīkhuni, see § 29 (III).
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

TEXT:
Na[m]d[i]nagarikaya Idadevāya dānāḥ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Idadevā (Indradevā), the Nādhinagarikā (inhabitant of Nandinagara).

A 46 (799); PLATE XXIV


TEXT:
1 Nāsika Gorakhiyā thabho dānāḥ
2 Vasukasa bhāriyaya

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is) the gift of Gorakhitā (Gorakhitā) from Nāsika; (of Gorakhitā) the wife of Vasuka.

A 47 (876); PLATE XXIV

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 142, No. 61., and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 32, No. 110.

TEXT:
Paḍelakasa Pusakasa suchi dānāḥ

TRANSLATION:
The rail-bar (is) the gift of Pusaka (Pushyaka), the Paḍelaka (inhabitant of Paḍela).

A 48 (878); PLATE XXIV

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 142, No. 63, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 32, No. 112.

TEXT:
[Pa]rakṣ[ī]kaya Sirimāyā dānāṁ

---
1 See classification I, 3, b (names referring to Vedic deities). In A 19 the name recurs as that of an inhabitant of Purikā.
2 This is the reading of Cunningham's eye-copy. In his transcript Cunningham reads gorakhiyā which appears to be the correct reading, and bhāriyā. Nāsika stands for Nāsika.
3 See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from animals and animal deities).
4 See classification II, 3, a (names derived from wealth).
5 Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
6 From the eye-copy of Cunningham.
7 See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
8 Barua-Sinha translates Paḍelaka as ‘the man of Pāṇḍya’ (?) which seems to be unfounded.
9 Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
10 From the eye-copy of Cunningham.
TRANSLATION:
The gift of Sīrimā (srimati), the Parakaṭikā (inhabitant of Parakaṭa).

A 49 (836); PLATE XXIV

On a rail-bar of the South-Western quadrant. Original lost. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 140, No. 21, and Pl. LV; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 21, No. 71.

TEXT:
Golāyā Pārikiniyā dānām

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Golā, the Pārikini (inhabitant of Parikina).

Barua-Sinha, following Cunningham, translate the inscription: ‘The gift of Pārikini from Golā’. As the epithet indicating the native place of the donor is placed sometimes before and sometimes after the personal name, and as Golā occurs as a female name in the Sānchī inscription List No. 596, there can be no doubt that here also Golā is the personal name. Pārikini then is probably derived from the name of a place. With Parikina may be compared Dhurakina in No. 259 of my List and Dabhikā, from which Dabhunikā is derived in No. A 42.

A 49a; Plate XXXIX


TEXT:
Tisā[yā Benakṣaṭikāyā dān[ā]

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Tisā (Tishya), the Benakṣaṭikā (inhabitant of Benakaṭa).

A 50 (721); PLATE VII


---

1See classification I, 4, b, 3 (names derived from minor deities).
2From Cunningham’s eye-copy which agrees with his transcript.
3See classification II, 1, b (names derived from appearance of the body).
4dāna may be a mistake for dāna = dānāth. The final anusvāra is sometimes not represented, see above § 25 (ii). It is hardly believable that dāna has been used in the plural number for dānāni.
5Benakaṭa is a place-name ending in asa like others mentioned above p. 7. In a Nāsik Buddhist Cave inscription, List No. 1123, we find Gotamiputra Śrī-Sadakṣarī (Gautamputra Śrī-Sudakṣara) called “lord (gaṇmin) of Benakaṭaka of Govadhana (Govardhana)”. According to Bimala Churn Lahiri’s Historical Geography of Ancient India, Paris [1954], p. 301, Benakaṭaka the place was situated on the Veya river in the Nāsik district. Nundo Lal Dey (The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, 2nd ed. 1927, p. 29) mentions “Benakataka” as “Warangal, the capital of Telengana or Andhra”; i.e. p. 28 he gives “Bena” as “the river Wain-Gaṅgā in the Central Provinces”, “a tributary of the Godāvari”.
4See AMAR., 1925/26, p. 148, Note 1, and p. 297, No. 48.
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

TEXT:
1 Baha[d]a[n]a[Jo]hira[natuno] Isi-
2 rakhitaputasa Ana[ndasa] thabho

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is the gift of) Ananda (Ananda), the son of Isirakhita (Rishirakshita), the grandson of Jahira (?) from Baha[da]a (Baha[d]a).

With Baha[d]a compare Ves[i]da in No. A 31. Barua-Sinha proposed to correct the first three words to Baha[d]a[Jo]ta[rirasa] dana[n, but the reading given above is absolutely certain as far as natuno is concerned. The names of the place and of the grandfather of the donor are not quite reliable, but the geographical name Baha[d]a[Jo]ta[rir may be cancelled.

A 51 (797); PLATE VIII


TEXT:
1 aya-Chulusa sutamttikasa Bhogavadha.
2 niyasa dana[na

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the venerable Chula (Kshudra), the student of the Sutrantas, the Bhogavadhanyas (inhabitant of Bhogavardhana).

A 52 (76); PLATE XXIV


TEXT:
1 Kosabeye[kaya] bhikhu[niya
2 Venuvagimiyaya Dhamarakhit-
3 yā dana[n

1 Barua-Sinha read Baha[d]a[Jo]ta[rirasanatana. The bracketed letters are blurred and doubtful, but ha is more probable than h. The fourth akshara is distinctly to, not go. The last two aksharas are clearly tau.
2 The second akshara is distinctly si.
3 See classification II, 2, a (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).
4 See classification I, 4, a, 3 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
5 The name has remained unclassified.
6 bhe has also the a-sign.
7 See classification II, 1, a (names derived from appearance of the body).
8 The term sutamttika of course refers to the study of the Suttapijaka, cf. PTSB, sub voce, Rhys Davids-Oldenberg, Vinaya Texts, Part I, p. XXX (SBE, XIII). The school of the Saurantikas, thought of by Hultsch and Barua-Sinha, did not arise before the beginning of the third century A.D. In Barua's later work (Barh. I, p. 46) the translation is 'well-versed in the Sutras'. The corresponding sutātika in Sāṃchi (List No. 635) is translated by Majumdar p. 297 'one who is versed in the Suttantas'. A nun versed in the sutras is called sutātikī (sautrāntikī) List Nr. 319, 352 (Sāṃchi).
9 This is the reading of Cunningham's eye-copy. His transcript reads: Kosameyakeya bhikhi[niya Venuvagimiyaya Dhamarakhita. The correct reading appears to be: Kosameyakeya (or Kosameyikaya) bhikhi[niya Venuvagimiyaya Dhamarakhita dana[n.


Translation:

The gift of the nun Dhamarakhätā (Dhamarakhätā),¹ the Kosabeyikā (native of Kausāmbi), the Venuvagāmiyā (inhabitant of Venukagrāma).

A 53 (859)*; Plate VIII


Text:
Sirisapada Isirakhitāya dānāṁ

Translation:
The gift of Isirakhitā (Rishirakhitā)² from Sirisapada (Śirishapada).

A 54 (804); Plate XXIV


Text:
1. Nadagirino bhānakasa Selapuraka-
2. sa thabho dānāṁ³

Translation:
The pillar (is) the gift of Nadagiri (Nandagiri)², the reciter, the Selapuraka (inhabitant of Sāilapara).

A person of the name of Naradagiri is mentioned as a donor in No. A 97; cf. also No. A 69, where the venerable Narada . . . is referred to.

A 54a; Plate XXVIII


Text:
.... girino bhānakasa bhātu .

Translation:
The gift of . . . ., the brother of (Nada)giri, the reciter.

The reciter whose name ended with the word girī is probably Nadagiri (Nandagiri),

¹See classification I, 1, b (Buddhist names).
²Liiders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
³See classification I, 4, b, 2 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
⁴From Cunningham's eye-copy. The transcript has Nandagarino and omits the sa of Selapurakasa.
⁵See classification II, 2, a (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).
DONATIONS BY INHABITANTS OF CERTAIN PLACES

35
donor of a pillar, mentioned in the inscription A 54. For bhātu cf. matu, dhitu p. XXVII (§ 33). In A 50 the Gen. sg. of natu is natuno. It is, however, impossible to read the traces of the akṣara following bhātu as no. The akṣara may have been pa or ha as Dr. Sircar has suggested, and represent the initial consonant of the name of the donor.

A 54b; PLATE XXVII


TEXT:

[Nā]garakhitasa cha mātu cha Kamuchukaye dānauṁ.

TRANSLATION:

Gift of Nagarakhita (Nāgarakhitā) as well as of (his) mother¹, the Kamuchukā (inhabitant of Kamuchu ?)².

Similarly it is recorded in No. A 96b that the mother of Goṣāla shared with her son in the expenses of a rail-bar.

¹ Cf. A 18, A 28, A 120.
² Dr. Kala regards Kamuchukā as the name of the mother, whereas Dr. Sircar reads the second part of the inscription: cha mātu Chakamuchukaye dānauṁ “and (his) mother Chakramochikā”. He notes: “The word cha possibly suggests that the present epigraph was the second of a set of two inscriptions, the first recording a gift of Nagarakhita, while the inscription under study records only the gift of his mother.”
3. A 55 DONATION BY A SCULPTOR (WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE NATIVE PLACE)*

A 55 (857)*; PLATE VIII


TEXT:
Budharakhitasa rupakārakasa dānam

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Budharakhita (*Budharakhita*),* the sculptor.
The name *Budharakhita* is found as that of a monk in A 57 and A 58.

---

*For donors following certain professions mentioned with reference to their native place see No. A 17 (*bhuddadesaka*) and A 22 (*aavārika*). In A 21 a donor is specified as *gahapati*.
*Lüders* treatment of this inscription is missing.
*See classification I, I, a (Buddhist names).
4. A 56-73 DONATIONS BY MONKS\(^1\)

(a) A 56-63 Monks having specific church titles\(^2\)

**TEXT:**

aya-Jātasa peṭakino suchi dānaṁ

**TRANSLATION:**

The rail-bar (is) the gift of the venerable (ārya) Jāta,\(^4\) who knows the Piṭakas.

**A 57 (867)\(^3\); Plate VIII**

**TEXT:**

Budharakhitas pa[m]cha-nekāyikasa dānaṁ

**TRANSLATION:**

The gift of Budharakhita (Buddharakshita),\(^5\) who knows the five nikāyas.

**A 58 (792); Plates IX, XXIX**


\(^1\) For donations by monks mentioned as inhabitants of certain places see No. A 8, A 17, A 38, A 39, A 41, A 51, A 54.

\(^2\) On the general importance of some of the church titles (*peṭakī, paṇichanekāyika, bhānaka*) cf. below p. 71 and notes. For monks having church titles mentioned with reference to their native place see No. A 51 (*sutaṭikā*), A 39 and A 54 (*bhānaka*).

\(^3\) Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.

\(^4\) See classification II, 3, a (names derived from birth).

\(^5\) Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.

\(^6\) See classification I, 1, a (*Buddhist names*).
TEXT:

1 bhadata-Budharakhita satupadana-
2 sa dana thabbo

TRANSLATION:

The pillar (is) the gift of the reverend Budharakhita (Buddharakshita) who has abandoned attachment.

The meaning of satupadana has not yet been ascertained. It does not seem to be a proper name, but rather denotes some clerical dignitary. Hultsch hesitatingly traced it back to Sk. sastrapadana and translated it ‘who is versed in sciences’, but although sata may stand for satthu, it is very improbable that the stra of sāstra should develop into lingual thā. Nor do I understand how upadāna could possibly have been used as an adjective. Barua-Sinha take satupadana as ‘a monumental Prakrit counterpart of the Pāli Satiṣṭhāṇika or Satipaṭṭhānika and the Sanskrit Sruṣṭivastabhāna or Sruṣṭivastabhānika’ (sic). I consider it unnecessary to discuss this explanation. In my opinion satupadana is an imperfect spelling for satupadana=Sk. śrīṣṭipadana, ‘who has abandoned attachment’. With sattā for satthu we may compare paricīpules such as mṛṭṭa=Skr. mṛṣṭa (D. II, 133), samatā=Skr. samatāstra (J. 322, 2), and with the whole term samavasatthēsana’, ‘one who has completely abandoned longing’ (D. III, 269; A. II, 41), and anupadāna ‘free from attachment’ or ‘clinging to existence’, frequently used of an Arhat.

A 59 (773); PLATES IX, XXXIV


TEXT:

bhadatasaya-Isipalitasabhānakasanavakamikasadanaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the reverend, the venerable Isipalita (Rishipālita)9, the reciter and superintendent of the works.

A 60 (787); PLATE IX

FRAGMENTARY inscription on the right outer face of the same pillar as No. B 55, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 28). Edited by Cunningham, SItBh. (1879), Pl. XIX (Pl. only);

1 See classification I, 1, 4, a (Buddhist names).
2 That this is the correct reading has been shown by Kern, Toev. II, 56; cf. esanā patinissatthā A. II, 42.
3 See classification I, 4, a, 3 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
The gift of . . . . mika.

The inscription seems to have consisted of about 16 *aksharas*, and it is possible that it recorded the gift of the venerable Isipālita, the superintendent of the works (*aya-Isipālita-sa navakamikasa dānaḥ*), just as the inscription on the corner pillar of the Western gate, see A 59. But the restoration must be taken for what it is worth.

A 61 (762); PLATE IX


Text:

*bhadaṁta-Valakasa bhanakasa dāna[m]* thabho

Translation:

The pillar (is) the gift of the reverend Valakasa, the reciter.

A 62 (738); PLATE IX


Text:

*aya-Isidinasa bhānakasa dānaḥ*

Translation:

The gift of the venerable Isidina (*Rishidatta*), the reciter.

---

1 Barua-Sinha: *bhānakasa*, but the *bhā* seems to have no ñ-sign.
2 Hultsch: *dāna*. The *anusvāra* is probable.
3 See classification I, 4, a, 6 (Vaishnavic names).
4 As observed by Hoernle, there is a hook or angle to the left of the *sa*, but I doubt that it has any meaning.
5 See classification I, 4, a, 3 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
Three sides of the pillar are decked with sculptures. Each face has three reliefs marked at the bottom by a railing and flanked, the uppermost by a palm-tree, and the lower ones by octagonal pillars with bell-shaped capitals. As this inscription is the only donative inscription on the pillar, it probably refers to the gift of the whole pillar, although the object of the donation is not stated.

A 63 (833); Plate XXV

On a rail-bar of the Southern gate. Original lost. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 140, No. 18, and Pl. LV; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 20, No. 68.

TEXT:

Kanhilasa bhānakasa dānaṃ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Kanhila (Krīshnāla), the reciter.

b A 64-73 Monks called bhadanta or aya

A 64 (850); Plate IX


TEXT:

bhadata-Devasena dānaṃ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the reverend Devasena.

A 65 (766); Plates IX, XXXI


TEXT:

bhadata-Mahilasa thabho dānaṃ

---

1 From Cunningham's eye-copy which agrees with his transcript.
2 See classification I, 4, a, 6 (Vaishnavite names).
3 Monks are also called bhadanta or aya when (a) their native place is mentioned and (b) specific church titles are given. For (a) see No. A 38 (bhadanta aya), A 41 (bhadantī), A 8 (aya); for (b) see A 39, A 38, A 59, A 61 (bhadantī), A 51, A 56, A 59, A 62 (aya).
4 Hultzsch and Barua-Sinha donāh. The horizontal stroke to the left of ā which gives the aksara the appearance of do is much thinner than the ā-stroke and probably accidental.
5 See classification I, 4, a, 1 (names referring to deities in general).
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The pillar (is) the gift of the reverend Mahila.¹

According to Lüders Mahila is probably a shortened form of a compound name such as Māhiplāti or Mahirakkhi. The suffix -(i)la, (i)lā is, however, common in personal names, s. Hilda, l.c. pp. 68 f., and above p. XXVIII on suffixes (9). Barua-Sinha’s derivation from Madhvi is phonetically impossible, the correction to Mihila is unnecessary.

A 66 (768); PLATE IX


TEXT:

bhadata-Samakasa thahbo dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The pillar (is) the gift of the reverend Samaka (Śyāmaka)².

Samakasa may be a clerical error for Samikasa, but it is more probably a defective writing for Sāmakasa, as Sāmaka occurs as the name of a monk also in A 73, and of different persons in the Nāsik inscription List No. 1126 and the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscription List No. 1337.

A 67 (842); PLATE X


TEXT:

aya-Apiṅkinakasa dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of the venerable Apiṅkaka (Apiṅkaka ?)³

Apiṅkaka is found again in the form Apiṅkaka as the name of a Buddhist monk in the Bhājā inscription, List No. 1081; Barua-Sinha’s derivation of the name from Sk. Aprakīra is quite unlikely.

A 68 (715); PLATE X


¹ See classification I, 4, a, 4 (names derived from minor deities).
² See classification II, 1, a (names derived from appearance of the body).
³ See classification II, 9, a (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth). apigirna “praised” is attested by lexicographers.

TEXT:
aya-Gorakhitasas thabho dānam

TRANSLATION:
The pillar is the gift of the venerable Gorakhita (Gorakshita).¹

A 69 (886)⁴; PLATE XXV

EDITED by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 2, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 35, No. 121.

TEXT:
aya-Nārīndra⁵

TRANSLATION:
(The gift of) the venerable Nārīnda (Nanda).⁴

A reciter Nādagiri (Nandagiri) is mentioned in A 54, and the name Nārīdagiri also occurs in A 97. Nāda, Nārīnda or Nārīnda by itself is found as a personal name in the inscriptions List Nos. 289, 1032, 1121, and 1345.

A 70 (690); PLATE X


TEXT:
aya-Nāgadevasa dānam

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the venerable Nāgadeva.⁵

A 71 (716); PLATES X, XXXII


¹See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
²Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
³From the eye-copy of Cunningham.
⁴See classification II, 2, a (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).
⁵See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
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Text:
aya-Paññhakasa thanbhō dānam

Translation:
The pillar (is) the gift of the venerable Paññhaka (Panthaka). ¹

A 72 (831); Plate X

On a rail-bar of the Southern gate, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (C.B. 6).
Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 140, No. 16, and Pl. LV; Hultzsch, ZDMG., Vol.
XL (1886), p. 72, No. 114, and Pl., and IA., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 236, No. 114; Barua-
Sinha, Bl. (1926), p. 20, No. 66.

Text:
aya-Punāvasuno suchī dānam

Translation:
The rail-bar (is) the gift of the venerable Punāvasu (Panarvasu).²

A 73 (800); Plate X

On a pillar of the North-Eastern quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 7).
Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 138, No. 88, and Pl. LV; Hultzsch, ZDMG., Vol.
XL (1886), p. 71, No. 97, and Pl., and IA., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 235, No. 97; Rama-
prasad Chanda, MASI., No. I (1919), p. 19, No. 6, and Pl.; Barua-Sinha, Bl. (1926),
p. 16, No. 42.

Text:
1 Maharasa amtevāsino aya-Sāma-
2 kasa thanbhō dānam

Translation:
The pillar (is) the gift of the venerable Sāmaka (Śyāmaka),³ the pupil of Mahara.⁴

The spelling with the long ā in the first syllable proves that Sāmaka is Sk. Śyāmaka,
not Śamaka, as suggested by Barua-Sinha, cf. note on No. A 66. Maharasa may be taken
as defective spelling for Mihiras as proposed by Barua-Sinha; their tentative equation of
Mahara with Sk. Madhvara is phonetically impossible.

¹See classification II, 3, a (names derived from birth).
²See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
³See classification II, 1, a (names derived from appearance of the body).
⁴See classification I, 3 a (names referring to Vedic deities).
5. A 74-80 DONATIONS BY NUNS

A 74 (761); Plate XI


TEXT:
Nāgaye bhichhuniye dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun Nāgā.

A 75 (870); Plate XI


TEXT:
Phagudevāye bhichhuniye dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun Phagudevā (Phalgudevā).

A 76 (840); Plate XI


TEXT:
Budharakhitāye dānāṁ bhichhuniye

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun Budharakhitā (Buddharakhitā).

A 77 (841); Plate XI


TEXT:
Bhutaye bhichhuniye dānāṁ

---

1 For nuns mentioned with reference to their native places see No. A 11, A 12, A 24, A 29, A 37, A 42-44, A 52.
2 See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).
3 See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
4 See classification I, 1, b (Buddhist names).
DONATIONS BY NUNS

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun Bhutā (Bhūtā)\(^1\).

A 78 (815); PLATE XXV

On a rail-bar of the South-Eastern\(^2\) quadrant. Original lost. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 139, No. 1, and Pl. LV; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 17, No. 49.

TEXT:
Sapagutaye bhichhuniy[e] dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun Sapagutā (Sarpauguptā)\(^4\).

A 79 (851); PLATE XI


TEXT:
... ... kaya bhichhuniya dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of the nun ... ... kā.

A 80 (772); PLATE XI


TEXT:
1 ..... to\(^5\) bhikhuniyā thabho
2 dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:
The pillar (is) the gift of a nun from .......

The syllable to is probably the ending of the ablative of a place-name. Barua-Sinha tried to restore the inscription by connecting it with the fragment No. A 126, but their reading Āvāsīkīya bhikhuniyā is absolutely imaginary, as the letter preceding bhikhuniyā can on no account be read ya.

\(^1\)See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and minor deities).
\(^2\)W. Quadrant\(^*\) in the heading of List Nos. 815-826 on p. 139 of Cunningham’s work is a mistake.
\(^3\)The correct ‘S. E. Quadrant’ is found on Plate LV.
\(^4\)From Cunningham’s eye-copy which agrees with his transcript.
\(^5\)See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and minor deities).
\(^6\)Cunningham read raśa, but the last akṣara is distinctly to and the preceding akṣara cannot have been ra.
6. A 81-113 DONATIONS BY MEN (WITHOUT REFERENCE TO NATIVE PLACE OR PROFESSION)¹

A 81 (824); PLATE XI


TEXT:
Aimutasa danaṁ

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Aimutsa (Aimitukta).²

A 82 (864)³; PLATE XI


TEXT:
Avisanasa danaṁ

TRANSLATION:
The name of the donor reappears in A 83.

A 83 (865)⁴; PLATE XII


TEXT:
(A)v[i]sanasa⁵ danaṁ

¹ For donations of men whose native places have been mentioned see No. A 6, A 7, A 13, A 23, A 25, A 26, A 30, A 31, A 36, A 40, A 47, A 50. A few inscriptions referring to men give the profession as well as the native place, cf. No. A 17, A 22; in A 21 the donor is characterized as gābapati. A 55 mentions the profession of the male donor, but not the native place.
² See classification II, 4, a (names derived from plants).
³ Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
⁴ See classification II, 2, a (names derived from mental disposition and temperament). Instead of a-vishāpa “not sorrowful” the name could also be interpreted as a-viśāpa “not having horns”.
⁵ Avisanasa has been read by all previous editors, but our estampage does not bring out any trace of a in the beginning, whereas Cunningham's eye-copy shows the a clearly.
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TRANSLATION:

The gift of Avisana (Avishana).

The donor is apparently the same as in A 82.

A 84-85 (828-829); PLATE XII

On a rail-bar of the Southern gate, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (C.B. 27). The inscription is engraved twice, above and below the medallion. The upper inscription (a) is carved in extremely cursive characters, while the lower inscription (b) is in ornamental script. The lower inscription was edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 140, No. 14, and Pl. LV; Barua-Sinha, BIF. (1926), p. 20, No. 64. Both inscriptions were edited by Hultsch, ZDMG., Vol. XL (1886), p. 75, No. 151, and p. 72, No. 112, and Pl., and IA., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 238, No. 151, and p. 236, No. 112. Anderson, Cat., Vol. I, p. 55, states that there is a third inscription to the same effect on another rail-bar (C.B. 50).

TEXT:

a Isānasa dāna
b Isānasa dāna

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Isāna (Īśāna).

A 86 (830); PLATE XII


TEXT:

Isidatasa dānapī

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Isidata (Rishidatta).

A 87 (868); PLATE XII


TEXT:

Isirakhita suchī dānapī

TRANSLATION:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Isirakhita (Rishirakhita).

A donor of the name of Isirakhita reoccurs No. A 88 (cf. A 53).

1 See classification I, 4, a, 5 (Śaivite names).
2 See classification I, 4, a, 3 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
3 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
A 87a; Plate XXVIII


TEXT:

...[sira]kh[i]tasa thabho dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The pillar (is) the gift of (I)sirakhita (Rishrakshita).

A donor, Isirakhita by name, occurs No. A 50, A 87 and A 88. The restoration (I)[si]-remains doubtful. The word -rakhita as second part of a compound is very common in personal names.

A 88 (848); Plate XII


TEXT:

Isirakhitasa dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Isirakhita (Rishrakshita).³

A donor of the name of Isirakhita also occurs No. A 50 and A 87.

A 89 (832); Plate XXV


TEXT:

Gāgamitasa suchi dānaṁ⁴

TRANSLATION:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Gāgamitra (Gaṅgāmitra).⁵

As stated by Cunningham, the name of the donor may be traced back to Gaṅgāmitra or Gargamitra, but Gaṅgāmitra or, with the usual shortening of the final vowel of the first member of the compound, Gaṅgamitra would seem to be the more probable form; cf. Gagaimata (for Gaṅgadate) in the Sāñchi inscription List No. 390.

¹Sircar reads: ...[ye Re]kh[i]tasa.
²See classification I, 1-4.
³See classification I, 4, a, 3 (names referring to Rishi-worship).
⁴From Cunningham’s eye-copy which agrees with his transcript.
⁵See classification I, 4, a, 4 (names derived from minor deities).
ON DONATIONS BY MEN

A 90 (853); PLATE XII

On a rail-bar, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 141, No. 38, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BL. (1926), p. 24, No. 88. There are two inscriptions, one (a) in the ordinary script of the time, and another (b) in thin and badly shaped characters.

TEXT:

a  Gosālasa dānāṁ

b  Tosālasa' mātā'  

TRANSLATION:

a  The gift of Gosāla (Gaśāla) .

b  Of the mother of [G]osāla (Gaśāla).

Probably the first inscription is the original one, and the second was added as an afterthought to record that the mother of Gaśāla shared in the expenses of the rail-bar.

A 91 (863)*; PLATE XII


TEXT:

Chulanasasa dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Chulana.

A 92 (855)†; PLATE XII


TEXT:

Jeṭhabhadrasa dānāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Jeṭhabhadra (Jyesṭhabhadra).  

---

* There can be little doubt that the engraver wanted to write Gosāla, but the first akshara is a plain to. The hook on the left of the sā is indistinct.

† The second akshara seems to be ta, not tu; cf. § 33 (l).

‡ See classification II, 3, a (names derived from birth).

§ Lūders' treatment of this inscription is missing.

¶ See classification II, 1, a (names derived from the appearance of the body). Cf. the remarks on Chula in A 17.

° See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
A 93 (834); Plate XIII


Text:

Devarakhita [dānāṃ]'

Translation:

The gift of Devarakhita (Devarakshita).  

A 94 (727); Plate XIII


Text:

Dhamagutasa dānāṃ thabho

Translation:

The pillar (is) the gift of Dhamaguta (Dharmagupta).  

According to Anderson, Cat., Vol. I, p. 32, this side of the pillar bears the statue of an Apsaras playing a seven-stringed harp.

A 95 (734); Plate XIII


Text:

Dhamarakhitasa dānāṃ

Translation:

The gift of Dhamarakhita (Dharmarakshita).  

A 96 (845); Plate XIII

On a rail-bar, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (C.B. 35). Edited by Cunningham, 

1 The last word which is a little blurred already in Hultzsch’s photograph seems to have disappeared now.
2 See classification I, 4, a, 1 (names referring to deities in general).
3 See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).
DONATIONS BY MEN


TEXT:

Dhutasa suchi dāno

TRANSLATION:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Dhuta (Dhûrta).¹

Barua-Sinha trace Dhuta back to Sk. Dhûta. I see no reason why it should not go back to Sk. Dhûrta as suggested by Hultzsch. The masculine form dāno is probably a clerical error.

A 97 (898)²: PLATE XXV

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 15, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 37, No. 132.

TEXT:

[Naṁ]dagirino dā(nama)³

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Namdagiri (Nandagiri).⁴

A ‘reciter’ (bhānaka) of the name of Nadagiri is mentioned as a donor in No. A 54.

A 98 (729); PLATES XIII, XLI

On a pillar of the South-Eastern quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P. 14), above the inscription B 47. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 133, No. 18, and Pl. XXV and LIII; Hultzsch, ΖDMG., Vol. XL (1886), p. 64, No. 37 (first part); and Pl., and IA., Vol. XXI (1892), p. 230, No. 37 (first part); Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 8, No. 16.

TEXT:

Pusaasa thanbho dânaṁī

TRANSLATION:

The pillar (is) the gift of Pusa (Pushya).⁵

A 99 (883)²; PLATE XIII


¹See classification II, 2, a (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).
²Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
³From the eye-copy of Cunningham.
⁴See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
TEXT:
[Bodhiguj]asa d[ā]naṁ

Translation:
The gift of Bodhiguta (Bodhigupta)¹.

A 100 (874)*; Plate XIII


TEXT:
Seriyā² putasa Bhāranidevasa dānaṁ

Translation:
The gift of Bhāranideva (Bharaṇīdeva)³, the son of Seri (Sri).

The earlier editors read Seriyāputa as a compound, but as Seriyā is clearly a genitive sg. of Siri (Sri) we prefer to separate the two words. Barua-Sinha take Seriyāputa as a place-name and translate ‘from Śriputra’. The words indicating the places of origin of the donors, however, are always put in the ablative, and in the genitive only, when a derivative in -ka (-ikā) or -iya is formed from them.

A 101 (847); Plate XIII


TEXT:
Mitasa⁶ suchi dānaṁ

Translation:
The rail-bar (is) the gift of Mitas (Mitra)⁴.

The inscription was wrongly identified by Hultsch with No. A 111.

A 102 (827); Plate XIV


---

¹ See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).
² Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
³ The e-mark of ze is quite distinct, but the estampage shows also a trace of an i-mark. Did the writer add this i-mark as a correction? The change of i to e is observed only in Kosabeyeka in No. A 52, where Lüders is inclined to correct the reading of Cunningham’s eye-copy to Kosabeyika.
⁴ See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
⁵ See classification I, 4, b, 3 (names derived from minor deities).
⁶ The reading Mitasa seems possible, the right limb of the ta being elongated.
⁷ See classification I, 3, a (names referring to vedic deities).
DONATIONS BY MEN


TEXT:

Muḍasa dānam

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Muḍa (Muḍa)'

A 103 (873)*; PLATE XXV

Edited by Cunningham, StBl. (1879), p. 142, No. 58, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 31, No. 107.

TEXT:

Yamī[ṣa]sā sā......

TRANSLATION:

(The gift) of Yamīta (?)......

A 104 (879)*; PLATE XXV


TEXT:

Vijitakasa suchi dānam

TRANSLATION:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Vijitaka.

A 105 (846); PLATE XIV

On a rail-bar, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Edited by Cunningham, StBl. (1879),

*See classification II, 1, a (names derived from the appearance of the body).

*Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.

*From the eye-copy of Cunningham. Barua-Sinha correct and restore the rest of the inscription as suchi dānam, i.e., however, is quite distinct in Cunningham's copy.

*The translations of Barua-Sinha. The rail-gift of Yamīta', 'The rail-gift of Yamendra' need no discussion. The name has remained unclassified.

*From the eye-copy of Cunningham. An inked impression received by Dr. D. C. Sircar, Ootacamund, in September 1959 shows that Cunningham's eye-copy gives the correct reading. In an article prepared for EI., Vol. XXXIII (1959/60) - kindly made available to us - Dr. Sircar says: "In the word suchi, the letter ē had been originally written for ch, though an attempt was later made by the engraver to rectify the error by adding a vertical stroke to the right lower end of ē. There is a mark at the upper left corner of the letter which, taken with the sign for medial i, looks like the medial sign for i as found in slightly later epigraphs. But the mark appears to be due to a flaw in the stone".

*See classification II, 3, a (names derived from birth).

**TEXT:**

Yakhilasa suchi dāna

**TRANSLATION:**

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Yakhila (*Yakhila*).  

A 106 (866)*; **PLATE XIV**


**TEXT:**

Sa[m]ghamitasa bodhichakasa dānaṁ

**TRANSLATION:**

(This is) the gift of a wheel of enlightenment (*bodhichakra*) by Sārīgahamita (*Sārīgahamita*).

*Sārīgahamita* or *Sārīgahamita* occurs as the name of a donor also in No. A 40 and probably in No. A 107.

A 107 (895)*; **PLATE XXV**


**TEXT:**

(Sam)ghamī(tasa dānaṁ)*

**TRANSLATION:**

The gift of Sārīgahamita (*Sārīgahamita*).  

For the donor’s name cf. No. A 106.

A 108 (844); **PLATE XIV**


*See classification I, 4, a, 2 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).

*In other cases, where the gift is specified as *suchi, thabhe, thabha*, the object of donation is put in the nominative. The genitive in *bodhichakasa* is an exception and induced Barua-Sinha to take the word as an epithet used in apposition to *Sārīgahamita*, ‘characterizing a tendency towards the ideal of Buddhahood’.  It is, however, not even evident from the inscription that *Sārīgahamita* belonged to the order of monks.

*From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The fragment consists only of the two letters *gla* and *mi* and a rest of the *akshara* preceding *gla*, not to be clearly deciphered. The restoration is quite conjectural.

*See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).

TEXT:
Sagharakhatasa m[ā]tāpituna aṭhāyā dānam

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Sagharakita (Sāṅgharakhita) for the sake of his parents.

A 109 (843); PLATE XIV


TEXT:
Saghilasa dāna[m] suchi [cl]...

TRANSLATION:
The rail-bar (is) the gift of Saghila (Sāṅghila)'.

A 110 (849); PLATE XIV


TEXT:
Sirimasa dānam

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Sirima (Srīmat)'

A 111 (846a); PLATE XIV

On a rail-bar, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (No. 148). Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 140, No. 32, and Pl. LVI.

TEXT:
Sihasa suchi dānam

TRANSLATION:
The rail-bar (is) the gift of Siha (Śīnha)'.

---

1 See classification I, I, a (Buddhist names).
2 This letter, the upper part of which is quite distinct, has not been noticed by the previous editors, perhaps the writer wanted to inscribe dīnāha here, as this word is normally put after the object of donation, but having found that it was written already, he stopped inscribing it.
3 See classification I, 4, a, 4 (names derived from minor deities).
4 See classification I, 2, A, c (names derived from signs of zodiac).
A 112 (880)¹; Plate XIV


**Text:**

1 ...... [ka]sa dānāṁ [a]tanā
2 cha [ka]la

**Translation:**

The gift of ...... [ka], and made by himself.

The relief containing this inscription (carried away to Uchahara) is a replica of the scene described under B 39. It presents the procession of king Prasenajit of Kosala around the Dharmasāla erected as a memorial of Buddha's first preaching in the city of Sravasti. The edifice, the wheel and the two figures on both sides of the wheel are nearly the same as those in the relief of the southern gate. A stone seat, however, in front of the wheel, on both sides of which a woman is kneeling, is added here. The standing figures are bigger than the representations of the kneeling women and this perhaps characterizes them as gods. In both reliefs a procession moves around the edifice. To the right, a chariot on which two men are standing and which is drawn by two horses is seen. To the left, a man on horse-back rides through the entrance gate. In front of him an elephant goes having a man on its back, shown in side-view in a very clumsy way. The elephant with its trunk gets hold of the branch of a tree hanging above.

On the roof of the edifice stands our inscription, the beginning of which is destroyed. Cunningham read it as ...... sa dānāṁ Atenā Charata; Barua-Sinha divide the inscription into a donative inscription and a "Jātaka label", and, remembering the words attanā marantāpi in the Vidūḍabhavatthu of the DhA., change the last words of the inscription to atanā marantinā. They remark, "The recorded scene is apparently that of Vidūḍabhā's invasion of Kapilavastu and non-violent attitude of the Śākyas." For the curious interpretations required to bring this explanation in union with the real depiction in the scene, the reader may look up Barua's work (Barh., II, p. 48 ff.).

The occurrence of the word dānāṁ clearly shows that the inscription does not refer to the scene represented in the relief, but that it is only a donative inscription emphasizing that besides paying the cost of the stone the donor himself had carved the relief.

A 113 (893)²; Plate XXV

Edited by Cunningham, StBh., (1879) p. 143, No. 10, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 36, No. 128.

**Text:**

...... tarasa..³

**Translation:**

(The gift) of ...... tara (?).

¹ Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
² I, 358: sangāsambuddhāsas pana hāsikā avattmahātākā nāma [atanā marantāpi pare jātita na vonopenī]
³ The relations of the completely enlightened one, however, are such who do not kill the enemies. Being put to death themselves, they do not deprive others of their life."
⁴ Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
⁵ From the eye-copy of Cunningham; the inscription is quite fragmentary.
7. A 114 - 128 DONATIONS BY WOMEN (WITHOUT REFERENCE TO NATIVE PLACE)\(^1\)

A 114 (822); Plate XV


TEXT:
Ujjhikāye dāna

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Ujjhikā (*Ujjhikā*)\(^2\).

A 115 (854); Plate XXV


TEXT:
Kachula[ya]... ... bhāriyāya dānam\(^3\)

TRANSLATION:
The gift of Kachulā (*Kachulā* ?), the wife of.....

The four or five *aksaras* missing before *bhāriyāya* must have contained the name of the husband of the donatrix, whose own name seems to have been Kachulā, cf. Chāpadēvāya Revatimitabhāriyāya No. A 34. Barua-Sinha’s restoration is wrong.

A 116 (871)\(^4\); Plate XV


TEXT:
Koḍāya\(^5\) Yakhyā dānam

---

\(^1\) For donations of women whose native places have been mentioned see No. A 9 (fragmentary), A 10, A 14, A 15, A 18-20, A 27, A 28, A 32-35, A 45, A 46, A 48, A 49, A 53.

\(^2\) See classification II, 2, b (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).

\(^3\) From Cunningham’s eye-copy. In the transcript the first word is given as *Kachulasi*, but the fourth *aksara* may be a mutilated *ja*.

\(^4\) See classification II, 1, b (names derived from dress).

\(^5\) Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.

\(^6\) To the right of the lower portion of the letter *d* the estampage shows a dot which could be read as *n* if it were not so low. It is perhaps only accidental. *Koḍāya* is probably a clerical error for *Kodiya*. 
Translation:

The gift of Yakhī (Yakṣī)', the Koḍāyā.

Lüders in his List translates this inscription as 'gift of a yakṣī (yakṣī) by Koḍā (Koḍā)', taking yakṣī as the object of donation' and Koḍā as the donor. That a yakṣī is the object of the gift is not probable as the inscription is not attached to a pillar. On the other hand Yakṣī occurs as the name\(^1\) of a nun not less than three times in the Brāhmaṇ inscriptions, see List Nos. 254, 344, and 500. For the interpretation of Koḍā as a woman belonging to the Koḍa or Koliya tribe cf. Lüders' explanation of Koḍi̱yāmi in A 14, A 15 and of Koḍāyā in No. B 72. A Koḍa Kalavāḍa also appears in the Vakāla stone inscription, List No. 971.

A 117 (872)\(^4\); Plate XIV


Text:

Ghosāye dānāṁ

Translation:

The gift of Ghosā (Goshā).\(^5\)

A 118 (823); Plate XV


Text:

(Dha)marakhitaya\(^6\) dānā suchi

Translation:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Dhamarakhitā (Dharmarakhitā).\(^7\)

A 119 (826); Plates XV, XL

On a rail-bar of the South-Eastern quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (C.B. 59). The inscription is incised in continuation of No. B 44. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879),

---

\(^{1}\) See classification I, 4, b, 1 (names derived from spirits and animal deities).

\(^{2}\) The only case where the object of donation is not put in the nominative is bodhihakasa in No. A 106.

\(^{3}\) Barua-Sinha also take Yakṣī as a personal name although they translate Koḍāyā as 'from Kunda (?).'

\(^{4}\) Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.

\(^{5}\) See classification II, 1, b (names derived from appearance of the body and from voice).

\(^{6}\) The dha which Cunningham gives in his transcript and his eye-copy is now broken off.

\(^{7}\) See classification I, 1, b (Buddhist names).
DONATIONS BY WOMEN


TEXT:

Nadutaraya dāna suchi

TRANSLATION:

The rail-bar (is) the gift of Nadutarā (\( \text{Nandottarā} \)).

A 120 (821); PLATE XV


TEXT:

Dhamaguta-matu* Pusadevaya dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Pusadevā (\( \text{Pusiyadevā} \)), the mother of Dhamaguta (\( \text{Dharmagupta} \)).

A 121 (875)*; PLATE XV


TEXT:

Mitadevāye dānaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The gift of Mitadevā (\( \text{Mitrayadevā} \)).

A 122 (862)*; PLATE XV

Rail inscription, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Edited by Cunningham, \( \text{StBH.} \) (1879), p. 141, No. 47, and Pl. LVI; Hultsch, \( \mathcal{Z} \text{DMG.} \), Vol. XL (1886), p. 74, No. 139, and Pl., and \( \text{IA}. \), Vol. XXI (1892), p. 238, No. 139; Barua-Sinha, \( \text{BL}. \) (1926), p. 27, No. 97.

TEXT:

Samidatāya dānaṁ

---

*See classification II, 2, b (names derived from mental disposition and temperament).
*Hultsch \( \text{Dhaka[m]na-} \).
*See classification I, 2, A, b (names derived from constellations).
*See classification I, 1, a (Buddhist names).
*See classification I, 3, b (names referring to vedic deities).
*Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
TRANSLATION:

The gift of Samidattā (Svāmidattā)†.

A 123 (758); Plate XV

On a pillar of the South-Western quadrant, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (NS. 6500)‡. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 135, No. 47, and Pl. LIV; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 11, No. 20§.

TEXT:

Sonāya dānaṁ thabhā†

TRANSLATION:

The pillars (are) the gift of Sonā (Śravaṇa)‡.

The gift of more than one pillar by the same person is recorded also in the inscriptions A 25, A 27, A 29, A 124.

A 124 (803); Plate XXV

Fragmentary inscription on a pillar, now at Batanmāra. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 138, No. 90, and Pl.; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 16, No. 43.

TEXT:

... sakāya thabhā dānaṁ§

TRANSLATION:

The pillars (are) the gift of sakā.

The inscription appears to be fragmentary, but I see no reason whatever why it should be combined with No. A 43, as suggested by Barua-Sinha. Sakā, moreover, does not sound like a personal name, and the term bhūchhami Sakā, 'the Buddhist nun', occurs nowhere, neither at Bhārhat nor in any other inscription.

A 125 (899)†; Plate XXV

Edited by Cunningham StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 16, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha BI. (1926), p. 37, No. 133.

TEXT:

... yaya dānaṁ§.

---

†See classification I, 4, b, 4 (Saivite names). Barua-Sinha think of Samidattā besides Svāmidattā.
‡See ASIAR. 1925-26, p. 148, Note 1, and Pl. LVIII d (above female figure).
§Barua-Sinha, BI. p. 100, No. 48 a, give an additional inscription Sṛyāya dāna thabhā, which they translate as 'the gift of Śrīyā (Śrīyā)—a pillar'. This inscription is probably the same as A 123 where they read thabhā instead of thabhā. As no one else has noted this additional inscription it has not been treated by us separately.

The second akṣhara is distinctly bhā, not bha, as given in Cunningham’s eye-copy. The vertical stroke at the bottom of bhā appears to be accidental.

See classification I, 2, a, b (names derived from constellations).

From Cunningham’s eye-copy which shows thabhā, whereas the transcript has thabhā.

Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.

From the eye-copy of Cunningham.
DONATIONS BY WOMEN

Translation:
The gift of ... yā'.

A 126 (887)*; Plate XXVI

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 4, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, Bl. (1926), p. 35, No. 122.

Text:
Avāsikā ... 3

Translation:
(Gift of ?) Avāsikā (?) 4 ...

A donor of the name Āvāsika from Ājanāva occurs in Lüders' List No. 619.

A 127 (903)*; Plate XXVI


Text:
1 Ko... dalākiye-
2 y[o] dana ṭanachakamapari-
3 [repo]6

Translation:
The plastering of the ṭaṇa-walk (is) the gift of Ko... dalāki(?).

Barua-Sinha divide this inscription into two parts and explain it as koladalākiyāya dāṇah "The gift of Koladalākhya (?)" and Vanacarīkamo Pārīrēyo "The woodland resort Pārīleya". On the latter inscription they add the following remark: "The label seems to have been attached to a scene of the grassy woodland, where the Buddha spent a rainy season, being waited upon and guarded by the elephant Pārīleyyaka or Pāreraka ... . The story of this elephant is given in the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya-Piṭaka, the Kosambi-Jātaka of the Jātaka-Comy. (F. No. 428), and the Kosambakavatthu of the Dhammapada-Comy.".

Lüders, whose treatment of the inscription has not come to our hands, remarks, while dealing with the chaṅkamas (i.e.), that probably a third chaṅkama was depicted in Bhārḥut.

1 Barua-Sinha propose to combine our fragment with the inscription No. A 35 where the usual dāṇah is missing. This is quite conjectural.
2 Lüders' treatment of this inscription is missing.
3 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The right part of the inscription is broken off.
4 Perhaps the name means: 'one who has a residence'. Accordingly it has been classified under II, 3, b (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth).
5 Barua-Sinha suggest to complete the inscription as Āvāsikā (ya bhikkhunīya dāṇah) "The gift of a nun of the local monastic abode." Their reference to āṅgika-bhikkhu 'resident monk' which is opposed to āṅgika-bhikkhu 'visiting monk' in this connection does not give sufficient support to the restoration proposed by them.
6 From Cunningham's eye-copy.
He refers to our inscription of which he says that in fact it seems to contain the word chakama, but that the rest of it cannot be deciphered at the moment. According to him the explanation of Barua-Sinha, referred to above, is not convincing.

The tentative translation given above takes the latter part of the inscription as specifying the gift of Ko., dalâki (?), as is done in other Bharhut inscriptions where we find the mention of pillars (thabha) and bars (suci) as gifts of certain individuals. It presupposes that there was a chaṇḍakama, in the immediate vicinity of the stūpa, on which the inscription was carved, when the plastering (parīṣepa - parilepa) was done. It is difficult to explain the word ṭana by itself. If we could take the half-circle in Cunningham's eye-copy, read as ō, as a full circle, and read it as th, then it is possible to explain ṭhana=ṭhāna<Sk. sṭhāna. The word sṭhānachāṇḍakama would then mean 'the spot to walk up and down (chaṇḍakama) at the place (sṭhāna) (of the Stūpa)'. Linguistically it is also possible that ṭana stands for ṭhāna, as loss of aspiration is found in the case of dh>d in the following proper names: Asaṅga B 64, Virudhaka- B 4, and Daṇḍakama- B 77.

A 128 (889)*; Plate XXVI

Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 143, No. 6, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, BI. (1926), p. 36, No. 124.

TEXT:

Chaṇḍā...*

TRANSLATION:

(The gift of ?) Chaṇḍā (Chaṇḍrā)*.

Chadā (Chandrā) is found in B 2 as the name of a Yakṣī and in List No. 1276 as the name of an upāsikā.

---

* Lödèrs' treatment of this inscription is missing.
* From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The inscription is broken off at the right.
* See classification I, 4, b, 3 (names derived from minor deities).
8. A 129-136 UNCLASSIFIED FRAGMENTARY DONATIVE INSCRIPTIONS

A 129 (689); Plate XXVI

Fragmentary inscription on a pillar of a gateway, now at Batanmâra. Edited by Cunningham, _StBh._ (1879), p. 128, No. 3, and Pl. LIII; Barua-Sinha, _Bl._ (1926), p. 3, No. 3.

**TEXT:**

1 hena . . . . . . .
2 torana cha . . . . . .
3 kata

The inscription apparently recorded the gift of a gateway, but no connected translation is possible. Cf. No. A 1 and A 2.

A 130 (892); Plate XXVI

Edited by Cunningham, _StBh._ (1879), p. 143, No. 9 and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, _Bl._ (1926), p. 36, No. 127.

**TEXT:**

1 . . . tu rajan[o] adhirajaka . . .
2 . . . yata...

**TRANSLATION:**

(Gift of the ?). . . . of the king (rajan), the supreme king (adhiraja ?)...

A 131 (883); Plate XXVI

Edited by Cunningham, _StBh._ (1879), p. 143, No. 5, and Pl. LVI; Barua-Sinha, _Bl._ (1926), p. 35, No. 123.

**TEXT:**

Mahâ[da] . . .

**TRANSLATION:**

(Gift of ?) Mahâ[da] . . .

---

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copy. The transcript has toranam (i.e. toranami).
2 Lidenes’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
3 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The inscription which runs in two lines is broken off on both sides.
4 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The inscription is broken off to the right.
5 Barua-Sinha’s completion of the inscription as Mahâdeva ova danam. ‘The gift of Mahâdeva’ is no more than a suggestion. Mahâdeva occurs in B 62 and B 81 as a designation of the Buddha.
A 132 (890); Plate XXVI

**Text:**

Satika…

**Translation:**

(The gift of) Satika (*Śvātika*)…

Compound names having Sati or Sāti (*Ścāti*) as first member are found at different places in the Brāhma inscriptions, cf. Lüders’ *List s.v.*

A 133 (900); Plate XXVI

**Text:**

. . . [pa]chasa na

**Translation:**

(The gift?) of . . . [pa]cha

A 134 (894); Plate XXVI

**Text:**

. . . yasinisa yāni…

**Translation:**

(The gift?) of . . . yasini, the Yāni…

A 135 (896); Plate XXVI

1 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing.
2 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The right part of the inscription is broken off.
3 See classification I, 2, A, a (names derived from constellations).
4 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The left part of the inscription is broken off.
5 This translation is only a tentative one. It assumes that the letter dā is left out before na and that this inscription was to end in (dā)na(m). Barua-Sinha interpret the inscription as *pānchāśanāṁ* ‘the five seats’ and see therein a reference to a ‘scene of the five spots in Uruvilvā, where the Buddha stayed five weeks, one week on each spot, after attainment of Bodhihood’. If the inscription would refer to the five seats we should expect *śāmīni* and not *śasānāṅk*; moreover there is no mentioning of specific seats of the Buddha during his stay in Uruvilvā but of his taking seat under different trees, cf. Waldschmidt, *Vergleichende Analyse des Catuṣparīṣudātra*, Festschrift Schubring, Hamburg 1951, p. 87 f.
6 From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The inscription is broken off on both sides.
7 This translation is a tentative one. Lüders in his *List* said: ‘No sense can be made out’. Barua-Sinha have ‘The gift of Yānka (the inhabitant of a place, the name of which is missing except the last three syllables) yasini’.
TEXT:
...sā Kusu...

TRANSLATION:
(The gift of ?) Kusu(ma ?)... from (Vedi)sā (?).

A 136 (757); PLATE XV


TEXT:
Yasika....

Yasika⁴ may be the name of the Yaksha figured on the pillar. It could also be that of the donor, although the word is not found elsewhere as a personal name and it is not even certain that it was the beginning of the inscription.

¹ From the eye-copy of Cunningham. The inscription is broken off on both sides.
² The translation is no more than a conjecture.
３ I am unable to state where the stone bearing the inscription is figured. In Barua's text it is called: Scene 64⁴. On his Plate LIX we are informed that No. 64⁴ is No. 65 of the Plate. But the statue does not agree with the description. The Yaksha does not stand with joined hands on a bearded and human-faced quadruped, but with the right hand raised on a sea-monster.
⁴ Under the assumption that the name is to be derived from yatis, 'fame' it has been classified under II, 3, a (names derived from wealth, fame, and birth).
TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

PART B

INSCRIPTIONS DESCRIBING THE SCULPTURAL REPRESENTATIONS

(a) THE SCULPTURAL REPRESENTATIONS AND THE TEXTUAL TRADITION.

The question, whether the artists of Bhārhat worked according to the Pāli Jātaka collection or not, has been answered in the affirmative by Bühler1 and in the negative by Minayeff2 and von Oldenburg.3 Foucher4 is of the opinion that although a literary source akin to the Pāli collection was followed, this could not have been the Pāli collection itself. His argument—which I am going to treat in detail—rests on three grounds: firstly, the Jātakas in the labels and in the Pāli-texts have different titles; secondly, the labels are written in a dialect differing from the Pāli; thirdly, several of the stories represented cannot be found in the Pāli collection.

1. I cannot give any value to the first of the above-mentioned reasons.5 The titles in the Jātaka collection are late, which may be concluded from the fact that they sometimes are based on a misunderstanding of the text. E.g. J. 341 bears the title Kaṇḍarījātaka. The name Kaṇḍari, however, is based, as mentioned in our treatment of No. B 60, on the false separation of the words in Gāthā 21 of J. 536, and in reality is the same as in the label of the Bhārhat relief viz. Kaṇḍarikī. The titles of the Jātakas often differ in the manuscripts of the Athavānpanā too. In Burmese, the Mūgapakkhaṭ. (538) is called Temiyaj., and the Mahāummagga. (546) appears as Mahosadhaṭ. For Guṇaj. (157) at least some Burmese manuscripts give Śīhaj., as well as Rajovāṭaj. for Mahākapijj. (407) and Chandakumbaraj. for Kaṇḍahāṣaj. (542). In some Sinhalese manuscripts Romakaj. (277) is styled Pāṭapajj. Also the commentator of the Jātaka himself, when alluding to the Jātakas, often uses titles, different from those standing in the text. Finally the occurrence of smaller differences in the titles may be considered as shortenings or extensions of them. E.g. the commentator mentions the Sammodamāṇaj. (33) as Vaṭṭajak. in Vol. V, 414, 27, the Vānarindaj. (57) as Kumbhāṭaj. in Vol. II, 206, 14, the Telapattaj. (96) as Takkasilaj. in Vol. I, 469, 30 f., the Guṇaj. (157) as Sigālaj. in Vol. II, 314, 21, the Ādittaj. (424) as Sovrāj.6 in Vol. IV, 360, 24; 401, 12, the Kosambij. (428) as Saṅghabhedaṭ. in Vol. III, 211, 10 f., the Chakkavāṭaj. (434) as Kākaj. in Vol. I, 241, 28 f., Vol. II, 318, 23 f., the Samuggaṭ. (436) as Karanḍajak. in Vol. V, 455, 2, the Chautévāṭaj. (439) as Mahāmitta-vindakaj. in Vol. I, 363, 7 f., Vol. III, 206, 14 f., the Mahākapijj. (316) as Vevatiyakajj.7 in Vol. III, 178, 7 f., the Vidhurapāṇḍitaj. (545) as Pūnvakaj. in Vol. IV, 14, 24 f.; 182, 19.

1 On the Origin of the Indian Brāhma Alphabet, p. 16 f.
2 Recherches sur le Bouddhisme, p. 152.
3 J. ASOS. XVIII, p. 185 f.
5 In the same way already Rhys Davids, Buddh. Birth Stories, p. LXI has expressed his opinion.
6 Suchirajataka (C4), Vidūrājataka (B4) in Vol. IV, 360, 24; Sivirajataka (B4) in Vol. IV, 401, 12 are distortions by the writers, cf. Andersen, J., Vol. VII, p. XIV.
7 In the Sinhalese manuscripts.
Exactly the same is to be observed in the other commentary literature. In *DA*, page 674 Buddhaghoṣa refers to the Sammodamānaj. as Vaṭṭakaj., on page 178 to the Vidhrurapaṇḍitaṇaj. as Punnakaj., besides on page 674 to the Daddabhaj. (322) as Paṭṭhuvuddiyanaṇaj., on page 657 to the Dhammaddhaj. (384) as Dhammikavāyasaj. In the *DA*, in Vol. I, 55 the Sammodamānaj. is called Vaṭṭakaj., in Vol. IV, 83 the Telapattaj., bears the name Takkasilaj., and the Kachchhapaj. (215) is cited in Vol. IV, 92 as Bahubbhānij. Such fluctuations in the titles of the Jātakas, however, must have existed already in the time when the Bhārhuṭ relief were carved. Only in this way indeed it is understandable that in the inscription No. B 42 two labels Bidalajata[kj] and Kukutajataka are given side by side as it were for choice.

The reason for these fluctuations is also recognizable. At the time of the Bhārhuṭ sculptures these titles were in no way literally fixed, but were used only as convenient short designations. In the beginning the different Jātakas did not have any real titles. The first Pāda of the first Gāthā was taken as the heading. This custom has been retained in the Jātaka-Atthavaṇṇanā, even where, on account of regroupings sometimes made by the author of the Atthavaṇṇanā, it did not suit any more. In the Vidhrurapaṇḍitaṇaj. (545) the heading is *pandā kisiyaśi dubbala*. This is indeed the first Pāda of the first Gāthā in the proper story of Vidhura and Punnaka, but not of the Jātaka as it stands now in the Atthavaṇṇanā, because the story of the Chaturopusathikaj. (441) from the Dasanipāta precedes it. Likewise the Kosiyaj. (470) and 9 further Gāthās precede the proper story in the Sudhābhajjanaj. (535); the title, however, reads *naguttame or naguttame girīvare*, which is the beginning of the first Gāthā in the proper story. The Mahāummagaj. (546) opens in the Atthavaṇṇanā with a whole row of narrations that were independent Jātakas in the original collection: G. 2 belongs to the Sābbasamhārakapāṇja (110), G. 3 to the Gadrabhapanaj. (111), G. 4-5 belong to the Kakaṇṭakaj. (170), G. 6-7 to the Sirikālakanaj. (192), G. 8-19 to the Meṇḍakaj. (471), G. 20-40 to the Sirimandaj. (500), G. 41 to the Amārādevijapāṇja (112), G. 45-47 to the Khajjopanaj. (364), G. 48-57 to the Bhūripāṇja (452), G. 58-61 to the Devatapāṇja (350), G. 62-83 to the Paṇḍhapanaṇḍitaṇaj. (508). The proper Mahāummagaj. begins only with Gāthā 84 and the Pratika of this Gāthā Paṇḍhulo sabbasaṇḍya therefore still appears in the Atthavaṇṇanā as the title. I regard it as most probable that the combination of several Jātakas had been undertaken by the author of the Atthavaṇṇanā himself who in this way wished to avoid repetitions in the prose-narrations. This regrouping would scarcely have been accomplished at the time of the origin of the Bhārhuṭ sculptures. The label *yavamaṇjhiṣṭaṃ jātakam* (cf. B 92) will therefore not refer to the Mahāummagaj. in its present form, but will only be the title of the story of Mahosadhā and Amārādevi. This story, on account of its containing only one Gāthā (41), originally stood as J. 12 in the Ekanipāta where it is at present mentioned under the title Amārādevipāṇja or Chhannapathapāṇja totally unsuitable for the story handed down to us in the Jātaka collection. The title *Yavamaṇjhiṣṭaṃ jātakam* therefore, according to my opinion,

1 G. 11 has probably been taken from the Sirimandaj. (500).
2 The Kosiyaj. stands in the Dvādasanipātaj, therefore it should contain 12 Gāthās. Indeed there is in the tale of the avaricious Kosiyaj an evident conclusion after the 12th Gāthā. The nine following Gāthās are an amplification or a second version of the tale.
3 In the Burmese manuscript (B4) the heading has been changed to *nena kipāmī*, which is the beginning of the first Gāthā in the text of the Atthavaṇṇanā. The Burmese manuscript B4 still bears the old heading.
4 The stanzas marked as G. 1 by Faussboll is no Gāthā but an Uddāna which does not belong to the canonical text.
5 G. 42 is G. 58 anticipated in the prose narration.
6 Another Jātaka, the Dakarakhhasaj. (517), has also been incorporated into the proper Mahāummagaj.
cannot be taken to prove that the artists of Bhārhatu were following a text-book different from the Pāli Jātaka as suggested by von Oldenberg. The same holds good for the title Kinnarajatakassai (cf. B 54). That the Praukika-headings took the place of titles is confirmed by the label janam bramano avayesi (B 51). It is identical with the heading in the Āthavannanā (J. 62). This way of citation seems to me to be one of the strongest proofs for the still disputed view that originally only the Gāthās of the Jātakas were collected together. Indeed I do not understand how it can be doubted that the original collection contained only the Gāthās. For (1) the stories are arranged according to the number of the Gāthās they contained, (2) they are referred to according to the first Pāda of the first Gāthā, (3) the prose-narration does not agree with the Gāthās in innumerable cases, and (4) the prose-narration handed down to us calls itself a commentary to the Jātaka (Jātakassai āthavannanā).

2. Regarding Foucher’s point three it cannot be disputed that there are representations of stories in Bhārhatu which are not to be found in the Pāli Jātaka book. But I don’t know why this fact should speak against the use of the Pāli collection by the artists. From amongst the sculptures at Bhārhatu that are either not designated as Jātakas in the labels or are totally unmarked, up to now 21 can be identified with certainty and two with probability with the stories occurring in the Pāli Jātaka collection. This, however, does not prove that all similar representations must be taken as Jātakas. The artists may as well have illustrated legends which were never Jātakas or had not become Jātakas at their time. For example this, in my opinion, is the case with the legends, the scene of which was a mountain Naçoda. On the other hand, it is scarcely a chance that the 18 scenes, labelled as Jātakas, are all to be identified with Jātakas in the Pāli collection. To me this seems to speak decisively for the fact that the artists of Bhārhatu worked according to the Pāli Jātaka collection.

This statement could be contradicted, if the sculptures would show differences from the text of the Pāli collection. While discussing such possible cases, it has to be taken into consideration that only such matter can be used for comparison which is proved to be old by the Gāthās and not merely mentioned in the prose-narration.

Lānman, JAOS., XVIII, p. 185 opines that the representation of the Arāmadāsakajī (Pl. XLV 5) is a good example showing that the sculptural representations agree with the canonical texts in the essentials, but deviate in details: in J. 46 the gardener gives leather bags (chammpandā) and wooden tubs (dārūkūta) to the apes, in J. 268 leather vessels (chammpagātakā) for watering of trees, while in the relief the monkeys use earthen pots in nets suspended from sticks carried on their shoulders. In the Gāthās, which alone are canonical, nothing however is said about the kind of the vessels used. So this can scarcely be called a contradiction.

In the Chammasātakajī (324), the fool pushed down by the ram is, according to the prose-narration, a religious mendicant carrying a skin garment (chammasātako paribhajako Bārāṇasiyam bhikkhūya charanino). In the Gāthās, however, he is a Brahmin carrying a burden suspended from a stick (Khāribhāra), and the relief (Pl. XLI 1; 3) exactly corresponds to it.

1 e.g. Weller, ZUL., IV, p. 47.
2 Oldenberg, G. N., 1911, p. 447.
3 Lüders proceeds to say that there are direct proofs showing that in olden times there were manuscripts containing only the Gāthās. Short hints at this fact have been made already by Franke (BB. XXII, p. 296 ff.) and Senart (J. d. Sér. IX, T. XVII, p. 404). But it seems to Lüders that they have not received sufficient attention, and so he collects all the material on pp. 140 ff. of his book on Bhārhatu which the reader desiring to have more information on the point may look up.
4 Of the 19th scene only the mutilated inscription ....niyajātaka (B 80) has remained, but not the representation.
It is also no deviation if the man who warns the Brahmin about the ram is represented in the relief as a well-dressed man standing upright, whereas, according to the prose, he is a merchant sitting in his shop; for in the Gāthās nothing is said regarding this person.

The representation of the Mahābodhiṇī (328) (Pl. XXVII 14) exactly tallies with the course of narration to be concluded from the Gāthās 1-3. The dog has heard the conversation of the king with his wife, by which it knows that the affection of the king for the ascetic has disappeared. It therefore barks at him and shows him its teeth, whereas in the prose narration the dog appears as a warner of the ascetic under total distortion of the original sense.

In the Mahākāpiṇī (407) only a slight difference between the relief on Pl. XXXIII 4 and the Gāthās is to be observed. According to G. 3 the monkey-king fastens the cane to his hind-feet (aparāpādēsudāhahaduddhatatāgānaha), on which the apes have to cross from one tree to another. In the relief the cane is fastened to its right hind-leg. The deviation is too insignificant to lead to the conclusion that the artist was following a different version. All the other deviations from the Pāli Jātaka only refer to the prose-narration. According to the prose-narration, the king gets the ape-king down from the tree by means of a scaffold which he got erected on the raft in the Gāndhāra. In the relief, two men are spreading a cloth in order to catch up the monkey, as is likewise narrated in the Jātakamāla (pātavatānasāvatāya vityaya 179, 1). The prose narrates that the exhausted ape-king is laid on a bed covered with a skin moistened with oil. In the relief he sits in conversation with the king on a cane-seat (mōraḥ) as the king himself does. Nothing of this kind is said in the Gāthās. Without hesitation, we may take the version of the story followed by the sculptor as the older one, the more so as the Bhārhat relief is in agreement in these points with the representation of the Jātaka on the Western gate of stūpa I in Sānchi².

Other cases of supposed discrepancies between the Pāli Jātaka story and the sculptural representation likewise turn out to refer to the prose-narration; see the treatment of No. B 45, B 46, B 49, B 57, and B 59.

What applies to the representations of the Jātakas also applies to the scenes from the life of the Buddha. We have to keep in mind that here also only deviations from the canonical texts can prove the use of a collection different from the Pāli Tipiṣṭaka. What appears in the later commentary literature is the form which the legends took in Ceylon in the 5th cent. A.D., and it is indeed quite possible that they were narrated differently on Indian soil even in the school of the Theras.

Now in Bhārhat only two stories are represented, which are handed down in the Suttas, viz. the visit of Ajātasattu and the visit of Sakka in the Indasatagūha, which are treated below under B 40 and B 35. Both the representations do not contain anything which is

---

¹ According to the prose, to his hip (ekāna attana katipati bandhitā III, 372, 5). Aryāśūra in the Jātakamāla follows in this point more exactly the text of the Gāthā (vetrata layā gāthahā ahadikya charovenu 178, 10). In the rest, however, he deviates from the Pāli prose-narration and from the sculpture. The Bodhisattva stretches not across the river, but across the space between the tree and a mountain in the vicinity, and he does not cut off the cane and fasten it to another tree, but leaves it rooted in the ground. The text of the Gāthās can be reconciled with both the versions.

² Surely also the account of the burial of the ape-king and of the worship of its skull is an addition in the prose-narration, as well as the identification of one of the bad monkeys, who mortally wounds the Bodhisattva by its jump, with Devadatta. In the Jātakamāla nothing of it is mentioned. The identification was originally missing even in the Samodhāna and has been added later on in the Burmese manuscripts. The Pachchupannavatathu of the Chuladhammayanapāla. (III, 178, 7 f.), however, refers to it.

³ Marshall, Guide to Sānchi, Pl. V.I.d.; Mém. conv. l'Asie Or. T. III, Pl. II, 6. The half-figure, which appears in the Bhārhat relief at the bottom between the ape and the king, is not explained with certainty. I regard it out as question that there is an ape again, as suggested by Barua, Bharhāt II, p. 130. Probably Foucher is right who sees in the figure one of the inhabitants of the forest, who brought the king to the tree of the Bodhisattva. See Beginnings of Buddhist Art, p. 42.

---
opposed to the canonical texts. On the contrary the visit of Ajātasattu is depicted even in details exactly according to the Sāmaṇḍaphalasutta (DN. I. 47 ff.). In the same way the representation of the visit of Sāka follows the text of the Sakkapaṭhasutta (DN. II. 263 ff.). Even the name of the cave in the label (Īdāsālaguhā) is the same as in Pāli, while with the Sarvāstivādins it occurs as Indraśālaguhā.

Moreover, the depictions of the non-canonical legends also show the greatest conformity with the Pāli version. This, for instance, holds good for the Erapatta-legend, treated below under B 36 and B 37.

It is doubtful whether in the relief representing the donation of the Jetavana, a deviation from the later Pāli sources is to be seen. I am showing below that the relief, in so far as it is also a depiction of the miracle of Śrāvasti, represents a version of the legend older than the one in the Pāli commentaries. Nevertheless the close relation with the tradition of the Theras comes to light, when we compare it with the version in the text of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, which differs to a greater extent.

In these circumstances even the occurrence of persons as the devaputra Arahatgutta (B 20), unknown to the Pāli commentary literature, in the Bhārhatu reliefs does not prove that the artists followed a tradition different from that of the Theras.

There is, as far as I see, in Bhārhatu only one deviation from the Pāli canon, viz. the representation of the Bodhi tree of Buddha Vipassin (treated under B 13). I am not able to give a satisfactory explanation. It is quite improbable that the text in the Mahāpādanaśasutta has been afterwards changed. It seems that here in fact the tradition of a different school comes to light which founds its way into the pictorial art, for also in Sāntchi, the Asoka appears as the Bodhi tree of Vipassin. The Kharoshthi letters used as marks of the sculptors on the eastern gate make it probable that also the artists from the North-West of India were at work at Bhārhatu. Perhaps the Vipassin-medallion which differs also stylistically from the type of the representation of Bodhi trees common in Bhārhatu is the work of some artist from the North-West. Be it as it may, I do not believe that this quite unique case can weaken the argument that the artists of Bhārhatu in general followed in their work the tradition of the Theras as it was laid down in the canonical Pāli texts.

3. I cannot enter here into a full discussion on the second point raised by Foucher against the use of the Pāli Jātaka collection, as the explanation of the linguistic deviations in the labels from the Pāli would require a special treatise. I intend to give it on a different occasion, and hope to be able to show that the text of the Pāli canon is translated from an older canon laid down in the popular language of Eastern India. When translating into the Western language, which we are used to call Pāli, not only numerous faults occurred, but at many places the Eastern forms have been retained. So for instance, in the Eastern language the kṣh of sāikṣha and of bhikkhu, bhikkhunī became kkh, in the Western language, however, it became chehā. But sēkṣha, bhikkhu, bhikkhunī were taken over without change as technical expressions in the church language. When the sculptors of Bhārhatu or their employers used the forms sēkṣha (B 45) and bhikkhunī which are in conformity with the Western colloquial language, so naturally we cannot conclude therefrom that they followed

---

1 See the treatment under B 32.
2 While in other cases always two standing worshippers only are represented behind the kneeling figures, we have here on the left side five and on the right side four standing worshippers.
3 This treatise mentioned by Lüders has been edited by E. Waldschmidt in 1954 from fragmentary papers left by Lüders under the title "Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Upanisāns" (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprache, Literatur und Kunst, 1952, No. 10).
4 In the vocative plural bhikkhār, even the ending -e<-as has been retained in the Eastern form.
5 This form occurs ten times in the inscriptions, at the side of bhikkhunī appearing only five times.
the text in a dialect different from the Pāli. At the first look the matter seems to be different in the label treated under B 51 viz. yathā bramana avādesi, for the first three words came from the Gāthā, that is to say, from the text of the canon. In Pāli we have yathā brāhmaṇa avādesi. The original text probably read bārhaṇe instead of brāhmaṇa, and for avādesi certainly avāsyeśi. Now today, we know how the Sanskrit translations of the canonical texts were made: countless Prakritisms were at first simply taken over and only gradually later on substituted by correct Sanskrit forms. The Pāli translators have worked apparently in the same way. Avāsyeśi was kept at first and only later on corrected to the right Pāli form avādesi; bārhaṇa was translated by brāhmaṇa, and brāhmaṇa was later on, not only here but in the whole sphere of Pāli literature, substituted by brāhmaṇa which is not at all a real dialectal form, but, as the hm shows, simply taken over from Sanskrit. From that label we can only draw the conclusion that in the 2nd cent. B.C. the text of the Pāli canon showed more Eastern forms than today.

The inscription A 56 shows that at the time of the construction of the railing a Buddhist canon was in existence, for the donor of a rail-bar, the venerable Jāta, is designated as petakin a ‘knower of the Piṭakas’. This, by itself, would not mean that Jāta studied the Pāli Tipiṭaka of the Theras, as the canon of other schools also consisted of Piṭakas. In Sārnāth, Set Mahet, and Mathurā we have inscriptions of donations from the time of Kanishka and Huvisaka in which the monk Bala calls himself trepiṭaka, and his pupil, Buddhamaha, trepiṭakā. As Bala uses Sanskrit full of Prakritism in his inscriptions, his Tripiṭaka will also have been composed in this language. But in the inscription No. A 57 a certain Budharakhiita is mentioned, who receives the designation pānichekaṇyita which is ‘knowing the five Nikāyas’. The five Nikāyas must be the five divisions of the Suttapiṭaka in the Pāli canon, for only here the division into five Nikāyas occurs. In the canons of the other schools, as is well-known, āgama is used instead of nikāya. Whether the contents of the five Nikāyas, especially those of the Khuddakanikāya, were at that time exactly the same as in the Pāli canon of today is a question in which we need not enter here. In any case the expression pānichekaṇyita confirms that the Pāli canon was in existence in the 2nd cent. B.C. in Western India. The probability that the artists of Bhārhat followed the texts of this canon is highly strengthened by this fact.

1 The missing of the length of vowels is naturally only graphic; bramane seems to be incomplete writing for brāhmaṇa.
2 List Nos. 925-927; 918; 38.
3 Budharakhiita is naturally a monk even if he is not called a bhikṣhu in the inscription; he is not a layman as Barua JPA 88, New Ser. XIX, p. 358 supposes.
4 The same title is received by the monk Devagiri in the Sānchi inscription 289. Mil. 22 mentions side by side tēpiṭaka bhikṣukā pānichekaṇyika pi cha chaṭānakekaṇyika cheva.
5 According to Buddhaghosa, D.A., p. 22 f., DhA., p. 26; Samantap. (Vin. III, p. 291), the whole of the Tipiṭaka indeed is divided into five Nikāyas. According to him the Vinaya-tipiṭaka and Abhidhammapiṭaka belong to the Khuddakanipāta. This conception occurs also in the Gandhāvanīsa (JPTS 1886, p. 57) which is probably composed not earlier than the 17th cent., but it can impossibly be the original. It is shown clearly by the terminology itself that the Vinaya-tipiṭaka and the Abhidhammapiṭaka were coordinated with the Suttapiṭaka. In the account of the council at Rājagaha found in Chullav. 11, 1, 7 ff., the pañcaka nikāya are obviously confronted as texts of the Dhamma with the ubhatanaṅgav as the texts of the Vinaya. Cf. Przybyszki, Le conseil de Rājagaha, Paris 1926, p. 338.
6 In Mil. 341 f. the inhabitants of the Dhammanagar are enumerated as suttantikā, senyakā, abhīdharmikā, dharmakathikā, jātakabhāṣakā, dīghabhāṣakā, mājjaṁabhāṣakā, saṃyuttabhāṣakā, aṅguttarabhāṣakā, khuddakahāṇikā. I do not believe that it can be concluded from the juxtaposition of the jātakabhāṣakā and the khuddakahāṇikā that the author did not look up the Jātaka book as a part of the khuddakanikāya, or even, as Barua JPA 88, N.S. XIX, p. 363 thinks, that a special collection of the commentarial Jātakas besides the collection contained in the Khuddakanikāya was in existence. The reciters of the Jātakas are mentioned especially after the preachers of sermons probably because both address themselves chiefly to the laymen whereas the expositions of the Nikāyas may have been meant principally for the monks.
(b) **LIST OF THE JATAKAS IDENTIFIED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>First identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 41</td>
<td>Harṣasajātaka</td>
<td>Nachchaj. 32</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 44</td>
<td>Laṭuvājātaka</td>
<td>Laṭukikaj. 357</td>
<td>Cunningham-Subhūti, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 38 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 46</td>
<td>Udajātaka</td>
<td>Dabbhapupphapj. 400</td>
<td>Hultzsch, <em>ZDMG. XI</em>, p. 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 48</td>
<td>Isimigo jataka</td>
<td>Nigrodhamigaṭaj. 12</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 49</td>
<td>Chhadāntiya jātakāṁ</td>
<td>Chhaddantaj. 514</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 61 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 50</td>
<td>Sujato gahuto jataka</td>
<td>Sujāṭaj. 352</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 76 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 53</td>
<td>Isisirhiya jātakāṁ</td>
<td>Alambusaj. 523</td>
<td>Minayeff-Subhūti, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 64 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 55</td>
<td>Vitura-Punakiya jatakarī</td>
<td>Vidhurapaṇḍitaṭaj. 545</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 79 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 56</td>
<td>usu(kāro) Janako rāja</td>
<td>Mahājanakaj. 539</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 57</td>
<td>Maghādeviyajātaka</td>
<td>Makhādevaj. 9</td>
<td>Cunningham, <em>StBh.</em>, p. 78 f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **B 1-12 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO THE FIGURES OF DEMI-GODS AND GODDESSES.**

**B 1 (794); PLATES XVI, XXIX**


**Text:**

Kupiro yakho

**Translation:**

The Yaksha Kupira (*Kubera*).

The figures on the corner Pillar on the North-Western quadrant of the stone-railing (P 5) are labelled as Kupiro yakho (B 1), Chadā yakhi (B 2), Ajakālako yakho (B 3) and the figures on the corner pillar of the South-Eastern quadrant (P 1) as Virudako yakho (B 4), Garīgotoyakho (B 5), Chakavāko nāgarājā (B 6). As Kupira (*Kubera*) and Virudaka (*Virūdhaka*) are the guardians of the Northern and Southern region respectively we can assume with certainty that on the last corner pillars of both the other quadrants Virūpakkha and Dhataraththa, the guardians of the West and East, were represented, each one with two companions. Vogel, *Indian Serpent-lore,* p. 212, is of the opinion that the names of the four world-guardians do not occur in the older Pāli texts, but they are given in the Mahāsāmasayutta (D. II, 258) and in the Aṭānātiyassutta (D. III, 197 ff.) in accordance with their fixed distribution in the four directions. Of the above named companions of Kuvera and Virudhaka three viz. Chakkavāka, Garīgita and Charīdā are not yet ascertained in literature. They seem to have been local deities venerated in the region of Bhārutt. The Yaksha labelled Supāvaso yakho (B 7) who is represented on the pillar of the South-Eastern quadrant evidently belongs to the same class too.

The corner pillar on which our inscription appears has three figures, one female and two male ones, each on one side of the pillar. The figure labelled Kupiro yakho is to the left of the figure of Chandrā (B 2). Kubera is represented standing with folded hands on a dwarf, who supports himself on his feet and hands. This is in accordance with his ordinary epithet naravāhana.¹ As recognised by Cunningham, he owes his position on the northern side of the Stūpa to the guardianship of the North which is attributed to him in Buddhist as well as in

¹Barua, *Barh.* II., p. 58, points out that Kuvera has been designated as nārīvāhana ‘one having a woman for his vehicle’ in the *Sm.* (p. 370), where, however, no more is mentioned than that he mounted a nārīvāhana for his journey to the upāsikā Nandamātā. Naravāhana certainly only means that his vehicle consists of human beings as it is the case in the Aṭānātiyas. (D. III, 200) where the Uttarakuruṣa, whose sovereign Kuvera is, are referred to as using men and women, young boys and maidens as vāhana.
Brahmanical literature; cf. *D. II*, 257 f.; *III*, 202; *Mvn. III*, 309.13; *Lalita*. 218, 9; 390, 19; *Mahām. p. 230.* In all these passages he is called the lord of the Yakshas. The spelling of his name in the inscription with *p* instead of *b* (surd instead of sonant) has parallels in such forms as *Erāpata-* and *Vitura-*.

**B 2 (793); PLATES XVI, XXIX, XXX**


**TEXT:**

*Chadā yakhi*

**TRANSLATION:**

The Yakshi Chadā (*Chandrā*).

This female figure is standing under a Nāga tree (*Mesua ferrea*) on a sheep or ram with the hindpart of a fish. This probably characterizes her as a water-goddess. With her right hand she grasps a bough of the tree over her head, while her left hand and her left leg are thrown around the trunk of the tree.

**B 3 (795); PLATES XVI, XXIX**


**TEXT:**

*Ajakālako yakho*

**TRANSLATION:**

The Yaksha Ajakālaka.

The figure to which the label is attached stands opposite to the figure of Kubera (B 1). He has the bud of a lotus in his right hand which rests on his chest, while his left hand hangs by his side holding some undefined object between the thumb and the forefinger. The figure stands on a monster with the body of a fish, but with human hands thrust into its mouth; thus according to the description of Anderson *Cat.* I, p. 24. Barua I.c. II, p. 61, says that the animal has the tail of a Makara and the forefeet of a lion or of a tiger. The picture is not clear enough to allow us to decide the question.

A Yaksha Ajakālaka is not known from other sources. In the *Mahām*. p. 231; 236 two Yakshas, Kāla and Upakāla, are mentioned, but they certainly have no connection.

---

1 According to King quoted by Anderson, *Cat.* p. 23.
with Ajakālaka. Barua-Sinha have identified Ajakālaka with the Yaksha Ajakalāpaka who in Ud. I, 7 is said to have had his dwelling at the Ajakalāpaka chaitya in Pāvā. In a dark rainy night he tried to frighten the Buddha by uttering horrid cries, but only with the effect that the Buddha pronounced an udāna. Although it would be quite appropriate that a Yaksha of the demoniac class should be associated with Kubera, it is difficult to account for the difference of the final member of the names. Hultzsch had carried back Ajakālaka to Sk. Ādyakālaka, an explanation not very satisfactory in itself, and not made more reliable by the remarks made by Barua and Sinha in its support, for I, at least, take it as most improbable that a local Yaksha should be “a terrible embodiment of the ruthless unborn Time, destroying living beings, whose essence is immortality”. Besides the form Ajakalāpaka which according to Barua and Sinha is just a side form of Ajakālaka cannot be brought into agreement with this explanation. The Commentary to the Ud. offers two explanations: Ajakalāpaka is either ‘some one making a bundle of goats’ because the Yaksha accepts gifts only together with a tied up group of goats; or Ajakalāpaka ‘some one who makes men beat like goats’, because people, when offering gifts shout like goats in order to satisfy him (so kira yakko aje kalāpāvita bandhamena ajayaśīhāsena sadhiṁ biḥo paṭiṭeṣu na ahiḥtāḥ i tasmā Ajakalāpaka ti pātityavā vā kaci pana ajake viya satte lāpeti Ajakalāpaka ti i tassā kira satte biḥo upaneto yāda ajasadam kato biḥo upathareṇa tadā so tassāti i tasmā Ajakalāpaka ti uccattī). Although I am of the opinion that the first part of the name is a word for goat, I think the explanations of the commentary are unacceptable. If both names have to be connected, which I think probable, it is nearest to take kālaka and kalēpaka as noun formations to the causative of a root kai that could as well form kālayati and kalēpayati. Perhaps this kālayati or kalēpayati had the same meaning as Sk. kālayati ‘to make some one run before oneself’, ‘to persecute’, ‘to scare away’, ‘drive off’.

B 4 (736); PLATES XVI, XXX


TEXT:

Virudaka yakho

TRANSLATION:

The Yaksha Virudaka (Virūḍhaka).

The pillar P 1 shows three male figures, each on one side. Our inscription refers to the middle figure, the right and left arm of which is united with the arm of the adjoining figure.

1. The explanation given above is the one offered by Lüders, Bhrk., p. 14f.—Earlier in his manuscript he had suggested the following derivation: “May we assume that Ajakalaka is a corruption of Ajagalaka and that Ajakalāpaka is a corruption of Ajagalāpaka or Ajagalāvaka, gālaka and gātalāpaka being derived from the causative of gat ‘to devour’, which may be gātel or gātalōpeti? That Ajakalāpaka contains gāt, the word for goat, appears from the commentary. However, it cannot be denied that gāvajana ‘devourer of goats’, which in Pāli sometimes, e.g. J. 427, 2, is corrupted into gajakara, would seem to be a more suitable name than ‘causing goats to be devoured’, and so my suggestion must be taken for what it is worth.” For an explanation as ājaka-lāpaka cf. M. A. Mehendale, S. K. Belvalkar- Felicitation Volume, p. 13.
(B 5, B 6 resp.); an armlet in the shape of a **triratna** encircles the common arm. The Yaksha is standing on rocks with caves tenanted by wild beasts and birds of prey. Attitude and dress are represented in the usual type of the Yaksha images.

Virūdhaka, P. Virūlha or Virūlha, the chief of the Kumbhāṇḍas, is with the Buddhists always the guardian of the Southern quarter; cf. e.g. D. II, 257 f.; III, 198; *Mvu*. III, 307, 13; *Lalita*. 217, 20; 389, 1; *Mahām.* 228 (cf. 752). Accordingly, as recognized already by Cunningham, his image is sculptured on the corner pillar of the South gate of the Stūpa. In the inscription he is still called a Yaksha, while in later times he has become a Nāga king. In the *Mahām.* p. 247 the four Lokapālas are inserted in the list of the Nāgarājās.

**B 5 (737); PLATES XVI, XXX**


**TEXT:**

Gaṅgīto yakho

**TRANSLATION:**

The Yaksha Gaṅgīta.

The figure, which according to the label represents the Yaksha Gaṅgīta, is on the left side of the figure of Virūdhaka and opposite to the figure of the Nāga Chakravāka. The Yaksha is standing in the typical attitude of the Yaksha images with one foot on an elephant and the other on a tree. This is sufficient to show that he is not a water spirit, and that the attempt of Barua-Sinha¹ to connect his name, which is otherwise unknown, with the river Ganges is futile.

**B 6 (735); PLATES XVI, XXX**

On the inner face of the same pillar as Nos. A 95, B 4 and B 5, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 1). Edited by Cunningham, *PASB*. 1874, p. 111; *StBh.* (1879), p. 26; 133, No. 24, and Pl. XXI and LIII; Hultsch, *ZDMG*. Vol. XL (1886), p. 65, No. 42, and

¹ The phonetic identification of Gaṅgīta with Sk. Gaṅgeya proposed by them is obviously impossible, and their other observations on Gaṅgeya are also incorrect. According to them the *Mep.* mentions a snake-king Gaṅgeya, "one belonging to the Ganges or Gangetic region," but in the said text nothing of that kind occurs. In the lists of Nāgarājās therein (167, 77-80) Gaṅgā Nāgarā, Sīdhur Nāgarā, Sīṭā Nāgarā, Palshur Nāgarā, are mentioned where Paśkarū obviously is a mistake for Paśkur (Oxus). The same line, only with the reversing of the last two names, is also found in the *Mahām.* p. 247. The water deities naturally represent the four wellknown worldstreams flowing in different directions, and when they are called here Nāgarājās, that corresponds to the later view seeing Nāgas in all water deities and even in Varuṇa. Barua further deduces from the representation of Gaṅgīta: 'There must have been a distinct Buddhist Discourse, the Gaṅgeya-Sutta, giving an account of the demigod, as well as of the circumstances that led to his conversion to Buddhism. This Sutta must have contained a description of the terrors caused by him before he was tamed by the Buddha." Such outbursts of imagination, unrestricted by any critical outlook, unfortunately occur frequently in Barua’s work.
INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO DEMI-GODS AND GODDESSES


TEXT:

Chakavāko nāgarājā

TRANSLATION:

Chakavāka (Chakravāka), the king of the Nāgas.

The figure on the right of the middle figure (B 4) is determined by the inscription given above. A nāga of the name of Chakravāka is not known from other sources. In attitude and dress he does not differ from the ordinary type of the Yaksha figures, but he is distinguished from them by a five-headed cobra surmounting his turban. He is standing on rocks with caves from which some wild beasts are looking out, right above a lotus-lake inhabited by water-fowl, a crocodile and a tortoise. This lake is apparently the abode of the Nāga.

B 7 (726); PLATES XVI, XXXI


TEXT:

Supavāsaka yako

TRANSLATION:

The Yaksha Supavāsaka (Suprāvrisha).

The image to which the label refers resembles in attitude and dress the Yaksha figures described under Nos. B 1, B 3, B 4, and B 5. The Yaksha is standing on the back of an elephant carrying a garland in his trunk.

The Yaksha is not known from other sources. His name probably goes back to Suprāvrisha, as suggested by Hultzsch. As the reading of the label is quite distinct, I cannot agree with Barua-Sinha who propose to correct it to Supavāsaka, merely because a lay-sister bearing the name of Suppavāsā is mentioned in A. 1,26. I refrain from discussing their further fantastic explanation of the name.

B 8 (770); PLATES XVI, XXXI


¹Cunningham’s remark on p. 20 that the pillar belonged to the West is probably a mistake. On the other face of the pillar a female figure, called a Lotus-nymph by Barua, is to be seen, standing on a lotus-cluster, cf. Barua, Bark., Vol. I, p. 19, and Vol. II, 75.

TEXT:

Sirimā devata

TRANSLATION:

The goddess Sirimā (Śrīmatī).

The goddess is represented standing on a rail like the Yakha Suchiloma (B 9) represented on the opposite side of the pillar. The artist did not, as usual with other deities, characterize both these figures by a vāhana. The goddess carries in her right hand, which is damaged, the same object, probably a chāmari, as the goddess figured in the centre of Cunningham’s Pl. XXI.

Amidst the solitary figures at Bhärhut some smaller deities are found the names of which occur in the canonical literature, and which therefore have their proper home probably in Eastern India. So our goddess as also the Yakha Suchiloma (B 9) are probably figures from the old Buddhist literature. Sirimā as a woman’s name occurs in the Nidānakathā (7.1, 34, 26; 41, 3), and also in the donor inscription No. A 48. It is the feminine form of Sirima which appears as the name of a man above in No. A 110. It corresponds to P. Śrīmati, Sk. Śrīmatī as remarked long ago by Hultzsch. In the Vv. I, 16, we are told that there was a beautiful courtesan at Rājagaha, called Sirimā, who on account of her devotion to the Buddha was reborn as a goddess. But the Sirimā represented on the Bhärhut pillar shares probably only the name with this goddess. In the Mv. and in the Lalitav. there is a travelling-benediction pronounced by the Buddha for the merchants Trapusha and Bhallika. The text, preserved in two only slightly different versions, contains a list of divine maidens (devakumārikā) who, in groups of eight, guard the four quarters. The first two guardians of the Western region are called Lakshmivati and Śrīmatī in the Mv. (III, 307, 8), and Śriyāmati and Yaśāmati in the Lalitav. (389, 7), where Śriyāmati is only an attempt to sanskritise Sirimā in accordance with the metre. This devakumārikā Sirimā, having her seat in the West, is undoubtedly identical with our Sirimā devatā and her statue has probably been, not without reason, assigned to a pillar of the South-West quadrant to protect that side of the Stūpa. Of course she too has nothing to do with the deity Śrī (Siri). Sirī appears in the Jātakas in allegorical poems as personification of good luck, thus in the Sirikalakaṇṇujī (382) by the side of Kāli, the personification of bad luck. Here she is the daughter of Dhataraṭṭha, the regent of the East, whereas the father of Kāli, Virūpakṣa, is the regent of the West. In the Sudhābhajanaj. (535) Siri, Good Luck, Āsā, Hope, Saddhā, Devotion, and Hiri, Modesty, are the daughters of Sakka. They show themselves in different directions, and here also (G. 44) the East is assigned to Siri.

It is completely false when Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 217, compares the Sirimā of Bhärhut with the Diana of Ephesus for she sees a token of fertility in her developed breasts. If the artist gave well-developed breasts, thin waist, and broad hips to the statue, he did not give them as special tokens of fertility, but he intended only to accomplish the ideal of the female body as it has been described to us again and again in Indian poetry.


2 In Mahābh., 9, 2621 Śrīmatī appears among the Mothers in the retinue of Skanda.

3 e.g. Kāvyādarśa 1, 87, 91; 2,218.
B 9 (771); Plates XVI, XXXI


TEXT:

Suchilomo yakho

TRANSLATION:

The Yaksha Suchiloma (Sūchiloma).

According to a Sutta which is found in the Sn. p. 47 ff. and again in the S. I, 207 f., the Yaksha Sūchiloma lived at Gayā in the Taṅkita-maññha in the company of the Yaksha Khara. When the Buddha dwelt at that place, Sūchiloma behaved haughtily and rudely towards him, but the Buddha calmly answered his question about the origin of passion and ill-will. In both commentaries on the texts the Yaksha is said to owe his name to the quality of the hair of his body which was like needles, thus proving that the original name was Sūchiloma. Similarly the Yaksha whose taming by the Bodhisattva is told in J. 55 is called Sīlesaloma, because everything stuck fast upon the hair of his body. In the label, Suchiloma, of course, may be an inaccurate spelling for Sūchiloma, but it is remarkable that there is nothing in the image to indicate that bodily peculiarity, the Yaksha being represented as an ordinary well-dressed man who, with folded hands, stands on a rail. Probably this conception of the Yaksha is influenced, as Barua remarks, by the later legend occurring in the SnA., where it is said that Sūchiloma and Khara by the advice of the Buddha became friendly, "gold-coloured and decked with heavenly ornaments". It is perhaps for the same reason that the name Sūchiloma is frequently changed in the manuscripts to Suchiloma (Sk. sūchilomā), 'White-haired'.

In later times Sūchiloma was metamorphosed into a serpent. In the snake-spell of the Bower MS. p. 224 he is called Sūchiloma, in that of the Mahān. p. 221 Sūchironām.

B 10 (790); Plates XVI, XXXII


1 Barua's supposition (Barh., III, p. 55) that the rail beneath the figure of Sūchiloma is representing the Taṅkita-maññha is quite unbelievable. According to the commentary the Taṅkita-maññha consisted of a stone-plate put on four stones. The explanation of the word given in AO., XV, p. 101, seems to me doubtful.
TEXT:
yakhini Sudasana

TRANSLATION:
The Yakshini Sudasana (Śūdrāsānā).

The label refers to a female figure raising her right hand and standing on a makara. Sudarśana occurs as the name of a Yaksha in the Mahām. p. 231, also of a Nāgarāja, ibid. 246 (cp. B 37), but Sudarśana does not seem to be known in Buddhist literature. In the Mbh. 13, 2, 4 ff., Sudarśana is the daughter of king Duryodhana of Māhishmati and the river goddess (devanadi) Narmadā. She was so beautiful that Agnī fell in love with her and married her. I am inclined to identify the Sudarśanā of the Epic with the Yakshini represented in the sculpture. The daughter of a river goddess and wife of a god may well have been called a Yakshini in the language of this time, and her vāhana, the makara, seems to indicate that she was the child of a river and perhaps a river goddess herself, just as her daughter-in-law Oghavatī, of whom it is said in the Mbh. that half of her became a river (ibid. V. 168). Her descent from the river Narmadā and the king of Māhishmati shows that she has been a local deity of Central India. She could therefore be very well known and adored in Bhārhat also.

B 11 (717); PLATES XVI, XXXII


TEXT:
Chulakokā devatā

TRANSLATION:
The goddess Chulakokā (Little Kokā).

The goddess is represented standing on an elephant under an Aśoka tree in full flower. With her right hand she grasps a branch above her head, while her left arm and her left leg embrace the stem of the tree which is entwined also by the elephant's tusk. The goddess has a counterpart in the goddess Mahākokā represented on a pillar at Pataoara (No. B 12). Barua-Sinha boldly translate Kokā by hunter-goddess, but there is absolutely nothing in the outward appearance of the goddess nor in her name to warrant this meaning. Sk. koka denotes the wolf; the chakravāka and a certain insect. Lexicographers give it also the meaning of frog and date-tree and quote it as a surname of Vīshnu. As a personal name it occurs already in the Ś. Br. and Koka is perhaps the name of a river. But koka has nowhere the meaning of dog, as supposed by Barua-Sinha, and the fact that in the

The first aksūhara has an i-sign and an u-sign.

I do not understand how Barua-Sinha can declare that it may be a date-palm.

That kōkā in J. 547, 362 does not mean dog, but wolf, was shown long ago by Cowell and Rouse, J., Vol. V, p. 273, note 1.
Dhā. (III, 31-34) a hunter, who has a pack of hounds with him, bears the name of Koka cannot possibly prove that the goddess Kokā had anything to do with hunting. I have no doubt that Kokā is an abbreviated name and that Mahākoka and Chulakokā are identical with the goddesses (devatā) Kokanāḍa and Chulla-Kokanāḍa, the daughters of the rain-god Pajjuna, who in s. 1, 29 ff. are said to have recited some Gāthās before the Buddha, when he was residing in the Kūṭāgārasālā at Vesāli. In the labels, the names are used in a shortened form as Bhūma for Bhūmasena. As Kokā is another name of Chakravāka both goddesses owe their names probably to their voice resembling that of a chakravāka.²

B 12 (811); PLATES XVI, XXXII


TEXT:

Mahakoka devata⁴

TRANSLATION:

The goddess Mahakoka (Great Kokā).

With regard to the goddess see the remarks on No. B 11.

---

¹This identification is also suggested by S. Paranavitana, Artibus Asiae, Vol. XVI (1953), p. 177, who translates Kokanāḍa and Chulla-Kokanāḍa as ‘Lily’ and ‘Little Lily’.

²A female figure very similar to that of Chulakokā is represented on a pillar shown by Barua, Bārh., III, Pl. LXV (76). She stands on a bridled horse winding her left hand and left leg round the stem of a tree while she grasps a branch hanging above her with her right hand. A label is missing. Barua I.c. II, p. 72, is of the opinion that we should be fully justified to take her as Majjhima-kokā, the middle hunter-goddess, and to see in her the tutelary deity of the middle class of hunters ranging the forest on horse-back, whereas Chulakokā is the tutelary goddess of the special class of hunters ranging the wood on the back of elephants, and Mahākokā is a goddess of the general class of hunters. I am afraid such a peculiar addition to mythology will not find much approval.

³Perhaps, as Barua (Bārh., II, p. 72) supposes, this is the pillar figured in Cunningham, StBh., Pl. XX, and Barua, Bārh., Pl. XXIII (19), where a woman is represented grasping with her right hand the twig of an Aśoka tree in full bloom, but there is no inscription visible in the photograph. She resembles the figure designated as Chulakokā but the workmanship is much cruder than that of the latter.

⁴From Cunningham’s eye-copy.
2. B 13-17 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO BODHI-TREES OF THE FORMER BUDDHAS.

B 13 (779); PLATES V, XXXIII


Text:

bhagavato Vipasino bodhi

Translation:

The Bodhi tree of the holy Vipasi (Vipaśyin).

On different pillars of the railing the Bodhi trees of five predecessors of the historical Buddha are depicted (Cunningham, Pl. XXIX and XXX). The Bodhi tree of Śikhin who is the second in the well-known row of the seven Buddhas is missing. But we may almost certainly assume that the relief which represented the tree of Śikhin has been destroyed or deported. All the five available reliefs have labels which do not leave any doubt about their identification. The addition of sālo after bodhi in the inscription B 14 makes it certain that bodhi is used in all the reliefs in the sense of Bodhi tree as it is frequently done in Pāli and Sanskrit literature.¹

The representation in all the five sculptures is stereotyped. On both sides of the stone seat, which rises above the Bodhi tree, a person is shown kneeling. These kneeling figures are sometimes two women (B 16, B 17), sometimes two men (B 13), sometimes a man and a woman (B 14, B 15). Some other people stand behind them, normally two as in B 14-17. In all these four reliefs, one person is depicted on both sides of the tree, offering garlands or strewing flowers, and the arrangement is always such that a man stands behind a kneeling woman, and a woman behind a kneeling man. In our relief (B 13), however, nine men, five on the left and four on the right side of the tree—the trunk of which is decorated with a broad band—are represented offering garlands or bouquets, or showing their veneration. These persons are meant as human worshippers which suggests that the sculpture illustrates, not the enlightenment of the Buddha, but the worship of the Bodhi tree (see B 14).

The names of the five Buddhas occurring in the different labels are the same as in Pāli. But of the Bodhi trees only the four of the last Buddhas depicted in the reliefs correspond exactly to the statements in the Mahāpadānasutta (D. II. 4), in the Bu. and in the Nidānakathā (J. I. 41 ff.), according to which the Sala (Shorea robusta) belongs to

¹ Cf. B 14, f. n. 2, p. 84.
Vessabhū, the Śīrīsha (Acacia sirissa) to Kakusandha, the Udumbara (Ficus glomerata) to Konāgamana, the Nyagrodha (Ficus indica) to Kassapa. These texts however mention that the Bodhi tree of Vipassī is the Pātāli tree (Bignonia suaveolens), and, as pointed out by Anderson, it is a special feature of our medallion that the tree represented is not the Pātāli, as assumed by Cunningham, but undoubtedly the Aśoka tree (Saraca Indica). A comparison of our tree with the unmistakable representation of the Aśoka tree embraced by a female deity with a leg (as in B 11) does not leave any doubt regarding the identity of the tree.

The divergence is surprising, but it would be wrong to attribute it to a mere mistake of the sculptor. He evidently followed another tradition, for the same tree reappears in Sānchi. There on six architraves of the four gates of Stūpa I the seven last Buddhas are symbolized by their Bodhi trees or their stūpas. In two cases, on the reverse of the uppermost architrave of the eastern gate (I) and on the obverse of the middle architrave of the northern gate (II), the seven Bodhi trees are represented one beside the other. On the four other architraves, trees and stūpas alternate. In two cases, on the reverse of the uppermost architrave of the southern gate (III) and on the obverse of the uppermost architrave of the western gate (IV) the arrangement is tree, stūpa, tree, stūpa, tree, stūpa, tree. In the remaining two cases, on the obverse of the uppermost architrave of the eastern gate (V) as well as on that of the northern gate (VI), the succession from the left to the right is: stūpa, stūpa, tree, stūpa, tree, stūpa, tree. As far as I can judge from the photographs of the architraves the first tree to the left in (I) is an Aśvattha, the last to the right an Aśoka, in (II) the first tree on the left is an Aśoka, the last to the right, which seems to be much weather-beaten, can be an Aśvattha. Now probably as the traditional succession of the Buddhas is followed in the arrangement, running once from the left to the right and at another time from the right to the left, and, as the Aśvattha or the Pippala (Ficus religiosa) is assigned in the whole Buddhist literature of all times to Sākyamuni, we may assume with certainty that the Aśoka tree is the tree of Buddha Vipaśyin as far as these sculptures are concerned. Of the rest of the architraves, I have only photographs of (IV) and (V) at my disposal which are sufficiently clear to confirm the above result. In (IV), the first tree to the left is probably an Aśoka, the last to the right is certainly an Aśvattha. In (V) the tree to the left is an Aśvattha, the tree to the right an Aśoka. In (IV) and (V) therefore apparently the first and the seventh Buddha are represented by their Bodhi trees, the other Buddhas by stūpas. The assignment of the Aśoka tree to Vipassin can also be confirmed by literary evidence. In the Mahāyāna, it is said of Vipaśyin: aśokam āśirvadā jino Vipaśyin (I.C. p. 227).

B 14 (714); PLATES XVII, XXXIII


1 Cat., I, p. 30.
2 Left or right has to be understood from the spectator's point of view.
3 Bloch's statement (ASIAR. 1908-9, p. 139, f. n. 2) that the Nidānakathā and other Pāli sources call the tree a nigrodha rests on a misunderstanding of the passage in the Nidānakathā J., I, 68 f. The Nyagrodha under which the Bodhisattva was sitting, when Sujātī was bringing the milk-rice to him, does not have anything to do with the Bodhi tree. In the Nidānakathā, the Āsūrtha is expressly mentioned as the Bodhi tree of Sākyamuni, see J., I, 34 ff. and J., I, 13 asatthārakkhavāle abhisambuddhissati.

**TEXT:**

bhagavato Vesabhunā' bodhi sālo

**TRANSLATION:**

The Bodhi tree of the holy Vesabhu (*Visvaabhū*), a Sāla tree.

The medallion represents a Sāla tree (Shorea robusta) hung with garlands, with a seat decorated with flowers in front of it. On the top of the seat, under an umbrella, there is a chakra surmounted by a triśūla. Two worshippers are kneeling on each side of the seat, a man to the left and a woman to the right. Behind the man there is a woman holding a garland and behind the woman a man scattering small objects, probably flowers, from a small bowl which he holds in his left hand.

The Sāla tree is mentioned in Pāli (*D. I*, 4; *J. I*, 42) and in the *Mahāmā*, p. 227 as the tree under which Visvabhū obtained enlightenment. The addition of sālo in the inscription makes it certain that bodhi is used here in the sense of Bodhi tree as is frequently done in Pāli and Sanskrit literature, and the presence of human worshippers in the relief affords additional proof that the sculpture illustrates, not the enlightenment of the Buddha, as supposed by Bloch, but the worship of the Bodhi tree as a pārśivāyika chaitya. The name of the Buddha is the same as in Pāli (*Vissabhā*). In Sanskrit it appears as *Visvabhū*; the nominative *Visvabhūk* (*Ms. 2*, 8; *Mahāmā* p. 227) is, of course, due to wrong Sanskritisation.

**B 15 (783); PLATES XVII, XXXIII**


**TEXT:**

bhagavato Kakusadhasa bodhi

**TRANSLATION:**

The Bodhi tree of the holy Kakusadha (*Kakutsandha*).

1 The last akṣara is really ०, but ० is certainly only an error for ०, the e-sign being by mistake elongated to the right.

2 Cf. agamā bodhisamāpi J., 479, 1; bodhi tassas bhagavato assettho ti vi śucchati J., Nidi, G. 79; J., I, 34 ff.; IV, 228 ff.; bodhisvāna Sāh., 32; 391; āsya yassa yassa rukkhassa māle chaturgamā parishāhkāhāna bojjhaṃ bodhisā paśitivijjhati so sobodisū ti viśucchati Dā, 416; bodhisā māle *Ms.,* I, 3; bodhisvāna, yāvad rājā ko bodhisā satasahasrān dattaṃ Dīya, 393; tīraṇīkkāhīnā pīppale 'svattho bodhisvān bodhisā cha kathaye Hal., 2, 41; bodhisā pīppale *Hem. An.,* 2, 240.


4 *ASL. Ann. Rep.,* 1908-9, p. 139, Note 1; see the remarks below under No. B 23.

5 But the instrumental *Visvaabhū, ibid.,* p. 249. *Vicēabkṛti,* the form of the name adopted by Barua is wholly unfounded.
The lower part of the medallion has been broken off, but enough remains to show that it was of the common type described under Nos. B 13, B 14, B 16, and B 17. In the middle is a Śirisha tree (Acacia sirissa) in full blossom. In front of it is a seat on each side of which a worshipper is kneeling, a woman on the left and a man on the right. Two persons are standing on each side of the tree, a woman holding a garland on the right and on the left a man throwing flowers from a cup which he carries in his left hand. The literary sources agree with the sculpture in assigning the Śirisha tree to Kakusandha (D. II, 4; J. I, 42; Mahām. p. 227).

The Pāli form of the Buddha's name is Kakusandha (D. II, 2 ff.; M. I, 333 ff.; Th. 1187 f. and J. I, 45 ff.; 94). As the name seems to be a compound of kakud and sanīha, we should expect rather Kakusandha. In Sanskrit the name appears regularly in the strange form Krakuchchhanda (Meu. I, 294; 318; II, 265; III, 240 f.; 243; Lalitav. 5; 281; 283; Divy. 393; Mū. 2, 9; Mahām. p. 227; 250; Hem. Abb. 236). The form Krakusandha occurs only Meu. I, 2 and as variant reading Mū. 2, 9.

B 16 (722); PLATES XVII, XXXIII


TEXT:

bhagavato Konāgamanaśa bedhi

TRANSLATION:

The Bodhi tree of the holy Konāgamana.

The medallion over which the inscription is engraved is of the same type as the medallion described under Nos. B 13, B 14, B 15, and B 17. In the centre there is an Udumbbara tree (Ficus glomerata) hung with garlands. In front of it is a seat formed of a slab supported by two pillars. On each side of it a woman kneels kissing the seat, while a man stands on either side of the tree, the one on the left offering a garland, the other holding in his left hand a bowl filled with some round objects, probably flowers, which he scatters with his right hand.

In conformity with the representation in the relief Konāgamana's Bodhi tree is everywhere stated to be the Udumbara tree (D. II, 4; J. I, 43; Mahām. p. 227).

Konāgamanaśa in the inscription is apparently a clerical error for Konāgamanaśa just as bedhi for bodhi. In Pāli the form of the name varies between Konāgamana and

2 Read Konāgamanaśa.
3 Read bodhi. The engraver has forgotten to add the vowel-stroke to the right. (A horizontal stroke to the left of dhī could be seen in the rubbing. This may not have anything to do with the missing right-hand vowel stroke of bh.)
Konāgamana (D. I, 2 ff.; J. I, 42 ff.; 94), while in the inscription on the pillar of Nigāli Sāgar it is written Konākamana. In Sanskrit literature it is distorted to Konākamuni (Msv. II, 265; III, 240 f., 243; Mahām. p. 227) and, under the influence of popular etymology, to Kanakamuni (Msv. I, 294; 318; Lalita. 5; Divy. 333; Dharmasaṁgraha VI; Meq. 2, 10; Mahām. p. 230). Kanakamuni, ‘Gold-Sage’, further gave rise to Kanakāhvaya (Lalita. 281; 283) and Kāñchana (Hem. Abh. 236).

B 17 (760); PLATES XVII, XXXIII


TEXT:

bhagavato Kasapasa bodhi

TRANSLATION:

The Bodhi tree of the holy Kasapa (Kāśyapa).

The medallion to which the label belongs is of the same type as the medallions described under Nos. B 13-16. The middle is occupied by a tree which by its leaves and berries is characterized as a Nyagrodha tree (Ficus indica), though the pendent roots are omitted, perhaps, as suggested by Cunningham, to make room for the many garlands hung up on the twigs. In front of the tree is a seat. On each side of it a woman is represented embracing the trunk of the tree, the one on the left kneeling and the other on the right sitting on a morhā and turning the back to the spectator. On each side of the tree a man stands carrying a garland.

The sculpture agrees with the literary tradition in representing the Bānian tree as Kāśyapa’s Bodhi tree; see D. II, 4; J. I, 43; Mahām. p. 227.
3. B 18-40 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO CERTAIN SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF THE BUDDHA

B 18 (777); PLATES XVII, XXXIV


TEXT:

Mahâsāmâyikâya Arahaguto devaputo bhagavato sâsâni patisaṁdhí

TRANSLATION:

Descended from (the hall of) the Great Assembly the angel Arahaguta

(Ārahagupta) apprises the Holy One of (his future) reincarnation.

The interpretation of the inscription is to be based on the sculpture. The centre of the relief is occupied by a seat surmounted by a parasol from which pendants hang down. The surface of the seat is decorated with ornamental bands and covered with flowers and pañchângulikas. On the foot-rest before the seat two foot-prints are seen, placed side by side and each marked with a wheel. A large crowd has gathered round the seat. With the exception of one person kneeling before the seat and touching the right foot-print, all are standing with their hands joined in devotion. Two figures in the left lower corner are represented with wings, thus showing that the assembly consists not of men, but of gods. The kneeling figure undoubtedly is the devaputra Ārahagupta of the label. Barua and Sinha give a translation of the label which disregards the most elementary rules of grammar, and further they give an explanation of the sculpture which is quite opposed to it. They interpret the sculpture as the visit of Ārahagupta to the palace of Sudhodana for paying homage to the newly born Boddhisattva and predicting the inception of the Law of the Divine teacher. A glance at the plate is sufficient to show the impossibility of this explanation. The older one of Hoernle is also untenable. Hoernle reads dhokâ instead of vokâto and takes it as a present participle of a verb *dhokkati 'to greet respectfully' which he infers from Hindi dhok or dhok 'obedient', 'greeting'. The two last words which he reads sâsâti patisaṁdhìnī may mean, according to him, that Arahaguta praises the re-incarnation of the Buddha and in his opinion the relief refers to the 'great assembly' in the Mahâvana near Kapila-

1The v of vokato differs from the v of devaputo and Bhagavato by showing no vertical. But all other readings suggested for the akṣara are out of question.
2As pointed out by Hultzsch, the left half of the sign of to is very short, but the reading to is practically certain.
3Read sâsâti.
4In the great assembly (of the gods) the future inauguration of the law of the Divine Master is being announced by the Angel Ārahagupta, the protector of the Arhats.
vatthu which the Mahāsamayasutta (D. II, 253 ff.) deals with. This text narrates how the
gods approach from all the worlds in order to see the Buddha and the monks and how the
Buddha takes this as an opportunity to announce the names of all these gods to the
monks. In my opinion this explanation of Hoernle is quite impossible on account of the
fact that the scene represented in the relief does not take place in the Mahāvāna but in
heaven. Nothing hints at a forest. Even the throne does not stand under a tree. It is only
surmounted by an umbrella. If, however, the scene of the event is in heaven then the
Tushita heaven only can be meant in which the Bodhisattva dwells before his being born in the
world. Accordingly also the paṭissamādhī of the label can only refer to his future incarnation.
It is further impossible that the paṭissamādhī is being praised, for sāsati cannot at all mean
‘praise’; sāsati is used in the sense of ‘to inculcate’, ‘to inform’, ‘to instruct something’.
sāsati is certainly a scribe’s mistake for sāsati; Arahaguto devaputto... sāsati paṭissamādhī(n)
therefore can only mean, ‘the devaputta Arahaguta proclaims the future incarnation’.
The genitive bhagavato can be connected with paṭissamādhī(n), but with the verb sāsati as well,
for verbs in the meaning of ‘to say’ or ‘to inform’ are construed in Sanskrit and in Prakrit
very commonly with the genitive. Now we read in the Nidānakathā (J. I. 48) that
the goddesses of all ten thousand Chakkavālas having heard of the Buddhahalāhala came
together according to a fixed rule in some Chakkavāla and that from there they went to the
Bodhisattva in the Tushita heaven and announced to him that the time had arrived for
him to become a Buddha for the welfare of the world (tadā pana sahā pi tā... ekachakkavāle
saṅgaṇipattāra Tusitaḥbhavana Bodhisattassā saṅnikah gantvā... so vo dānā kālo mūrṣa Buddhatīrṣyā
saṁyayo mūrṣa Buddhahalāhā tī yāvīnā). This narration agrees exactly with the relief and the
inscription, if we take Arahaguta as the speaker of the gods and connect Bhagavatato—also
the order of the words suggests—with sāsati. Then we can translate the whole as above.
Vokato apparently is to be read vokkantī and corresponds to Sk. vyavakrāntaḥ as Pāli vokkanto
to vyavakrānti; cf. gabbhe vokkanto dukkhaṁ (dīvā), Therag. 709. From the term we may
gather that Arhadgupta was an inhabitant of one of the celestial abodes above the Tushita
heaven. Mahāsāṃyātiḥ is a derivative of mahāsāmāyā=Pāli mahāsāmāya, Sk. mahāsāmāja,
which denotes the Great Assembly of the gods in the title of the Sūtra mentioned above.
It is probably to be taken as the name of the sahā where the great assembly took place.

It is of importance for judging the connection of the sculptures with the literary tradition
that this request of the gods is not mentioned in the Muc., and it is told in the Lalitav.
(p. 11 ff.) in quite a different form. Here again the narrow relationship between the
sculptures and the Pāli tradition is evident. Whether the personality of Arahaguta, whose
name does not occur anywhere in literature, has disappeared in the Ceylonese tradition or
whether it has been added in the Indian tradition cannot be decided. In Bhārhatu,
Arahaguta appears once again in a similar role in the relief which represents the renunciation
of the Bodhisattva (B 20). The Nidānakathā (J. I. 64, 1 ff.) only speaks of goddesses accompa-
nying the Bodhisattva, while in the relief one of the figures is marked out by the label as
Arahaguto devaputto."

B 19 (801); PLATES XVII, XXXV

On the same pillar as No. A 73, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 7). Edited

1His presence is indicated in the sculpture by the foot-prints on the foot-rest.
2About the alleged deviations of the inscriptions and the sculptures from the Pāli canon pointed
out by Minayev in his Recherches sur le Bouddhisme, it has already been shown by Oldenberg
ΞDMG., LII, p. 640 ff. that they do not prove anything.
by Cunningham, P.āŚB. 1874, p. 112; StBh. (1879), p. 83; 138, No. 89, and Pl. XXVIII
and LV; Rhys Davids, Buddhist Birth Stories (1880), p. CIII; Hultzsch, 2DMG. Vol. XLI (1886),
(1937), Pl. XXVI (35); Lüders, Bhār. (1941), p. 45-52.

TEXT:

bhagavato ukrahitä

TRANSLATION:

The conception of the Holy one.

In the sculpture Māyā is represented sleeping on her bed. She is lying in full dress
on her right side with her right hand under her head. A lamp on an ornamental stand
is burning at the foot of the bed, while a water-vessel is placed at the other end. Two women
seated on cushions are in attendance, one having a chāmari, the other raising her hands as if
in astonishment. A third woman is sitting on the opposite side with her hands joined in
the attitude of devotion. In the upper part of the medallion a big six-tusked elephant with
an ornamental cloth on the top of his head is seen flying down through the air.

The question is whether the descent of the Bodhisattva in the shape of an elephant
was meant by the artist only as a dream of the mother or as a reality. The legend has been
treated in details by Windisch, Buddhhas Geburt, p. 153 ff. The texts of the Pāli canon do not yet
know it; it is mentioned neither in the Achchariyabbhutadhāmas. of M. (123) nor
in the Mahāpadānas. of D. (14). In M. III, 120 it is only said shortly: sato sampajānō
Bodhisattva Tusitā kāya chaevita mātuh kuchchhiṅi ukkami, so also in D. II, 12 of Vipassin with the
addition: ayam ettha dhammatā. In the original text of Aśvaghosha's Buddhach. I, 3 the Bodhi-
sattva is clearly indicated as a fruit of the conjugal intercourse of Sudhodana and Māyā.
In the following verse the entering of the elephant is mentioned quite shortly as a dream of
Māyā. In the Nidānakathā, J. I, 50, 2 ff. as well, it is only said at first that the Bodhisattva
took his rebirth in the womb of the queen. Later on in a sort of appendix the entering of
the elephant as a dream is narrated in greater extent than anywhere else. It is peculiar that
the description ends with the words: "So he took his rebirth under the constellation
Utarāśaṅghā" (etuvā uttarāśaṅghānakkhatte paṭīsandhiṁ ganhi).

In the story in the Msv. II, 8, 16 ff. as well as in the identical narration of the conception
of the Buddha Dipamkara in I, 205, 2 ff. in general a dream is told, but in the verses I,
207, 8 ff.; II, 11, 19, ff. it is said that the Buddha having taken the form of an elephant,

Although the meaning of ukrahitā is undoubtedly 'conception', it is difficult to account
for the form of the word. [Cf. above p. VI, 92 (II).] The term used for conception in
Msv., II, 17, 11; Latītā, 75, 7, is garhānukṛtā; and ukrahitā is generally used for the Buddha's
entering into the womb of his mother Msv. II, 8, 19 f.; 9, 6; 20; 10, 6; 11, 21; 12, 2;
6; 16; 20; Latītā, 55, 5. Hultzsch therefore read ukrahitī in the inscription, but the first
letter, as he remarks himself, is distinctly u. Unless we will assume a mistake of the engraver, it
will be impossible to trace ukrahitā back to avukrānti, there being no evidence that avo ever became u
in any dialect. The prefix a can go back only to apa, as taught by Hemachandra in his grammar I, 173.
The examples quoted by him from the Prakrit can be paralleled by forms of ait and aino in Pāli
(Bevöchtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanaus, 1954, 110). I am therefore of opinion that
ukrahitā represents Sk. aprakrānti, and in support of this view I may refer to the ancient verse in Msv.,
II, 8, 18 and Latītā, 55, 8, where the ordinary kukshim avukrāntaḥ is replaced by udaram upagataḥ.
like a white cloud, entered the womb of his mother: pāṇḍaruṇāḥakānīḥ bhavita gajaraṇī
shaḍānto... mātun kuskismin okraṇo. In the following verse I, 207, 11 f.; II, 12, 1 f. the
queen narrates this to her husband as a fact (rājavarā pāṇḍaro me gajaraṇī kuskisin okraṇa),
but immediately afterwards the king speaks to the astrologers of a dream (supinasmin aṣya
sarve bhagātā bhātān phalaviṇākāṃ). As an actual event, the entering of the elephant in the
womb of the mother is furthermore spoken of in the praise song of Nāmatīdeva in I, 98,
12: Māyāyā devyāh kuskismin praviṣhita sa kumudasadṛśī varo gajaraṇapāṇāḥ, as well as in the
Gāthā II, 298, 6:

Tushīte bhavane dīya otarītva himasamā nāgo bhavita shaḍānta
rājī kho agraṇahātu praviṣhita kuskismin tato trīṣāhāra prakampe lokadhātu

Windisch thought it possible to add to these passages another one. In Miuvu II, 8,
16 f. it is said of the dream of Māyā:

aha supinam janani jinasam kṣaṇe paśyati varasipakapahāna
hīmaḍaraṇānībhābhाः
udaram upagato gajapradāhano latitaṅgatāṁ anuvadanyadrasanandhāṁ

The stanza occurs again in the Latitarā. 55, 6 ff.

Māyādevī sūkṣmaṇaṇapraṣuptā imaṁ vaḍānam apaśyat
hīmaḍaraṇānībhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhाः
cūlaṇaṇaḥaṇaḥaṇa
udaram upagato gajapradāhano latitaggatāṃ drīḍhaṇāṃyagādramanandhāṁ

The Latitarā account is similar in general to that of the Miuvu. The vision of the
elephant is taken as a dream. But in the introductory sentence (55, 3) the remark is found that
the Bodhisattva entered the womb of the mother as a young white elephant (pāṇḍuro gajapoto
bhātā). As Windisch mentions, this is hinted at already in the Prachalaparivarta 39, 6 ff. There
the Bodhisattva in the Tushita heaven asks with the statement that according to the texts of
the Brahmīs a Bodhisattva has to enter the womb of the mother in the form of a great
elephant with six tusks. That the artist of Bhārhit took the matter as a real occurrence is
shown by the inscription according to which, the arriving or, if we take īkramita as a mistake
for okramita, the descent of the Bodhisattva is represented in the sculpture. The reality of the
elephant is also hinted at by the gesture of one of the female attendants sitting in front of the
couch. Her raised hands can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than as an expression of
astonishment at the miracle¹. One could object against this view by saying that in the old

¹This stanza, apparently old as is shown by the tradition in the texts of two different
schools, has been used by the poet of another verse in which the queen narrates her dream (Latitarā.
56, 14 ff.; 57, 11 ff.):

hīmaḍaraṇānībhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhābhाः
sucharaṇa suśibhaktāt shaḍāntaḥ mahātām
pāṇḍuro gajapradāhāṁ yogakalpas varṇaḥ
udāri mama praviṣhitaṁ tasya hetuḥ śrīnākṣa (or śrīnākāha)

The stanza in Pushpitarā metre together with the introductory remark reappears also in the
story of Dipankara's conception, Miuvu I, 205, 2 ff.; here, however, with the variant se=aṣyaḥ for me,
and Windisch wished to conclude therefrom that we have originally in the stanza not the words of
Māyā, but a story, that means the historification of the dream. But se does not stand in the manus
scripts. It has been added to the text by Senart as expressly stated by him on p. 537. So it is nothing
else than a false conjecture for me as we can now state on account of mama in the recast stanza of the
Latitarā.

²Barua, Bharh, II, p. 12, assumes that the maid presses with her hand against the leg of the bed
in order to prevent the queen rolling down or to prevent the couch being unbalanced under the pressure
of the descending elephant. This explanation seems to me as improbable as the one suggested by
St. Kramrisch who takes the maid to be dozing at night.
Indian art the person of the Buddha is not represented, not only in his last existence on earth but also in the immediately preceding period of his stay in the Tushita heaven. That is proved by the relief in the middle of the so called Ajātasatru pillar (Cunningham Pl. XVI).

But it is doubtful whether this practice has been followed in our particular case, for here the Bodhisattva does not appear in human form but in the disguise of an animal. Another consideration is perhaps still more weighty. The representations in Bāharut follow the standpoint of the Hinayāna. The Hinayāna, however, accepted the dream as a prophecy of the birth of a future Buddha, but not the supernatural immaculate conception. This is still maintained with all emphasis in the Sakish (Khotanese) poem of instruction 14, 54-56, and Aśvaghosha adheres to this standpoint. In the Nidānakathā a hint at the historification of the dream is to be found, but only in the appendix mentioned above on p. 89. In the popular belief, however, the historification was apparently already made a fact in the 3rd cent. B.C. At the end of the sixth edict of Aśoka in Dhauli we find seyo, ‘the white one’, which refers to the figure of an elephant, and on the rock of Kālī we find gajatane, ‘the best elephant’ under the figure of an elephant. On the rock of Girnār too, an elephant must have been carved out once. For below the thirteenth edict we find: (sa)vasveto lusti sarvakakasukhāhara nāma ‘the completely white elephant named ‘the bringer of happiness to the whole world’’. These inscriptions do not leave any doubt that the carvings of the elephant referred to the Buddha, or to speak more exactly to the Bodhisattva. In this case it seems only possible to relate the representations to the person of the Buddha, and not to a dream prophesying the birth of a Buddha.

Under these circumstances it seems to me more probable that the representation of the conception was intended as a reality. If one likes to consider the gesture of the female attendant as meaningless it would indeed be possible to make the following suggestion: the relief, as the inscription says, depicts the entering of the Bhagavat, but the artist did not know how to express it in some way other than by representing a dream which, at least according to the stories in the Mau. and the Latitav., took place at the same time as the conception. That seems to be the view of Foucher, who sees (L’art Gréco-bouddhique I, 291 ff.) just in such representations the basis of the historification of the original dream. An altogether sure decision of the question is scarcely possible.

In some other point, I believe, I am more justified in deviating from Foucher. The queen in the relief lies on her right side, as she does also in the relief of Sāachi, in a relief in Amarāvatī and on the frieze of Boro-Budur, whereas in the art of Gandhāra she is depicted always as lying on her left side. Foucher is of the opinion that this is due to an inadvertency or unskilfulness of the old artists. But this reproach is not justified if it can be proved that at their time the dogma of the entering of the Bodhisattva into the right side of the mother did not exist at all. Indeed in the Mau. as well as in the Latitav. it is stated that the Bodhisattva was conceived in the right side of the mother’s womb (maṭṭur dakhine kuksho upamanaḥ, Latitav. 60, 16), that after entering he remained in the right side of the mother’s womb (dakhine pārśve paryākam abhūjita tishṭati, Mau. II, 16, 12, also I, 213, 8; abhyantaragataś cha bodhisattvā Māyādevyād kuksho dakhine pārśve paryākam abhūja nishāna)

1The possibility of this explanation has already been thought of by Oldenberg, ZDMG., LII, p. 642.
2How Cunningham, p. 84, can say “The position leaves her right side exposed” I do not understand.
3Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pl. XXXIII, Foucher, Beginnings of Buddhist Art, Pl. IX, 2.
4Burgess, Buddhist Stupas of Amarāvatī and Jayaśeṣṭa, Pl. XXVIII, 1; Foucher l.c. Pl. III.
5Pleyte, Buddha-Legende, fig. 13.
6See also Beginnings of Buddhist Art, explanation of Pl. III, A 1.
*bhūt Lalitav. 59, 22 f.). Therefore it is said also in the Lalitav. 55 that he descended into the right kukshi: dakhināyān (sic) kukshāv avakrāmad avakrānta cha sa dakhināvāchāraḥ *bhūn na jātu vāmāvācharaḥ. The entering into the right kukshi and the stay of the embryo there is quite in accordance with the Indian belief that a male child develops always in the right kukshi*. A clear hint at the supernatural entering into the right side of the mother occurs only in the Nidānakāthā (J. I, 50, 22 f.), where it is said that Māyā dreamt that the elephant was walking three times from right to left around her bed and went into her womb having hit her right side: mātusayanānā tikkhatattānā padakkhaṇān katuā dakhināvāpas蔓 tuṭetna kuchhāhīn pariṭṭhasadiso abhi. The author of the stanza in the Mev. (I, 203, 1 f.) certainly did not know of an entering from the right side. He says expressly that the queen lay down on her right side:

sā dāni dakhiniṇā paṁstena parināyaśa śāvaravarnam ।
kusumalatā va dravasvarah sayanam pariśtīlayasyāt_tv

The old artists therefore did not have any reason to represent the queen lying on her left side, the less so as this position would have been totally improper for her. According to the Buddhistic view, as it is handed down in A. II, 244 f.*, the human beings devoted to sensual pleasures sleep lying on their left side. This position called kāmabhogisēyā is opposed to the position styled sīhasēyā which owes its name to the belief that the lion takes such position while sleeping. In the sīhasēyā the person lies on the right side, placing one leg upon the other. This is the position taken by the Buddha while lying down; thus D. II, 134; 137: atha kho bhagavā dakhiniṇaṃ pasena sīhasēyaṃ kappesi pāda pādaṁ achchādāya; found shortened also in J. I, 119, 10 f.; 330, 27 f.; Dāk. I, 357 etc. The sīhasēyā is also prescribed for the monk (A. IV, 87), especially in the middle watch of the night (A. I, 114; II, 40). Therefore strictly speaking just the artists of Gandhāra are guilty of a mistake when representing Māyā in kāmabhogisēyā.

Cunningham says that the artist tries to depict the tusks of the elephant by some strokes as consisting of three teeth on either side. He may be right in this respect, though I cannot find anything of it in the photograph. The relief here conforms with what is said in the Mev. and the Lalitav. (shadvishāya, Mev. I, 205, 3; II, 8, 17; Lalitav. 55, 7; 56, 14; shadutta, Mev. I, 207, 8; II, 11, 19; shadutta, Lalitav. 39, 17; 55, 3). Neither Aśvaghoṣa nor the Nidānakāthā mention this attribute. The decoration of the head of the elephant has been added by the sculptor on his own. In the Mev. and the Lalitav. it is only mentioned that he was red-headed (surakṣaṭīrtha, Mev. I, 205, 3; II, 8, 17; Lalitav. 39, 17; 55, 7; indragopakaṣṭiras, Lalitav. 55, 3). That the elephant was carrying a white lotus in its trunk is a speciality of the Nidānakāthā. In the relief the elephant does not carry a lotus.

B 20 (814); Plates XVIII, XXXII


1See the literature given by Windisch Lc., p. 19.
2The Singhalese manuscript C* reads, however, phāletā 'having split' which is possibly the right reading.
3Senart reads in the first line parināyaśa; the manuscripts, however, read sanniyasa. The original reading of the first half of the verse was probably sā dāni dakhinānānā paścena sānīyaśa satīlaconom. In the second half of the stanza stood, as shown by the metre, originally dānadvamal. The meaning is not changed by these readings.
4Cf. D.I., 574 f.
INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO SCENES OF BUDDHA'S LIFE

17 ff., and Vol. III (1937), Pl. XXIII (18); Lüders, Bhārḥ. (1941), p. 172.

TEXT:

Arahaguto devaputo

TRANSLATION:

The angel Arahaguta (Arhadgupta).

The subject of the sculpture of which only the left half is preserved is the abhinisñkramaṇa of the Bodhisattva. In the upper portion the Bodhisattva, who is indicated by his footprints, is stepping out of the palace, watched by two female deities. In the middle portion the horse Kanthaka is seen being led along the city-wall by Chhanna, while two gods are looking on with their hands reverentially joined and a third is waving a chauri. A parasol and two chaurs over the horse show that the Bodhisattva is sitting on it. In the lower portion the horse appears again on its way outside the city, accompanied by several gods rendering homage or giving vent to their delight. One of them is bearing a drum, while the one on the left who stands with his hands joined in devotion, seems to be the leader of the host, as he is designated by the label. We have met him already in the relief described under No. B 18, where he appears as the speaker of the gods exhorting the Bodhisattva to incarnate himself. Buddhist literature seems to ignore his name.

B 21 (775); PLATES XVIII, XXXVI


TEXT:

1 Sudhārūmā devasabhā
2 bhagavatō chūḍāmaho

TRANSLATION:

The hall of the gods Sudhārūmā (Sudharmā).
The festival of the hair-lock of the Holy One.

[B 21 and B 22 refer to one and the same sculpture.]
See the remarks under No. B 22.

B 22 (776); PLATES XVIII, XXXVI

On the left outer face of the same pillar as No. A 59, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 3). The inscription is engraved on the same relief as No. B 21, on the roof of another building. Edited by Cunningham, PASB 1874, p. 113; StBh. (1879), p. 109; 137,

From the photograph of Cunningham’s Plate XX.

Text:

1 Vejayanta pā-
2 sāde

Translation:

The Vejayanta (Vaijayanta) palace.

[B 21 and B 22 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

In the Nidānakathā of the *Jātaka* (I, 64 f.) it is told that the Bodhisattva, when he had left his native town, cut off with his own sword his hair together with the head-dress and cast it to the sky. Sakka received it in a golden casket and deposited it in the Chūlamānicheetiya in the Tavatimsa heaven. As pointed out by Huber, the same story, with slight variations, is found in the *Mūla.* (II, 165 f.), in the *Lalitav.* (p. 225), and in the Chinese translation of the Abhinshkramaṇaṇaṇa and the Vinaya of the Mulasarvāstivādins. In these latter texts it is added that on the anniversary of the event the Thirty-three gods celebrate the festival of the hair-lock. This festival is represented in the sculpture. In the left upper corner there is a building surrounded by a railing. It has a pinnacled dome roof and an arched gateway which affords a view of the hair-lock and the head-dress in the interior. They are lying in a bowl placed on a throne and surmounted by a parasol decorated with pendants. On each side a god stands. According to the label the edifice is the hall of the gods Sudharmā, which is frequently mentioned in Buddhist texts as the hall of the Thirty-three gods presided over by Indra and is well known also in epic and classical Sanskrit literature. A late legend of its origin is told in the Kulāvakajātaka (J., Vol. I, 204).

The adjoining building in the right upper corner is a three-storied palace, again surrounded by a railing. In each of the arched doors opening on the balconies of the second and third storeys the head of some person is seen, while on the lower floor Indra is standing with four female attendants around him. He is looking down at the scene below, where four Apsaras are dancing to the music of a band of four male and three female musicians. Among the instruments they are playing on a small drum to be beaten with a stick, a large drum played upon with the hand, and two vīṇās can be distinguished. One of the females seems to be clapping her hands, while the two others may be singing. Vaijayanta, the name of the building, is an epithet applied to all sorts of things belonging to Indra. It occurs in the Buddhist texts in Pāli and Sanskrit as the name of his palace, and it is known also in Brahmanical literature. In *M.* I, 203 Indra is said to have the Vaijayanta palace built after a victory over the Asuras; according to the later legend referred to in the Kulāvakajātaka (J., Vol. I, 203) it rose spontaneously from the ground.

On the uppermost relief of the outer face of the same pillar as No. A 62, now in the

---

1 The last akṣara, which can be read only de, is a clerical error for do.
2 See reference B 21.
3 D., II, 207; J., 489, 20; 494, 3; 523, 1; Mūla., I, 32, 10; III, 198, 2; Divy., p. 220; etc.
4 M., I, 283; J., 545, 78; Mūla., II, 346, 20; Lalitav., 58, 20; 212, 1; 213, 18; etc.
INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO SCENES OF BUDDHA'S LIFE


TEXT:

1 bhagavato Sakamunino
2 bodho

TRANSLATION:

The building round the Bodhi tree of the holy Sakamuni (Śākyamuni).

The sculpture represents a Pippala or Aśvattha tree (Ficus religiosa) bearing berries. Two small umbrellas are visible on the top of it and streamers hang down from its branches. In front of the trunk, which is decorated with an ornamental band and some foliage, the seat, or sayāsana, stands, consisting of a slab and four supporting pilasters. It is strewn with flowers and surmounted by two triśatnas. The tree is surrounded by a pillared hall, the sides of which are represented in the peculiar Indian perspective as slanting upwards. The hall has an upper storey with a balcony fenced in by a railing. Four arched doors, two on the front side and one on each wing, open on the balcony. An umbrella is raised before each door, and the two lateral doors are ornamented with a female statue on either side. The roof is crowned by three pinnacles on the front side. On the right of the building is a detached pillar with a bell-shaped capital bearing the figure of an elephant carrying a garland in its trunk. The shaft of the pillar is prolonged downwards into the middle panel, and at the foot of it there is a stout male figure holding some round object on his head. This person is quite different from the gods represented in the middle relief and certainly has no connection with them, but appears to be a deity of the nether world who acts as the tutelary deity and bearer of the pillar.

On either side of the seat a worshipper is kneeling, a man to the left and a woman to the right. Behind the woman a man stands with folded hands, and to the left of the kneeling man there is a woman holding what seems to be a bunch of flowers in her upraised left hand while with her right she is throwing flowers on the seat. In the upper portion of the relief divine beings are represented worshiping the tree. On either side of it, in the air, is a winged human figure with the hind limbs, the claws and the tail of a bird. One is throwing flowers from a bowl which he carries in his left hand, while the other is offering a garland. Below

---

1 Lüders mentions that the figure is represented with a coiled pad of cloth intended as a support (P. chambata) on the head. It seems however more probable that the object which the figure carries on its head is a pot, used for offerings by the visitors to the temple, which is similar to the one borne on the head by some of the Mathurā statues known as 'porteurs de vase'; cf. J. Ph. Vogel, *La Sculpture de Mathurā*, Paris 1930, *Ars Asiatica*, XV, Pl. XLIX and L. In this case the figure does not have anything to do with the pillar in front of which it stands.

2 I shall not go into the question whether these beings are to be called Gandharvas or Kinnaras. Barua, *Bh.* III, p. 57, calls them Vidyādharas and remarks: “They must be Vidyādharas, for we read in the J. Nidānakathā (Faustull, 7, 1): Viśādharā gandhamandālākāthā mahātāparāsasṃ saktakām Bodhārukham agaminu”. Should this be right, it would be of importance for the history of the evolution of the conception of the Vidyādharas, which I have treated in *ZDMG*, XCIII, p. 89 ff. But the quoted passage seems to be an invention of Barua, at least I am sure that it does not occur in the Nidānakathā.
those Kinnaras, on either side of the tree, two men of much larger size than the rest of the figures stand, and therefore are certainly meant to be gods. They are represented in the conventional attitude of delight, waving their garments with their right hands and touching their lips with their left hands either in astonishment or to sound a whistle.

The building round the Bodhi tree is found once more in a relief on a cross-bar (No. 55) reproduced by Cunningham on Pl. XXXI, 3. It shows three gates which do not appear in our relief, but in other respects it does not differ very much, if it is borne in mind that the roof here is opened, as it were, in order to reveal the tree. Even the pillar with the elephant1 appears here again. At Śāñcī there is an image of the building resembling even more closely that of the pillar relief on the southern gateway in the scene of Aśoka’s visit to the Bodhi tree. In all these cases the building evidently represents the hypaethral temple erected by Aśoka round the Bodhi tree. This temple, it is true, appears instead of the tree with the plain seat also in a relief on the western gateway at Śāñcī, which clearly illustrates the temptation of the Bodhisattva. Here on one side Māra’s hosts are retreating, while on the other side the gods are celebrating the victory of the Bodhisattva. But in the Bhārhatu reliefs there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the sculptors wanted to represent anything but the sanctuary of the Bodhi tree and its worship by divine and human beings. The visit of the holy sites is recommended in the Mahāparinibbānasutta (D. II, 140) as apt to cause religious emotions and a similar effect was apparently expected from looking at their images. The relief is thus an exact counterpart of the two adjoining upper reliefs (Cunningham Pl. XIII, side and inner face) where the parinirvāṇa is alluded to by some Stūpa and the dharmacakrapravartana by the Dharmaśāla of King Prasenajit at Śravasti (see B 38, B 39). This is decisive for the interpretation of the inscription. It is impossible for me to follow Bloch i.e. note 1 who translates it the attainment of supreme wisdom by the holy Sākyamuni. Bodhi cannot be used here in the sense of enlightenment, but must denote either the Bodhi tree or the building erected around it. It may be pointed out in favour of the latter alternative that the label is engraved on the roof of the building just as the names of the Sudhammā sabhā (B 21) and the Vejayanta palace (B 22) are written on the roofs of the buildings to which they refer, and secondly that the term used for the tree in Nos. B 14 etc. is bodhi, not bodha.

Sakyamuni is the designation of the Buddha already in the Pāli Canon1 and in the Aśoka inscription on the Rummindū pillar. The asvattha tree has been, as far as I know, everywhere and at all times the acknowledged Bodhi tree of the last Buddha. Bloch’s statement that the author of the Nidānakāthā and other Pāli writers call the tree a nirgrodha tree is due to a misunderstanding of j. I, 68 f. The nirgrodha tree under which the Bodhisattva was sitting when Sujātā offered him the milk rice has nothing to do with the Bodhi tree. The Nidānakāthā shares the common view regarding the nature of the Bodhi tree as appears from such passages as j. I, 15: assattharukkhamāle abhisambujhissati; I, 16: bodhi tassa bhagavato asattho ti paññhechatthi.

---

1Both Cunningham, p. 121, and Anderson, Cat. Vol. I, p. 57, assert that the figure is an elephant. In the plate it is not quite distinct.
2I agree with Barua, Barh., II, p. 32 f, that the Bodhi tree is an Āśvattha, not a Śirisha, as Cunningham, Stīh., p. 115, assumes. I, however, do not see any reason why the tree here depicted should be that Āśvattha which was planted according to the Pachchupannavaṭṭhī of the Kālingabodhī (479) by Ananda before the gate of the Jetavana. The elephant pillar by the side of the Bodhi temple in both the reliefs speaks decisively in favour of the fact that the same building is meant in both cases. It is in no way astonishing that the artists followed more or less their fancy and that their representations differed from each other in details.
3D. II, 274.
B 24 (740); Plates XVIII, XXXVII


**TEXT:**

1 purathima(m d)isa' Sudhâ-
2 vâsa de[v]ā

**TRANSLATION:**

In the eastern quarter the Sudhâvâsa (Sudhâvâsa) gods.

[B 24-26 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

In view of the fact that we find in the following two inscriptions utarâm disa (B 25) and dakhinâm disa (B 26), the restored reading purâthimah disa may be called certain. The use of the accusative is the same as in Gâthâ 9 of the Mahâsamayasutta (D. II, 258, 4 f.), where purimah disah, utarâm disah are found by the side of dakhimena, pachchimena. The Sudhâvâsa gods are mentioned already in the D. II, 50; 253 f. In the later classification of the gods they are the inhabitants of the five highest Rûpadhâatu heavens.

Further remarks on the sculpture are found under No. B 26.

B 25 (741); Plates XVIII, XXXVII


**TEXT:**

1 utarâm disa [t]ini³ sa-
2 vaganisâ

---

1 The amusâra and the da have been destroyed by a deep cut.
2 purimah disah Dukharaftche dakhimena Vehâhako
3 pachchimena Verppakko kicaro utarâm disah II chattaro te maññiya samantâ chatturo disâ II
daddalamâd ettham na eke kâpelavatttave II
3 With the exception of Cunningham who read tium, all editors read tissi, but as the letter is almost completely destroyed, the ti can by no means be called certain.
4 All editors agree in reading the second akshara of the line ta, but if the letter is compared with the ta in the first line, there can be little doubt that it is ga. After sa the surface of the stone has been damaged. Hoernle supplied si, which cannot be right as, with the exception of the torana inscription, no sa occurs in the Bhârhati inscriptions. On the other hand, Hultzsch and Barua-Sinha may be right in supplying si, although in that case we have to assume that the supposed as was separated from sa by an unusually large gap. However, I consider it far more probable that the inscription ended with sa and that the apparent traces of letters are mere fissures in the stone. Cunningham also, in his eye-copy as well as in his transcript, gives no letter after sa.
TRANSLATION:

In the northern quarter the three (classes of) Savaganisásas (Sarvagānṛśāsas?)

[B 24—26 refer to one and the same sculpture.] I am unable to offer a translation that would satisfy myself. All interpretations of the inscription published hitherto are based on the reading tu instead of ga in the line 2. Hoernle and Hultzsch transcribe the text uttaraṁ disa tīni savatani sisāni. Hoernle rendered it: ‘to the northern (or upper) side (are) three heads turned towards each other’, while Hultzsch’s tentative translation runs: ‘in the northern direction; [three covered] heads’. Hultzsch understood savatani as Sk. sahujiṇi, Hoernle traced it back to an adjective sahujiṇi, unknown elsewhere, but both translations are equally unsatisfactory as no three heads are seen in the sculpture, neither ‘turned towards each other’ nor ‘covered’. Hoernle’s attempt to refer the inscription to the relief in the lower panel is of course only a makeshift that need not be discussed. Barua and Sinha divide savataniisāni into savata-nisāni and boldly equating savataniisā with Sk. sarvatraṁśrīta or sarvāṭmaṁśrīta translate the inscription: ‘on the northern side—three classes of all pervading (Rūpabrahmas)’, which, apart from other reasons, cannot be accepted as nisā cannot possibly represent niśrīta. Probably, as remarked already above, the true reading is uttaraṁ disa tīni savaganisātrā, and as tiṇī is used in the Prakrit with nouns of all three genders and Sk. abhīṣahāvati, áśāhāvati becomes abhīṣāvati, áśāvati in Pāli, we may perhaps translate the inscription into Sk. uttaraśām dīti taryah sarvagānṛśāsah,¹ ‘in the northern quarter the three (classes of) Sarvagānṛśāsas’, i.e. of the gods whose kindness extends to all beings. However I am ready to admit that this explanation of the name can by no means be called certain. But although the meaning of the name remains doubtful, we shall see later on that the three Savaganisásas correspond to the gods of the eleven lower Rūpabrahmalokas of the later cosmographical system; see the remarks on No. B 26.

B 26 (742); PLATES XVIII, XXXVII


TEXT:

1 dakhināṁ disa chha Kā-
2 māvacharasahasāni

TRANSLATION:

In the southern quarter the six thousand Kāmāvacharās.

[B 24–26 refer to one and the same sculpture.] The inscription, which was strangely misunderstood by Hoernle, was correctly translated by Hultzsch. In the later classification of the gods the Kāmāvacharās are identical with the gods of the six Devalokas as opposed to the twenty Brahmalokas.

¹Bhrh. p. 53 Lüders translates saragānṛśāsah.
The twenty gods represented in the sculpture are arranged in two rows, one above the other, each row being again divided into two groups of five figures. To make the division quite clear, trees are placed between and at the end of each group. The figures, which according to the labels are representatives of the Sudhhavasa gods (B.24), the three Savaganiisias (B.25), and the six thousand Kamavacharas (B.26), do not differ from each other in their outward appearance, all standing with their hands reverentially joined and carrying their dupattas over their right arms. Greater individuality is exhibited only by the group of the left lower corner, the label of which unfortunately is missing owing to the breaking off of the stone. Here four gods are represented in exactly the same attitude as the gods of the other three groups, but the first figure on the right has wings and the two figures on the left are characterized as Nāgas by their snake-hoods. The winged figure is probably a Suparna. The fifth figure is seated on a rock, supporting his cheek with his left hand and scratching the ground with a stick. This is the typical attitude of the mourning Māra, as is shown below (B.77), and I have no doubt that here also the figure is meant for Māra who is mourning, while all other gods celebrate some happy event in the Buddha’s career. We do not know the name of the last group, but we may be sure that it was assigned to the Western quarter.

In my opinion the position of the relief below the panel showing the Bodhi tree as well as the attitude of the figures shows clearly that the gods are represented as paying attention, not to the tree, but to the dance of the Apsaras in the lower relief. This is of importance for understanding the distribution of the quarters among the different classes of deities.

The quarters are evidently allotted to the gods according to their rank. In the Buddhist cosmological system the Sudhhavāsikas are the inhabitants of the five higher Rūpabrahma worlds. As the inhabitants of the still higher Arūpabrahmalokas do not have any corporeality at all, the Sudhhavāsikas are the highest gods that could be depicted. Among the quarters, the East was at all times looked upon as the most prominent quarter, and it is therefore duly assigned to them. According to the system the Kamavacharas, on the other hand, are the gods of the six Devalokas standing at the end of the heavens. Therefore we should expect that the Western region is assigned to them. Instead of that the Southern quarter has been reserved for the Kamavachara gods. This, however, becomes understandable at once, when we realize that in the relief Nāgas appear in the western region, probably also Suparnas. These beings can at the best be called demi-gods and stand beneath the real gods; therefore the last region, the dighanānamānasayanā dīśā as it is called in j. 535, 58, is rightfully attributed to them. Lastly the Savaganiisias, even if their name remains unexplained, can only correspond to the gods of the eleven lower Rūpabrahmalokas of the later system. So they stand beneath the Sudhhavāsikas, but higher than the Kamavacharas, and hence it is quite understandable that the Northern region, which generally enjoys precedence over

1 The snake-hoods are indistinct in the Plate, but Anderson, Cat. Vol. I, p. 72, expressly states that the two figures are Nāgas.
2 The Nidānakathā, j.I., 75, 2 ff. narrates how the hosts of Nāgas, of Suparnas, of Devas and of Brahmac (gods) (but not Vidvādhāras which Barua, Barh. III, p. 2 adds out of his own fancy) celebrate the enlightenment of the Bodhisattva at the Bodhi tree. According to the Mau. II, 15, 14 ff. the same beings viz. the Nāgas, Suparnas, Devas and Brahmakāyikas worship the mother of the Bodhisattva after the conception. It is indeed quite probable that in the relief these four classes of deities are represented.
3 Coomaraswamy (j.R.A.S. 1928, p. 392 f.) and Waldschmidt (Buddhistische Kunst in Indien I, p. 70) on the contrary assume some connection between our relief showing the twenty gods with a relief above (see B.25) depicting the building around the Bodhi tree of the holy Sākyamuni. They maintain that the gods represented venerate the Buddha after he reached the enlightenment.
the Southern one, is attributed to them. The distribution of the gods to the regions is accordingly as follows

N
tini Savaganišā
ti

W
[Māra, Nāgas, Supaṇṇas]

E
Sudhāvāśa devā
devā

chha Kāmāvacharasahasāni

Now the statements regarding the regions given in our inscriptions can hardly refer to the habitations of the gods in the cosmos. According to the Buddhist view the heavens of the gods lie above and not at the side of each other. The arrangement of the gods can only have been made in respect of the places which they occupy as spectators of the dance of the Apsaras. In the theatre of the classical Sanskrit period also the seats of the spectators are divided according to the different castes and marked by pillars in different colours (Bharata 2, 48 ff.). An amphitheatre, differing from the later theatre, has to be thought of as our case as the spectators stand in all the four different quarters. Already in ZDMG. XCV, p. 264 ff., I have shown that this was the oldest form of the auditorium for the spectators to assemble and that it, as long as the representations consisted of mimic dances and not of real dramatic performances, served its purpose completely.

B 27 (743); PLATES XVIII, XXXXVII


TEXT:

1 sāḍikasamādā
2 turāṅ devānāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The music of the gods accompanied by (?) a mimic dance.

[B 27–31 refer to one and the same sculpture.] For the interpretation of the label we must turn to the sculpture¹. On the left side of the panel there is a group of eight female musicians seated under a tree. Two are clapping

¹For Barua’s explanation of this and the preceding relief one may refer to his book (Barh., Vol. II, p. 8 ff., Vol. III, p. 1 ff.). So much only may be mentioned that in the middle relief (B 26) he at first saw the assembly held by the gods in the Tusita heaven in order to exhort the Bodhisattva to take his rebirth on the earth. The lower relief, representing according to him a forecast of the birth of the Bodhisattva, expresses the great rejoicings of the deities. Later on, when T. N. Ramachandran had told him the right explanation of the figure of Māra he declared that the middle relief was showing the gods having come to congratulate the Buddha on his victory over Māra. Then the lower relief is also brought in connection with the same. According to the Lalitas. 321, 7 ff. as well as according to the Nidānakathā (7. 1, 79, 8 ff.) the daughters of Māra in the form of women of different ages try to entice the Buddha. Some approach him as maidens, others as women, who have given birth to children once or twice, others as women even more advanced in age. The female dancers in the relief are said to represent these daughters of Māra in their different stages of age and the dancing boy should perhaps hint at the fact that mothers also are amongst them. A refutation of these views is superfluous.
their hands; two are playing on the seven-stringed viṇā with a plectrum, two are drummers, one beating a small drum with a stick, while another is beating a larger one with her fingers, and only the instruments played by the two females in the middle of the circle cannot be made out with certainty. The right half of the panel is filled by four female dancers, arranged in two pairs, one before the other. They are called Apsaras in separate labels and special names are given to them. Between the two, named Alambuṣṭa and Misaṅka, a child is dancing too, and it will be noticed that Alambuṣṭa is distinguished from the rest of the dancers by wearing a turban which ordinarily appears only as the head-dress of men. This shows that the performance of the Apsaras is a mimic dance in which Alambuṣṭa, evidently the chief actress, plays the part of a man.

As recognised by Hoernle, turāṇ is an inaccurate spelling for tuṣṭaṇ, which according to Hemachandra 2, 63 is the regular Prakrit equivalent of Sk. tuṣraṇ, and refers to the music of the heavenly orchestra. Hoernle was probably right also in connecting sādikā with Sk. saṭṭaka, the name of one of the Uparāpakas. Instead of saṭṭaka the commentator of the Karpūramaṇḍapī constantly writes sāṭaka, and as we find nāṭika by the side of nāṭaka, it is quite possible that by the side of sāṭaka there existed a feminine form sāṭikā, which in Prakrit became sādikā. Sādīkāṣaṁmadāṇa may be inaccurate spelling for sādikāśaṁmandāṇi, or it may be a compound in which the final vowel of the first member has been shortened as frequently in Prakrit. In the Śāṅhitādopanisa (542) it is said that the saṭṭaka is similar to the nāṭika, but entirely written in Prakrit and without prāsēka and visheṣaṁbadāṇa. The acts are called javanikā and the rasa prevailing is adhāhata. According to another classification of dramatic performances the saṭṭaka belongs to the devīnāṭya, because the music and the dances employed in it are not of the higher or Mārga class, but local varieties used in different parts of the country. According to the Nāṭakakal. 2156 f. in saṭṭaka, because women are predominant, the king himself talks like a woman: saṭṭaka stīrpaḥdhanavāda nāṭpakasya mūrtidhātaḥ nīdayaḥ stīrpaḥ pāṭot. The only saṭṭaka that has been made known to us is Rājaśekhara’s Karpūramaṇḍapī. Of course, the sādikā of the relief is not identical with the later saṭṭaka, but from what we are told about the language, the music and the dances of the saṭṭaka or sāṭaka it becomes very probable that it originally was the name of a mimic dance performed by women, which in later times developed into a real drama. Saṁmada is taken by all translators as an adjective meaning ‘gay, gladdening, joyous’, although the word occurs elsewhere only as a noun. I cannot offer a better explanation. Perhaps, saṁmadā, originally, as indicated by the sam-, ‘gladdening together with something else’, was used as a technical term of the Nāṭyaśāstra in the sense of ‘accompanied by’.

---

1 The clapping of hands is apparently the pāṇīṣṭaśudda (to be so read with the comm.) which is mentioned in D. II, 147, besides bherisadda, muthikas, viṇās, gītas, sammas. A different expression for the clapping of hands seems to be pāṇīṣrāra, P. pāṇīṣraṇa, which occurs several times as a musical entertainment (D. I, 6; III, 183; J. 535, 15; 537, 111; Meu. II, 52, 15). The man clapping the hands is pāṇīṣrārī (Meu. III, 118, 3), pāṇīṣraṇa (J. 545, 60). Later on, it seems, one did not know of the exact meaning of the word. Buddhaghosa explains DA. 85, pāṇīṣraṇaḥ by kahaṇīśattā pāṇīṣrānaḥ it pi vadanti, DA. 587 pāṇīṣṭaśuddoḥ by pāṇīṣṭaḥkhaṇḍhaṁ saṁmadantaḥ saṁsaddoḥ kahāḥkhaṇḍhaṁ it pi vadanti. The pāṇīṣraṇa in J. 545, 60 is explained in the commentary by pāṇīṣṭaḥkhaṇḍhaṁ gājante. The clapping of the hands accordingly seems to have accompanied singing.

2 With the one, the instrument is invisible as she turns the back to the spectator. The other is perhaps using cymbals (P. samma, Sk. sam nyā).

3 Lévi, Théâtre indien, Appendice, p. 30. Śāṭaka is quoted in the Petersburg Dictionary with the meaning of nāṭakahāda from the Sabdkalpadrāma, but the passage cannot be verified.

4 Lévi, ibid., p. 5 f.

5 Three more saṭṭakas have been published in recent years by A. N. Upadhye; cf. his edition of Vīvēśvara’s Śāṅhitāmaṇḍapī, Journal of the University of Poona, Humanities Section, No. 13, pp. 33-76 (1960).
I am going to show below in the discussion of No. B 39, pp. 113-118 that the three upper reliefs of the Pasenadi-pillar refer to the bodhi (cf. B 23), the parinirvāṇa and the dharmachakra-pravartana (cf. B 39) by representing their sites and their worship by gods and men. We should expect to find an allusion also to the fourth incident generally associated with them, the jāti. As in the upper row there was no room for a fourth panel, any scene referring to the jāti had to be placed beneath one of the other three reliefs. Now the dance of the Apsaras represented below the bodhi relief is certainly meant to celebrate some happy event in the life of the Buddha, as among all the gods who watch it Māra alone is filled with grief and sorrow. The dance is a mimical performance in which a child takes part and the chief actress appears in the guise of a man. Taking all things together, there can be little doubt, I think, that the play acted by the heavenly ballet is the nativity of the Bodhisattva, in which Śuddhodana and the infant Bodhisattva himself come on the stage. Probably miracle-plays of this sort were customary at Buddhist festivals and therefore ascribed also to the inhabitants of the heavenly worlds. By associating the relief with the festival celebrating the birth of the Bodhisattva, the figure of the mourning Māra mentioned in the remarks on B 26 finds its full explanation. Aśvaghosa also does not forget to mention this fact in his narration of the birth of the Bodhisattva. After having spoken of the music of joy of the gods in the sky, he goes on to say: Kāmadeva alone did not feel joy when the highest amongst the liberated of the world was born. So the relief, as it seems to me, fits in very well with the row of pictures on the pillar.

**B 28 (744); Plate XVIII**


**TEXT:**

Misakosi⁴ achharā

**TRANSLATION:**

The Apsaras Misakosi (Mīśakosi).

[B 27-31 refer to one and the same sculpture.] See the remarks on No. B 31.

**B 29 (745); Plate XVIII**


**TEXT:**

Misakosi⁴ achharā

**TRANSLATION:**

The Apsaras Misakosi (Mīśakosi).

[B 27-31 refer to one and the same sculpture.] See the remarks on No. B 31.

**B 29 (745); Plate XVIII**


**TEXT:**

Misakosi⁴ achharā

**TRANSLATION:**

The Apsaras Misakosi (Mīśakosi).

[B 27-31 refer to one and the same sculpture.] See the remarks on No. B 31.

TEXT:

Sabhadā'1 achharā

TRANSLATION:

The Apsaras Sahbadā (Saṃbhadrā).

[B 27–31 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

See the remarks on No. B 31.

B 30 (746); PLATE XVIII


TEXT:

1 Padumāvat[i]  
2 achharā

TRANSLATION:

The Apsaras Padumāvati (Padmāvati)

[B 27–31 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

See the remarks on No. B 31.

B 31 (747); PLATES XVIII, XXXVII


TEXT:

1 Alāh–  
2 busā achharā

TRANSLATION:

The Apsaras Alāmbusā (Alambushā).

1 The first akharā is distinctly su, not su, as read by Cunningham, Hoernle and Barua-Sinha.
[B 27–31 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

As rightly pointed out by Barua-Sinha, it is not by mere chance that Alambusa and Missakesi B 28 are placed foremost in the sculpture. They seem to have enjoyed greater esteem with the Buddhists than the rest of the heavenly nymphs. Their names are coupled in a list of Apsaras occurring in Vr. 2, 1, 10 f.; 4, 12, 26, and they are heading the list of the eight Apsaras residing in the Western quarter in Mvn. III, 308, 8; Lalitav. 390, 5. Alambusa has gained special renown by the seduction of the great ascetic Isisiga, for which, according to the Alambusa-jataka (523), she was selected by Sakka from amongst her numerous companions. Alambusa and Misakesi are frequently mentioned also in the Epics and the Puranas.

Padmavati occurs as the name of one of the eight Apsaras assigned to the Northern quarter in Mvn. III, 309, 8 and Lalitav. 391, 3. The name is not found in Pali texts nor is an Apsara of that name known in the Brahmanical literature. Barua-Sinha are inclined to identify her with Punarikka who appears in the Epics and the Puranas and is mentioned also in the list of the Vr., but the Lalitav. clearly differentiates the two, naming Punarikka among the Apsaras of the Western quarter.

The name of the fourth Apsara which clearly is Sahhad in the label, has hitherto been read or corrected to Subhadda. Barua-Sinha have identified the name with Subhadda, which occurs as the name of an Apsara in the passage of the Vr. quoted above. The printed text, it is true, has Subhadha, but all manuscripts, both Sinhalese and Burmese, read Sambaddha or Sambahadda (S* once Sambaddha), which exactly agrees with the form of the name in the label, the missing being frequently omitted in the inscriptions of this time. An Apsara of the name of Subhadra has never existed.

B 31a; Plate XXXIX


TEXT:

Muchilido nagaraja

TRANSLATION:

Muchilida (Muchilinda*), the king of the Nagas.

The wording of the label is similar to the text of the inscriptions No. B 6 (Chakavako nagaraja) and No. B 36 (Erapato nagaraja). It refers to the picture of a five-headed snake surrounding and sheltering a stone-seat standing underneath a tree. The Buddha is symbolized as sitting upon the seat by two footprints cut into the footstool, each of them ornamented by a wheel. The sculpture depicts a well-known event taking place in Uruvilva (Pali Uruvela) under the Bodhi-tree, in one of the first weeks after the Enlightenment of the Buddha*. When there was a great storm and shower of rain, the king of the Nagas protected the Buddha by winding his coils seven times round the Buddha’s body and spreading his hooded canopy over the Buddha’s head. The episode is very often represented in Buddhist sculpture, from Bharhut, Sanchi, Amaravati etc. onwards up to modern times.

---

1 Pali Muchalinda (Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali- Proper Names, Vol. II, pp. 638 f.); Muchilinda is common in Buddhist Sanskrit texts, see Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary s.v.

2 A comparative edition of the Sanskrit text is to be found in E. Waldschmidt, Das Catusparijansastra, Teil II, Berlin 1937, pp. 96-101.

**TEXT:**

Jetavana Anādhapeṭīko deti koṭisatānthatena ketā'

**TRANSLATION:**

Anādhapeṭīka (*Anāṭhapiṇḍīka*) presents the Jetavana, having bought it for a layer of creces.

[B 32–34 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

The story of Anāṭhapiṇḍīka’s presentation of the Jetavana to the Saṅgha occurs in the *Chullae*, 6, 4, 9 ff.; 6, 9, 1 ff., and in the Nidānakathā of the *J.* Vol. I, p. 92 f.

In the Chullavagga we are told that prince Jeta reluctantly sold his park to Anāṭhapiṇḍīka for a layer of creces. Anāṭhapiṇḍīka had the money brought out in carts and ordered the ground to be covered with pieces laid side by side. Only a small spot close by the gateway remained uncovered, and here Jeta himself erected a koṭṭhaka, while Anāṭhapiṇḍīka built vihāras and all sorts of buildings required for the residence of the monks. Later on, when he had entertained the Buddha and his retinue at his own house, he asked the Buddha what he should do with regard to the Jetavana, and was advised by the Buddha to dedicate it to the Saṅgha of the four quarters, whether now present or hereafter to arrive’. Anāṭhapiṇḍīka did so, and the Buddha praised the gift of vihāras in some Gaṇthās.

The account in the Nidānakathā is more explicit, although prince Jeta is here ignored altogether. Anāṭhapiṇḍīka is simply said to have purchased the Jetavana for a layer of eighteen creces and to have erected a large number of buildings, among which the Gandhakuti for the Daśabhala is expressly mentioned. After the completion of the buildings Anāṭhapiṇḍīka arranges a sumptuous inaugural ceremony. Together with 500 setṭhis and accompanied by his son, his two daughters and his wife, each followed by a retinue of 500 persons, he receives the Buddha who has come for that purpose from Rājagaha. The account of the conversation between Anāṭhapiṇḍīka and the Buddha, the transfer of the āraṇa to the Saṅgha and the praise of the Buddha is almost literally the same as in the Chullavagga, but it is added that the merchant poured water from a golden bhīṣṭhākāra on the hand of the Buddha.

The representation of the sculpture is more in keeping with the later version. In the right half of the medallion Anāṭhapiṇḍīka is standing by the side of a bullock cart with the yoke tilted up in the air and two bullocks unyoked lying beside it. A labourer is engaged in unloading coins from the cart, while another is carrying a load of coins on his back to the spot where they are to be spread. Two other seated labourers are covering the ground.

1 The reading is distinctly ketā, not kete as assumed by Barua-Sinha.
with the coins which by their square form and the symbols they bear are shown to be punch-marked kahāpaṇas. In the centre Anāthapiṇḍika is seen again, pouring out the water of donation from a bhūnakāra on the hand of the unseen Buddha. On the opposite side six well-dressed male persons stand, the foremost among them with his hands reverentially joined, while another is waving his garment and a third one expresses his approval in the typical fashion by whistling. They are probably the setṭhis whom Anāthapiṇḍika has invited to take part in the inauguration festival. The most conspicuous person may be prince Jeta, although he is not mentioned in the Niḍānakathā, but it is not quite impossible that he is meant again for Anāthapiṇḍika and that the scene represents the reception of the Buddha by the merchant at the head of his followers.

Besides, the medallion shows two buildings on the left side, which according to separate labels (B 33, B 34) are the Kosambakuṭi and the Gandhakuṭi. In the left lower part at the side of the Kosambakuṭi a mango tree loaded with fruit is to be seen. The block at the foot of the tree can scarcely represent anything but a stone seat, and the railing depicted in front of it is certainly meant as a fence for the tree.1 It seems to me scarcely probable that this mango tree which has got such a prominent place in the sculpture is only representing the mango trees which were spared when, according to a modern version of the legend, the trees in the park were cut down.2 I should rather believe that Cunningham3 was right when he identified it with the Gandamba tree in the legend of the great miracle of Śrāvasti, which the Buddha by his supernatural power made grow up from the kernel of a mango fruit before the eyes of a large crowd at Śrāvasti. This indeed does not exactly agree with the statement of the text according to which the miracle took place in ‘front of the gate of Śrāvasti’ or ‘between the Jetavana and Śrāvasti’.4 Now we are told by Hüan-tsang that 60 or 70 feet to the east of the Saṅghārāma founded at the site of the old Jetavana there was a Vihāra nearly 60 feet high containing a seated Buddha Statue. Here the Tathāgata once had a discussion with the Tīrthikas.5 This Vihāra, built at the place of the discussion, is already mentioned by Fa-hien. Giving particulars, he says that it lay outside the Eastern gate of the Jetavana, at a distance of 70 feet in the Northern direction and to the Western side of the street.6 I fully agree with the opinion of Foucher7 that the Vihāra marked the place of the victory of the Buddha over the Tīrthikas on the occasion of the great miracle. Accordingly at least in the 4th century the miracle was already localized in the immediate vicinity of the Jetavana. A stotra on the eight great chaityas, translated by Fa-t'ien in about 1000 A.D., expressly called the Jetavana the locality of the Mahāprādhārāya.8 All this makes it, I think, very probable that the artist added the mango tree when representing the Jetavana. The anachronism of which he made himself guilty while doing so may have scarcely disturbed him. The wish to show the famous tree in his picture must have overcome the possible scruples regarding the historical truth. Below, in the treatment of the inscription B 39, I am going to explain that in the rest the Bāhūrūt relief, when depicting the miracle of

---

1 I cannot understand how Barun, Barh. II, p. 30, is able to explain it as a basement of a new edifice.
2 Spence Hardy, Manual of Buddhism, p. 218, states that the trees in the park, with the exception of the sandal and the mango trees, were cut down. In the older texts nothing is said of it. In the Jetavana relief on the railing of Buddha-Gayā four different trees are depicted in order to hint at the garden, but in any case no mango tree is to be seen. See Bachhofer, Frühindische Plastik, Pl. 42.
3 StBh. p. 87.
4 cf. Sarabhamiga-jātaka (No. 483), J. IV, 264.
5 Divy. p. 155.
6 Beal, II, p. 10.
7 Legge, p. 59 f.
8 Beginnings of Buddhist Art, p. 183 f.
Srāvastī, represents an older version of the legend than the one found in the Pāli commentaries. On the other hand exactly here the close connection with the tradition of the Therās is evident if the version in the text of the Mūlasarvāstivādins is held against it.

The wording of the label closely agrees with the text of the Pāli scriptures: *ataha kho Anādhapindikko gahapati sakatahi hirānāṁ nibbhānopetvā Jetavanam koṭisathurāṁ santhāpessi* (Chullav.); *Jetavanam koṭisathurāsavā atṭhārasaharathakkoṭhi kīritvā navakamman paṭṭhāpessi; imānāh Jetavana nivāraṇā āgatānāgatasssa chātuddīsasā Buddhāpanukhhasa sanghassā dhammad adāsi* (Nidānak.). Anādhapindikko, which is defective writing for Anādhapindikko, is in the form of the name in the eastern language of the Canon. The form *kīta* was correctly explained by Bloch as gerund going back to *kṛyātāḥ = Sk. kṛtvā, P. kītvā.

**B 33 (732); PLATES XIX, XXXVIII**


**TEXT:**

Kosabak[u]ṭi

**TRANSLATION:**

The cottage of the Kosabas (*Kuśāmbis*).

[B 32–34 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

As to the meaning of the term see the remarks on No. B 34.

**B 34 (733); PLATES XIX, XXXVIII**


**TEXT:**

gadhakuṭi

**TRANSLATION:**

The perfume cottage.

[B 32–34 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

---

1 Hultzsch and Barua-Sinha read *Kosab[p]hobara*; but there is no *amanvāra.* Cunningham's eye-copy also shows no *amanvāra.*

2 Hultzsch and Barua-Sinha read *gad[n]hobara*; but there is no *amanvāra.* In Cunningham's eye-copy no *amanvāra* is visible either.
The sculpture definitely proves that gandhakūṭi and Kosambakūṭi were not rooms or apartments, but one-storied buildings of moderate size. The gandhakūṭi seems to have been the larger structure. It has an oblong roof with two pinnacles, while the roof of the Kosambakūṭi is round and bears but one pinnacle. In all other respects the two buildings are much alike. The open arched gate affords the view of a seat decorated with floral designs.

Neither of the kūṭis seems to be mentioned in the earlier Buddhist literature. It is only in the later texts that the terms turn up. In the Nidānakathā it is said that Anātha-piṇḍika had it erected in the midst of the Jetavana. In the commentary on Sn. 456 agiho applied to the Buddha is explained as meaning 'without longing' (ageho), since 'houseless' would not suit, the Buddha having various dwelling-houses in the Jetavana such as the Mahā-gandhakūṭi, the Kārmerīṇḍalamāla, the Kosambakūṭi, the Chandanamāla etc. The gandhakūṭi at the Jetavana is mentioned also in J. II, 416 in the story of the wicked pabbajikā Sandari who tells the people that she goes to the Buddha: aham hi tena ekagandhakūṭyāṃ vasāmi, 'for I live with him in the same gandhakūṭi'. In Divy. 46, 5 ff. it is stated that the earth quaked when the Buddha entered the gandhakūṭi at the Jetavana. Gandhakūṭi, however, is not the special name of the building at the Jetavana, but a generic term for the private residence of a Buddha in a vihāra. The gandhakūṭi in the Jivikambavana at Rājagaha is mentioned in J. I, 117, 14; 119, 8. 10. 22. The Buddhās of the past ages had their gandhakūtis just as Śākyamuni. In the Dh. A. IV, 203 ff. there is a story of a householder building a magnificent gandhakūṭi for the Buddha Vipassi. The gandhakūṭi of the Buddha Kāśyapa in the Rishipatana at Benares is mentioned in Aṣṭ. II, 40. In Divy. 333, 4 ff. a gandhakūṭi is assigned to each of the last seven Buddhās. In the Muq. 279,1 gandhakūṭi is the first in a list of monastic buildings. From such terms as sarvabhiṣagandhavāsiḥ gandhakūṭīm (J. I, 119, 10), sarvabhiṣagandhakūṭi (J. I, 119, 22; 330, 27) it appears that it owed its name to the scent of perfumes which filled it.

Kosambakūṭi, on the other hand, seems to be a proper name. Barua-Sinha's derivation of Kosamba from Keusumbha is linguistically impossible and unsuited as to meaning, kusumbha, safflower, as far as I know, having never been used as a perfume. Kosambakūṭi can represent only Sk. Kusambakūṭi, and the cottage probably owed its name to the fact that it was built by some natives from Kusambhi. In two Mathurā inscriptions (Museum Nos. 121 and 2740) it is stated that some persons set up a Bodhisattva image in their own chaityagāmaka. Similarly the Kosambakūṭi would seem to be the kūṭa of the Kosambha. As pointed out by Barua-Sinha, Buddhaghosa says SA. (Vol. I, p. 308) that the Kosambakūṭika was on the border of the Jetavana (Jetavanassasa pachchante). This statement is in conflict with the passage quoted above from the commentary of the Sn., and seems to be contradicted also by epigraphical evidence. The inscription No. 918 in my List, dated in the reign of Kanishka, records that the monk Bala set up a Bodhisattva, an umbrella and a post at Śrīvasti on the walk of the Holy one at the Kosambakūṭi (Śrīvastivī bhagavato chāmkame Kosambakūṭisyā). It is true, the Jetavana is not mentioned in the inscription, but as the chāmkama of the Buddha may reasonably be assumed to have been within its confines, the same site may be inferred for

1 The term seems to have the meaning 'sanctuary' in some inscriptions, e.g. in the Kanheri Buddhist cave inscription No. 6 (List No. 989); Bührer A. W. F., V, p. 77) states that by the term mahāgandhakūṭi, to be found in the text, 'as the position of the inscription shows, the great Chaitya was meant'. Similarly the expression talaigandhakūṭa for a sanctuary is used in the Sāṃśātra inscription of Mahāpāla, samvat 1083, L, Vol. XIV (1885), p. 140.
2 In the Chullav. and in the Nidānakathā chāmkamas or chāmkamānas are mentioned among the structures erected by Anātha-piṇḍika in the Jetavana.
the Kosambakūṭi. Unfortunately the sculpture does not settle the question. As shown in the treatment of B 33 the Gaṇdambara tree is also represented, though it was not in the Jetavana but only in its vicinity. At any rate the Kosambakūṭi appears to have been in existence from the middle of the first century B.C. to the middle of the first century A.D.

B 35 (805); PLATES XIX, XL


TEXT:
Idasālaguha

TRANSLATION:
The Idaśāla (Indaśāla) cave.

The story to which the sculpture refers is the Sakkapaṇhasuttanta, No. 21 of the D. (II, 263 ff.)¹. When the Buddha has retired for meditation to the Idaśāla cave on Mount Vediyaṇaka in the vicinity of Rājagaha², Sakka feels a desire to pay him a visit together with the Tavatimsa gods, but fearing that he might not meet with a good reception, he sends the Gandharva Pāṇchasikha in advance to put the Buddha in a favourable mood. Pāṇchasikha takes his vīṇā and sings before the Buddha a love-song embellished with complimentary allusions to the Buddha. When Sakka sees that the Buddha is pleased with the song, he asks Pāṇchasikha to announce his arrival to the Buddha. With the permission of the Buddha, Sakka and the other gods enter the cave, and in the ensuing conversation between the Buddha and Sakka the Buddha answers several questions addressed to him by the god.

The medallion has been injured by cutting away both sides when the pillar was set up as an architrave in one of the cenotaphs at Batanmāra, but the middle portion and the inscription are in a good state of preservation. The sculpture represents the cave, in the centre of which a seat decorated with floral designs and surmounted by an umbrella indicates the presence of the Buddha. Nine gods are seated cross-legged around it, the one facing the seat being probably meant to be Sakka. On the left, outside the cave, Pāṇchasikha stands playing the vīṇā; unfortunately the right half of the figure has been cut off. Above the cave, rocks on which two monkeys are seated, a tree, and holes from which the heads of some animals are coming out represent the mountain on which the Idaśālaguha was situated.

The name of the cave is the same as in the Pāli texts and Idaśālagaghā was also the form of the name in the Dīrghāgama of the Dharmagupta, while in the texts of the other schools Indaśālagaghā is the current form³. As remarked by Barua-Sinha (p. 125), Idaśālagaghā is an upamidhāpāṇhāt, 'a name derived from an object standing at close proximity', because

³ Waldschmidt l.c., p. 61, note.
the Indasāla tree, as mentioned by Buddhaghosa (DA. Vol. III, p. 697), marked the entrance of the cave. In the commentary on j. 455, 1 sallaki, the incense-tree (Boswellia thurifera), is explained by indasālārukkahe, and it is not impossible that the tree represented above the cave in the medallion is meant to be an incense-tree.

B 36 (752); PLATES XIX, XXXIX


TEXT:

Erapato [nâ]garajâ

TRANSLATION:

The Nāga king Erapata (Erapatta).

[B 36 and 37 refer to one and the same sculpture.] See the remarks on No. B 37.

B 37 (753); PLATES XIX, XXXIX


TEXT:

1 Erapato nāgarajâ
2 bhagavato vadate

TRANSLATION:

The Nāga king Erapata (Erapatta) worships the Holy One.

[B 36 and 37 refer to one and the same sculpture.] After comparing the different versions of the legend of the Nāga king as found in the Dhâ. (III, 230 ff.), in the Mvu. (III, 384, 1 ff.), in the Dulvä1, in the Fo-pên-hing-tsi-king2 and in other Chinese sources3, one has to concur with Waldschmidt4 that the Bhārhat relief

1 Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, p. 46 f.
2 Beal, Rom. Leg., p. 276 ff.
4 Budd. Kunst in Indien, I, p. 76.
agrees best with the Pāli version. According to it the Nāga has met with his existence by his bad conduct in a previous birth. At the time of the Buddha Kassapa, when he was a young monk, he broke a leaf of an eraka tree by inadvertence, and failing to confess his offence, he has been reborn in the Gaṅgā as a huge serpent king called Erakapatta. He is anxiously awaiting the appearance of the next Buddha, and to ascertain when this happy event will take place, he teaches his daughter a Gāthā containing questions which nobody but a Buddha can answer. Every fortnight he makes her dance on his hood and sing that Gāthā, and as he has promised both his daughter and his wealth to the man who will be able to answer the questions, many men try to win the maiden during the long interval between the two Buddhas, but in vain. When the Buddha, sitting under one of seven Śīrīṣa trees not far from Benares, beholds the young Brahmin Uttara, who has made up his mind to compete for the prize, he teaches him the right answers. The Nāga king realizes that a new Buddha has arisen in the world. Filled with joy, he lashes the waters with his tail so that the banks of the river are washed away. He is then conducted by Uttara to the Buddha who comforts him by a sermon.

The relief shows three different stages of the story. In the upper part Erakapatta emerges from the Gaṅgā as a five-headed snake. His daughter stands on his hood, and on her left side the young Brahman Uttara rises from the water. Her gesture indicates that she is talking to him, and he is offering her a lotus-flower. In the right corner below, separated from the river by a strip of land, there is another sheet of water which is probably meant to represent the inundation caused by the Nāga. Here Erakapatta is seen on his way to the Buddha. This time he is in human form, but carrying a five-headed snake over his head-dress. He is followed by two females who are characterized as Nāga girls by a single headed snake on their heads. The left side of the relief is filled by the last scene where Erakapatta, again in human form, is kneeling before the invisible Buddha sitting on a stone seat beneath a tree which may be a Śīrīṣa tree. Five more trees are figured on the banks of the Gaṅgā and the water-sheet. They probably represent the rest of the trees mentioned in the text, although their numbers do not exactly agree.

All persons and events mentioned in the Pāli text, which in the other versions partly do not occur at all, are represented in the relief, for instance, the young Brahmin Uttara, the daughter standing on the head of the Nāga, the Śīrīṣa trees and probably even the inundation caused by the Nāga. The material deviations are very small. Instead of the seven Śīrīṣa trees only six are depicted and nothing is said in the Pāli texts of the two Nāga girls accompanying the Nāga king on his way to the Buddha. The only real difference lies in the name of the Nāga, Erakapatta in the label of the relief, Erakapatta in the commentary. But this too is of no importance. I fully agree with Vogel, Indian Serpent Lore, p. 207 ff., when he explains the different forms of the name of the Nāga king as resulting from the sense-suggesting distortions of Airāvata. Airāvata occurs as an epithet of the Sarpa Dhṛitarāśtrā already in the AV. 8, 10, 29 and in the Pañcaviṃśābrāhmaṇa 25, 15, 3. The Nāga Airāvata is also often mentioned in the epic. An old secondary form of the name is Airāvana which appears in Pāli as Erāvana or Erānapa. In the Mahāsāmanayasutta (D. II, 258) the Mahānāga Erāvana is mentioned in the list of Nāgas. In the Dhammakasutta of the Sn. the upāsaka

---

1 The characteristic features of the Śīrīṣa tree are better brought out in the medallion described under No. B 15.
2 I cannot understand how Barua, Barh. II, p. 68, is able to assert that the representation agrees in the latter point with the narration of the Mvu. There (384, 1 f.) it is only said, exactly as in the Dh.A., that Elapatra offers his daughter and a rich treasure as reward for the solution of the question.
3 Mhv. 1, 3, 139 ff.; 174; 31, 5; 14, 58, 25; 43. Hariv. 1, 3, 112; 6, 27.
4 Text: Erāvano, but Dh. 688 Erāvano.
Dhammika praises the Buddha on account of his wisdom which has been acknowledged also by the demi-gods and such divine beings as Erāvana and Kuvera (V. 379):

āgachchhi te satikhe nāgarājā
Erāvana nāma jina ti suti 1
so pi āyā mantaṅyitvājñhagamā
sādhū ti sutiṇā pattiṭhāpo 11

The author of the SnA. totally misunderstood the stanza. He takes the nāgarājā Erāvana as Indra's elephant of which he gives a fanciful description. The reading of the stanza leaves no doubt that the Nāga king of the legend is meant by Erāvana: "The Nāga king Erāvana came to thee when he heard that a Jina has come into existence'. He also came in order to have consultation with thee and when he had heard (thee) he was pleased, (saying) 'well'. Airāvata occurs somewhat often in Buddhist Sanskrit texts:

M. p. 168, 45; Mahām. p. 247; in the serpent charm (Bower MS. p. 224; Mahām. p. 221):

maitrī me Dhitārāmśheshu maitrī Airāvataśu 3 cha 1
Virāpākṣheshu me maitrī Kṛṣṇa-Gautameśhū cha 11

In Pāli the stanza runs (A. II, 72; Chullav. 5, 6; J. 203, 1):

Virāpakkhehi me mettaṁ mettāṁ Erāpattehi me 1
Chakāypattehi me mettāṁ kaññā-Gotanakehi cha 11

It is scarcely to be doubted that Erāpatha here is only the corresponding form of Elācata or perhaps Elācana of the eastern language.

But the matter does not rest only with this transformation of Elācata. Later, the unintelligible name, was changed into *Elāpatta 'leaf of cardamom,' and *Elāpattā with the shortening of the final syllable of the first member of the compound. Both the forms have then been sanskritized: the name reads Elāpatra in the Brahmanical, Elapatra in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts. To explain the name, a story has then been invented by the Buddhists. The Nāga is said to have been a monk in the former birth who committed the sin of plucking away leaves from cardamom plants (elā) standing in his way. *Elāpatra has then been taken over into the western language as Erāpatra with change of l to r. Erāpattra has probably to be read in the label of the relic where Erāpata is written. If the DhA. writes Erakapattra instead of it, this is simply an attempt to elucidate the name. As the word er does not exist, so eraka was substituted in its place, which designates a form of reed, in any case a plant growing near water. (When the Vṛshyandhakas in Prabhāsa on the seashore get into a quarrel they strike each other with erakās, changed into clubs; Mbh. 16, 3, 36 ff.) Accordingly the name is thus interpreted in a new story: The Nāga in a former birth, as a young monk sailing on a boat on the Gāṅga, grasped a bush of Erakās growing on the bank and did not let it loose even when the boat went on, so that a leaf was plucked (daharaḥbhikkhu huto gāṅgāya nācāṁ āhariṣyā gacchidantu ekasmin erakahumbu erakapattāṁ) 5

1 or '(that thou art) the Jina'.
2 The meaning is 'in order to take advice from you'. Mantasyavājñhagamā is either text-corruption for mantasyitvājñhagamā or a mistake of the Pāli-translator who took the mantasīma of the original in the eastern language as a gerund.
3 In the Bower MS. nairāvataśu which is a simple mistake of the writer; cf. Hoernle, ibid., p. 231 f.
4 Chullav. and J. insert here one more mettāṁ.
5 MBh. 6, 31, 6; Horisi. 1, 3, 113; 5, 46, 39. Vogel has shown that in later times one was not conscious of the identity of Elāpattra and Airāvata and that they were taken as two different Nāgas.
6 M. p. 167, 44; Dīya. 61, 4 (so in the manuscripts; in the text we find Elāpatra); Mv. III, 383, 19; 384, 1 ff.; Mahām. p. 222; 247.
7 Si-yu-ki (Beal) I, p. 197; Watters, On Tuan Chwang's Travel I, 242.
8 Erakagumba and erakapattra show the normal shortening of the final syllable of the first member in a compound.
INScriptions Attached to Scenes of Buddha’s Life

As he did not confess his crime he is reborn as a Nāga king Erakapatta. It is therefore evident that even in the name of the Nāga there exists no difference between the label and the Pāli text. Erakapatta is nothing else but the younger form coming out of Erapatta.

B 38 (750); PLATES XIX, XXXIX


Text:

bhagavato dhamachakrā

Translation:


[B 38 and 39 refer to one and the same sculpture.] See the remarks on No. B 39.

B 39 (751); PLATES XIX, XXXIX


Text:

1 rāja Pasenaji
2 Kosalo

Translation:

King Pasenaji (Prasenajit), the Kosala (Kauśala).

[B 38 and 39 refer to one and the same sculpture.] The relief bearing this and the preceding inscription shows a two-storeyed edifice resembling the building round the Bodhi tree described above No. B 23. In the centre of the lower storey there is a large wheel with a parasol over it and a garland hanging over its nave. It is flanked on each side by a well-dressed man in devotional attitude. Below, at the right-hand corner, there emerges from the gateway of a palace a chariot of which only the heads of the two horses and of the driver are visible. On the left appears a chariot drawn by four richly caparisoned horses. A king has taken his place in it together with his charioteer, who is holding the reins, and two attendants, one carrying a parasol and the other waving a chaurī. In front of the chariot two men, apparently running, and before them two horsemen
are seen from behind. The sculptor evidently wanted to represent the pradaksinā of the edifice, and he has therefore continued the royal procession on the right, where two men mounted on elephants are moving in the opposite direction.

As the royal personage in the procession is called King Prasenajit of Kosala in the label, Foucher was of the opinion that the sculpture refers to the great miracle of Śrāvastī. But his view can hardly be upheld. As shown below in detail, the typical representation of the miracle is quite different in the Buddhist art of Bhārhat and Sāñci. Moreover, there is nothing in the sculpture to indicate that subject.

The legend of the great miracle of Śrāvastī is narrated in the Pachchuppannavatthu of Sarabhamigajātaka (483; IV, 263, 7 ff.), in the Dhātā (III, 199 ff.), in the Prāthāryasūtra of the Dīya. (p. 143 ff.), and in Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita (20, 54 ff.). Foucher followed the history of the representation in art in an instructive treatment3 which needs some additions only as far as the sculptures of Bhārhat and Sāñci are concerned.

In the Pāli literature, the miracle, as Foucher remarks, is often called the double miracle under the Gaṇḍamba tree. So the miraculous creation of the mango tree forms here an introduction to the narration of the yamakapattiḥāriya. In the Jātaka the Buddha has the announcement made, that after seven days he would perform a miracle which would destroy the Tīrthikas under the Gaṇḍamba tree before the gate of Sāvatthī. The Tīrthikas and the vast crowd of men come to Sāvatthī to be witnesses of the miracle. King Pasenadi offers to erect a pavilion (maṇḍapa) for the great spectacle but the Buddha refuses, adding that god Sakka will construct a pavilion of jewels twelve yojanas long for the purpose. To prove the Buddha a liar, the Tīrthikas cause all the mango trees in the vicinity of Sāvatthī to be cut down. In the morning of the great day, Gaṇḍa, the gardener of the king, gives a mango fruit of unusually big size to the Buddha. The master eats it and orders the gardener to plant the kernel into the earth. Instantly a vast mango tree beset with flowers and ripe fruit shoots up. In the evening Sakka makes Vissakamma build a pavilion of jewels. The gods from their ten thousand chakkavāsala come together. Then suddenly it is said in a very short manner: satthā aṭṭhāya addanaṁ asaddhāraññi saccakhi yamakapattiḥāriyaṁ kalīvarah bhavantu šūnjanaṁ ūpayya Buddhānaṁ nissuno dhammaṁ deseti i ṭheṇ ṭheṇ ṭheṇ ṭheṇ amateṇaṁ pālam, “When the master had made the yamakapattiḥāriya, which destroys the Tīrthikas and which cannot be carried out by pupils, and when he knew that many people were disposed to believe in him, he descended, sat down on the seat of the Buddha and preached the Dharma. Two hundred millions of beings drank the drink of immortality.” At the first sight it might appear that the author could have understood the miraculous creation of the mango tree and the erection of the pavilion out of jewels as the ‘double miracle’. The remark, however, that the Buddha “descended” after having performed the miracle shows that the Buddha did the yamakapattiḥāriya, when standing in the air, and the same is clearly seen from the Dhātā where the narration is much more extensive and contains many details which can be omitted here. The basic elements of the story are the same as in the Jātaka. Regarding the locality in Sāvatthī, where the miracle takes

---

1 Beginnings of Buddhist Art, p. 178 ff.
2 A.O. XV, p. 98.
4 J.I., 77, 24; 88, 20; Mīla, 17, 44; 31, 99; 30, 82 (ambamula pāṭikāram); Samantapāśādikā I, p. 88 f. Gaṇḍamba has later on been understood as the mango tree of the gardener Gaṇḍa; originally, however, gaṇḍamba seems to have been the expression for an unusually great mango fruit. In J.V., 99, 4; 108, 6 f. also a gaṇḍamuhaka-tree is mentioned. A similar expression is gaṇḍamahāsa which means, according to Amara and other lexicographers, great blocks of rock fallen down from a mountain (ehuyitā śhulopalā giri).
place, nothing more specific is said. The offer of Pasenadi, to erect a pavilion for the Buddha is also found here as well as the refusal of the offer by the Buddha with a reference to the expected help of Sakka, but we do not hear anything further about the building of the pavilion. On the other hand it is narrated that the Tirthikas build a pavilion for themselves and that Sakka destroys it before the miracle takes place. The miracle consists in the Buddha's creating a *ratanachañkama* in the air and while walking up and down on it he sends forth flames of fire and streams of water from the different parts of his body. He also makes his double appear before him with whom he exchanges question and answer. Two hundred million living beings are converted by the instruction which he gives in the meantime.

The *Prāthihārya-sūtra* of the *Dīya* is swollen to a great extent by lengthy repetitions and inserted episodes. I here restrict myself to hint at several points which, as it appears to me, are of importance for the evolution of the legend. The offer of Prasena-jit to erect a pavilion for the miracle (*prāthihāryamaṇḍapā*) is here accepted by the Buddha. The pavilion is erected between the town of Śrāvasti and the Jetavana. At the same place the adherents of the six Tirthikas build a pavilion for every one of them.

The miracle of the mango has here totally disappeared from the narrative, not, however, the person of the gardener Gaṇḍaka, whose former history on the contrary is told at great length. His real name is Kāla and he is the brother of Prasena-jit. His hands and feet were cut off by the king's command on account of an alleged offence in the harem, but by the order of the Buddha his body was restored by Ananda with the help of *satyakriyā*, and he had become a follower of the Buddha since that time. Now he has attained the *anāgāmipāla* and is in possession of supernatural powers. On account of that he is able to fetch a Karṇīkāra tree from the Uttarakūrava-dvīpa which he plants in front of the pavilion of the Buddha, whereas another gardener (*ārāmika*), named Ratnaka or Rambhaka, who apparently enjoys similar powers, plants an Aśoka tree from the Gandhamadana behind the pavilion.

After a number of smaller miracles the Buddha, asked by Prasena-jit, first performs the wonder of fire and water, afterwards, being asked a second time by the king in the presence of all gods, he shows a miracle by multiplying his appearance which extends in a chain up to the highest of the Rājaphrahma worlds. Pañchika, the general of the Yaksas, destroys the pavilion of the Tirthikas by a storm. At the end, the Buddha creates another representation of a Buddha with whom he holds conversation and preaches the Dharma so that many hundreds of thousands attain the different stages of holiness.

In the *Buddhach*, the miracle is treated very shortly in two stanzas. It is only said that the Buddha, when he dwells in Śrāvasti, accepts the demand of the Tirthikas to show his miraculous strength and defeats them by his manifold magic powers. Probably Aśvaghosha restricted himself here, because he had already narrated the performance of the miracles in details before in the story of Buddha's stay in Kapilavastu (19, 12-15). Here the wonder of fire and water, as well as that of multiplication is mentioned but mixed with all sorts of other miracles: the Buddha touches the carriage of the sun with his hand, goes on the path of the wind, dives into the earth as if it were water, walks on the surface of the water as on land and goes through a rock.

The comparison shows that the Pāli-version of the legend, even if it was fixed later, is on the whole undoubtedly the older one regarding the contents. The wonderful creation of the Gaṇḍamba tree must have once formed the beginning of the story. The appearance

\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{The description has been taken \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{fālito} i.e. from Paśasambhidāmāgga I, 125 f.}\}}}}}}}}\]}}\]
of the gardener Gāndhaka and the totally unmotivated planting of the Kārikā and of the Aśoka tree by the two gardeners in the Divy, are only understandable as reminiscences of the original miracle of the mango tree. On the contrary the erection of the pavilion for the Buddha by Prasenajit as described in the Divy., is apparently older than the building of the pavilion of jewels by Vīśvakarman, which latter is not even rightly narrated in the Dīkā. In the original version nothing could have been said of a pavilion. The miracle of the mango tree, which has the only purpose to create the tree under which the Buddha intends to perform the yamakapratīkāya, becomes indeed quite superfluous by the erection of the pavilion. Consequently the mango tree does not play any role in the Pāli tales of the performance of the miracle.

The original legend therefore runs as follows. The Buddha announces that he would perform a miracle under the Gardambha tree in Śrāvasti in order to triumph over the Tīrthikas. The Tīrthikas therefore cause all the mango trees in the vicinity of Śrāvasti to be cut down. The Buddha, however, orders the kernel of a mango to be planted in the earth, out of which a big mango tree immediately grows up. He takes his seat under this mango tree and from there he raises himself up in the air to perform the yamakapratīkāya. It seems, the yamakapratīkāya, “the double miracle” was originally understood only as the sending forth of fire and water. This wonder stands at the top of all the wonders in all the sources with the exception of the Buddhachāk. The multiplication of the appearance seems to be a later addition. The collections of Foucher (p. 155 ff) show that the miracle of the fire and water was gradually also added to other legends and even transferred to persons other than the Buddha. On account of that it was bound to lose its reputation, and so it is understandable that one felt the need to intensify the wonder of Śrāvasti to make it a really “great” pratīkāya. Apparently the doubling of the appearance was first added as it is told in the Paṭisambhidāmagga and in the Dīkā. The designation yamakapratīkāya also suited this doubling, even if understood in a somewhat different sense than what the expression originally conveyed. Gradually one went still further: out of the doubling of the figure, its multiplication up to a Buddhapiṇḍi developed, of which the Divy. tells. In this text a trace of the older doubling also has been retained when at the end we suddenly hear of the creation of the double with whom the Buddha converses. Lastly, as Foucher (p. 158) remarks, the wonder of fire and water has been completely displaced by the wonder of duplicating. According to the description in the Aśokavadāna the miracle of Śrāvasti consists only of the creation of the row of Buddhas, reaching up to the heaven of the Akanishthā gods.

This reconstruction of the original legend, gained purely from literary sources, is also in conformity with the sculptures in Bhārhat and Sāñchi. On the front side of the left pillar of the northern gate in Sāñchi a relief is found which is described by Sir John Marshall as follows: “In centre, a mango tree with the throne of the Buddha in front. Round the Buddha is a circle of his followers bringing garlands to the tree or in attitudes of adoration.” Sir John Marshall then hints at the great miracle of Śrāvasti as the probable subject of the relief. He remarks, however, that it contains no definite indication of the miracle. I do not believe that this circumstance goes against the explanation of the relief. As the Buddha is not being represented, the doubling or the multiplication of his person, even though the legend should have contained it, could not have been represented in the picture. But the depicting of the miracle of fire and water was also bound to cause difficulties under the

1 Cf. E. Waldschmidt, Wunderarige Mönche in der osttürkischen Hinayāna-Kunst, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge VI, pp. 3-9.
2 Divy. 401; Przyłuski, Legende d’ Aṣoka, p. 265.
3 Guida to Sāñchi, p. 58.
given circumstances, and its avoidance would be quite understandable.

Marshall's identification is justified by a relief in Bārhut which has already been taken note of by Waldschmidt. On the corner pillar of the angular entrance at the Western gate, three reliefs, one below the other, are carved at the right side. Due to the conformity in style and equality of execution, they must have been made by the same artist and stand in some internal connection (cf. Cunningham's Pl. XVII). The middle relief shows the well-known ladder in Sānkāśya. The upper relief depicts the gathering of gods listening to a sermon of Buddha whose presence is hinted at by a tree and a throne. The two reliefs therefore refer to Buddha's preaching of law in the Trayāstriṃśa heaven and his descent from there. The lower relief shows the same subject as the relief in Sānchi mentioned above: a mango tree with a stone seat in front of it. It is worshipped by a number of standing persons—altogether twenty—or is being saluted in the well-known fashion by waving of clothes and touching of mouth. Undoubtedly the miracle of Śrāvasti is meant, which immediately preceded the ascent of the Buddha into the heaven of the Trayāstriṃśa gods. Thus the miracle of the mango alone is represented here also; nothing is to be seen of the miracle of fire and water.

Thus we observe that the typical representation of the miracle of Śrāvasti in the art of Bārhut and Sānchi is quite different from what we see in our relief. There is nothing in the sculpture to indicate that subject. In my opinion the panel has to be interpreted in connection with the two adjoining panels of the pillar. Apparently the sculptor intended to allude to the three great events in the life of the Buddha, the sambodhi, the parinirvāṇa and the dharmaśākya-pravartane, by representing the buildings erected on the sites where they had taken place and their worship by divine and human beings. Just as the Bodhi temple is meant to remind of the enlightenment of the Buddha and the Stūpa of his death, the Dharmaśākya is a memorial to his preaching. Like the Bodhi temple and the Stūpa with the lion-pillar

1 *Buddh. Kunst in Indien*, p. 78.
2 A parallel is given by the story of the visit of the Buddha to Kapilavastu which is connected with the yamakaparṇīṭhārya. In the reliefs in Sānchi depicting the visit (Northern gate, right pillar, front side, 3rd panel; Eastern gate, right pillar, inner side, 2nd panel) only a chaikama is represented in the air on which one has to imagine the Buddha walking. The chaikama is made through magic by the Buddha for himself, according to DhK. (III, 163), in order to break the insolence of his relatives. In the *Mvu.* (III, 114, 7 ff.) it is told more precisely that the Buddha creates the place for walking in the air so that he may not be required to stand up before the Sākyas coming to visit him. In the Nidānakathā (J. I, 86, 17 ff.) the chaikama is not expressly mentioned. Here we are told that the Buddha in order to force his relatives to worship him against their will raised himself into the air and performed a pāṭibhārīya similar to the yamakaparṇīṭhārya under the Gāndhāra tree. In the *Mvu.* the Buddha standing in the air performs the yamakaparṇīṭhārya. Two of them are narrated in particular, viz. the wonder of the fire and water and, provided the text has been rightly handed down, the creation of the figure of a bull sometimes in this, sometimes in the other region. It is remarkable that here also the wonder of fire and water is mentioned in the first place. Further on the legend, that blind Mahāprajñāpati regains her eyesight by the water streaming out on the occasion of the miracle, is combined with the foregoing. The different miracles attributed to the Buddha on this occasion in the *Buddhāsc.* are already mentioned above (p. 115). One gains the impression that the legend originally mentioned only a place of walking, created by magic in the air by the Buddha, in order to raise himself above the Sākyas. The yamakaparṇīṭhārya seems to have been added to it from the legend having its origin in Śrāvasti. The sculptures at Sānchi in any case suit with this interpretation, even though they cannot be looked upon as proofs. The yamakaparṇīṭhārya, even when it may have been a part of the legend at the time of the production of our reliefs, could not be shown on account of the fact that any personal representation of the Buddha was avoided in sculptures.
3 Cunningham, *Buddh. Stud.* p. 90 f., 119, wanted to connect the edifice with the dharmaśākya or, as he calls it, the puyasālā of Prasenajit. Barua, *Baru. II*, p. 48, takes the relief to be an illustration of the Dhamma- chetiya-Sutta (*M.* II, 118 ff.) which, according to my opinion, is unfounded. In any case, the opinion of Barua that the two figures at the side of the wheel represent the king twice, once to the left as worshipping, and once to the right as retreating, is erroneous.

4 Cf. note 1 on p. 102.
the Dharmaśāla is to be taken as a historical building, which, as Hūan-tsang tells us, was erected by king Prasenajit for the Buddha in the city of Śrāvasti. To leave no doubt about the identity of the building the sculptor added the pradakṣiṇā procession of the king, which at the same time illustrates the worship of the place by men, while the two large figures inside the building are gods revering the wheel like the two gods revering the tree in the corresponding relief of the Bodhi.

**TEXT:**

A[jā]tasat[u] bhagavato varṇāde

**TRANSLATION:**

Ajātassata (Ajātaśatru) worships the Holy One.

The story represented in the sculpture is related in the Śāmaṇḍaphalasutta (D.I, 47 ff.). In a beautiful moonlit night King Ajātassattu of Magadha, on the advice of the physician Jivaka, makes up his mind to pay a visit to the Buddha. He orders Jivaka to get his state-elephant ready, together with five-hundred she-elephants for his women and sets forth in royal pomp from the city of Rajagaha to Jivaka’s Mango Grove, where the Buddha is staying. Arriving at the entrance of the grove, the king dismounts and walks on foot to the door of the hall in which the lamps are burning. Buddha, who is sitting there amidst the monks, is pointed out to the king by Jivaka. The king bows to the Holy One and, having taken his seat aside, asks him about the advantage to be derived from the life of a recluse. When the Buddha has answered his questions, the king takes the vow of a lay-disciple and confesses the great sin of his life, the murder of his father.

The sculpture conforms to the story in every detail. In the lower part the king is seen sitting on his state-elephant with a female attendant bearing the parasol behind him. To his right there are two more elephants mounted by two women. They have much smaller tusks than the elephant of the king, apparently to show that they are she-elephants.

---


2 The particulars have been explained by Foucher in the description of his Pl. XXVIII. He mentions that one of the carriage coming forth from the gate in the right lower side of the picture, nothing more is to be seen than the heads of both the horses and of the charioteer. This has to be rectified. The feet of the horses are quite clearly to be seen in the photograph of the lower relief. The artist has gone beyond here as well as in the Bodhi-relief (B 23) of the same pillar, the rail forming the frame for his representation. It is impossible that this two-horsed carriage is identical with the four-horsed carriage of the king. The artist apparently added a second carriage to the carriage of the king and introduced two pedestrians, two riders on horse-back, and two elephants in order to indicate this procession. I am not quite sure, whether the door is meant to be the gate of the royal palace or of the town. It could also mean the entrance gate to the district of the sanctuary.

3 The u-sign is indicated only by a very slight elongation of the right bar of the ta. Hultzsch read Ajātāsata.
as stated in the text. In the right corner another elephant with large tusks is kneeling, the female-mahout sitting far back near the tail. This is the elephant of Jivaka, who has dismounted and is talking to the king as indicated by his raised right hand. Two trees laden with mangoes show that the scene is Jivaka's Mango Grove. The seat of the Buddha is in the upper right corner below a parasol with pendants hanging down from it. The presence of the Buddha is symbolized by his foot-prints on the foot-rest. The king is kneeling before the seat, while Jivaka and four women are standing behind him with their hands reverentially folded. A burning swing-lamp indicates that the visit takes place at night.
4. **B 41 - 62 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO IDENTIFIED SCENES FROM JĀTAKAS' AND AVADĀNAS**

**B 41 (700); PLATES XIX, XL**


**TEXT:**

haṁsa-jātakam

**TRANSLATION:**

The Jātaka of the mallard.

The Jātaka was identified by Cunningham with the Nachchajatakas, No. 32 of the Pāli collection, which contains the well-known story of the Golden Mallard, the king of the birds, who allows his daughter to choose a husband after her own heart from amongst his subjects. Her choice falls on the peacock, who overjoyed begins to dance and in doing so exposes himself. Shocked at this indecency, the king of birds refuses him his daughter. The sculpture is fragmentary. The lower half and portions of both sides are broken off, but enough remains to show that it represented a mallard and to the right of it a peacock with outspread tail. If the fragment, a photograph of which has been published together with the drawing, formed part of the sculpture, some more mallards are represented in the lower left corner showing their back to the exposed peacock.

**B 42 (695); PLATES XIX, XLI**


**TEXT:**

biḍalajātara kūkuṭajātaka

**TRANSLATION:**

The Jātaka of the cat (also called) jātaka of the cock.

---

1 A label containing the word jātaka appears also in the fragmentary inscription B 80.
2 Cunningham's eye-copy has haṁsa-jātaka. The editors would prefer to translate haṁsa by 'wild gander.'
3 Lüders' treatment of this inscription (B 42) has been lost.
4 ra may be a clerical error for ka.
To the left of the relief there is a tree, on a branch of which a cock is sitting high above the ground. To the right, underneath the tree, a cat of a comparatively big size squats. She looks up to the cock on the tree and is obviously talking to him. The relief has already been identified by Subhūti with the Kukkutajātaka (J. 383) of the Pāli collection, giving the fable of the cat which used to catch the cocks by different stratagems in order to devour them. Now the Bodhisattva is born as a cock and the cat realizes that it will be difficult to get hold of that especially intelligent bird. The cat therefore decides to offer herself as his wife. She approaches the cock when he sits on a tree, flatters him, and tries to persuade him to take her as his wife. The cock, however, suspects some treachery, refuses her proposal, and keeps himself away from danger. Just the event of the conversation between the cock and the cat is represented in our relief.

Bidala corresponds to sk. bidāla (cf. Pāṇini, 6. 2.72), whereas Pāli texts use bilāra or bilāla.1

The relief bears two labels according to the main characters in the story, whereas for the Pāli Jātaka, as mentioned above, only the title kukkutajātaka is used.

**B 42a; Plate XLI**

On a coping stone, now in the Allahabad Municipal Museum (Ac/2910). Edited by Kala, BhV. (1951) pp. 32 f., Pl. 7; Sircar, EL, Vol. XXXIII (1959/60), p. 60, No. 7; an illustration of the coping stone is also given by Stella Kramrisch, The Art of India through the Ages, (1954), Pl. 15.

**Text:**

gajājātaka 2  saso  jātaka 3

**Translation:**

The Jātaka of the elephant. The hare in the Jātaka (?)

The wording and distribution of this inscription is very peculiar. The first part is inscribed at the top of a panel showing two people of rank standing in a court-yard formed by three cottages. One of the cottages is placed in the longitudinal direction right in front of the spectator, the two others on either side of the first. Dr. Kala gives the following detailed description of the panel. "In the space between these cottages are two richly attired persons engaged in conversation. The figure on the left side holds an animal (hare) in his right hand while the left one is raised above the breast. The right side figure hears the discourse of the other with rapt attention. One more animal is noticeable in the scene .... The front cottage is thatched with grass and reeds and has a gabled roof. The walls of the house appear to have been made of wood. There is a sliding door and a star shaped window on each of its sides. The two side cottages have vaulted roofs supported by wooden beams. The cottage in the right has three finials. A disc ornament is also carved near these." 1

The second part of the label (viz. jātaka) is engraved at the top of a different panel,

---

1 See Lüders, Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons, Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1933, § 35.

2 *gaja* is probably a mistake for *gaja*.

3 The reading of Dr. Kala is *jātaka*. The stroke of the -e is, however, quite clearly written. *jātaka* can only be a loc. sg., or has to be regarded as a mistake for *jātakam*.
further to the right, of which the left part only has been preserved. The relief depicts a domed hut of the type used by hermits. Behind the dome of the hut the tops of two trees are visible. Judged by some remnants to the right of the hut, it looks as if the hermit had been sitting on a mat before the door of the hut.

Dr. Kala informs us that Barua was of the opinion that the label on the left is completed by the word jātaka on the right, and that the inscription should be read as gajātaka sasajātaka, to be understood like bidalajātaka kukuṣajātaka of B 42, giving two names for the same story. This interpretation raises some difficulties: the Saṣajātaka—the tale of the hare jumping into the burning fire in order to offer his roasted flesh to a hermit—is well known and represented several times in early Indian sculpture. Dr. Kala himself was able to publish the up to now oldest illustration of the Jātaka, found on the fragment of a Bhār hut pillar, recently recovered and at present in the Allahabad Museum. According to the part of the scenery left in our relief, it is not impossible, that the panel to the right (labelled jātaka) is again illustrating the Saṣajātaka. In this case the word sas would belong to the panel to the right, whereas the relief to the left ought to be a picture of the jātaka of the elephant. An elephant, however, is not to be seen in the relief, and the animal in the hand of one of the two men in conversation with each other looks similar to the hare in the representation of the Saṣajātaka on the fragment of the pillar published by Dr. Kala. This fact is in favour of looking at the word sas as part of the label of the left panel. As yet we do not see a possibility to solve the problem. The propositions made by Dr. Barua and Dr. Sircar to connect the illustration with Jātaka 345 (gajakumbhajātaka) or Jātaka 322 (daddabhajātaka) are by no means convincing. There is nothing in the stories which would suit the picture.

B 43 (724): PLATES XIX, XL


TEXT:

nāgajātaka

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka of the elephant.

With the help of Subhūti, the sculpture to which the label belongs was identified by Cunningham with the Kakkātajātaka, No. 267 of the Pāli collection. In that Jātaka the Bodhisattva is a big elephant living with his mate in the Himalaya near a lake infected by

1 For illustrations of the Jātaka in Central-Asian painting see A. von Le Coq (und E. Waldschmidt), Die buddhistische Spatstätte, Vol. VI, pp. 57-58.
3 Referring to Barua’s article in J. U. P. H. S., Vol. XIX, p. 48. Dr. Baij Nath Puri of Lucknow University says that the sculpture can only relate to the Gajakumbhajātaka “which describes the previous birth of the Buddha as a minister of the King of Benaras who took a tortoise and a hare giving to the slothful king an object lesson of how the indolent came to misery. The tortoise is symbolised by his laziness and the hare by his activity, though the popular version is just the reverse.” [India in the Time of Patanjali, Bombay 1937, p. 233]. Unfortunately the hare does not occur in the Pāli text.
a huge crab which used to catch and kill the elephants sporting in the water. When the crab has seized the Bodhisattva's feet with its claws, the Bodhisattva is unable to pull the monster out of the water. He feels that the crab is drawing him down and roars for help. While the other elephants run off, his mate turns towards the crab and coaxes it with flattering words so that it loosens its grasp. Then the elephant tramples it to death.

In the medallion the elephant is represented stepping out of the water, while the crab clings to his right hind-foot. Two elephants, one of whom may be intended as the mate of the Bodhisattva, are visible in the background. In the water some aquatic bird is swallowing a fish, while four more fish are swimming about.

As the elephant is the hero of the story, Nāgajātaka seems to be a more appropriate title of the Jātaka than Kakkaṭajātaka.

B 44 (825); PLATES XX, XL


TEXT:

laṭuvājātaka

TRANSLATION:

The quail Jātaka.

The subject of the medallion was identified by Cunningham with the Laṭukikajātaka, No. 357 of the Pāli collection, where the Bodhisattva appears as the leader of a large herd of elephants. A quail, that has her nest with her unflugged brood on the feeding-ground of the elephants, implores him not to trample on the young birds. The Bodhisattva and his herd cautiously pass by without injuring the birds, but a solitary rogue elephant who comes after them crushes the nest in spite of the entreaties of the quail. The quail alights on a tree and threatens to take her revenge which she accomplishes with the help of a crow, a blue fly, and a frog. The crow pecks out the eyes of the elephant, the fly drops its eggs into the empty sockets, and when the elephant, blind and maddened by pain, is seeking for water to drink, the frog deludes him by his croaking to a precipice. He tumbles down and is killed. In the medallion the different stages of the story are represented: the elephant trampling down the nest with the young birds; the quail on the tree; the crow pecking out the eyes of the elephant; the fly laying its eggs in the wounds; and, at the top, the frog and the elephant falling headlong down the rocks. The elephant on the right, who is followed by a smaller elephant, seems to be meant for the Bodhisattva and his herd.

B 45 (704); PLATES XX, XL

On a coping-stone, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (A 108). Edited by Cunningham, PASB. 1874, p. 115; Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 76; 131, No. 15, and

1 The ka which is distinct in Cunningham's and Hultsch's reproductions is nearly effaced in the impression before me.

2 A similar story is found in the Paṭichatana (ed. Kielhorn), I, 15.
The sculpture to which the label belongs was identified by Rhys Davids with the Dübhiyamakāṭajātaka, No. 174 of the Pāli Jātaka book; see Buddhist Birth Stories, Vol. I, p. CIII. In the Jātaka the Bodhisattva is a brahmin in a village of Kāśi. One day, wandering along a road, he comes to a place where a trough is put up which people use to fill with water from a deep well in the neighbourhood for the use of animals. The brahmin draws water for himself, drinks it and washes his hands and feet, when a monkey approaches him begging for water. The brahmin fills the empty trough and gives the monkey to drink and then lies down under a tree to take rest. When the monkey has quenched his thirst, he pulls a monkey-grimace to frighten his benefactor, and when the Bodhisattva upbraids him, he soils him. The sculpture undoubtedly represents the Jātaka, but it differs from it in details. On the left side stands a young man wearing plain dress and his hair cropped with the exception of a knot over the forehead. He is pouring out water into the hands of a monkey from a vessel, while a similar vessel, apparently wrapped round with cords, stands in front of him. On the right the same man is represented carrying a pole (śhāngīkā) with two water-vessels under a tree on which a monkey is seated, maliciously looking down on the man. In the outermost right corner is another tree.

The sculpture clearly represents two stages of the story, on the left the gift of water to the monkey, on the right the mocking of the monkey. It is of little consequence that in the relief there is no well from which the man has drawn the water and that he is not lying under the tree, when the monkey makes faces at him. The version of the story followed by the sculptor apparently related that the man was fetching water, when he met the thirsty monkey on the road, and that, after having given him something to drink, he was derided by the monkey, when he continued his way. On the other hand, it is of importance for the interpretation of the inscription that, judging from his dress, the man represented in the sculpture cannot be meant to be a brahmin. Nor does he look like an ascetic. He has the appearance of a brahmāchārin who, according to Manu (2, 219; 193; 182) and other law-books, may wear his hair clipped with the exception of a lock, has always to keep his right arm uncovered, and whose duty it is to fetch pots full of water daily for his guru. In the label he is called sekhā.1 Barua-Sinha’s derivation of the word from stichatti in the sense of water-drawing is absolutely impossible, and Hoernle was certainly right in taking it as equivalent to Pāli sekha, sekhā being the true western form for the sekha of the eastern dialect. In the language of the Buddhist scriptures sekha has assumed a special meaning. It denotes a monk as long as he has not acquired arhatship, but it cannot have been used in this sense in the inscription, as the person represented in the sculpture is not a Buddhist monk. In Sanskrit saikṣha occurs only in the Kośas. It is said there to mean a tyro who has just begun his studies

1In the Sāṇḍhi inscription (List No. 570) the corresponding word for ‘student’ occurs in the form segha.
(prāthamakalpika), which perfectly agrees with the result arrived at from an examination of the sculpture. It should be noted that the difference between the sculpture and the Jātaka extends, not to the Gāthās, but only to the prose narrative which in many cases has been proved to deviate from the original tale.

B 46 (703); Plates, XX, XLII


TEXT:
udajātaka

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka of the otters.

The sculpture to which the label belongs was first identified by Hultzsch with the Dabbhapupphajātaka, No. 400 of the Pāli Jātaka book. It is the humorous story of two otters who, having caught a large rohita fish by united effort, begin to quarrel about the division of their prey. They ask a jackal to make an equal division of the fish. The jackal awards the tail to one of the otters, the head to the other and takes the middle portion for himself as arbiter’s fee and brings it to his wife who has manifested a longing for fresh fish. The Bodhisattva is said to have been a tree-spirit at that time who witnessed the event.

The sculpture shows two otters and a jackal between them on the rocky bank of a river in which two fish are visible. The tail and the head of a fish are lying on the ground before the otters. On the right the jackal is seen trotting off with the middle portion of the fish in his mouth. On the left before two trees an ascetic is seated with a water-vessel and a basket filled up to the top before him. It appears that the sculptor did not know the version of the story as it is given in the prose account of the Pāli Jātaka and that in the version known to him the part played by the tree-spirit was assigned to an ascetic living by the river bank. Probably in the mouth of this ascetic the last Gāthā containing the moral was originally put.

B 47 (730); Plates XIII, XLI


\[1\] The ō-sign of ōja is quite distinct.

\[2\] The author of the prose apparently forgot the purpose of the presence of the tree-spirit and calls the last stanza an Abhisambuddhagāthā. In the Tibetan version of the story (Schiefner, Tib. Tales, p. 332 ff.) which is very much deteriorated, the witness of the event has totally disappeared.
TEXT:
migajātakaṁ

TRANSLATION:
The Jātaka of the deer.

The sculpture to which the label belongs has been identified by Hultzsch with the Rurujātaka, No. 482 of the Pāli collection. The story belongs to the class of tales of the virtuous animals and the ungrateful men. A young spendthrift casts himself into the Ganges to drown himself, but is saved by the Bodhisattva, who at that time was a gold-coloured ruru deer. He carries him on his back out of the water and sets him after some days on the road to Benares, asking him at the same time not to disclose his haunt. The queen of Benares has dreamt of a golden deer and longs to see it. After being informed by the brahmins that there are really golden deer, the king offers a large reward to anybody who will bring him news of such a creature. Instigated by his greediness, the wretched young fellow shows the king and his followers the way to the dwelling place of the deer. The king is ready to discharge an arrow, when the deer addresses him and reveals the perfidy of the traitor. At the request of the deer the king pardons the wretch and grants a boon of inviolability to all creatures.

In the medallion three stages of the story are represented. In the lower part the deer is seen swimming in the stream with the man on his back. A doe drinking from the water serves no other purpose but to fill a blank space. In the centre of the upper part, where three trees indicate that the scene is in a forest, the large deer is quietly lying on the ground, while four female deer are running away in fear of the king who has pulled his bow and is on the point of shooting his arrow at the deer which is pointed out to him by the traitor standing by his side. In front of the deer the king appears once more, attended by two men, probably the treacherous young man and a servant. The attitude of the king, who stands with his hands folded in devotion, shows that here he is represented as conversing with the deer and paying his respects to him for his magnanimous behaviour.

In agreement with the Gāthās, where the deer is called a ruru deer, the title of the Pāli Jātaka is Rurujātaka, while in the label it is called migajātaka. I do not know which species of the deer family was denoted by ruru; the animal represented in the sculpture is certainly neither an antelope nor a gazelle, but, as shown by the antlers, a stag, probably a sāmbar.

B 48 (698); PLATES XX, XLVII


1 The sign for the anusūra has not come out on the estampage, but it can be clearly seen in the photograph.
2 Again by Huber, BEFEO. Tome IV (1904), p. 1093.
3 In Vaij. 66, 27 it is said to be a large black buck (mahān krishṇapātakā), but no such animal exists in India.
TEXT:

isimigo jataka

TRANSLATION:

The Jataka of the riya-antelope.

The sculpture illustrates the Nigrodhamigajataka, No. 12 of the Pāli collection, one of the most famous birth stories and frequently told or alluded to in Buddhist literature. In the Pāli commentary it is located near Benares. In the Mvu., where the story is related at great length (I, 359 ff.) the scene is the well-known Isipatana Migadāya or Rishipatana Mrigadāva, and Hiuan-tsong in his description of Benares tells us that there was a stūpa in the park to commemorate the event. The Chinese pilgrim’s account enabled Cunningham to identify the Jataka’s, but he misunderstood the details of the sculpture and mis-interpreted the inscription. The legend as told in Pāli consists of two parts. In the first part we are told that the Bodhisattva was born as the leader of a large herd of antelopes by the name of Nigrodha, while an equally large herd belonged to another antelope king called Sākha. The king of Benares was passionately fond of hunting, and to stop the excessive slaughter of the deer, the two leaders agreed with the king to send one animal every day, alternately from one and the other herd, to the execution block to be killed by the cook. One day, the story goes on, the lot falls on a pregnant doe of Sākha’s herd. In vain she implores her leader to pass her over until she has brought forth her child, but when she turns for help to the Bodhisattva, the great Being at once goes himself to the place of execution. The cook is highly astonished to see the king of the deer. He informs the king, who is deeply affected by the magnanimity of the Bodhisattva and at his request grants immunity not only to the deer, but to all living creatures. Cunningham thought that the relief represented the interview between the king and the Bodhisattva, which leads to the agreement about the daily offering of one antelope, but the man standing before the antelope carries an axe on his left shoulder and therefore can be only the cook who has come to kill the antelope. The animal itself is standing with its forefeet placed on what seems to be a log of wood wrapped round with cords, which is perhaps meant for the block of execution, the gandikā or dhannagaṇḍikā spoken of in the Pāli text. As indicated by a tree behind the antelope the scene is not the kitchen of the royal palace, but some place in the deer park. The antelope is called isimigo in the inscription. Cunningham took the name as an abbreviation of Isipatanamiga and translated it by Rishi-deer. His explanation, although accepted by Hultzsch and Baran-Sinha, appears to me extremely improbable, and I am convinced that isimiga goes back to riya-miga. In Pāli, it is true, riya has become issa as proved by issamiga (J. V, 416), issāmiga (J. V, 431), issasinga (J. V, 425), and therefore isimiga may be considered as belonging to another dialect; but in Pāli we have also Isisinga, the name of the hero of the Alambusa (No. 523) and the Nalinikāj (No. 526), which undoubtedly represents Riyaśtinga, and even in J. V, 431 one of the Burmese manuscripts reads isimigasa. From the Gāthā in J. V, 425, where women are called issasingam iśāvattā, it appears that riya designates the black buck (Antelope cervicapra) with screwshaped horns. On the other hand, the antelope of the relief seems to have short straight horns, and it cannot be denied that,

1DhA. II, 148; MIt. p. 203.
2Strangely enough, his identification was rejected by Hocnle and Oldenberg, JAOS. Vol. XVIII, p. 191.
3Cunningham wrote isipatanamiga.
with its slight hunchback, it has more the appearance of a nilgai (Boselaphus tragocamelus) than of a black buck. But even if the animal of the inscription should not be a riṣya, this could hardly be used as an argument against the proposed translation of īṣimigo, as we may reasonably assume that in such minutiae the sculptor followed his own taste.

The grammatically incorrect use of the nominative īṣimigo in the title of the Jātaka has a parallel in Saṇjato gahuto jātaka in No. B 50.

B 49 (785); Plates VI, XLI


TEXT:

chhadantya jātakam

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka relating to the six-tusked elephant.

The sculpture to which the label refers was identified by Cunningham with the Chhaddantajātaka, No. 514 of the Pāli Jātaka book. The prose tale is later and much embellished version of the Jātaka, which is sometimes even at variance with the Gāthās. The chief points of the story as warranted by the Gāthās are as follows. The Bodhisattva is born as a white elephant with six tusks, who lives as a leader of a large herd under a banyan tree near Mount Suvannapura. He has two mates, Sabbabhaddā and another whose name was perhaps Subhaddā¹. The Bodhisattva pays more attention to Sabbabhaddā. In the prose story, for instance, it is told that one day he presents her a large lotus flower which another elephant had offered him. Subhaddā, out of jealousy, starves herself to death and dies with the wish to be reborn as the consort of the king of Benares in order to wreak vengeance on the Bodhisattva. When she has become queen, she pretends to have a craving for the tusks of the white elephant and despatches a hunter to the place where he lives. Attired in the yellow robe of a monk, the hunter hides in a pit and discharges an arrow at the elephant. Although sorely wounded, the Bodhisattva, out of reverence for the hunter’s religious dress, does not harm him, and when he is informed that the hunter has come for his tusks, he summons him to saw them off himself before he dies. The queen on receiving the tusks hearing the death of her former mate is filled with remorse and dies of a broken heart.

On the right side of the medallion the six-tusked elephant is seen standing under a banyan tree, accompanied by a female elephant who by a lotus flower on her front is characterized as the beloved Sabbabhaddā, while another female elephant appearing in the background is apparently the jealous Subhaddā. On the left the elephant, with an arrow stuck

¹ In the prose tale they are called Mahāsubhaddā and Chullasubhaddā, but in G. 17; 34 the name of the favourite she-elephant is Sabbabhaddā, while the name of the second she-elephant does not occur in the Gāthās. Subhaddā is mentioned in G. 29 only as her name in her birth as queen of Benares.
in his navel, is kneeling to let the hunter cut off his tusks with a large saw. On the right of the hunter his bow and an arrow are lying on the ground.

Foucher wrote a special study 1 on the Chhaddantaj. (514) and pointed out the numerous deviations to be found between the Gāthās and the prose account. Leaving aside the prose account of the story, the Bhār̥hut relief seems to deviate only in two points from the tale as it can be deduced from the Gāthās: the Gāthās 25 ff. tell how the elephant, struck by the arrow, rushes at the hunter to kill him, but retreats when he sees the reddish garment of the hunter which is otherwise worn by the Rishis; for, someone who bears the characteristic marks of the Arhats, should not be killed by the pious:

\[\text{vadhissam etan iti parāmasanto}\\ kāsāsām adādakhi dhajanā isānām}\\ dukkhenā phuṭṭas' udapādi sānṇā\\ arahaddhājo sabhi avajjavāpo ni²\]

In the relief, however, the hunter does not wear the garments of a monk, but the usual lower garment and a turban. Now in fact the hunter, according to the Āthavānanā, puts on yellow garments in order to deceive the elephant and the same thing is told in the Jātaka version as it is found in the Kalpanamaṇḍūtikā and in the prose of J. 221. Nothing, however, of it is said in G. 23, where the preparations made by the hunter in order to kill the elephant are described. The disguise in itself is quite superfluous, as the hunter hides himself in a pit covered by planks to shoot from there his arrow at the passing elephant. 3 Obviously the composer of the Gāthās, when he used the word kāsāsā, thought of the usual dress of the hunter, which is also a red-yellow garment as can be seen from other passages. For instance, according to the legend, the Bodhisattva when he thought of leaving the worldly life exchanged his garments first with the kāśāya of the hunter. In the verse Mou. II, 195, 6 f. it is said: tatvādakshid aranyasmin lubhātaka kāśāyaśprāvijan; he requested him: imau kāśikau gṛihinītā dehi kāśāyaṁ tvam mama. According to the Mou. prose, however, he is not a usual hunter but one created by the Šuddhavāsa gods. In the Buddhach. 6. 60 ff., and in the Lalitav. 226, 1 ff.; 238, 1 ff., where the kāśāya has already changed to several kāśāya-garments, it is likewise said that the hunter was a god who had taken the form of a hunter. 4 It could therefore appear, that the hunter had equipped himself with the kāśāya for this special purpose. 5 Āśvaghosa describes the kāśāya as the dress suited for the

---

1 Milango Sylovin Līvi, p. 231 ff.; Beginnings of Buddhist Art, p. 185 ff.
2 The next two Gāthās (26 and 27) with which the elephant is alleged to have addressed the hunter, are certainly later additions. From the words samāpteṣu ṣūkṣmaṇena nāgo aditvābhucchito lubhātakam ājyabhāši in G. 28 it can be clearly seen that the elephant has not spoken to the hunter before. Both these Gāthās belong to the Buddhist lyric poetry and as such they are found in the Dh. 9, 10. Later on, probably a story modelled on the Chhaddantaj, was invented and in fact there is such a Jātaka, which was taken up as J. 221 in the collection, from where it found its way into Dhā. (1, 80 ff.). Whether the verses 967 to 970 in the Th. refer to this Ċātvaka or to the already interpolated Chhaddantaj, is not easy to decide. If one would relate them to the J. 221 one must suppose that originally the narrative ran more in conformity with the story of the Chhaddantaj, than the one handed down in the Āthavānanā, for the Therāgāthās speak of a six-tusked elephant that was wounded, while in the J. 221 the elephant is not described as six-tusked and escapes the missile of the hunter. Finally, however, it is still more probable that the verses from the Th. refer to the Chhaddantaj. But they themselves are perhaps only a later insertion, for there they completely fall away from the context. Besides, I would like to point out that what the grammatical commentary on the Gāthās 18-27 has the character of Āṭṭhakathā, for the interspersed bhikkhave 48.13; 50.8 makes it probable that the grammatical commentary and the prose narration come from the same author.
3 In the relief the hunter has struck the elephant from below as the arrow is planted in its belly.
4 This remark is lacking in the Diego. 391, where it is said that the Bodhisattva received kāśāyaṁ sastriṁ from the hunter for his kāṭika garments; however only a short reference is made to the story.
5 Subsequently this legend has been further developed in this respect. In the Nidānakathā G. 278 (p. 65) the full equipment of a Buddhist monk which a Mahābrahmaṇa, the former Ghaṭikāra, provides, appears in the place of the kāśāya of the hunter.
forest (vanyāṁ vāsaḥ) although he makes the hunter say that when he goes hunting he is accustomed to put on kāśīya in order to produce from a distance trust in the mind of the deer (ārād anena viśvāya mṛgāṇ nihammi). In the prose of the Chandākinīra (IV, 283, 16) it is also mentioned, without giving any special cause, that the king of Benares when he went hunting put on two kāśīya, and it is not necessary to imagine the kāśīya of the hunter as the robe of a Buddhist monk. The kāśīya which, according to the prose of the Jātakas, is worn by the executioner, and according to the Aśvalāyana Gīthās, 1, 19, 11 by the young brahmin students, will have been scarcely different from the kāśīya of the hunter. Therefore in this respect it is not necessary to suppose that the sculptor of Bhaṛhut has deviated from the story as it is given by the Gāthās.

The matter seems to be different with regard to the second deviation on which Foucher lays much stress. In the relief the hunter cuts the teeth of the elephant with a saw, exactly as on the medallion from Amarāvatī on a fresco at Ajañṭā, and a freeze from Gandhāra. According to the Gāthās he uses a kharā for this purpose. In G. 31 the elephant says to the hunter: utṭṭhihe tuath ludda kharāṁ gohetvā daute ime cchinda purā marāmi, and accordingly in the narrative Gāthā 32 we read utṭṭhiya so ludda kharāṁ gohetvā cchinda dantēn gaṅgutamassata. In the prose the instrument used is a kakascha, a saw (V, 52, 12 ff.), and accordingly in the grammatical commentary of G. 31 kharāṁ is also explained by kakascha. Foucher is of the opinion that the commentator goes too far when he wants us to believe that knives are saws, ‘autrement dit que les vesseys sont des lanternes’. Now indeed I am also inclined to see in the commentator a man who generally is not very much worried by scruples, whether in linguistic or in material questions. Nevertheless some doubts may have come to him, as perhaps also to others, whether it is possible to cut elephant-teeth with a razor—this undoubtedly is the meaning of kharā. In this case, however, I believe that he is not to be blamed for he merely became the victim of a corruption of the text. In other cases in the Gāthās where we hear of the cutting of elephant’s tusks the instrument used is called kharā. In J. 545, 10 it is said achchhechchhi kaṁkhaṁ viśikichchhitāṁ chundo yathā na gaṇadantaṁ kharanā, ‘you have cut off doubts and hesitations like a chunda an elephant tooth with the kharā’. In J. 234, 1 Asitābhū says to her husband who has faithlessly left her that her love for him has vanished: so‘yam appatiṣāliko kharachchhitāṁ va rerukaṁ ‘it is not again to be joined together as an elephant-tooth cut by a kharā’. The commentator explains kharā in both places as kakascha ‘saw’ and although the word is missing in Sanskrit we do not have any reason to doubt the correctness of his explanation, particularly because the Abhidhānappadipīka 967 also gives the meaning ‘saw’ for kharā. Therefore the supposition lies at hand that also in the Chhadantā j. kharāna has been corrupted from kharāṁ, which is more rare, and in fact the Burmese manuscript reads kharāṁ at all places. On account of this I am quite sure that even according to the Gāthās the instrument used by the hunter was a saw as well as in the other representations mentioned above, and that the Gāthās therefore do not reflect, as Foucher supposes, a version of the story older than the Bhaṛhut relief.

1 J. III 41, 2; 179, 1.
2 According to the context chunda seems to be a worker in ivory. The commentary explains the word by dantakāra. There must have been, however, a difference between the chundas and the dantakārās for in the list of craftsmen in Māl. 331 both appear separately: the chundas are placed between the kapppakas (barbers), and nāhīpakkas (bath attendants) on one side and the māḍakāras (garland-makers), suvarṇapakāras (goldsmiths), saujhakāras (silversmiths) etc. on the other, whereas the dantakāras appear between the chammakārās (leather-workers), and rathakārās (chariot-makers) on the one side and the rajju-kāras (rope-makers) and the koṭchhakārās (comb-makers) on the other. Chunda is probably the general expression for ‘turner’ and is the same as chandakāra which in J. VI, 339, 12 certainly designates a turner.
3 Thus we have to read instead of kharā cchhitāṁ.
4 This is the meaning of the word reruka according to the commentary.
B 50 (694); PLATES XX, XLI


TEXT:

Sujato gahuto jātaka.

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka (entitled) ‘the mad Sujata’ (Sujata)*.

On the left side of the relief a humped bull is resting on the ground with the forepart of the body raised. To the right, in front of the bull, a boy with long hair combed back is shown in crouching position. With his right hand he holds a bunch of grass up to the bull and is apparently trying to feed it. A man with a turban stands behind him holding his left arm and hand across his breast while his right hand is just to be seen above the head of the boy.

Cunningham already rightly identified this scene as representing the Sujatājātaka (352). According to the story a landlord in Benares became so much afflicted with sorrow at his father’s death, that he did not leave the memorial where his father’s bodily remains were deposited, neglecting his business, forgetting bathing and eating and always lamenting bitterly. His son Sujata, who according to the Samodhāna is Buddha in one of his former births, cures the grief of his father in an ingenious manner. He goes outside the city where a dead ox² is lying and offers grass and water to the animal asking it repeatedly to eat and drink. People passing by wonder at it and go to tell the father that his son apparently had become mad. Now the father forgets his sorrow, goes to his son and reproaches him for his senseless behaviour. But the son points out that the bull lying before him is still having a head, feet and tail, so that there is much more hope to see it stand alive once again than the dead grand-father, whose body has totally vanished, but for whom the father continues to grieve in total neglect of all his duties. Thus the father realizes the foolishness of his lamentations and is cured of his sorrow.

Cunningham hesitatingly proposed to translate the inscription "Birth as Sujata the Bull-inviter ", taking gahuto as a compound-word, made out of go or gau a bull, and huto from the root hū to call, invite, or summon. Barua-Sinha call this translation ‘quite reasonable’, but take gahuto as a compound corresponding to Sk. gobhrit or Pali gobhato, gobhâteko which according to them means a cow-server or cow-feeder. Hultzsch on the other hand refuses to see in gahuto a compound-word and takes it as Sk. grihítaḥ ‘caught, seized, surprised, or understood’. He is followed by Lüders who in his List translates gahuto as ‘mad’. This explanation would correspond to the word ummattako occurring in the Pāli Jātaka.

B 51 (810); PLATES XX, XLII

On a pillar, now at Pataora. Edited by Cunningham, StBl. (1879), p. 65 ff.; 139, No. 97, and Pl. XXVI and LV; Hultzsch, ZDMG. Vol. XL (1886), p. 76, No. 155; IA.

¹ The treatment of this inscription does not occur in the remnants of Lüders’ manuscript.
² We give the translation according to the one appearing in Lüders’ List, which seems to us more probable than the explanation of Barua-Sinha referred to below.
³ In the relief, however, the bull does not lie on the earth like a dead animal, but, as already mentioned, has the forepart of his body raised. Its attitude is like that of a ruminating animal.
The Jātaka ‘because the brāhmaṇa played’.

The Jātaka, to which the label refers, was identified by Subhūti as the Aṇḍabhūta-jātaka, No. 62 of the Pāli Jātaka book. It is one of the numerous Jātakas illustrating the cunningness of women. The Bodhisattva is a king of Benares, who, when playing at dice with his purohitā, used to sing a ditty which states that all women do something wrong when they get an opportunity. On account of the truth of this saying he always wins the game, and the purohitā is threatened by utter ruin. In order to break the spell he buys a girl before she has been born and brings her up in his house without ever allowing her to look at a man except himself. When she has grown up, the purohitā begins to play again with the king. Whenever the king sings his ditty, the purohitā adds: ‘excepting my girl’; and thereby wins while the king loses. To seduce the girl, the king then, in a most artful way, has a scamp smuggled into the purohitā’s house, where they enjoy themselves to their hearts’ content. Before the lover takes leave, the couple plays a trick on the brahmin. The girl tells him that she should like to dance and asks him to play the vīṇā for her, but blindfolded, her modesty forbidding her to dance while he is looking on. The purohitā consents, and when she has danced awhile, she asks him to allow her to hit him once on the head. When the purohitā has granted her request, she makes a sign to her lover who is hidden in the chamber, and he deals his unsuspecting rival a terrible blow. When after that the king and the brahmin continue their game, the usual exception of the girl made by the brahmin has lost its power and he loses again. Being informed by the king of the cause of his bad luck, he charges the girl with her misdemeanour, but she proves her innocence by a new trick perpetrated with the assistance of her lover.

A portion of each side of the medallion which bears the inscription has been cut away when the pillar was set up as a beam in a cenotaph outside the village of Patara. Fortunately the inscription and enough of the sculpture has been preserved to render the identification certain. In the lower half of the medallion the brahmin is sitting, blindfolded and playing the vīṇā, while the girl is standing before him stretching out her right hand. An arm with a closed fist appearing between her and the brahmin shows that the lover is concealed behind her. On the right the girl seems to have been represented once more in a dancing attitude. The upper storey of a house with two windows, a balcony and a pinnacled roof, represented in the upper half of the medallion, indicate that the scene is the house of the brahmin. For two reasons the label is of considerable importance for the history of Buddhist literature. The words yaṁ brāhmaṇo avāyesi, corresponding to yaṁ brāhmaṇo avādāsī in the Pāli text, are the first Pāda of the only Gāthā of the Jātaka, and the label proves that the mode of using the first line (pratika) of the first Gāthā as the title of the Jātaka, which has been preserved in the Pāli Jātaka, had not yet gone out of fashion in the second century B.C., although the later custom of calling a Jātaka after the hero or some incident of the story was already quite

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copy and photograph. Cunningham brumano, Hultsch bram[ţ]ano. bu is found in B 31, bra in B 66; the symbols do not show much difference. I can discover no subscript ha in the photograph. Cunningham’s eye-copy gives jātakān, but the ja seems to have no ă-sign.
common. Secondly the form āvāṣyati, which stands for āvāṣyati, confirms the view that the original text of the Gāthās was composed in the dialect of Eastern India, where intervocalic d had been replaced by y. Bramana, if this is the right reading, is probably only a faulty spelling for brāhmāna; cf. Brāhmadēva in No. B 66; Kanhilasa in No. A 63.

B 52 (769); PLATES XX, XLIII


TEXT:

yavamajhakiyaṁ jātakam

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka relating to the market-towns.

Whereas Cunningham imagined to have discovered the scene represented in the sculpture in the famous story of Upākośa and her lovers told in the Brīhadkathāmañjari and the Kathāsaritgāra, Andersen in the Index to the Jātaka, p. XV, pointed out that the medallion illustrated an older version of that story which forms an episode of the Mahāummāgga-jātaka, No. 546 of the Pāli collection. The Jātaka deals with the adventures of the Bodhisattva in his existence as the sage Mahosadha, councillor of king Vedeha. The four envious ministers of the king attempt to supplant him. They steal some ornaments from the royal treasury and send them secretly to Amarā, the wife of the sage. Amarā, who is almost as clever as her husband, keeps an accurate account of these dealings. When the ministers accuse Mahosadha of having stolen the ornaments, the sage escapes in disguise. Amarā invites the four ministers to come to her home. When they arrive, she has them shaved, thrown into the dung-pit and finally put into rush-baskets. Then taking the ornaments with her, she has the baskets carried to the royal palace, and there in the presence of the king she reveals the truth.

In the medallion the king is represented sitting on his throne, attended by a female chari-bearer and surrounded by six of his courtiers. On the right, Amarā stands accompanied by a female servant. With her right hand she points at two baskets the lids of which have been taken off, exposing the shaven heads of the ministers, while a third basket is being uncovered by a servant and a fourth still unopened is just arriving, being carried on a pole by two servants.

The divergence of the fable from the Jātaka book with regard to the title of the Jātaka can be sufficiently accounted for from the Pāli text itself. The Mahāummāgga-jātaka is clearly composed of two parts, the first treating of Mahosadha’s marvellous cleverness by which he solves numerous questions and triumphs over the attempts of the four ministers to destroy him, and the second, of his victory over a hostile king by means of a wonderful tunnel. The pratika ‘pañchālo sabhasenaṁ’ (J. VI, p. 329) which serves as the title of the Jātaka in its

2 Barua’s interpretation of the sculpture is so palpably wrong that it is unnecessary to discuss it.
present form consists of the first words of the first Gāthā of the second part of the Jātaka (l.c. p.396). It shows that the first part of the story having the words ‘maṁsāṁ goṇo’ as its pratīka originally formed an independent Jātaka, which in later times, after the redaction of the Jātaka collection, was combined with the Ummagajātaka having the pratīka ‘paṁčāla sabbatīyā’. It is apparently the story of Mahosadha’s cleverness, now forming the first part of the Jātaka, which is called yavamajhikayān jātakam in the inscription, the name referring to the four market-towns at the four gates of Mithilā1; the scene of Mahosadha’s various adventures, cf. Gāthā 41 ‘esa magga yavamajhakassa’ (l.c.p. 365, 25).

B 53 (802); PLATES XX, XLII


TEXT:

Iṣi[ṁ]\[ya] j[ā]ta(ka)[ṁ]

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka relating to Iṣiṣīṅga (Riṣiṣīṅga)2.

Cunningham assisted by Minayeff and Subhūti identified the scene to which the label belongs as the introductory story of the Alambusajātaka, No. 523 of the Pāli collection, which is briefly referred to also in the Naḷinikājātaka, No. 526. The Bodhisattva is born as a brahmin, who, when he has reached the proper age, retires to the forest. A doe in the brahmin’s privy place eats the grass and drinks the water mingled with his semen and becomes pregnant. When she has given birth to a boy, the brahmin brings him up and instructs him in the practice of meditation. This boy is Iṣiṣīṅga, whose love-affairs are the subject of the Jātaka.

In the upper part of the medallion the hermit is seen squatting and attending to the sacred fire. The scene seems to be intended to represent the life of the brahmin in the hermitage which is further indicated by a hut, a vessel with a lid and two vessels filled with food and suspended in nets from a piece of wood. In the lower right corner the conception is represented in a most naturalistic manner. In the centre the hermit is taking up the boy who has just been brought forth by the doe. The dress of the hermit is quite different from that of the ordinary ascetics appearing in the sculptures. He wears his hair coiled up in braids, has a long beard, a girdle and a kind of kīṭa; apparently made of bark or kuśa grass around his loins and the sacred thread over his left shoulder. He is thus clearly characterized as a brahmanical vānaprastha, which is in keeping with the Jātaka tale.

B 54 (701); PLATES XX, XLIII

On a coping-stone, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (A 112). Edited by Cunningham, PASB. 1874, p. 111; Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 69 f.; 131, No. 12, and Pl. XXVII and LIII; Hultzsch, ZDMG. Vol. XL (1886), p. 61, No. 12, and Pl.; Warren, Two Bas-Reliefs


TEXT:

kinsonrajātakaṁ

TRANSLATION:

The Kinnarajātaka.

The lower half of the sculpture to which the inscription belongs has been broken off, but enough remains to show that it represented a well-dressed man seated in an arm-chair², together with a man and a woman, who by their kilts made of leaves are characterised as kinnaras, standing on his left. Whether the kinnaras have been represented with bird-legs cannot be said as the lower part of the relief is broken away.

Cunningham, Rhys Davids³, and Grünwedel⁴ identified the sculpture with the Chandakinnarajātaka, No. 485 of the Pāli Collection. It is the story of a king who in the Himālaya meets a kinnara couple, falls in love with the kinnari and shoos her husband, but leaves her, when she, enraged, rejects his love-suit. Sakka, moved by her lamentations, revives the husband.

Vogel found a representation of the Jātaka in the Gandhāra sculpture⁵ published by Foucher, Mémoire sur l'Asie Orientale, Tome III, p. 23 f., and Pl. IV, 4; 5. The sculpture follows closely the text as it appears in the Gāthās of the Jātaka. At first (1)⁶ we see the kinnara-couple diverting itself; the man plays the harp, and the woman dances to its music. In the second scene (2) they continue their play, but now they are watched by the king, who is concealed behind a tree. The king rides the horse with the bow at his back. In the next scene (3) we see the king standing behind a rock having the bow bent and aiming at the man who still plays on his harp, while his wife is dancing. A tree separates this picture from the following scene. (4) Here the man, shot to death, lies on the ground and the harp is seen in front of him. The woman sits lamenting at his side. The king has taken her by her hand to take her away. In the next scene (5) he still holds her by the hand. She, enraged, rejects him. The scenes, which may have followed, are lost. The representations on Burmese tiles are more simple. On a tile from the Māṇgalachetiya in Pagan⁷, the archer has just charged the arrow which can be seen flying in the air. The kinnara sits before him, with the arrow in his breast, his lamenting wife at his side. On another tile from the Pagoda of Petlek⁸ three is a man who directs his bent bow against the kinnara standing at the side of

¹ Photograph earlier in Cunningham’s work, only a sketch had been given.
² A man sitting in a similar chair is found in the relief from Gaya in Cunningham’s Mahābodhi, Pl. IV; Barua, Gaya and Buddhā-Gaya, Vol. II, fig. 63. Barua, p. 109, has probably rightly seen in this relief the representation of the Sujātā (306).
³ Buddhist Birth-Stories, Vol. I, p. CII.
⁴ Buddhist Studies, p. 92.
⁵ It is kept in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, a replica in the British Museum. JITENDRA NATH BANERJEE, without knowing the article of Foucher, published the relief anew and identified it with the same Jātaka in IHQ, X. 544 ff.
⁶ I do not know why Foucher takes the first two scenes in reversed order. The repetition of the kinnara couple thereby becomes ununderstandable and the succession of the scenes in the whole frieze is disturbed.
⁷ Grünwedel, Buddh. Studien, fig. 69; Foucher, l.c. p. 32, fig. 5 a.
⁸ Foucher, l. c. Pl. IV, 6.
his wife. From the heaven Sakka descends to make good the calamity brought about by
the man.

Warren rejected, in my opinion rightly, the identification of the relief from Bahrut
with the Chandakinnaraj mentioned above, as there does not exist the slightest similarity
between the two. In the Jataka, the king shoots the kinnara in a mountain range or in a
forest; here, however, the kinnara and his wife stand in front of the king who sits comfortably
in an arm-chair. Warren himself wanted to explain the relief as a representation of the
Bhallatiyajataka (504). The Bhallatiyajata, different from the bulk of the Jatakas, is a
complete, small epic poem which in its prose does not offer anything beyond the statements
about the persons engaged in dialogue, exactly as it happens in the Mahabharata. The
contents are as follows:

Bhallatiya, king of Benares, sees, when hunting on the Gandhamadana mountain,
a kinnara couple, which embraces each other weeping and lamenting. On his question the
kinnara tells him as the cause of their grief that they had been separated for one night by a
swollen river 697 years ago. This moving story is inserted into another one, which is narrated
by a person called samaga, as becomes clear from the last three Gathas. This samaga
adds the admonition, apparently addressed to a married couple, to avoid quarrel and fight.
He therefore receives the thanks of one of them, whether of the husband or of the wife cannot
be decided from the Gathas. According to the prose narration the samaga is the Buddha
himself who, with the help of the story, reconciled king Pasenadi and his wife Mallikā
after they have had a matrimonial quarrel. Later on the queen expressed her thanks to him.

Oldenberg, though hesitatingly, followed the identification of Warren. Foucher
also first joined him and explained as Bhallatiyajataka two reliefs from the Boro-Budur,
where a king is depicted in a scenery of rocks having a conversation with a kinnara couple,
whereas Grünwedel, i.e., considered the same as representing the Chandakinnarajataka.
Since the Gandhara frieze mentioned above was discovered, Foucher became inclined
to the view that in Bahrut as well as on the Boro-Budur the Chandakinnarajataka was
depicted: si grande est la routine de l'art bouddhique. I cannot believe in the
correctness of this view. The oldest illustration of the Chandakinnarajataka is given in
the Gandhara frieze. If this was the traditional one, then we should expect that the
representations in Bahrut and on the Boro-Budur were similar to it, but this is not the case
and it does not convince me that the Javanese artist should have suppressed the essential
episode, the murder of the kinnara, as violating the sentiment, and that he should have
depicted instead of it the king in conversation with the kinnara couple, although the story
does not give any occasion for such a talk. The attitude of the figures — the kinnara-couple
speaking, the king worshipping the two with hands joined together—seems to me to speak
decisively in favour of the interpretation of the Javanese reliefs as Bhallatiyajataka.

On the other hand I agree with Hultzsch who opposed the identification of the
Bahrut relief not only with the Chandakinnarajataka but also with the Bhallatiyajataka,
for the reason that the king sitting in his arm-chair can impossibly represent the king hunting
in the mountains as told in the Bhallatiyajataka. Foucher as well declares, that this reason

---

1 Warren, Two Bas-Reliefs of the Stupa of Bahrut, p. 8 ff.
2 "Faos. XVIII, p. 188; 191.
3 "Beginnings of Buddhist Art, p. 242; Pl. XLI, 1. Ijzerman had already referred to the plates from
4 Mfm. conc. l'Asie Orientale, Tome III, p. 7 f.
ought to be decisive if one were to trust the sketch of Cunningham. That this sketch does not deserve suspicion is proved by the publication of the photograph. So today possibly Foucher also would consent to the identification of the relief proposed by Hultzsch with the kinnara-episode, the last tale in a series of stories narrated to the former Purohita of king Brahmadaatta of Benares by his pupil and present Purohita Takkaríya in the Takkaríyajáta of (481) 1.

The tale is quite clear in its course, although the text is badly preserved and the Gáthás therefore give great difficulties in details. A hunter catches a kinnara-couple in the Himavat and brings it to the king in Benares to whom such beings are quite unknown. When he hears from the hunter that kinnaras are clever in dancing and singing, he commands them to show their art. In fear of making an error and saying something false the pair remains silent. Enraged the king orders (G. 7):

"They are not gods, and also not Gandharvas. They are animals brought to me for the sake of profit. This one may be roasted for supper, the other one, however, may be roasted for breakfast".

Now the kinnar regards it timely to speak. She says (G. 8):

"A hundred thousand of bad speeches do not weigh as much as one piece of good speech. Fearing calamity from bad speech, the kinnaras are silent, not out of stupidity".

The king, pleased with the kinnar, answers (G. 9):

"The one who spoke to me, should be set free and be taken to the Himavat-range. But the other one is to be delivered to the kitchen and roasted in the early morning for breakfast."

Now the kinnara also feels urged to open his mouth (GG. 10-12):

"The cattle depend on the god of rain, these beings on the cattle. On you, oh great king, I depend; on me, my wife depends. One of us when released, could only go into the mountains, after having known that the other one is dead"

"Censure in fact cannot be easily avoided. The men with whom one has to manage, are different, oh king. The thing for what the one receives praise, for that the other meets with a censurer."

---

2 Instead of migā ime athisasabhātā ime, which is also metrically incorrect, migā ime athisasabhātā me is to be read. In the grammatical commentary later on the two last words have been explained in conformity with the contents of the story, but the me is attested by mama: athisasabhātā ime i athisah pachchādhisahatena buddhānubhātā tathābhavasena mama abhātā.
3 In the fourth pada the Sínahalese ms. gives ekaḥ cha pana pāṭārāse pachanta, the Burmese ekaḥ cha nam pana pāṭārāse pachanta. The original reading was probably ekaḥ pana pāṭārāse pachanta.
4 Dabhāsikāsanam samkāmapādī kileṣa tasmā buddhi kimpurāṇa na bulyā. The third pada cannot be right; the explanation of the commentator, who seems to take kileṣa as verbūm finitum, is without value. I should suppose—dabhāsikā sanvānām kileṣaḥ. It is to be noted that kileṣa apparently has not been used in the Buddhist sense.
5 The edition reads according to the Burmese ms. nātho 'ham bhāryāya ekaḥ, but C's mama nāthā mama bhāryād mama nāthā, whereas Cō has only mama bhāryād. The commentary, according to the Sínahalese ms. reads mama nāthā ti mama pana bhāryād mama nāthā anāma assā pāṭārīto. Here, corresponding to the tvam-nāthe in the third pada, mama nāthā stands clearly instead of manināthā, and the pada originally read manināthā bhāryād mama or manināthā mama bhāryā, where bhāryād is the representative of the original eastern form bhāryā.
6 The two last padas read in the text and the commentary without any variant dvana vaddatavā iva muñca pachcheyya pokkatanah, which is not understandable to me. The commentary explains: amhākāri dvanaṃ antare ko ekaḥ mānaṃ nāthe sāvaḥ maṇṇayam muñca pachchey Hīmavantah pachcheyya sāyaṃ samānaṃ pana maṇṇayam anākampānām na jāktam iva tasmā sa che ṣi imām Hīmavantam pustukāmo pāthamānaḥ maṇi mārakā pachchē pāsālī. dhālantah is perhaps an attempt to rectify dhālantah distorted from original dhānān mānaḥ. I have translated accordingly, but I am by no means sure to have found the right meaning.
7 na ve nīda suparissajjitaḥ che, with the reading suparissajjitaḥ in the Burmese manuscripts. The che is ununderstandable, and passed over in the commentary.
“Everyone is without understanding for somebody who understands (the matter) differently than how he does. Everybody has understanding for the man who yields to (one’s own) understanding. All beings understand (things) in their own way, each one for himself. Whose understanding shall I follow under these circumstances?”

The king thereupon releases the kinnara too and the story ends with a Gāthā, wrongly attributed to the king in the prose account (G. 13):

“The kinnara together with his wife stood silent. Because he spoke, fearing danger for himself, he became free, safe and sound. Speech, indeed, brings profit to men.”

Nobody can deny that the relief is in best conformity with this narration. Only the label seems to go against this identification, as indeed the story of the kinnaras in the form as it is handed down, is in reality no Jātaka but only cited in a Jātaka as an example. Now it is quite possible that the story was originally an independent Jātaka. In any case, however, it must have been taken into the Takkāriyajātaka. before the final redaction of the Jātaka-collection was made, for the Takkāriyajātaka. with its 13 Gāthās is rightly inserted in the Terasani-pāta. I therefore should like to believe that Kinnarajātaka is only another name for the Takkāriyajātaka. The nomenclature appears justified from two points of view. The narration of the kinnaras is not only the most important part of the Jātaka in regard to its size—it comprehends more than half of all the Gāthās—but in respect to its essence as well: the whole little poem teaches nothing but worldly wisdom in an unorthodox manner, and ends with the climax in the last words: vādhā kīr ev’ athavāti narāgam ‘speech, indeed, brings profit to men’.

Supplementary Note on the Takkāriyajātaka

The Takkāriyajātaka, due to various reasons, is one of the most interesting in the Pāli collection. According to the prose narration the contents are as follows: King Brahmadatta of Benares has a Purohita possessing yellow eyes and protruding teeth. The wife of the Purohita has illicit relations with another brahmin of the same appearance. The Purohita resolves to get rid of his rival by a stratagem. He goes to the king and tells him that the Southern gate of his town is badly fortified and is inauspicious. One ought to build a new one made out of auspicious timber and fix it after offering a sacrifice to the tutelary deities of the town under an auspicious constellation. The king consents. The Purohita has the new gate made, the old one pulled down, and announces to the king that on the following day there would be a favourable date to offer the sacrifice and to erect the gate. He further added that one ought to sacrifice and bury underneath the gate a brahmin possessing yellow eyes and protruding teeth. When the Purohita returns to his house, he is not able to keep silent, being full of joy over the success of his stratagem and tells his wife that he would sacrifice her lover the next morning. The wife in a hurry warns her lover, who thereupon runs away from the town together with all the other brahmans having yellow eyes and protruding teeth. When on the morning of the offering-day no other suitable brahmin is to be found the king commands to kill the Purohita and give his office of Purohita to his pupil Takkāriya. The old Purohita is brought to Takkāriya in letters who explains to him in a series of stories, the bad results of untimely speaking and saves him afterwards from death by pretending that the favourable constellation has not arrived. He lets the day pass. At night he allows his teacher to escape unnoticed and performs the sacrifice with a dead ram.

¹The text and the commentary of the Gāthā are distorted in many ways. In the first pāda certainly parachitte has to be read instead of parachítta corresponding to cītavahāsa in the second pāda. In the last pāda we have to read either kass’idha chittasa vasena vatte or kass’idha chittissa vassu vatte.
²AO. XVI, p. 131 ff.
The gentle conclusion of the story has obviously been added only when the small poem containing nothing specific Buddhistic was made a Jātaka. In the Jātaka the role of the Bodhisattva could only be attributed to Takkāriya. By this fact, however, the sacrificing of the Purohita by Takkāriya became excluded. The narrator even avoids to speak of the killing of the sacrificial animal used instead of the Purohita. He makes Takkāriya sacrifice a ‘dead’ ram (nataṃ elakai).

The word Takkāriya assigned as a name to the pupil of the Purohita appears in the first two Gāthās. In G. 1 the Purohita laments:

aham eva dubhāsitaṃ bhāsi bālo
bhāko v'araṇāte ahit avidhāno
Takkāriye sobhham imaṃ putāmi
na kīr eva sādhu ativelabhāti

"I myself as a fool have spoken bad words like the frog in a forest, who calls the serpent to the spot. Takkāriya’, I fall down in this pit. Indeed, it is not good to speak at improper time”.

Takkāriya answers:

pappoti mache ativelabhāti
evānaṁ vadihitam sokaparidvānaṁ cha
attānātha yeva garahāsi etthā
āchera yan tam nikhanantī sobhā

"So the man, who speaks at improper time, experiences death, as well as grief and lamentation. You ought to blame yourself in this case, oh teacher, if they bury you in the pit”.

The form Takkāriye, for which the Sinhalese manuscripts read Takkāriya in the text as well as in the commentary, offers difficulties. The commentator had undoubtedly the reading Takkāriye before his eyes, as he explains the word as feminine: tassa Takkāriyata iṭṭhilāgaṇaṁ nāma. This explanation is of course impossible. I cannot follow Hertel either, when he expresses the view that the person addressed was originally a female, perhaps the wife of the Purohita. From the stanza of the response it is apparent that the Purohita is the teacher of Takkāriya. Takkāriya therefore must have been his pupil. The right explanation of the form, as I think, has been given by Geiger (Pāli Gr., p. 81). He takes it as a ‘Magadhis’ and quotes as a parallel Bhāṣikā which appears in D. I, 225 f. as a vocative of the name Bhāṣika.

The name Takkāriya is somewhat striking. A gōtra of this name is not known. Inscriptions from the middle ages, however, mention on different occasions a place Tarkāri or Tarkārikā, instead of which sometimes Takkārikā is written. It is a centre of Vedic studies from where many families of brahmins went to the East and South. The place was situated in Madhyadesa in the vicinity of Śrāvasti. That means a region which fell certainly into the mental horizon of the author of the Gāthā.

We therefore may suppose that Tarkāri was a settlement of brahmins many centuries before it appears in the inscriptions mentioned, the inhabitants of which called themselves with pride Tarkārikas or Takkāriyas.

1 I take this as a vocative, see below.
2 This is apparently the sense of the last pāda, although it is expressed in a somewhat round about manner.
3 Perhaps we have to read in accordance with the Sinhalese manuscripts etto ‘therefore’, although the commentator explains the word by etasmih kārmā.
4 ZDMG. LX, p. 785.
5 The references are collected and discussed by N. G. Majumdar, I.A. XLVIII., p. 208 ff.
If the Jātaka were to contain only the first two Gāthās, the prose narration would not offer any difficulty except in the concluding portion. But doubts about its originality are raised when one examines the stories put into the mouth of Takkāriya. They are clearly divided into two groups. At the beginning there are four short stories of men acting as foolishly as the Purohita. Each story contains a Gāthā ending with the words: ayam pi attho bahu tādiṣo va ‘also this case is highly similar’. Next follows the long and very different story of the king and the kinnara-couple, already known to us, containing not less than seven Gāthās.

The contents of the first four stories are as follows:
1. The courtesan Kāli in Benares has a brother named Tuṇḍila who spends the money she gave him on women, drinks, and games. One day after losing everything, he comes dressed only in loin-cloth, to his sister and begs money of her. She refuses to aid him. Just when he stands weeping before the door, the son of a rich merchant comes to visit the courtesan. He asks Tuṇḍila the cause of his grief and when he does not succeed in making the courtesan have pity on her brother, he gives Tuṇḍila his own clothes and himself puts on the garments usually given to the visitors in the house of the courtesan for the night. The next morning, when he wants to leave, these garments are taken away by female servants so that he has to move on the street naked and mocked at by the people. The Gāthā runs as follows:

kim eva ahaṁ Tuṇḍilam āṇupuchchhe
kaneyyasan bhātaraṁ Kālikāya
gaggo veye ahaṁ vatthuyuṛaṁ cha jino
ayam pi attho bahu tādiṣo va

‘Why should I have inquired after Tuṇḍila, the younger brother of Kālikā? Now I am naked and deprived of both garments. Also this case is highly similar’.

2. A Kulinka-bird tries to separate two fighting rams, as it fears that they will kill each other. When they do not listen to its words, it flies between the fighting ones and gets crushed by the heads of the clashing animals. The Gāthā reads:

yo yuijhamāṇānam ayuijhamāno
menḍantaraṁ achchupatī kulīnko
so piṁsito menḍasirehi tattha
ayam pi attho bahu tādiṣo va

“The Kulinka which, without fighting, flew between the contending rams was crushed there by the heads of the rams. Also this case is highly similar”.

3. Cowherds from Benares wish to get fruits from a palm-tree*. They make one of them climb up the tree and throw the fruits down. At the very moment a black serpent crawls up the trunk of the tree. Four of the men standing below hold a cloth at four corners and ask their companion to spring down on it. He does so, but comes down with such force that the four are not able to stand upright but strike their heads against each other, so that all come to death. The Gāthā reads:

chatto raṁ paṭṭhakam aggasenaṁ
ekaṁ cha posam anurakkhamāṇāṁ
sabbe va te bhinnasīrā sayiṁsu
ayam pi attho bahu tādiṣo va

*The edition reads: āṇupuchchheyaṁ kareyaṁ saṁ bhātaraṁ Kālikā yani; the emendation according to CPD, I, p. 201.
*achchupatī is explained in the CPD as metrical haplology for achchupatī from achch-upa-patati. Differently, but not convincing, Kern, Toev. I, p. 61.
*Read Bāmavasthitoṁ va gopālakā phalīlam tāturukkhaṁ diso. 
"Four men took a cloth, and while saving one man, they all lay down with their heads broken. Also this case is highly similar 1.

4. Thieves have stolen a goat and concealed it in a bamboo thicket. When they arrive on the next day in order to slaughter the animal, they find that they have forgotten to bring a knife with them. They free the goat. It jumps around happily, and when it strikes out with the legs, a knife appears, which a maker of wickerwork has concealed there in the bamboo thicket. Immediately the thieves take it and slaughter the goat. The Gāthā reads:

ajā yathā ve ugumbasmin baddhā
avekkhipanti asik' ajñagaññhi 1
ten' eva tasā galak' āvakantain
ayam pi attho bahu tādiso va 11

"When the goat, bound in the bamboo thicket, found the knife, while striking out (with the leg), its throat was cut with it. Also this case is highly similar 2.

At the first look, perhaps, the similarity of these stories with the narration of the Purohita, stated in the refrain of the Gāthās, seems to consist only in the fact that all cases deal with a calamity brought about by oneself. One is instantly reminded of the stanza spoken by Damanaka in the Tantrākhyāyika (I, 54), when he brings Sārijvaka to his master Puṅgalaka and thereby loses his influence on the lion:

jambuko luoṣuyuddhena sva[v.. chāṣhādhabhūtinā 1
dītikā tentracäyena traya 'narthās sva[v.. kriyāh 11

"The jackal by the fight of rams, and we by Āshādhabhūti, the female-messenger by the weaver, these three are made unhappy by themselves 3.

Here also three completely different tales are bound together by the thought that in all cases the calamity is due to one's own actions. The first story even has a parallel in the second story of the Jātaka. A jackal sees two rams fighting. It throws itself between the two in order to lick the blood which drops from their foreheads and thus meets with death between the heads of the fighting animals. But there is some important difference between these two narrations. The jackal is driven by its thirst for blood between the rams; the Kullīka, however, by the wish to save them from calamity. The wish to help others is also the motive of action for the son of the merchant and the four men in the third tale. Only in the story of the goat and the knife it seems to be missing. It also does not appear in the numerous other versions of the tale 4. However, I am convinced that in the original prose narration the finding of the knife was not a matter of chance but that the idea of the story was as follows: Thieves once had stolen a goat in order to eat it and had hidden it in a bamboo thicket. When they intended to slaughter the goat, the knife was lost in the thicket. In order to help them the goat took part in the search, found the knife, and so brought death to itself. Only in this way the narration fits into the context. It is quite possible that the author thereby brought a new characteristic into the old story of the goat and the knife (avakhipanīyam 5), but he changed somewhat also the second story to suit his purpose. Certainly the Kullīka here took the place of the jackal secondarily, for whereas the intereference

1 yathā is striking. Do we have to read padā?
2 Andersen, ZDMG. LXVI, p. 143, thinks of deriving avekkhipanti from *avaśhipati — avaśkhipati, which seems to be too bold.
3 The whole literature is mentioned in Edgerton's instructive article "The Goat and the Knife: An Automatic Solution of an Old Crux", JAOS. LIX, p. 366 ff.
4 For the compound cf. Kāśikā to Pāñini V, 3, 106.
of the jackal is motivated by its natural greed, the Kuliṅka really has no reason to interfere with the fight of the rams.

To this may be added that the purpose of the story of the kinnara told by the pupil at the end is clearly to show that a word spoken at the right time brings profit. We should therefore expect that the preceding examples show that untimely speech leads to calamity, in the same way as in the second Gāthā Takkāriya expressly refers the Purohita to the fact that a man when he speaks at the improper time experiences death, calamity, and grief. Instead of this, cases are mentioned in which the intention to help others leads to disaster. Now the Purohita brought himself to calamity by untimely speaking, however in no way did he speak with good intention. In the present prose account the examples cited do not fit into the main narration. If it were narrated that he spoke an untimely word to help others and thereby nearly brought himself to death, then it would be understandable that the pupil told him other cases “highly similar” of well-meant but untimely interference in the affairs of others, and gave at the end an example of talking at the right time.

In fact a story, corresponding to these requirements, is widely spread in later literature. We know of it, thanks to Hertel, who in ŽDMG. LX, p. 778 ff., Pañchātantra p. 140, collected the different versions of the tale and compared it with the Jātaka.

In the Pañchātantra translation of Dubois' (1) Damanaka narrates the following in order to show that it is dangerous to tell the truth to kings. King Darma-Daha of Oudjyny (Ujjayinī) gets a big tank dug out, but it is not possible to fill it with water, as all the water flows out into a deep cavity by some unnoticeable gap. A muni instructs him that this is a consequence of some magic which would end only when a Rājaputra or a muni is sacrificed. The king immediately orders to kill the muni, to whom he owes the advice, and to throw his body into the tank. The body by chance fills up the gap, so that the tank gets filled and can be used to fertilize the land all around.

Another version is preserved in the story No. 25 of the Tantrākhyāna (2). The opening stanza says:

hitah na vākyam ahitaṁ na vākyam
hitahitaṁ yady ubhayāṁ na vākyam
Kuruṇṭhakaṁ nāma Kaliṅgarājā
hitopadeśi vivaranā pravīśṭaḥ

"One shall not speak something profitable nor something unprofitable, nor shall one speak, when something is both, profitable and unprofitable: A king of Kaliṅga, Kuruṇṭhaka by name, entered the gap in the earth, because he had given good advice."

In the tale belonging thereto it is narrated that the king Kuruṇṭhaka of Kaliṅga once rides out for hunting. His horse runs away with him and carries him to a village, where suddenly a gap in the earth has appeared which the people cannot fill in by any means. The king tells them that it can be filled if a man bearing lucky marks can be offered in sacrifice. As he himself is the only man of this kind he is thrown into the earth gap.

In the fourth tale of the Pañcākhyānavārttika(3), instead of the king, a skull-bearing ascetic named Koranṭaka appears. The opening stanza reads here:

hitah na vācyam ahitaṁ na vācyam
hitahitaṁ naivy cha bhāshan̄yam

---

1 Panča-Tantra, p. 34.
2 Bendall, JRAI. XX, p. 491; Hertel, Pañchātantra, p. 318.
3 Bendall: to ahitaṁ.
4 In L. Kuruṇṭhaka.
5 Hertel, Pañchātantra, p. 139 f.
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Korantakako nāma kopaḷayōgi
hitopadesaṁ bilam praviṣṭhaṁ 11

The story is according to Hertel: In the town Kapiyāpura Pāṭana, king Kanakaśēkhara rules. He gets a tank dug out near the town in which, however, no water can be retained, although he makes it laid out with stone, with glass and with tin one after the other. A visiting ascetic who bears the 32 lucky marks on his body, confirms the view of the minister that a hostile demon (evahūra) is responsible for the disaster, and informs the king, when asked, that it is necessary to kill a man, bearing the 32 lucky marks on his body. He adds that this man should be buried in a hole underneath the tank, and that a chapel should be erected at the place. The king orders his minister to find out such a man. As no one besides the ascetic is to be found the minister orders to kill the ascetic himself in consequence of his advice.

This version is in conformity with the 114th tale in Hemavijaya’s Kathāvatārakāra (4)². Only the names are different. The inhabitants of the village Puraṇa have constructed a tank in which the water does not remain. When all other means do not help, the people turn to a great yogin, named Sūranātha, who advises them to bury in the tank a man possessing the 32 lucky marks on his body. As Sūranātha himself bears the marks he becomes the victim of his own advice.

The opening stanza of the Pañcākhyaṇavārttika with the variant tu for cha in b, Herantako nāma kopaḷabhikṣur in c, and hitopadesaṁ cha in d, recurs in the recension Ṣ of the Southern textus simplicior of the Pañcāhatastra (5)³. But the story here deviates. The king in order to have a field irrigated gets a dam put across a river. The river, however, runs out through a gap in the earth. A muni named Herantaka informs the king that the gap can be filled if a king or a muni throws himself into it. The king is ready to sacrifice himself but the muni declares that the king should not die; therefore he would throw himself into the gap.

In this form the story appears still often in South India. Hertel, Pañcāhatastra, p. 68, mentions that it forms the first tale in the collection ‘Folklore of the Telugus’ by G. R. Subramiah Pantulu (6)⁴. The monk here bears the name Erunda. Benfey, Pañcāhatastra I, p. 108, hinted at the fact that it reappears in the legendary history of the Chola kingdom (7). The river there is the Kaveri. The tale is mentioned shortly by Wilson, Mackenzie Collection I, p. 183⁵. According to it the king was named Kanaka, the muni sacrificing himself Erunda.

There still remains a great number of stories showing a relationship more or less apparent with the stories mentioned above. Already Benfey, Pañcāhatastra II, p. 529, has utilized a legend told by Hulan-tsang in great details (8)⁶. It is connected with a monastery lying on a big river more than a hundred li to the south-east of the capital of Khotan. This river, used by the inhabitants to irrigate their fields, suddenly ceases to flow. The king on the advice of an ascetic, brings an offering to the Nāga in the river, whereupon a woman emerges from the water and tells the king that the river has dried up because the Nāga, her husband, died. He should give her one of his great ministers as husband. A high official, after donating a monastery, declares that he is ready to sacrifice himself for the benefit of all. On a white horse he rides into the river and is drowned. After a short while the horse emerges with a drum of sandalwood on its back. The drum contains a letter

1 In the translation of Hertel, Vol. II, p. 25 f.
2 Hertel, ZDMG. LX, p. 779; LXI, p. 34.
3 I do not have access to the book.
4 Cf. H. H. Wilson, Mackenzie Collection, II, p. CCLXVI.
5 Beal, Si-kê II, p. 319 ff.
reporting to the king the success of the sacrifice. When the drum is suspended in the southeaster of the town, the river again begins to flow. Hilān-tsang adds that at his time the drum had disappeared since a long time, and of the monastery only ruins were to be seen.

Benfey, *Pāṇḍavasatāntāra* I, p. 109, has already referred to the eighth story of the Vikrama-charita (9). In the Southern recension, placed at the top by Edgerton in his edition, it is narrated that a merchant in Kashmir has a tank dug out to erect therein a temple dedicated to Vishnu lying on the water. But the water let into the tank always flows away. A heavenly voice announces that the water would remain only if the tank is sprinkled with the blood from the throat of a man, carrying the 32 lucky marks on his body. The merchant in vain promises 100 loads of gold as a reward to a man who offers himself for sacrifice. When king Vikrama has heard of the happening, he resolves to give his life for the sake of the people. He goes there and begins to cut his throat. At this moment a deity holds him back and allows him to choose a boon. The king desires that the tank may be filled, which then immediately happens. There are deviations in the other recensions of the work of which I may only mention that in the metrical recension the merchant offers as a reward seven golden statues, whereas in the shorter and in the Jain recensions, only one statue, made out of ten loads of gold, is promised.

The motif of the golden statue recurs in a tale of the Samyaktvakaumudī (10). The gate of the city Varaśakti during its construction by king Sudharma falls down thrice. His minister advises the king to sprinkle it with the blood of a man, killed by the ruler himself, in order to make the gate firm. This plan is not liked by the pious king; on the advice of another high official, however, he has a man made out of gold and jewels and promises that he would give it in reward besides ten million gold pieces, to the man willing to give his son as offering. A brahmin couple offers the youngest of their seven sons, but the king cannot make up his mind to perform the sacrifice, and the deities of the city, satisfied also with the courage shown by the youngest, allow the building of the gate to proceed steadily.

Similarly the sacrifice actually does not take place in the tale of Āmrabhaṭa, narrated in a somewhat unclear manner in Merutūṇga’s *Prabhādhchintāmaṇi*, p. 220 f. (11). Āmrabhaṭa has a temple built in Bhṛgupura. When a ditch is being dug the walls collapse, on account of the vicinity of the Narmāda, and begin to bury the workmen. At this moment Āmrabhaṭa, together with his wife and children, jumps into the pit. By this action he removes the obstacle and still comes out alive.

Hertel (*ZDMG*. LX, p. 781) has in this connection further referred to the tale of Āruṇī Pāṇḍhāla in the *Mbh*. I, 3, 19 ff. (12). Āruṇī on the advice of his teacher Ayoda Dhaumya fills in a hole in an irrigated field by creeping inside, and receives the blessings of his teacher for his obedience.

Lastly Hertel (ibid. p. 780) has mentioned as a parallel the well-known Roman tale of the formation of the lacus Curtius found in Livius VII, 6 (13).

Let us now review the first seven tales connected with each other by their contents and partly also by formal characteristics. It is quite understandable that the names Kurunṭhaka, Koraṇṭa, Hēraṇṭaka in the opening stanza of Nos. 2, 3, 5, and Erunda in No. 6, Eranda in No. 7, all go back to one and the same form. In all cases it is the name of the man, who meets with death. Except in No. 2 this man is everywhere a religious mendicant; in Nos. 3 and 5 he is called more exactly a skull-carrying ascetic. Only in No. 2, where he bears the

---

1 *HOS*. XXVI, p. 92 ff.; XXVII, p. 84 ff.; cf. also XXVI, p. LXXX f.
3 p. 196 in the translation of Tawney.
same name as the ascetic in other cases he is supposed to be the king of Kāliṅga. I have no doubt that the Kālingarāja in the stanza replaced the original kapālayaṅga (No. 3) or kapālabhikṣuḥ (No. 5). Now, as it is highly improbable that the villagers kill their own king, the popular motif of the horse running away to a distant place has been brought into it. So it can be supposed that the king comes to a place where he is not known.

The narrations Nos. 1-4 oppose in one point the Southern ones, Nos. 5-7, which are closely related to each other: In Nos. 1-4, the ascetic or the king brings himself to calamity against his own will, in Nos. 5-7, however, he chooses death willingly. Hertel is of the opinion that the motif of self-sacrifice done willingly is the original, because in the opening stanza of Nos. 2, 3, 5, it is mentioned that the ascetic or the king entered the gap (sīvarah or bilaṁ praviśṭaḥ) and was not made to enter it (praviśtaḥ). To me, however, it seems that praviśṭaḥ, if required by the context of the story, can be understood also as an enforced entering into the earth-hole. This in fact is the case in Nos. 2 and 3. Now the stanza shows as clearly as possible that 'silence is gold' is the moral of the story. The ascetic or the king brings death upon himself because in giving an advice he does not show regard to it. He, who offers himself willingly as sacrifice, does not come to death by good advice (hiyapadesaṇa) but due to generosity. Hertel, in his opinion that the tale originally has been an example of generous self-sacrifice, finds the proof in the stories of Livius (No. 15), in the Mbh. (No. 12), and in the Vikramacharita (No. 9). But the Roman story cannot decide anything in this question and the story of Ārūṇi is far different in contents. It indeed does not praise generosity but obedience of the pupil to his Guru. The tale of Vikrama, however, is, as most of the stories in the Vikramacharita, an example for the generosity (auḍārya) of the king. In the same way Āmrabhaṭa in the story of the Prabandhachintāmaṇi acts out of generosity and possibly the narration in Nos. 5-7 has been changed under the influence of this and the other related stories. The author of the stanza, however, in my opinion, cannot have thought of the self-sacrifice of the ascetic as it is incompatible with the plain wording of the stanza.

The narration of the ascetic who met with death by giving good advice is in conformity in nearly all points with the original version of the prose narration of the Takkāriyāya, to which we arrived by the examination of the Gaṭhās. It was not on account of his talkativeness, but because he spoke to help others, that the teacher of Takkāriyā found death. The untruthfulness of his wife, the jealousy for the rival, the teacher's intention to get rid of him, all this is apparently later addition of the author of the prose. It is not backed by the Gaṭhās. Whether in the original narration the teacher was the Purohitā of the king is not to be found out from the Gaṭhās. In any case, however, he was, as is shown by the vocative ačera in G. 2, a member of the priestly class as well as the hero in the later stories. It is possible that the matter in which he gave his advice was about the building of a city gate. In No. 10 also a sacrifice of a human being for securing the construction of a city gate occurs. If one compares the expressions sobhham imam patāmi in G. 1, yan taṁ nikhamanti sobha, with the expressions sīvarah praviśṭaḥ, bilaṁ praviśṭaḥ in the stanzas of Nos. 2, 3, 5, it does not seem unreasonable that the poet of the Gaṭhās had in view a person's being pushed down in an earth-hole, may it be a simple gap in the earth as in No. 2 or, as in Nos. 1, 3-7, an opening in a tank or a river. On the other hand the yellow eyes and the protruding teeth of the Purohitā in the Jātaka story may be old and more original than the lucky bodily marks

*By the side of it in the different recensions we are also told of his helpfulness, his heroism and his cleverness.
ascribed to the person sacrificed in Nos. 2-4. Just the demoniac appearance makes the man suitable to be offered to some deity.1

B 55 (786); PLATES XX, XLIII


TEXT:

Vitūra-Punākṣiyajātakāṁ

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka which treats of Vitūra (Vidhura) and Punākṣa (Punāka).

The Jātaka represented on the pillar bears in the Pāli collection the title of Vidhurapanditajātakā (No. 545). Vidhura is the name of the Bodhisattva, when born as the kattar of the Kuru king Dhanañjaya in Indapatta. Vimala the wife of the Nāga king Varuṇa, having heard of his virtues desires to listen to his discourses on the law. In order to induce the king to bring him to the Nāga world, she pretends to have a sick woman's longing for his heart. The Nāga king instructs his daughter Irandati to seek for a husband who will be able to fetch the sage. When the Yaksha Punākṣa2 sees Irandati dancing on a mountain in the Himalaya, he falls in love with her. He rides on his aerial horse to the Kuru king and challenges him to play at dice, risking Vidhura as the king's stake, his own stake being the most precious jewel. The Yaksha wins the game and carries off Vidhura, making him hold on to the tail of his horse. When they arrive on the summit of Mount Kālāgiri, Punākṣa

1 Compare the use of such a man in the concluding ceremony of the Āvamedhika; AO. XVI, p. 142 f.

2 The meaning of the word kattar is given in the Pāli Dictionary as 'an officer of the king, the king's messenger'. Cowell translates 'minister', Dutoit 'helper', Francis (V, 113 f.) in addressing a person 'my Ancient'. But the kattar of the Gāthás has undoubtedly the same meaning as Sk. khattari. The old form khattar is still retained in D. 1, 112; 128, and probably khattar was changed to kattar only in Ceylon where the meaning of the expression was no more clear, and where the word was taken as 'maker from kri', or perhaps as 'cutter' from kri. Khattri derived from kshad 'to carve, to slaughter, to prepare dishes', originally meant 'the carver of meat, the server, the distributor of food in a noble household'. (For a detailed discussion on the word khattari as it appears in the Sk. literature from the Atharvaveda onwards see Lüders, ZDMG. XCIX, p. 115 ff.)

3 Punāka in the inscription is naturally only written for Punākṣa; Punākṣa in the eastern language, which does not know the lingual s, corresponds to Punākṣa.

4 The mountain Kālāgiri, where Punākṣa intends to kill Vidhura (G. 196) lies in the vicinity of Rājagaha. Kālāgiri is represented in the SnA. (201) by Kālapabata, and is certainly identical with Kālasila, a rock raised, according to D. II, 116, at Ṣigila, the Kishigiri of the Sk. texts, near Rājagaha. The home of the poet of the Gāthás was the eastern part of India as is to be seen from his familiarity with the localities and local stories of the cast. The wonderful jewel, which Punākṣa intends to use as his stake in the game, lies on the summit of the Vepulla (G. 36 ff.), one of the five mountains surrounding Rājagaha. It is apparently identical with the modern Vipulağiri; see Cunningham, ASR. Vol. I, p. 21. Also the Vipulak in Mbh. 2, 21, 2 f. goes probably back to the name of the mountain. Thus the jewel on the mountain in our Jātaka owes its origin to the local tradition of Rājagaha (for details see Lüders, l.c. p. 113).

That the fairy-tale of Vidhura and Punākṣa has its home in eastern India is also shown by the fact that it was originally composed in the eastern language. In the Gāthás many peculiarities of this language appear. In Gāthás 2 and 3 and in the little song of Irandati (G. 7) even the nom. sg. ending in -e has been retained (see Lüders, l.c. p. 112).
tries to kill the sage. He holds the sage with his head downwards over a precipice, when Vidhura succeeds in rousing his curiosity by promising him to inform him about the qualities of a good man. The Yaksha is converted by the discourse of the sage. He declares himself ready to take him back to Indapatta, but Vidhura insists on being led to the Nāga world. When they have arrived there, Vidhura is kindly received by the Nāga king and his wife, who take delight in conversing with him. Puṇṇaka gets Irandati, presents his jewel to Vidhura and brings him back to Indapatta.

Most of the scenes of the sculpture were already correctly explained by Cunningham. In the upper relief Puṇṇaka and Irandati are seen talking to each other in a rocky landscape. The rest of the relief is filled by the palace of the Nāga king. In the arched door of the upper storey appears the head of a woman, probably Irandati. Below, the Nāga king and his wife are seated on a chair. The Nāga king, who is distinguished by a five-headed snake over his head, while his wife has only one snake, is addressing two men who are standing before him, one behind the other, with their hands reverently joined. The scene undoubtedly represents the return of Puṇṇaka in company with Vidhura to the Nāga’s palace. It thus appears that the sculptor has united in the upper relief all scenes connected with the Nāga world without paying attention to the chronological order of the events. Under these circumstances I think it quite probable that the man who is represented entering by a gateway in the left lower corner of the relief is again Puṇṇaka, but this time entering the Nāga palace after his meeting with Irandati.

The lower relief, which unfortunately is incomplete, is taken up by the gambling scene in the palace of Dhanañjaya in Indapatta. In the courtyard a man is seated on a cushioned chair. By the horse standing on his left and the large square jewel on his chest he is characterized as Puṇṇaka. He was probably represented in the act of gambling with the Kuru king, but the figure of his partner is lost. From the windows and arched recesses in the upper storey of the palace several women are looking out. In the gateway on the left of the relief stands a man who appears to be meant for Vidhura as he wears round his neck the broad collar which is the distinguishing mark of the sage in the middle relief.

In the left lower corner of the middle relief the Yaksha is seen starting on his aerial journey with Vidhura holding on to the tail of the horse. In the upper portion rocks and trees indicate that the scene is the summit of Kālāgiri. On the right, Puṇṇaka is suspending Vidhura by the heels with head downwards over a precipice, on the left the two appear once more standing side by side. Puṇṇaka, whose figure is half destroyed, has raised his left hand as if speaking to the sage. There remains the group in the lower right corner. Here Puṇṇaka is seen on horseback with Vidhura apparently sitting behind him and clinging to his chest. According to the text of the Jātaka the two are riding in this way to the palace of the Nāga king after the conversion of Puṇṇaka, whereas on the homeward journey the Yaksha grants Vidhura the more honourable seat in front. It seems therefore that the sculptor inserted the group as the connective link between the events on the Kālāgiri and the arrival in the Nāga world represented in the upper relief.

The hero of the story is identical with the Vidura of the Mahābhārata. The reason

1 See Gāthās 238 and 294.

2 The identity of the sage Vidhura with the Vidura of the epic is shown by Lüders, i.e. p. 115 ff. by demonstrating that both held the same office, had the same family-relations (p. 124), and that both were acting in the same way (p. 126).
why the name has been transformed into Vidhura in the Pāli text is not known. The spelling Vitura in the label has a parallel in Kupira in No. B 1. The name of the Yaksha occurs also in the Buddhistic Sanskrit literature. In the Mahām., pp. 235 f., Pūraṇaka is mentioned as one of the four mahāyakshhasenāpadis who guard the eastern quarter and as one of the four dharmabhṛttis of the mahārāja Vaisravana.

B 56 (709); PLATES XXI, XLV


TEXT:

u[su](kāro) Janak[o] rāj[a] Sivala devī

TRANSLATION:

The arrow-maker. King Janaka. Queen Sivala (Śivalī).

The labels enabled Cunningham to connect the relief in a general way with the Mahājanakajātaka (No. 539), but it was only when the text of the Jātaka had become available that the scene could be identified with an episode in the second part of the story. King Janaka has turned ascetic and is wandering through the country followed by his queen. In vain he tries to persuade her to leave him. When they have reached the city of Thānā, Janaka comes on his begging tour to the house of an arrow-maker who is engaged in his work. Closing one eye, he is looking with the other to ascertain if the shaft of the arrow is straight. To the king the use of only one eye by the arrow-maker is a new proof for his conviction that a second person is a hindrance for attaining one’s goal and he urges once more upon his wife the necessity of leaving him alone. The sculpture is an exact representation of the story.

The name of the queen in the Gāthās and in the commentary is Śivalī, which occurs as a female name also in J. I, 34, 9; 40, 9. It has a parallel in Śivalī, the name of a Thera frequently mentioned in Buddhist literature. Śivalī in the label is therefore probably a clerical error for Śivalā, though it may stand for Śivalā or even Śivalī (Sk. Śivalī), which is the name of an apāsikā in the Amaravati inscription List No. 1268.

1 Perhaps the name has been equalized with the name of another person called Vidhura who, in association with Sañjīva, forms the pair of main disciples of the arhat Kakusandha (see D. 2, 4; M. 1, 333; the stanza 1, 357 = Theragāthā 1187 ff.; S. XV, 20, 5 (printed Sañjīva); Nidānakathā, J. I, 42, 26 (read Vidhuro instead of Vidhūro, as in C C’). The Mahāvadhānavūra, however, the Sk. text corresponding to D. 2, 4, reads Vidura as the name of one of the main disciples of the Buddha Krakasunda, see Waldschmidt, Mahāvadhānavūra, p. 76. So Vidura seems to be the original form of the names of both persons. The Vidhūra in Pāli, as it appears in G. 3; 5; 6 of the Jānaka is apparently a metrical lengthening.

2 By this Punukka is proved to be a figure in the local stories of Eastern India. Also the poet of the Gāthās cautions in G. 44 Punukka to call himself a person from Anāga and so connect him with the East.

3 The last akṣhara is distinctly te, not te as read by all previous editors.

**TEXT:**

Maghâdeviyajataka

**TRANSLATION:**

The Jataka concerning Maghâdeva.

The story of King Makhâdeva of Videha, as he is called in Pâli, who, when his barber showed him the first grey hair from his head¹, renounced his throne and became a hermit, is told in Sutta 83 of the *M.* The story was converted into a Jataka, the Makhâdevajātaka, No. 9 of the Pâli collection, which is briefly repeated in the beginning of the Nimjātaka (No. 541). The sculpture agrees exactly with the Jātaka. In the centre the king is seated in an arm-chair, with his hair hanging loosely on his shoulders. The barber presents him the hair which he has pulled out and the king accepts it with his right hand and turns his head sideways to inspect it. A stand in the foreground carries the utensils of the barber, the shaving-basin and the brush. On the left of the king there is a person with folded hands in respectful attitude. He is apparently Maghâdeva’s eldest son, to whom the king addresses the Gâthâ announcing his retirement from the world².

The name of the king has elicited much comment. In the Sinhalese manuscripts it is generally Makhâdeva, whereas the Burmese manuscripts have Maghâdeva and Maghâdeva. But, as pointed out by Barua-Sinha, the Suttanta of the Majjhimanikâya is referred to in the Chullaniddesa, p. 80, as Maghâdevasuttanta (sic), and in the Mahâvuttapatti 180, 31 we find Makhâdeva. This is apparently meant for the name of the Videha king as it is followed by Nemi, the name of one of his successors. In the Suttanojâtaka (No. 398) Makhâdeva is also the name of a Yaksha, or rather of the fig tree in which he dwells. Here the Burmese manuscripts read Mâghadeva. In the *Sna.* p. 332, Maghâdeva occurs as the name of an ancient king. Hoernle takes Makhâdeva as the original form, while Barua-Sinha think that it goes without saying that Makhâdeva and Maghâdeva are Prakrit forms of Mahâdeva. I am, on the contrary, convinced that the original form from which all others are distorted is Makhâdeva³. Maghâdeva belongs to that class of names that are formed by adding *deva* to the name of a constellation; cf. from the Brâhmī inscriptions Pusadeva (821 = A 120), Poṭhadeva (205), Haggadeva (29), Phagudeva (780 = A 30), Phagudeva (870 = A 75), Bhârûnideva (874 = A 100), Senadeva (177; 178).

¹Barua-Sinha: -jâtaka[ṃ], but the anusvāra is very uncertain.
³In the prose tale of the Jātaka the king informs first his son of his intention and then, in the Gâthâ, his ministers, but in the original tale the Gâthâ was probably addressed to his son and the ministers did not appear at all, just as they are not mentioned in the Sutta. The representation of the Jātaka apparently follows the original version, for at the side of the king and the barber, in the medallion, only a man, elegantly clad, appears in respectful attitude.

⁴The Siamese printed edition reads Maghadeva throughout.
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TEXT:

bhisaharaniya jataka[nth]

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka relating to the stealing of the lotus-stalks.

The Jātaka to which the label belongs was identified by Hultzsch with the Bhisa jātaka No. 488 in the Pāli collection. It contains an ancient legend referred to already in the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* and told twice in the *Mahābhārata*, which by the Buddhists was turned into a Jātaka. In the Pāli story the Bodhisattva is a wealthy brahmin who, together with his six younger brothers, his sister, a male and a female slave and a friend, has renounced the householder’s life and dwells as ascetic in the Himavat near a lotus-lake. The six brothers, the slave and the friend take turns to fetch lotus-stalks for food. He, whose turn it is, deposits the stalks he has gathered, divided into eleven portions, on a flat stone. The others then come up and each takes his allotted portion and eats it in his own place. By this mode of life they gain time for practising their austerities. By the power of their virtues Sakka’s world trembles, and the god resolves to find out whether they are really free from worldly desires or not. On three successive days he causes the Bodhisattva’s share to disappear. When the Bodhisattva accuses his companions of having stolen his lotus-stalks, they, each in his turn, clear themselves of the charge by swearing an oath in which they invoke temporal blessings on the thief. Three other beings who live near the hermitage, a tree-spirit, an elephant, and a monkey join the ascetics in the swearing, but with the difference that they hold out a miserable life for themselves in case they should have been the thieves. Then Sakka who invisibly attended the scene manifests himself, confesses what he has done, and returns the lotus-stalks. The Bodhisattva forgives him.

On the coping-stone an ascetic is seen seated in front of his hut on a stone on which a skin is spread. A well-dressed man carrying a bundle of lotus-stalks approaches him from the right. Around him are a woman wearing an ascetic’s dress, an elephant and a monkey squatted on the ground. The sculpture apparently represents the returning of the lotus-stalks by Sakka. Of the witnesses of the scene the sculptor has shown only three—a female who is probably meant for the sister, the elephant and the monkey. He has certainly done so, not because he followed a different version of the story, but because he found it impossible to cram all thirteen into the narrow compass of the relief.
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---

* Ait. Br. V, 30, 10 ff.
The Jātaka relating to the dumb and paralysed (cripple).

The Jātaka to which the label refers was identified already by Cunningham as the Mūgapakkhajātaka, No. 538 of the Pāli collection, although he could not avail himself of the text. S. von Oldenburg was the first to be able to compare the sculptural and the literary representations of the story. In the Jātaka it is told that the Bodhisattva is born as the much desired only son of the king of Benares, Temiya by name. One day, when he is one month old, they bring him to the king who is sitting in the court of justice. The king fondly embraces his son, places him on his lap and plays with him, while at the same time he passes a sentence of death on four robbers. The Bodhisattva is terrified, and his fear increases, when, recollecting his former births, he remembers that once he has been a king who had to suffer thousands of years in hell for the deeds he had perpetrated in that position. In order to avoid becoming king again, he follows the advice of a goddess to pretend that he is deaf and dumb and unable to move his limbs, and although various means are tried to find out his true mental condition, he succeeds in living as a seeming idiot for sixteen years. At last the king orders his charioteer to carry him on a chariot to the forest and bury him there. When the charioteer is digging the grave, the prince suddenly opens his mouth, revealing his true condition and declaring his resolution to take the ascetic vow. The king, informed by the charioteer of what has happened in the forest, proceeds with a large retinue to the dwelling-place of his son, but his endeavours to lead him back to a worldly life are in vain. On the contrary, the discourses of the young ascetic make such an impression on the king that he also, followed by his wives and the citizens of the town, embraces the religious life.

The sculpture represents three different stages of the story. In the upper left corner the king appears seated cross-legged on a round chair with the young prince on his lap and two attendants behind him. Above this group there is the upper storey of a house with a balcony and a pinnacled roof, supported by two posts, evidently meant for the sābhā in which the king is sitting. In the foreground there is the chariot with four horses, from which the prince, who is represented to the right of it, has descended. On his left side the charioteer is seen digging the grave with a hoe. In the right upper corner the prince in the attire of an ascetic, seated cross-legged between two trees, is conversing with the king who, attended by four of his courtiers, stands with folded hands before him.

S. von Oldenburg was of the opinion that the scene could be explained in two ways—the sculpture represents either the king who visits his son, who has become an ascetic, or the prince

---

1 The third akṣhara is distinctly pha as recognized by Cunningham. The horizontal stroke of the ē-sign of ki is preserved. The fifth akṣhara was read sa by Cunningham. Although it is much damaged, it is practically certain that it was ya. The ē-sign of ēśā and the anusāra of kāṇh, though not quite distinct, are very probable.

2 JAOS. XVIII, p. 190 f.

3 Barua, Barth. II, p. 152 has totally misunderstood the representation. According to him the king sits in the chariot with a grown-up boy held up in his hands. In the scene below, Barua explains the prince as the charioteer, and the charioteer, working with a hoe, as a departing ascetic. Anderson, Cat. I, p. 118 f., however, has already described everything correctly.
who sees the ascetic in order to become his pupil, as it is narrated in the Tibetan version of the tale. I think the second explanation is out of question. The story in the Kanjur, translated by Schiefner, is a strongly modified version of the Jātaka. For our purpose it is unnecessary to enter into discussion of all the deviations. In any case the characteristic episode of the king’s sitting in the court, which is proved by Gāthās 37 and 38 to be an old component of the story, is missing in the Tibetan version. The place of the charioteer who has to kill the prince has been taken by the executioner. This is apparently a secondary alteration, for in opposition to it here also the prince, in a stanza corresponding to G. 3 of the Pāli, puts the question to the charioteer as to why he is digging the grave. In the Tibetan version furthermore the conversation between the king and his son does not take place in the forest to which the prince has retired. The prince, on the contrary, returns from the spot, where he was to be buried, to the king’s palace and from there he goes to the forest with the consent of the king, where he leads the life of an ascetic under the guidance of a Rishi. As the relief agrees in the first two points exactly with the older version attested by the Gāthās and has nothing in common with the Tibetan narration it is impossible to presume that the artist followed the Tibetan version in the third scene. Also there is not the slightest ground to show why this scene could not be explained in the sense of the Pāli Gāthās. S. von Oldenburg mentions the fact that in the Burmese Temiyajātaka the king visits the prince not in the forest but in a monastery as going against such possibility. But I cannot regard this objection as valid. The Burmese Temiyajātaka, which by the way has been composed only in 1787, is an adaptation of the Pāli Jātaka which generally very closely follows the original. When the author speaks of a monastery instead of an āśrama he is probably no more aware of his deviating from his text than when he renders pabbajātī ‘to become Rahan’. I take it as quite possible or even probable that the original narration of the Jātaka followed by the artist was more simple than the one now handed down to us in the prose. Such features as the construction of the āśrama by Vissakamma, the conversion of the king with his family, of all his subjects, and of two other kings may have been added later on. The Gāthās do not contain anything of it, nor, on the other hand, anything which is opposed to the sculptural representation.

In this case, quite exceptionally, the title borne by the Jātaka in the Sinhalese tradition and by the label is essentially the same. As the reading is distinctly mūgapakhika, not mūgapakkiya, it is unnecessary to discuss the absurd explanations given for mūgapaka. The Pāli term mūgapakkha has a parallel in mūgapakkhika in G. 254 of the Nidānakathā, where it is said that the Bodhisattvas are never mūgapakkhika. In the Jātaka the compound mūgapakkha occurs only in G. 55. In G. 4; 5; 33; 38; 54 pakkha is used by the side of mūga, which shows that pakkha in mūgapakkhika cannot represent Sk. paksha as suggested in the PD., where mūgapakkhika is rendered by ‘leading to deafness (sic)’, while Rhys Davids translated it ‘clased among the dumb’. In the commentary of the Jātaka (12, 26) pakkho is explained by pithasappi ‘one who crawls with the use of some support’ (lit. chair), which is used also instead of pakkho in the prose tale (4, 15). A more accurate explanation of pakkha is furnished by G. 33:

\[nāmaṁ asandhiṁ pakkho na badhito asatată
nāmaṁ aśvākatā mūgo mā maṁ mūgam adhārayi\]

3. The model for these additions was perhaps found in the story of Vissakamma’s constructing the Kaviṭṭha-hermitage, told in the Samghāvaggaṭātaka. See Lüders, *Buddh.*., pp. 112-119, especially p. 114.
I am not pakkha, because I have no joints; I am not deaf, because I have no ear; I am not dumb, because I have no tongue. Do not think that I am dumb.' It appears that pakkha denotes a person who is unable to move, who is paralysed. The term phaka (phakka) used in the inscription must be a synonym of pakkha, and this is confirmed by the Mdp. (271, 121), where phakkah occurs in a list of bodily defects, preceded by andhalah, jatyandhalah, kandah, and followed by pañghah etc. Probably phaka is the correct form which was changed into pakhha in Pāli under the influence of the common term pakhkhāhata, 'struck on one side', 'paralysed'.
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TEXT:

Kadāriki

TRANSLATION:

Kadāriki (Kadāriki).

Barua and Sinha have identified Kadāriki with the hero of the Kandaḷirjātaka (341) which afterwards was embodied in the Kupāḷajātaka (536; Vol. V, p. 437 f.). He is a king of Benares who is extraordinarily good looking. Nevertheless his wife falls in love with a hideous cripple. In one of her nightly visits to her lover the queen loses one of her earrings. The king, who has secretly followed her, picks it up and by this article is able to prove her misdemeanour. He gives order to behead her, but Paṭṭāḷaḍanda, his wise purahita, detains him from acting rashly. He persuades the king to undertake a journey through the whole of India in his company in order to become acquainted with women's ways, and the experiences they gather during their travels are sufficient to convince the king of the innate immorality of womankind, so that after his return he pardons his wife and has her only turned out of the palace. The king of this Jātaka, which is the prototype of the introductory story of the Arabian Nights, is called Kandaḷi in the Athavāṇanā, while the queen appears there under the strange name of Kinnarā. Barua and Sinha therefore explained the Kadāriki of the inscription as combined from Kandaḷi and Ki, an abbreviation of Kinnarā. I have shown1 that the name Kandaḷi in the prose tale owes its origin to a wrong division of the words Kandaḷirikininarānāh in G. 21 into Kandaḷi and Kinnarānāh instead of Kandaḷirikin narānāh. The real name of the king therefore was Kandaḷiki, exactly as in the inscription, while the queen was not named at all in the original story. Barua-Sinha's identification is thus established beyond doubt, and it is only surprising that in the relief there is nothing to indicate the somewhat strained relations between the couple. The king and the queen stand side by side to all appearance in perfect harmony, the queen having put her right hand on the shoulder of her husband. The question as to what the two persons hold in their hands has not been solved. Anderson (Cat. I, p. 69) mentions that the woman in her left hand carries a bird that has lost its head, while the man holds in

1 ZDMG. XCIII, p. 101 ff.
his left hand a flower-spike and in the right hand, which hangs by his side, a small round object. Barua (Barh. II, p. 117) maintains that the bird in the hand of the woman is a pigeon or a dove and that the man does not hold a flower but a hawk on his breast. He points out that according to the Dīrp. p. 300 the pigeon is the symbol of rāga and further asks whether the attributes should not mean that the king like a hawk swooped down upon the turtle-heart of the queen given away to another man. The pictures accessible to me do not allow to judge the value of the different interpretations. The hawk in Barua’s explanation may owe its existence more to the wish for an ingenious comment than to the observation of what is really represented. Perhaps the object in the king’s hand, interpreted as hawk, is the lost ear-ornament of the queen which as corpus delicti plays such an important part in the story. If Barua is right that the queen has only one ear-decorations—it is not to be verified from the pictures—it would show that the artist represents the loss of one ear-ring in exact conformity with the Jātaka text.
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TEXT:
1 Vijapi
2 vijadharo

TRANSLATION:
The Vidyādhara Vijapi (Vijālipin ?)

The panel shows the figures of a man and a woman, both well-dressed. The man is standing and engaged in winding (or unwinding) his turban. The female figure on his right is seated on a stone and holding some flowers in her raised right hand. The background is filled with rocks, and in the right corner there is a strange object lying before a tree. It is of oblong shape, placed aslant, with a head-piece in the centre flanked on each side by a smaller protuberance. It seems to be wrapped up crosswise with cords, just as another oblong object of smaller size, which is half covered by the larger one. Barua and Sinha have identified the two persons of the relief with the Vidyādhara and the wife of the Dānava who are the chief actors in the Samuggajātaka (436)*. The Jātaka is the oldest version of a tale that has found its way into the introductory story of the Arabian Nights. A Dānava has captured a beautiful girl and has made her his wife. In order to keep her safe, he puts her in a box which he swallows. One day he wishes to take a bath. He goes to a tank, throws up the box and lets the girl bath first. He then bids her to enjoy the open air and himself walks off to the tank. At this moment a Vidyādhara comes flying through the air. The woman invites him by signs to descend and places him in the box, into which she slips

*This is the reading of Hultzsch. Cunningham read vijapi, Hocnle vijati. The first aksara is clearly vi, the second almost certainly ja, although the form of the letter differs from the ja of the second line. The third aksara can be read only ṣi. The word is engraved by another hand than vijadhara.

**Beal’s identification of the two figures with Sumedha and his wife is out of question.
herself when the Dānava returns. The demon swallows the box again without examining it, and it is only by an ascetic gifted with supernatural sight that he is informed of what has happened. He throws up the box, and as soon as he has opened it, the Vidyādhara muttering a spell flies up into the air. According to the Atthavanaṇanā the faithless wife is turned away by the Dānava.

I think that Barua-Sinha’s identification may be accepted. In that case the strange object mentioned above may be suitably explained as being an attempt to represent the box opened with its lid lying in front of it. Barua’s suggestion that it represents the armour and dagger of the Vidyādhara is not convincing. The rocky landscape also would be appropriate to the situation. Perhaps the sculptor has represented the Vidyādhara as arranging his dress before entering the box. Barua-Sinha’s explanation gains in probability if we remember that the upper panel shows a couple, the female partner of which is regarded as the type of an adulterous wife. It would therefore seem to be quite likely that the sculptor should have chosen a similar couple also for the lower panel.

The meaning of vijāpi remains doubtful. Hoernle’s reading vijati is impossible, and even if vijapi were taken as a clerical error for vijāpi, the meaning of the word would not become much clearer, as vijāpi cannot easily be explained as a derivation from vijātayati in the sense of ‘unraveling’ or ‘unwinding the head-dress’. Hultzsch took Vijāpi as the name of the Vidyādhara which he traced back to Sk. Vijagīn, but there are considerable phonetic difficulties implied in this derivation. In my article in the ZDMG. I have discussed Sk. Vidyāpin, Vidyāvid or even Vidyājalpin as possible Sanskrit equivalents of the name, but the most probable original form would seem to be Vījalpin, which would have a parallel in Vījalpā, the name of a malignant spirit mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa 51, 50 ff. However, it cannot be denied that none of these explanations of vijāpi is quite satisfactory and convincing.

B 62 (881)¹; PLATES XXI, XLI


¹ Lüders’ treatment of this inscription (B 62) has been lost. But we find a detailed note by him on the story of Tūmītumigla in his book Bhār. I.c. of which the text below is an English translation. Lüders begins stating, that the original of the medallion depicted in Cunningham’s book Pl. XXXIV.2 was lying buried under the walls of the palace at Uchahara. Cunningham had excavated it for a short while and took its impression from which was prepared the sketch published by him. Of the inscription, which it bore, only Cunningham’s eye-copy was available up to 1959 when the stone was recovered. An inked impression received in September 1959 from Rai Krishnadasji, Curator of the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, is read by Dr. D. C. Sircar, Government Epigraphist, Ootacamund, in an article prepared for EI., Vol. XXXIII (1959/60), as follows: tūmītumīgla dhakshabhimhū [Vat]a[gar] [a] [m] [de]\* [Mah[ā]-de[(e)]]nam. Regarding the eye-copy Dr. Sircar says, that it is defective since the mark between the aksharas ti and mī, represented in it as a clear rā, does not appear to be a letter at all on the impression. It is too close to mi considering the space between any two other letters of the record. We have also to note that the said vertical mark actually continues beyond the proper upper end of the supposed ra. The mark is again not as deep as the incision of the letters of the record. . . . The last word was read as Mahādevanāṁ on the basis of the same eye-copy and the genitive plural in it was regarded by Cunningham as used in the instrumental sense. Hultzsch regarded vādevanāṁ as a mistake for devanāṁ. There is, however, no mātṛa attached to r in the word. On the other hand it exhibits a damaged e-mātṛa.” Dr. Sircar is also of the opinion that the anusvāra-like mark with as in Mahādevanāṁ might be due to a flaw in the stone. The reading of Dr. Sircar is in complete conformity with the reconstruction given by Lüders.
TEXT:

tiramitimagi-lakuchhimha Vasuguto māchito Mahādevānāṁ
(tirimitimagiliakuchchhimē Vasugutto mochito Mahādevena)

TRANSLATION:

Vasuguta (Vasugupta) rescued by Mahādeva from the belly of the sea-monster (tirimiti-miṅgila).

Chavannes identified the scene represented with a story in the Tsa-p’i-yu-king. Foucher showed the story also to be in the Divyāvadāna and the Mahāvastu and it appears, as Barua and Sinha have noted, as well in Kshemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalata.

The Chinese version is the shortest and the most simple. Five hundred merchants start on a sea-voyage. The ship comes near a giant fish which swallows the waves together with all living animals contained in them. With an irresistible force the ship also is drawn into the throat of the gigantic fish. In vain the merchants pray to the different gods, whom they worship. Then the captain of the boat (sa-po=sīrthavāha) says to them that he knows of a great god called Buddha. They should pray to him in place of other gods. Thereupon all the merchants together shout ‘namo Buddhāya’. In this way the fish learns that a Buddha has again appeared in the world. It realizes that it would be improper to do any harm to the living beings. It therefore shuts the mouth so that the water begins to flow back and the ship is saved. The fish really has been a monk in its former birth. The name of the Buddha reminds it of its former existence and this led it to the decision to spare the life of the beings.

In the Divy, the story forms an introduction to the Dharmarucyavavadāna (223, 21 ff.). The monk Dharmaruci was a giant fish in his former birth. The story points in essence to only one variation. Here the Buddha himself joins in the action to some extent. As the merchants, on the advice of some upāsaka, shout ‘namo Buddhāya’, the Buddha, who stays in the Jetavana, hears the call with his divine ear and arranges that the giant fish, Timiṅgila or Tirimiti-miṅgila, also hears it. The reference to Timiṅgila’s formerly being a monk is missing in the story itself. But in the second part of the Avadāna, where the different former existences of Dharmaruci are narrated in details, it is described that he was a monk in the time of the Buddha Diparikara as well as in the time of the Buddha Krakuchchhanda. And at the end of this story it is mentioned of him that on hearing the word Buddha in later times he would remember his former births.

It is unnecessary to narrate in detail the story in the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalata, because the Dharmarucyavavadāna (No. 89) is only a metrical version of the Avadāna in the Divy., having the same title and keeping close to the original.

In the Mnu. (I, 244, 19 ff.) the story of the giant fish is likewise connected with the Dharmaruchi legend, but it shows a few peculiar features. The head of the five hundred merchants here bears the name Thapakarni or Sthapakarnika. At the moment when the merchants call the different gods, the venerable Pūrṇaka observes it. He flies up from the Tuṇḍaturika mountain and appears in the air above the ship. The merchants cry: ‘Bhagavan, Bhagavan, we take refuge with you!’ But the Sthavira answers them that

1 Contes I, p. XII, II, p. 51 ff.
3 BL, p. 61 f.
4 Variations Thapakarnika, Sthāpakarnika, Sthāpakarṇika.
he is not the Bhagavat, but only a śrāvaka. They all should cry with one voice 'namo Buddhaya! They do it. When Timitiimitigila hears the name of the Buddha it remembers
that at a time, lying indefinitely back, when it was the brahmin Meghadatta, it had heard of Buddha Dipamkara from his friend Megha¹. The further continuation of the story is
the same as in the other versions. When the gigantic fish starves itself to death, it is reborn as
Dharmaruci.

The version of the Mnu. is influenced, as already observed by Senart, by a similar story
known from the Pūrṇāvadāna in the Divy. (24, 9 ff.). The rich merchant Bhava in
Śūrṇāraka has four sons Bhavila, Bhavatrāta, Bhavanandin and Pūrṇa. The first three,
born of a wife of equal rank, are fond of adorning themselves richly. When the father
reproaches them for their extravagance, they do away with the jewels they wear as ear-decora-
tion, and put on in succession an ear-decoration made of wood, of stava², and tin, with the vow
not to wear again the ear-decoration of precious stones as long as they have not earned 100,000
pieces of gold. Since that time they are called Dārakarṇin, Stavakarṇin and Trupukarṇin.
Pūrṇa, born of a slave girl married by the merchant, remains a bachelor, enters the Buddhist
order, and lives as a monk in the country of the Śrōṇāparāntakas. Later on Dārakarṇin
goes on an expedition with other merchants in order to bring the Gosīrpa-sandal-
wood. The Yaksha Mahēśvara, to whom the forest of sandal trees belongs, raises a storm.
The merchants in their distress appeal to all the gods. Dārakarṇin alone does not take part
in the general excitement. When asked he explains to his companions that he is remem-
bering with repentance his brother Pūrṇa, who had warned him against the sea-voyage.
On hearing this, the merchants shout with one voice: 'Adoration to the venerable Pūrṇa!' A
goddess informs Pūrṇa that his brother is remembering him in distress. Pūrṇa meditates
and appears sitting cross-legged in the air above the ship. The storm ends. Mahēśvara asks
Pūrṇa about the explanation of the miracle, and when he is informed in the course of the
conversation that a Buddha has appeared in the world he keeps quiet. The merchants
are able to return home to Śūrṇāraka with their load of sandal. There Pūrṇa builds the
palace of sandalwood, called the Chandanamāla, for the Buddha. Furthermore it is narrated
how the Buddha, journeying through the air, visits Śūrṇāraka and is received solemnly in
that palace by the king and his four brothers. Āśvaghosha must have known a version of
the Avadāna in which Stavakarṇin, and not Dārakarṇin, was mentioned as the head of the
merchants, and also he, and not Pūrṇa, as the one responsible for the building of the palace
of sandalwood. In the Buddhacharita 21, 22 f. it is said in the list of the conversions by the
Buddha, according to Johnston's translation: "Then He went by His magic powers to the
city of Śūrṇāraka and in due course instructed the merchant Stavakarṇin³, who, on being
instructed, became so faithful that he started to build for the Best of seers a sandalwood
Vihāra, which was ever odorous and touched the sky ". From this version of the Pūrṇā-
vadāna obviously is taken the name Thapakarṇi or Sthapakarṇika, as well as the
intervention of Pūrṇaka in the story of Timitiimitigila of the Mnu.

In the medallion one sees the giant fish into whose throat the ship occupied by three
persons is sliding in. Other fish, shown with their heads down, suggest that the whirlpool
is attracting the ship. Above, the ship⁴ appears a second time, as it is bound homewards

¹In the Divy., Meghadatta appears with the name Mati, Megha with the name Sumati.
²The meaning of stava is not known. Burnouf may be right when he translates it as 'lac'.
³According to Johnston, AO. XV, p. 291: Tib. rna stod, apparently error for rna stod.
⁴The artist, however, depicted only one boat. What Foucher, p. 43, would like to explain as ropes
with rings for keeping the boat in the state of balance are surely, as Cunningham has already remarked,
p. 124, rudders. It is doubtful whether the details in the sketch are exactly reproduced.
in safety. So far the depiction agrees with the literary tradition. But the inscription near it shows that a new version of the legend is intended here. Cunningham (p. 142) read it—Tiranuli Migila Kuchinema Vasu Guto Machito Mahadevnam. According to his eye-copy on Pl. LVI, it reads—tiram tiimiigilakuchhimha Vasuguto mačito Mahadevnam. Hultsch restored it to—tiramhi tiimiigilakuchhimhā Vasuguta mačito Mahādeva—"Vasuguta (Vasugupta) rescued to the shore by Mahādeva from the belly of the sea-monster". I do not believe that the restoration of tarami to tiramhi is correct. As the encounter with the giant fish takes place in the high sea, far from the shore, it cannot properly be spoken of as a rescue to the shore. Besides it seems doubtful to me whether the locative tiramhi could be used in connection with mačito in the accepted sense. Further on the locative of the -a stem in the language of the inscriptions does not elsewhere show the pronominal ending, but always ends in -e: raje A I, susāne B 64, Abode B 69, Naṇḍe B 70, Naṇḍe pavana B 73, B 74, Naṇḍapāde B 76, Himavate B 79. I am therefore convinced that Cunningham in his eye-copy has not overlooked the 'h', inscribed below in 'mhi', but that he erroneously took some stroke behind the first ti as standing for the akshara ra. I am also convinced that in the beginning of the inscription we have to read tūtimiimi-gilakuchhimhā.

However we may think about it, the hero of the story in this version is in any case called Vasugupta, and the saviour from the calamity is named Mahādeva. In the first instance one may suppose that Mahādeva is the name of some personality corresponding to Pūrnaka in the version of the Mū. But the Mahādeva mentioned here is clearly the same person, who in a different inscription (B 81) to which we have to refer later on, receives the attribute 'bhagavat'. Thus it must be the name of the Buddha. The designation of Buddha as 'the great god' does not occur, as far as I know, elsewhere in the Buddhist literature. The Mep. 1, 16, only gives 'devatida' which appears for instance in the Divy. 391, 4. In our inscription Mahādeva is chosen perhaps under the influence of the text which the sculptor was going to follow. In any case, as already mentioned, the expression is used in the Chinese version of the story in order to show the Buddhā's foremost rank at the head of the other gods. When the merchants appeal to the other gods in vain, the sārthavāha (in Chavannes' translation) says: 'I know one great god who is called Buddha'.

1 ZDMG. XL, p. 76.

2 Probably in the inscription the long vowels and the anusvāra have not been written. It might also be possible that the last word was Mahādevanāmena.

3 Hultsch rightly remarks: "Mahadeva probably refers to the Mahāsatta or Bodhisatta".
5. B 63-67 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO JĀTAKA-OR AVADĀNA-SCENES NOT YET IDENTIFIED


TEXT:

Dighatapasi sise anusāsati

TRANSLATION:

Dighatapasi (Dirghatapassī) instructs his pupils.1

The relief is a vivid representation of the contents of the inscription. On a raised platform to the left an ascetic is seen sitting cross-legged. He no doubt is the teacher Dighatapasi of the inscription and his upraised right hand shows that he is just instructing his pupils sitting before him on the ground, four of whom are represented to the right side of the relief. The presence of a tree in the back-ground shows that the preaching is going on in the open air. Underneath the tree a pot and some other utensil, probably belonging to the ascetic, are to be seen. The teacher is characterized as an ascetic by the abundant matted hair fastened in a knot. Similarly the four pupils do not wear a turban as the other worldly men normally do, but have their long hair rolled into a knot. Only one pupil who is to be seen from behind in the middle of the relief lets his hair fall loose on his back.4 This fact induced Barua to infer that this pupil is a female one, whereas in the opinion of Cunningham all the four pupils are females. Cunningham was led to this opinion by his reading sise in the inscription which he interpreted as 'female Rishis'. We do not see any necessity to believe that any one of the four pupils is a female one, and the form sise (acc. pl. masc.) makes it probable that all of them are male ones.

Cunningham already took Dighatapasi as a proper name and identified the ascetic with Dighatapassī, a Nāgapūrtha and follower of Nātaputta, mentioned in the Upāsiutta (56) of the M. (I. 371 ff.). The sutta tells that Dighatapassī once visited the Buddha at Nālandā, and had a discussion with him. He gave a report of this to Nātaputta which resulted into a discussion between the Buddha and Upāli and the subsequent conversion of the latter. There is no connection between this story and the representation in the relief. So Barua rejected to see in the ascetic the Jaina recluse Dighatapassī and translated the inscription 'The venerable ascetic instructs his pupils' taking Dighatapasi as an epithet instead of a proper

---

1The fragmentary inscription No. B 81 probably also belongs to this group.
2Lüders' treatment of this inscription (B 63) has not been recovered.
3This is the translation of the inscription by Lüders in his List.
4Barua says that the three pupils to the right hold 'two small stick-like things' in their hands. This can only be said of one of them who is depicted the lowest of the three; the two others do not seem to hold sticks. The middle one has his right hand and fore-finger raised, as if he is pointing out something and the third one is talking to the ascetic emphasizing his words with both of his uplifted hands.
name. It seems, however, unbelievable that digha can mean 'venerable', and it is more probable that the explanation in MA. III, 52 is correct where it is said 'Dighatapasi ti
dighattā evam laddhanāmo', that Dighatapasi received his name on account of his long
stature. Lüders takes the word as a proper name in his List and further asserts in Bhārānt.
p. 3, n. 4, that Dighatapasi cannot mean 'the venerable ascetic' but is apparently a proper
name.

B 64 (697); PLATES XXI, XLVI

On a coping-stone, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (A 23). Edited by Cunningham,
StBh. (1879), p. 96; 190, No. 8, and Pl. XLVII and LIII; Hultzsch, ZDMG. Vol.
XL (1886), p. 61, No. 9, and Pl.; IA. Vol. XXI (1892), p. 228, No. 9; Barua-Sinha,
Pl. LXXV (97); Lüders, Bhārānt. (1941), p. 3.

TEXT:

Asadā vadhu susāne sigalāñati.

TRANSLATION:

The young woman Asadā (Āshādhā). The announcement to the jackals on the burial-ground.

The sculpture shows a woman seated on a tree to which she clings with both hands. She is evidently addressing three jackals sitting below under another tree. In the foreground
a man is lying either sleeping or dead, but as according to the inscription the scene is a burial-
ground, he is probably meant for a corpse.

Cunningham's suggestion that the sculpture refers to the story of the origin of the Kolivya
as told in SnA., p. 354 ff., cannot be accepted. The scene of that story is not a burial-ground,
but a forest. The name of the leprous princess is not Asadā, but Piyā, and she does not
live on a tree, but in a pit. The man lying on the ground cannot be king Rāma, who does
not appear in that situation in the story, and there are no jackals connected with the legend.
Barua-Sinha think that the label may perhaps be taken to refer to a scene of a Jātaka-
episode similar to one of the Asilakkhañājātaka (No. 126). It is unnecessary to enter into
the details of that Jātaka, as the similarity is very small. The scene of the Jātaka story,
it is true, is a burial-ground, but neither the sitting of the woman on the tree nor the presence
of the jackals agrees with it.

As long as the story represented in the relief has not been identified, the meaning of the
last two words of the inscription cannot be established with certainty. As hati can hardly
be a verbal expression, the words seem to form a compound. Hultzsch was inclined to take
sigalāñati as a clerical error for sigāle hati=Sk. śigālā jāṭī, 'who has observed the jackals'.
But this is extremely improbable, since the term sigāle hati could only mean 'the habitual
observer of the jackals', which, of course, is out of question. Barua-Sinha translate: 'The
woman Āshādhā, the jackals in a funeral ground, (her) kinsmen', taking hati as the equiva-
 lent of Sk. jāṭī. I agree with Barua-Sinha in dividing the label into two parts, which is
supported by the fact that Asadā vadhu is separated by a blank from the rest of the inscrip-
tion, but I would prefer to derive hati from Sk. jāpti and to refer sigalāñati to some
announcement made by the woman to the jackals.

1 Barua gives the choice to identify the representation either with the Mūlapariyāyajātaka (245)
or the Tittirajajātaka (489) 1 both giving an account of a far-famed ascetic teacher instructing his pupils'.
These identifications are too vague to be convincing. See above Introduction p. X.
2 It seems very probable that the woman sitting on the tree makes an appeal on behalf of the man
lying on the ground (sleeping or wounded?) to the jackals looking up at her.
Asaḍā is Sk. Ashāḍhā, with the usual inaccurate spelling of ḍ instead of ḍh, and an abbreviation of some name such as Ārāḥamitti. The name belongs to the large class of personal names the first part of which is formed by the name of an asterism; why it should be taken to mean 'the buxom', as suggested by Barua-Sinha, I am unable to see.

**B 65 (702); PLATES XXI, XLV**


**TEXT:**

jaṭilāsabhā

**TRANSLATION:**

The assembly of the Jaṭilas (ascetics wearing matted hair).

The sculpture to which the label belongs is a fragment. It shows on the left a tree among wells, on the right a recess with a short-haired man of whom only half of the head and upper part of the body is preserved. Cunningham's identification of the sculpture with the conversion of Uruvelā Kassapa and his two brothers is very improbable. Barua has tried to complete the fragment by the photograph of a lost fragment which bears the figure of an elephant⁴; and in his search for a suitable subject of the sculpture he has hit on the Indasamāṅagottajjātaka (No. 161) or the Mitṭamittajjātaka (No. 197) both of which contain the story of a tāpasa who was killed by his pet elephant. But this identification cannot be accepted as a glance at the figure 98a on plate LXXV in Barua's book will be sufficient to show that the two fragments do not go together.

**B 66 (788); PLATES XXII, XLIV**


**TEXT:**

Brahmādevo māṇavako

**TRANSLATION:**

The young Brahmin Brahmadeva (*Brahmadeva*).

The story represented in the sculpture is not known. The preserved portion of the relief is divided into three compartments. In the upper compartment there is a large building surrounded by a railing. In the windows and the arched recesses behind the balcony of the upper storey the faces of a number of women are visible. From the gateway in the left

⁴According to Barua there are visible at the feet of the elephant some burning fire altars. I am not able to recognize anything of it in the photographic reproduction.
corner issues a man mounted on an elephant. On the right four well-dressed men are standing in a line. The foremost figure of the four holds a small object in his left hand, while his right hand is uplifted. As the man on the elephant also has his right hand raised, they are apparently talking together. The three men on the left of the speaker seem to bring presents, each holding a tray, the first filled with small round objects, perhaps pearls, the second with square coins, and the third with necklaces.

In the middle compartment the four men appear again in a line, but this time mounted on elephants decorated with bells hanging down before their foreheads. The first in the row from the right is holding up a tray with coins, while the third, who seems to be the most prominent person, is distinguished by a parasol and a chaúri carried by an attendant whose head is visible in the background. Before the line of elephants another elephant is kneeling. He is held down with the ankalṣa by a man of whom only the head is seen, the body being hidden behind a tree which belongs to the lower scene. This is evidently the same man who in the first scene is riding on the elephant, and from the label it appears that he is the young Brahmin Brdhadeva.

In the lower compartment, of which only the upper portion is preserved, Brdhadeva is seen once more kneeling before a throne placed under a tree and surmounted by a parasol with pendants hanging down on both sides, while behind him the four men are standing again in a line with their hands joined in devotion. Anderson states that the tree is the Bodhi tree of the historical Buddha, but I doubt very much that this is correct, as it does not show distinctly the characteristically pointed leaves of the Ficus religiosa.

Of the rest of the sculpture only the head of a person is still visible below the throne. Whether it belongs to the scene above or to another scene in continuation of the story in the lost portion of the sculpture cannot be made out.

Barua and Sinha translated the label ‘the young [Rûpa]-Brahma deity Subrahmā’, for which later on Barua substituted ‘the youthful Rùpa-brahma deity’. Barua is of opinion that the relief illustrates the concluding part of Siddhârtha’s battle with Mâra, the congratulations of the Brahmakâyika deities, with Subrahmâ at the head*. This interpretation would hardly convince anybody, even if it were not based on the palpably wrong translation of the inscription.

B 67 (710); Plates XXII, XLV


TEXT:

chitupâdasîla

*Cat., Part I, p. 58.

A similar explanation has been given even before Barua by Coomaraswamy. In JâRâ. 1928, p. 391 Coomaraswamy reads the inscription Bra(h)ma deva niţânakâraka and translates it ‘the youthful Brahman (entreats the Buddha to teach)’. He remarks further on ‘Brahmā is distinguished by his long coiled locks and absence of a turban; as described in the Lalita., where he is designated Śikhi Mahâ- brhâma’. The story how Śikhi asked Buddha to teach the law is found in Lalitâsa. 393, 20 ff. But I do not see that anything has been said there about his physical appearance, and the attribute mûûnakâraka, which is totally out of place for a Mahâbrhman, has not been given to him.
TRANSLATION:

The rock of miracles and portents (or miraculous portents).

The meaning of the inscription can hardly be definitely established as long as the subject of the relief has not been identified. The sculpture represents a game in which on either side two persons take part. A gaming-board containing 36 squares is drawn on the flat surface of a rock, which splits into two, engulfing the two men on the right and perhaps also the tree under which they are sitting. Of the two men on the left, one is raising his right hand which indicates that he is speaking, while the other is seated cross-legged. Before him lies a small square object which looks like a punch-marked coin, but may be a stone used for the game. Six similar pieces are lying to his left. In the background there is a square block ornamented with three-forked symbols.

Regarding the text of the inscription, Hoernle is in doubt whether *śīla* stands for *śīlā* (Sk. *śīlā*) or for *śilāḥ* (Sk. *śilām*). The sculpture leaves little doubt that it is the word for rock (*śīlā*); this has been assumed by Hultzsch. Hoernle’s suggestion to refer *chitupāda* to the gaming board and to explain it either as *chatushpaṇḍa* or *chitrapāda* certainly misses the mark. The mistakes of the sculptor which Hoernle has to assume are quite improbable and I do not understand how far these two expressions could suitably designate the gaming board. *Chitupāda* literally ‘arising out of a thought’, ‘wish’, ‘intention’ is a word used often in Pāli; in connection with *śīlā*, however, it does not yield any meaning. But *uppāda* is in Pāli also a normal representative of Sk. *upatāya* ‘abnormal phenomenon’ and thus it is most probable that *chitupādasīla* represents Sk. *chitupatāsīla*. A rock of wonders and of abnormal phenomena’ or ‘a rock where miracles and portents happen’ would seem to be quite an appropriate name for a rock which suddenly splits*. The strange block with three-forked symbols has its counterparts in the sculptures described under Nos. B 73 and B 74 which represent scenes on mount Nāgoda. It is therefore not unlikely that the gambling scene also has to be localized on that mountain very rich in miracles. This suggestion is however uncertain as long as the story has not been found in literature. Certainly the relief does not illustrate the Littaj. (91) as Barua thinks. There is not the slightest similarity between the Jātaka and the sculpture, and that the label cannot be translated as ‘the gambler fond of the square-board game’ needs scarcely be mentioned.

¹ Usually it appears in connection with *supina* and *lakkhaṇa*; *D. I*, 9, 4; *Sn. 360*; *J. 87*, 1; 546, 216; *Mīl. 178*.

² This explanation is already given by Hultzsch, *IA. Vol. XXI* (1892), p. 229, note 25, where he translates: “Chitā upatāya yanm sat śīlā,” ‘the rock where miraculous portents happen’.” He further remarks: “The Pāli *uppāda* represents both *upāda* and *upūta*.”
6. B 68 - 69 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO THE REPRESENTATIONS OF CHAITYAS

B 68 (699); PLATES XXII, XLVII


TEXT:

migasamadakam chetaya

TRANSLATION:

The Chaitya where the animals of the forest hold their siesta.

The name of the chaitya is not known from other sources and as both migas and samadaka are ambiguous terms, the label has to be interpreted from the sculpture to which it is attached. Unfortunately the scene represented in the panel is not perfectly clear. The centre of the relief is formed by a tree with a stone seat in front of it. Six antelopes, three males and three females, are lying around it. They seem to be black bucks (Antelope cervicapra), though the horns are rather short. On the proper right side two wild animals are visible, the one facing the spectator, the other turned to the right and characterized by a mane as a lion. The antelope in the foreground is lying with its head resting on the ground. Hoernle therefore was of the opinion that the sculptor wanted to represent the antelope as having been crushed under the platform of the chaitya and, following a suggestion of Tawney, translated the inscription ‘the deer-crushing chaitya’ (migasamadarakam chaityam). An antelope in exactly the same attitude as in our relief is found in the relief on Cunningham’s Plate XLIII, 8, and there it is undoubtedly a dead animal bewailed by the ascetic as told in the Migapotakajātaka (No. 372). Nevertheless I think it more probable that in our relief the antelope is simply meant as sleeping, no stones being visible to indicate that it was killed by them, and as the presence of the two lions also is left unaccounted for by Hoernle’s interpretation, it does not carry conviction.

Cunningham translated the inscription1 ‘Deer and Lions eating together Chetiy’, and the derivation of samadaka from sam-ad is accepted also by Barua-Sinha who offer quite a number of optional renderings such as ‘the chaitya on an animal feeding-ground’, or ‘on a grazing ground of the deer’, or ‘where the deer are devoured’, etc. But the antelopes in the relief neither graze nor are they being devoured, and in my opinion it is extremely unlikely that samadaka should have any connection with the root ad; nor can I follow Barua, when he asserts that the sculpture refers to the Vyaagghajātaka (No. 272). There it is related how a forest is infested by tigers or, as the commentator erroneously says, by a lion and a tiger. They kill animals of all kinds and for fear of them nobody dares enter the forest.

1 Read chetiyaṁ.
2 He read samadika or samadaka.
When the stench of the carcasses, left by them on the spot, becomes intolerable, a foolish tree-spirit, without heeding the warnings of another tree-spirit, drives the wild animals away, but only with the result that the villagers, no longer kept back by the fear of the tigers, come and hew down the trees and till the land. In vain the tree-spirit tries to bring back the tigers. I fail to see the slightest resemblance between this story and the scene of our relief where nothing of the tree-deities is to be seen and where certainly the antelopes are not represented as being frightened or even killed by the lions.

Hultsch took migasamadaka as migasammadaka and rendered it by 'the chaitya which gladdens the antelopes'. *Hultsch's derivation of samadaka is probably correct, but I think that the meaning of the word has to be modified a little. In Pāli bhattasamadana is a common term denoting 'after-dinner nap, siesta'. Migasammadana then would mean either 'the siesta of the antelopes' or 'the siesta of the wild animals' and there would be no difficulty in explaining the name of the chaitya as being formed by adding the suffix -ka to sammadana. The siesta of the antelopes would seem to be well illustrated by the sculpture. But peace and quietness apparently prevails also between the antelopes and the lions of the relief, and so we may assume that the term migasamadaka is used here in the wider sense and that the chaitya owed its name to the miraculous event that all animals of the forest held there their siesta without doing harm to one another*.

**B 69 (693);* PLATES XXII, XLII**


**TEXT:**

Abode chaityaṁ

**TRANSLATION:**

The Chaitya on the A(m)boda (the mango-mountain).

The relief shows a tree which, judging from the leaves, can be a mango tree. It has a stone seat in front of it. Some rocks in the right corner from which a brook flows down suggest that the place of the scene is on a mountain. Two elephants are approaching the stone seat, the bigger one of the animals bears a bundle of lotus fibres in its trunk, apparently intending to deposit it on or before the stone seat. The smaller animal sprays itself with water from the brook. Because in the relief treated under B 68 the tree with a stone seat is called chaitya (for chaitya) it can be taken as absolutely certain that chaityaṁ here is a scribe's

---

*See *D.* II, 195; *S.* I, 7; *J.* VI, 57; *II,* 63, 14.

* A very similar representation is found in the relief on Cunningham's Pl. XLIV, 8. Here six stags (Rusa axis), three of them male and three female, lie or stand round the tree with a stone seat underneath it. But here the lions are missing. The wish to identify the sculptures as Jātakas at all costs led Barua to see in the latter relief a representation of the Tipallathamigajātaka (16). Apart from the unacceptable interpretation of the particulars, the identification with the Jātaka is quite impossible on account of the fact that the chaitya figuring in the centre of the picture remains altogether unexplained.

* Lüders' treatment of this inscription (B 69) is missing in the manuscript. What follows below is based on his remarks l.c., pp. 23-25.
mistake for chatiyath. The explanation of chatiyath as loc. sg. of p. chati `pot, vessel' given by Barua and Sinha is linguistically impossible, apart from the fact that in the relief no vessel of any kind is represented. Likewise I cannot agree with Barua-Sinha's identification of the relief with the Mātīposakaj. (455). In the Jātaka it is narrated that the Bodhisattva was once reborn as an elephant. He was captured to serve the king of Kāś as state elephant, but was released by the same king when the latter heard that the elephant had to nourish his blind mother left behind in the forest. When the Bodhisattva had returned to his mother he sprinkled her with water from a lotus pond. Now we find in the relief indeed two elephants and also a brook which could perhaps take the place of the lotus pond; but it is not depicted how the one elephant besprinkles the other. This besprinkling is an essential part of the story. It is not only to be seen from the fact that it is expressly mentioned in the Gāthās; it has also led to a further development of the legend. The Mau, where the Jātaka occurs (Vol. III, p. 139 ff.) and the Fo-pen-hing-tsi-king (Beal, Rom. Leg., p. 366 ff.) narrate that the elephant's mother regained her eye-sight by the besprinkling, in the same way as the blind Mahāprajāpati regained the power to see when the water at the mahāprātiṣṭiṣṭā in Kapilavastu streamed down on her. Besides it is expressly stated in G. 4 ff. of the Jātaka that the noble elephant lived with his mother on the mountain Chaṇḍāraṇa. In the prose narration is added that, after the death of his mother, he went into the hermitage Kараṇḍāka. There the king erected a stone image of the elephant, and men from all India used to assemble at the spot every year to celebrate the festival of the elephant. In the Mau, the mountain on which the elephant and his mother stayed is called Chaṇḍāgarī, a hill in front of the Himavat. These particulars are not in conformity with the inscription which says that the Chaitya was on the Aboda. Hoernle took Aboda as equivalent of Sk. Arbuda, the old name of the famous mountain Abū, but it is not probable that the u in Arbuda should have become a. On the other hand the landscape represented shows decisively that Aboda is the name of a mountain. This is confirmed by the form of the name. No less than six times in the Bhārhat inscriptions the name Naḍoda is found, twice with the addition pavata, and a mountain Rikshoda is mentioned as the birth place of brahmans in the Kāśikā on Pēn, 4, 3, 91: Rikshoda pavata bhijana eshm brāhmaṇānam. Arksobā brāhmaṇā. Whatever the second part of the name may be, its composition with nāḍa `reed' and rikha `bear' makes it almost certain that Aboda contains the word amva `mango'. Aboda accordingly is written in the normal fashion for Amboda. The Chaitya on the Amboda, the mango-mountain, was probably a sanctuary of local importance. In the relief its veneration by elephants carrying offerings is represented; cf. similar reliefs on Cunningham's Pl. XXX 2 (B 70-72) and XLVI 6.

1I. X, p. 120.
2I am of the opinion that these names of mountains, like Himavat etc., are formed with the suffix vat. Rikshavat, Naḍavat, Amravat were transferred in Prakrit to the a-flexion and with the softening of t to d and with contraction of a to o became Ačchhoda, Naḍoda and Amboda. Rikshoda is a result of incomplete Sanskritisation. The correct Sanskrit form Rikshavat is attested in the Epics and in the works of Kālidāsa.
7. B 70-76 INSCRIPTIONS REFERRING TO THE LEGENDS CONNECTED WITH MOUNT NAĐODA1

**B 70 (755); PLATES XXII, XLVI**


**TEXT:**

1. Bahuhathiko nigosho
2. Naļode

**TRANSLATION:**

The banyan tree Bahuhathika (*Bahuastika; of many elephants*) on (Mount) Naļoda.

See the remarks on No. B 72.

[B 70, B 71 and B 72 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

**B 71 (754); PLATE XXII**


**TEXT:**

Bahuhathiko

**TRANSLATION:**

(The banyan tree) Bahuhathika (*Bahuastika; of many elephants*).

See the remarks on No. B 72.

[B 71, B 70 and B 72 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

**B 72 (756); PLATES XXII, XLVI**

Together with Nos. B 70 and B 71 on the lowermost relief of the inner face of the same pillar as No. A 62, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (P 29). Edited by Cunningham-1

---

1 There is an inscription classified under Group 9 (Fragmentary Inscriptions) probably referring to some legend connected with the Himavat mountains (see B 79).

2 Hultzsch, *IA.* Lc., note 42: "Bahuastha yatra vaḥ, where many elephants (are worshipping)".

Cf. also B 81.

TEXT:
1 Susupālo Koḍāya
2 Veṇḍuka a–
3 rāmako

TRANSLATION:

Susupāla (Śīṣupāla), the Koḍāya (Koḍiya). The park-keeper Veṇḍuka.

[B 72, B 70 and B 71 refer to one and the same sculpture.]

This relief, which according to the inscription B 70 represents some story connected with a nyagrodha tree on mountain Naḍoda, is in its centre filled by a big banyan tree, with a seat in front of it, decorated with an ornamental band and strewn with flowers. On either side three elephants, one of which is a very young animal, are bowing down or offering garlands. On the right are the figures of two men, both badly damaged. One who is standing with his hands joined in devotion has lost his head; of the other almost nothing but the turban is preserved. The background is formed on the right by rocks, on the left by a slab or bench covered with flowers above which there appears a strange conglomeration which Hoernle, misled by his erroneous reading Veṭiko instead of Veṇḍuka, took to be an egg-plant. It indeed seems to be a tree or plant, but I do not dare to determine its exact nature.

The relief bears no less than three inscriptions viz. B 70, B 71 and B 72. Underneath the stone seat, on the decorative rali forming the basis of the relief, we find B 71 and on the stone-seat itself B 70 which gives a fuller version of B 71. The third inscription (B 72) is in the right upper corner above and at the side of the damaged head of one of the two human worshippers near the tree. According to these inscriptions the nyagrodha tree represented in the sculpture is found on the mountain Naḍoda and carries the name Bahuhatthika “by the side of which are many elephants”, which corresponds to the scene depicted.

The worship of Chaityas by elephants was apparently a favourite theme associated with different localities. Both Fa-hien* and Hūan-tsang* tell us that a herd of wild elephants offered worship to the Stūpa of Rāmagrāma by presenting flowers and sprinkling water on the ground. This legend is perhaps represented on the lower architrave of the eastern gate of Śāñchi where elephants offer flowers and fruits to a Stūpa. In the treatment of B 69 we have come across the worship of a tree with a stone seat underneath on mountain Asīboda. What kind of tree is meant there cannot be fixed with certainty. In the relief on the coping stone shown on Cunningham’s Pl. XLVI 6 it is again a nyagrodha tree worshipped by three elephants which lay down branches of trees in a bowl placed on a stone seat.

As regards the two persons who appear as lookers on of the scene, Veduka is certainly the same person who in the relief B 73 is represented as milking a tattered cloth on mountain Naḍoda. In our inscription (B 72) he is called arāmako, apparently an imperfect spelling for ārāmako, while in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit, the usual form ārāmika. As it appears from

*Transl. by Legge, p. 69.
*Cunningham thought that the sculpture represented that legend, but, apart from the fact that the object of the worship is not a Stūpa, but a tree, the label expressly states that the scene is Naḍoda which, as proved by the inscriptions Nos. B 73 and B 74, was some mountain.
Mahāv. VI, 15, 1; Chullau. VI, 21, 3 the arāmikas were park-keepers and sometimes servants of the Saṅgha, without being monks. It is more difficult to account for the epithet of Susu-pāla. Hoernle was of the opinion that Koḍāya might be connected with Sk. Kauḍāṇya, P. Kodaṇṭha, which is phonetically impossible. Barua-Sinha’s derivation of Koḍāya from Koḍa-rīja or Koṭha-rīja, ‘the ruler of a fort’ need not be discussed. I am sure that Hultzsch was right in taking Koḍāyo as a clerical error for Koḍiyo, ‘belonging to the Koḍya or Koṭiya tribe’.

The legend represented in the relief remains unknown for the time being. But the inscription B 81 allows with high probability to identify the saint to whom the Chaitya belonged.

B 73 (707); Plates XXII, XLVII


Text:

V[e]ḍuṅka katha dohati Naḍode pavaṭe

Translation:

Veḍuka milks the tattered garment on Mount Naḍoda².

On the left side of the relief a man is seen squatting on the ground. With both hands he holds the two ends of a somewhat peculiar object, which is suspended from a tree. He is evidently ‘milking’ them into a small basin held between his knees. The sculptor has even represented the stream of liquid gushing out. The right half of the relief is occupied by four square blocks of different size. Their upper side is slightly concave and covered with symbols which, being three-forked, differ from the ordinary paṭheṅgulinaskas.

In Bāhrut quite a number of representations is found, the scene of which is the mountain Naḍoda⁴, which seems to have been in the vicinity of Bāhrut and connected with several local legends. R. P. Chanda (MAŚI. No. 30, p. 6) identified it with a chain of hills called Naro, six miles to the north of Bāhrut. The identification is attractive, even if phonetically it is not completely free from doubt, for then we should expect to get at least Naṭo.

Veḍuka is undoubtedly identical with the gardener Veḍuka mentioned in No. B 72 in

¹ Barua hints at the Mahāvījñāna. (493), whereas in his list the relief is directly identified with the said Jātaka. How this is possible, I am at a loss to understand. The only similarity between the sculpture and the Jātaka is the circumstance that in both of them a nyagrodha appears.

² The first akṣara was read as by Cunningham. Hoernle and Bühler adopted this reading, while Hultzsch read as. The e-sign, although partially coinciding with the framing line of the label, becomes almost certain by the occurrence of Veḍuka in No. B 72.

³ It is unnecessary to discuss Hoernle’s translation of the inscription as it is based on an interpretation which nobody will uphold now. Nor can I follow the confused speculations of Barua-Sinha which culminate in the invention of a Jātaka. Their identifications of Veḍuka with Vaṭika, the hero of Avaṭāra 6 in the Av. (I, p. 28 ff.) and at the same time with Vaṭika, a supposed surname of Sakka, and of Naḍoda with Nārada, or Naḍoda pavaṭe with Nārada and Parvata are absolutely unfounded.

⁴ The name of the mountain is at times directly mentioned in the labels and at times it is to be inferred. As regards the explanation of the word Naḍoda I refer to my remarks on No. B 69.
a relief which illustrates an event on Mount Naḍoda. The only word in the inscription which presents any difficulty is kattha, which may denote either the object which is milked or the substance which is milked from it. Hultzsch states that Bühler wanted to explain it as kvattha ‘decoction’. According to Panipī 3, 1, 140, besides kvattha there existed in the same meaning also koṭha, and we may agree that kattha may stand for koṭhānī and, if necessary, also for kāṭhānī. But the sense so obtained is hardly satisfactory. Hultzsch proposed to take kattha as a graphical or dialectal variant of kathā (kāṭhā) ‘wood’. I am ready to admit that owing to the negligence of a mason, who forgot to put the dot in the centre of the letter, a tha may occasionally appear as ttha, but the superfluous addition of a dot in writing kattha for kattha, as Hultzsch’s suggestion implies, is highly improbable, and the derivation of kattha (with dental th=kattha) from kāṭhā is phonetically impossible. Moreover the milking of a piece of wood would not agree with the sculpture. There can be little doubt that the thing (kattha) which Veduka is milking is an object hanging down from the tree which is certainly neither a piece of wood nor a bhūti’s mashak as suggested by Hoernle. What it is meant for will be understood at once, if we remember that the annuvāra is frequently not written in these inscriptions and that therefore kattha may be an imperfect spelling for kāṇṭhānī. kauṭhā is the garment of a religious mendicant patched together with hundreds of rags; cf. Bhartrihari 3, 19: vastrāna cha jīrnāsatakaḥca saṁaya cha kauṭhā; 3, 74 jīrnā kauṭhā tataḥ kīm; 3, 86 raṇīgākṣhaṇaḥsīrṣṇajirvānasaṁah sampraptakauṭhā ākāh; 3, 101 kauṭhiṁ śatakhandajagajāratāraṁ kauṭhā puna śūryi; Śāntiś. 4, 20 dhṛiṇajārakauṭhākālāvaya. In Śāntiś. 4, 7 the garment of a forest recluse is said to be pieced up with withered leaves: jīrnāpalākasaṁhārikritau kauṭhānī varāṇo vane. Mahāv. 8, 12 we are told that Ananda made garments from rags (cchinnaka) having the appearance of folds of rice in Magadhā (Magadhākhetra) with their manifold boundaries. Exactly in the same way the artist has represented the kauṭhā.

The story of Veduka’s milking has not yet been identified. It belongs to the circle of legends gathered round Mount Naḍoda which form the subject also of the sculptures referred to under Nos. B 70, B 72, B 74, B 75, B 76, B 81.

**B 74 (708); PLATES XXIII, XLVII**


**TEXT:**

jabu Naḍode pivate

**TRANSLATION:**

The rose-apple tree on Mount Naḍoda.

On the left side of the sculpture there is a tree from which two human hands emerge, one holding a bowl filled with food, while the other is pouring out water from a vessel, resembling a tea-pot, upon the right hand of a man sitting on a mūṭha, or wicker stool. We know from the medallion illustrating the gift of the Jetavana and other sculptures that vessels of that peculiar form (bhūkhāra) were used in the ceremony of pouring the water of donation on the hand of the donor; the scene therefore evidently represents the gift of food to

¹Variant reading: śrīnapalākapatrasaṁhitau.
the man by the deity residing in the jambū tree. Another man is walking away carrying a small vessel which he apparently has filled at the tree. According to Anderson, Cat. Vol. I, p. 97, there is on the right a block of stone exactly like those of the relief described under No. B 73.

The same scene, with slight modifications, occurs in a relief at Buddha-Gayā reproduced in Cunningham’s Mahābodhi, Plate VIII, No. 4. Here the man who receives the water of donation and the bowl with food from the tree-spirit is standing by the side of a māyā and a bench, and the man walking off is missing, but the block of stone appears here also in the background. Bloch referred the scene of the Buddha-Gayā sculpture to the feeding of the Bodhisattva by Sujātā. I am unable to discover the slightest resemblance between the relief and that story.

Barua-Sinha translate jābu by ‘the rose-apple trees’, which is not in keeping with the sculpture where only a single tree is represented. But I see no reason why jābu should be taken as a plural form, jambū being the regular nom. sing. of the feminine base, both in Pāli and Prakrit. I quite agree with Barua-Sinha in rejecting Hoernle’s suggestion that the jambū tree of the relief is the tree of Mount Meru from which Jambudvīpa derives its name. On the other hand I fail to see how it should possibly be connected with the jambū trees mentioned among other trees in Gāthā 584 of the Vessantarakātaka or with the Sambulajātaka (519), as suggested by those two scholars. R. P. Chanda and Coomaraswamy see in the relief the representation of a legend narrated in the Dīkā. I, 203 ff. There we are told that five hundred ascetics on their way from the Himālaya to Kosambī come to a great nyagrodha tree in a forest. The goddess of the tree gives them food and water to drink and to bathe. At the request of the oldest of the group of ascetics she comes out of the tree and informs the ascetics that she had gained great power for having fasted unto death in a former life as a workmaid of Anāthapiṇḍika. Now the relief corresponds to the story as far as the miraculous feeding by the tree-goddess is concerned. But I am very doubtful whether just this story is illustrated. The tree in the relief is a jambū tree, in the story, however, it is a nyagrodha. That speaks against the identification, as well as the circumstance that the men being fed and offered a drink in the relief are not ascetics. Hoernle’s explanation of the Bhāhrūt relief is quite mistaken, and Barua himself withdrew the curious explanation he gave (B. I. p. 97 f. and Bahr. II, p. 162 ff.) later on in Bahr. III, p. 47. The story of the jambū tree represented in the relief is one of the Nadoda legends which have not yet been discovered in literary sources; cf. the remarks on No. B 73.

B 75 (711 and 901); Plate XXIII

FRAGMENTARY inscription on a coping-stone, now lost. Edited by Cunningham, StBh. (1879), p. 131, No. 22, and Pl. LIII. The inscription appears to be identical with the fragment published by Cunningham, ibid. p. 143, No. 18, and Pl. LVI. It was edited again by Barua-Sinha, B. I. (1926), p. 86, No. 201; Barua, Bahr. Vol. II (1934), p. 115; Liddell, Bahr. (1941), p. 99 f.

1 ASIA. 1908-09, p. 143 f.
2 Bloch’s statements are wrong in details. Sujātā feeds the Bodhisattva after he gave up the penance and not the Buddha after he gained the Bodhi.
3 Kacchiyana 2, 1, 34.
4 MASI. No. 30, p. 5 ff.
5 JARAS. 1928, p. 393.
6 TA. X, p. 121.
7 Regarding the label Barua-Sinha say that all former editors read jābu. The right reading jābu however has already been given by Hultzsch, ZDMG. XL, p. 62 and in my List No. 708.
TEXT:
Dusito giri dadati Na . . .

TRANSLATION:
Dusita presents the mountain Na(ñoda?).

Cunningham (StBh. p. 131, No. 22) gives an inscription found on a piece of a coping-stone which is now lost. He reads it Dusito-giri dadati. According to his eye-copy on Pl. LIII, it is to be read as dusitogirida dati; after these letters still a vertical stroke is visible which can be a remnant of na. Between da and dati his sketch shows a lacuna which has to be explained. Like all labels of the coping-stone the inscription must have been engraved on the lowest step of the pyramids above the reliefs. If an inscription runs over several steps the result naturally is that gaps sometimes appear in the middle of a word, e.g. in the inscription B 63 dighatapassati samanāsati or in the inscription B 73 veñukokathado hatinādopa vate. On the step of the pyramids there is room for six letters. Also it is certain that nothing precedes dusito which must be the first word of the inscription.

Amongst the fragments of inscriptions now lost Cunningham gives one which he reads on p. 143, No. 18 dusitigiri datina. According to his eye-copy on Pl. LVI it runs dusitogirida tina. It seems to be clear that Cunningham gives the same inscription erroneously twice and that we have to restore it as Dusito giri dadati na. Dusito is probably a personal name, and the first three words are defective writing for Dusito giriin dadati 'Dusita presents the mountain'. Barua and Sinha take the following na as negation and connect the inscription with G. 1 of the Suchchajaj (390) in which we hear of the not-giving of a mountain. This is highly improbable. The negative particle na would have to stand before the verb. It is much more probable that the concluding part of the inscription is lost, and I have already proposed in my List of Brāhmi inscriptions No. 711 to restore the na to Nañoda. As the scene represented has been lost and as particulars of the legends referring to mount Nañoda are not known for the time being, this restoration can only be called a possibility.

B 76 (781 and 791)*; PLATE XXIII


TEXT:
[Na]ñodapāde dhenachhako

1 From Cunningham’s eye-copies on plates LIII and LVI. In the copy on plate LIII na is only partly legible, in the copy on plate LVI the second da has been omitted. Restore perhaps Nañoda or Nañodam.
2 Suchchajaj esta na cchajai vāchāya adadak girim
   kim hi less’ achnjantassa vāchāya adadak pabhataṁ
The second line is obviously spoiled.
3 What Barua and Sinha remark for the explanation of dusito can be passed over in silence.
4 Cunningham’s inscription No. 70 (List 981) appears to be identical with his inscription No. 79 (List 791), mentioned amongst the three inscriptions found on displaced pillars. It is very improbable, that there should have existed two labels with the same text.
5 From Cunningham’s eye-copies Plate LIV No. 70 and 79. Cunningham read Dodapāpekena charo in No. 70, and nañoda pāde chena chhako in No. 79. The first akṣara, which has been omitted in No. 70, is marked as damaged in No. 79. The right half of the cross-bar of ko is wanting in No. 70. Hultsch followed Cunningham in reading chenachhako, but the first akṣara can only be dha.
TRANSLATION:

The dhenachhaka (?) at the foot of (Mount) Naḍoda.

Barua-Sinha boldly identify dhenachhako with dhonasākho which in J. 353, 4 seems to be a name of the banyan tree. The meaning of dhonasākha is obscure. Instead of dhona- the Ceylonese manuscripts read also yona- and dona-, the Burmese manuscripts constantly vena-, and I should consider it not quite improbable that the original reading was ponasākha=Sk. pravonasākhaḥ, 'with sloping branches'. But even granting that dhena- of the inscription is a misreading for dhona-, or that dhona- of the Pāli text is a corruption of dhena-, it seems to me impossible that -chhako should be the equivalent of P. -sākha, Sk. -sākhaḥ. As we know from the inscriptions Nos. B 73 and B 74 several things producing miracles such as a jambū tree granting food and a tattered cloth that could be milked, existed on Mount Naḍoda, and one might be tempted to take dhenachhako as a misreading for dhenuchhako, which may represent dhenūtsakah, the 'cow-well', i.e. a well which yielded milk like a cow; but in the absence of the sculpture all conjectures are practically futile.
3. B 77-78 INSCRIPTIONS ATTACHED TO THE REPRESENTATIONS OF CHAṆKAMAS

B 77 (696); PLATES XXIII, XLVI


TEXT:

Daḍanikamo chakama

TRANSLATION:

The walk Daḍanikama (*Dṝṣṭhanishkrama:* of Strong Exertion).

Cunningham's explanation of *Daḍanikama* need not be discussed. Hultzsch doubtfully rendered it by Sk. *Dāyaṇānīkrama,* Barua by *Dṝṣṭhanīkrama,* referring to the term *dāhānīkama,* an epithet of the solitary monk in *Sr̥n.* 68, which in the corresponding passage of the *Mv.* (I, 357) is replaced by *dṝṣṭhanīkrama.* As in the Bṛhaṇīt inscriptions the *anusvāra* is generally omitted and *dha* is written as *da,* phonetically both explanations would seem to be equally good, but Barua's is certainly the more plausible one. But his translation of the inscription 'the walk wherefrom the egress is difficult' is impossible, as *dāhā* cannot have the meaning 'difficult.' Pāli *dāhānīkama* means 'of strong exertion' and if *dādanikama* in the label is the same word, it must have the same meaning, although at first sight it is a little difficult to conceive how in that case it could be the designation of a *chaṇkama,* a terraced walk. Perhaps the sculpture will help us to understand the term.

The centre of the relief is occupied by the *chaṇkama* decked with *paṭṭanaṅgulīkas* and flowers. In front are two colossal heads of demons with a large hand between them. Between these heads and the *chaṇkama* lies a bundle of fagots, apparently burning. On the left side of the bundle a snake is visible, and a lizard on the right side of it. In the background just above the *chaṇkama* four lions appear (of three of these only the heads can be seen). On the right side stands a well-dressed man with folded hands followed by four men dressed in the same fashion. In the left corner a man sits on the ground with his head leaning on his left hand. In his right hand he holds a small stick pointed to the ground.

Barua has identified the sculpture with the *Uragajātaka,* No. 354 of the Pāli collection. The *Jātaka* belongs to the class of the stories intended to drive away the grief (*sokāpanodana*). The Bodhisattva is born as a brahmin who lives together with his wife, his son, his daughter, his daughter-in-law and a female servant. One day he is working on his field together with his son. When the son is burning some rubbish, he is bitten by a poisonous snake and dies. The brahmin is unmoved. He sends for his family and the servant. When they have arrived, they burn the body, but not a single tear is shed by any one. On account of their virtue Sakka's throne manifests signs of heat. He resolves to reward their equanimity by
filling their house with the seven treasures, after having uttered the lion's roar. Standing
by the side of the funeral pyre he asks by turns the Bodhisattva and the four females why
they do not weep and is highly pleased with their answers which all tend to show the futility
of grief. According to Barua the burning fagots in the sculpture represent the heap of
rubbish burnt by the brahmin's son and at the same time his funeral pyre. The snake is the
snake that has caused his death and what I take to be a lizard is declared to be the corpse
of the youth. The person sitting in the proper right corner is supposed to be Sakka, while the
four lions are said to symbolize his lion's roar. The persons standing on the left side are
identified with the brahmin and the four female members of his family, and the chaṅkama
which Barua, following a remark by Cunningham, takes to be an altar 'is designed as a
protection of fire against the wind and signifies symbolically...a dividing line between the
living and the dead'.

Vogel has already remarked that this interpretation of the sculpture is impossible.
Apart from the fact that the heads of the demons are ignored, that the explanation of the
chaṅkama is certainly wrong and that the symbolization of Sakka's lion's roar is highly
improbable, the five standing persons cannot represent the brahmin and the four female
members of his household as all of them are clearly characterized by their turbans as male
persons. Nor can the seated figure be Sakka. A man in the same attitude is found in
the relief on Pl. XXXVII, (cf. B 26), fig. on the left, and it cannot be doubted that there
Māra is represented as mourning, while all the other gods are rejoicing at the birth of the
Bodhisattva. The attitude is quite in keeping with the description of Māra in literary
sources after his defeat by the Buddha. 'Then ', it is said in the S. I, 124, ' Māra, the Evil one,
went away from that place and sat down on the earth with crossed legs, not very far from
the Holy one, silent, discontented, with his shoulders falling and his face bent down, down-cast,
bewildered, scratching the earth with a piece of wood' (atha kho Māra pāpimā... tambā śīhāp
apa-kkamma Bhagavato avidūre pathaviyaṁ pallaṅkana nisīdi tuṇhībhiṁ maṁkubhūto pallakkhando adhomukho
pajjhayanto oppatiibhiṁno kaṭṭhena bhūmiṁ vilikhanto). The same description is found in the
Laññav. and the Mvu. with the only difference that in the Mvu. an arrow (kāṅda) takes
the place of the piece of wood (kāśśika). Mvu. II, 283: Māra ca pāpimāṁ duḥkhi dumarshalla
saṁsajjāyo antakālyapariṇāmaṇaṁ ekamante pradhyāye kāṅgana bhūmiṁ vilikhanto; II, 349: Māra
ca duvannā āsa kāṅgana likhate maṁṭhīṁ vajjīvaṁ 'smi devadēnaṁ sākṣiyāṁśaṁ tāpiṁ; III, 381: Māra
pāpimāṁ Bhagavato avidūre saṁsajjāyo abhūthi duḥkhi duvannā vilikhanto vilikhanto. Laññav. 378: atha
khuḷā Māraḥ pāpīyaṁ... ekamante prakrāmayaṁ sthitā prabho duṅkhī 

In the Nīdānakathā (J. II, 78) Māra is spoken of as sitting at the corner of a road and
meditating on the sixteen points in which he is not equal to the Buddha by drawing lines on
the sand until his three daughters arrive and enquire after the cause of his grief. In the
Māra- and Bhikkhuṇiṣaṁyutta of the S. (IV; V) it is regularly stated that Māra is plunged
into grief whenever one of his many attacks on the Buddha or some monk or some men has
turned out unsuccessful. The representation of the mourning Māra apparently was con-
ventional, and we may be sure that in our sculpture also the deserted person drawing figures
on the ground was at once rightly understood as Māra by every Buddhist. We may further
assume that the cause of his depression apparent in the relief is the fact that he has failed to
subdue some saint meditating on the chaṅkama. The saint, of course, does not appear in the
relief, as neither the Buddha nor Buddhist clericals are ever represented in the sculptures

¹ There is not the slightest evidence that the figure wearing a turban in the relief Pl. XLVIII, II is
a female as asserted by Barua.
of this time. But the means by which Māra tried to inspire him with fear, stupefication and horripilation and to disturb him in his concentration, as it is often said in the Suttas, appear to be indicated by the lions, the demons and probably also by the burning fagot, the snake and the lizard. Similar phantoms are mentioned in the accounts of Māra’s combat against the Buddha in the Nidānakathā, the Mū., the Lalitav. and Aśvaghosha’s Buddhacarita. Here also we read of monsters with tongues drawn out or with spike-like ears, of lions and lion-faced demons, of poisonous snakes and demons spitting out serpents, of showers of live embers and blazing straw. And just as the gods came to praise the Buddha, when Māra was vanquished, so here five gods, probably Sakka and the four Lokapālas, have come to offer their congratulations. We do not know the name of the saint whose victory over Māra is commemorated in the sculpture, but it may be easily imagined that the chaṅkama where he had gained the upper hand was called after the strong exertion he had displayed on that occasion. We know from the Chinese pilgrims that many chaṅkamas of Buddhhas and Arhats of the past were shown in their time in India. Evidently the Dadhānikkama chaṅkama as well as the Tikotika chaṅkama (B 78) belonged to this class of time-honoured monuments.

Chaṅkama probably has been at first the designation of a levelled and cleaned spot on which the monks walked up and down in meditation. The word is taken thus, for instance, by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg in the translation of Mahāv. 5, 1, 13 ff. (SBE XVII, p. 7). But certainly already in the canonical texts the chaṅkama is also a place for walking built with great care. In the Mū. 3, 3, 6 f. chaṅkama is mentioned in the list of constructions which a layman erects on behalf of the order, and from the statements in the Chullav. 5, 14, 2 it appears that the chaṅkama was a raised promenade place, lined with bricks, stones, or wood and furnished with staircases and railings. Chaṅkamas of this kind are mentioned apparently also in the Suttas, as here we read often about stepping on the chaṅkama and of descending from the chaṅkama: vihārā nikkhamma chaṅkamaṁ abbhūṭṭhāsi D. 1, 103; chaṅkamā olohiṁ paṇiṁnte āsane nissidi Sn. I, 212. Also the huts of leaves for ascetics were furnished with raised promenade places. In J. II, 273 we are told that the king allows an ascetic to live in his park 'paṇṇaśālaṁ kāretā chaṅkamaṁ māpetu'. In J. V, 132 is described how Jotipāla steps forth from the hut in his hermitage built by Sakka, how he mounts on the place for promenade and enters into meditation while walking up and down: paṇṇaśālāya nikkhamiṁcha chaṅkamam āruṇaṁ kātipayavo avaraṇa chaṅkami. The erection of such chaṅkamas for the use of monks is also testified by the inscriptions. The Kanheri inscription No. 998 of my List mentions the donation of a cave, a water cistern, a number of benches to sit on, a chair (pīṭha) and a walk (chaṅkama).

Such chaṅkamas, however, have also been erected as memorials on such places where the Buddha or his predecessors were supposed to have walked up and down. Hsuan-tsang (Beal II, p. 48; Watters II, p. 52) reports that on the site of Rishipatana a chaṅkama of four Buddhhas of former times was shown. It was about 50 steps long and seven feet high and consisted of dark blue stones. On it a statue of the Tathāgata was standing. In I-tsing’s Kiu-fa-kao-seng-chuan (Chavannes, Religieux Eminents, p. 96) it is mentioned that in Nālandā a chaṅkama of the Buddha existed. It was about 2 ells broad, 14 or 15 ells long and more than 2 ells high. It was decorated with lotus flowers made out of white lime in order to mark the steps of the Buddha. According to the inscriptions Nos. 918, 919 and 925 of my List there was in Bāraṇaśi and in Śrīvaśti as well a chaṅkama of the Buddha on which the monk Bala

1 S. I, 129: bhayaṁ ekhambhītattanñā lojanānissanā uppādetukāmo samādhīṁcha chaṅkamaṁ.
2 As Hsuan-tsang mentions (Beal I, p. 183; Watters I, p. 311), steps of the former four Buddhhas were also shown in the neighbourhood of Mathurā. Probably also in this case ‘the steps’ are to be regarded as chaṅkamas.
erected a statue of a Bodhisattva in the first years of Kanishka’s reign. According to the legend of the Nidānakathā (f. I, 77 f.) the Buddha, after his enlightenment, built for himself, between the Bodhi tree and the Animisachetiya, a chāṇakama of jewels running from west to east on which he walked up and down for a period of seven days1. The place was known as Ratanachāṇakamaachetiya. Fa-hien (Legge p. 88 f.) mentions this Chaitya in his description of Gayā. Hsuan-tsang (Beal II, p. 122; Watters II, p. 119 f.) says that in later times a wall of bricks, more than three feet high, was erected at the walk. This wall has been preserved till today. Cunningham (Mahābodhi, p. 8 ff.) has found on the northern side of the Bodhi-temple a plain wall of bricks, 53 feet long, 3 feet six inches broad, and somewhat more than three feet high. On each side were the fragments of 11 bases meant for the fixing of octagonal pillars. So the brick construction once must have been roofed.

Cunningham recognized such a chāṇkama with a roof in the relief depicted on Pl. XXXI 4 of Stīh. and Pl. V 1 of his book Mahābodhi (cf. ibid. p. 9 f.). The relief shows an open hall, supported by octagonal pillars. It has an upper storey on the balcony of which three arched doors lead. A roof crowned by pinnacles vaults above the whole construction. Through the entire length of the building a block of stone is extended, decorated on the surface with flowers and in front with paṭākahālīkas. The long block is divided in four parts by the pillars standing in front. Cunningham, Stīh., p. 121, once assumed that here the seats of four Buddhas were represented. But this division of the block is only apparent. St. Kramrisch wants to see in the relief, as Barua writes in Barh. II, p. 25, a representation of the ratana-chaṅkama which the Buddha built for himself. Against this view speaks the fact that the presence of the Buddha is not hinted at by his steps as we should expect. Cunningham indeed was of the opinion that the flowers on the surface of the chaṅkama were meant to indicate the places touched by the feet of the Buddha. Therefore, according to him, they are arranged in two rows to mark the steps on the right and the left side. I am not able to discover anything of such a regular arrangement. Besides, the flowers are intermingled with twigs. These flowers and twigs are apparently tokens of worship offered by the devotees here as well as on the stone seats under the Bodhi trees. On the front side of these stone seats, just as on our chaṅkama, the paṭākahālīkas sometimes appear. Therefore I am of the opinion that not the chaṅkama of the Buddha but a chaṅkamaachetiya, built as a memorial on the scene of the event, is represented. The building depicted should by the way be more rightly called a chaṅkamaśālā. This expression, besides chaṅkama, is to be found in the list of buildings for the order in the Mahā 3, 5, 6 f. It is used according to the Chulā 5, 14, 2 to designate a hall for walking, protected against heat and cold, which apparently means that it is provided with a roof. In any case, however, more simple, raised, but not roofed chaṅkamas were built as chaityas, and representations of two such chaṅkamas are preserved at Bhār hut.

B 78 (765); PLATES XXIII, XLVII


TEXT:

Tikoṭiko chaṅkama

1 Also when visiting Kapilavastu, the Buddha creates by magic a chaṅkama in the air on which he performs the yamakapāṭṭhāraṇya. See the relief on the Northern gate of the Stūpa of Sālāchā.
Translation:

The walk Tikotika (triangular).

In the left corner of the medallion is a chankama of triangular form decorated with floral designs. The recess in the middle is filled by a three-headed serpent. Near the chankama are two trees and a water-trough. In the lower left quarter are two lions and the whole of the right half is occupied by a herd of seven elephants in the attitude of feeding, drinking and throwing their trunks backwards. Cunningham took the sculpture as a representation of the Nagaloka. It is unnecessary to discuss this assumption which is based on perfectly impossible explanations of tikotiko and chakamo. Barua-Sinha’s attempt to interpret the bas-relief by a Jatuka invented for the occasion has been refuted already by Vogel, JRAS. 1927, p. 594 ff. Barua’s later suggestion that the medallion represents the lake near Benares in which the Buddha used to wash his clothes is incompatible with the clear meaning of the label. I quite agree with him that, like the dađanikama walk, the triangular walk also is some monument associated with some legend which is not known to us.

1 Tikotiko naturally cannot have anything to do with Triśaṭa. Its meaning can only be ‘triangular’. Hultsch, IA., i.e., note 47: “Triśaṭa hotya yasya sabh, ‘triangular’”. By chance kofi just in connection with chankamana occurs in J. III, 85, 8; IV, 329, 5.
9. B 79-82 FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTIONS REFERRING TO THE JĀTAKAS OR RELIGIOUS LEGENDS

B 79 (894)*; PLATE XXIII


TEXT:

... ... [da] Himavate i ... ... ... ...

TRANSLATION:

...on the Himavata (Himavat)....

According to Barua-Sinha it is doubtful whether this inscription is ‘a votive or a Jātaka label’. The only readable word Himavate reminds one of the stories connected with mountain Naḍoda treated under B 73 ff. Some remarkable event which took place on the Himālaya may have been depicted on the lost relief to which this inscription originally belonged.

B 80 (897)**; PLATE XXIII


TEXT:

... ... [n]iyajātaka

TRANSLATION:

The Jātaka of ... ... niya.

The inscription records the name of some Jātaka. Barua restores the label to Bhojājānīya-Jātakañ, the title of the J. 23 in the Pāli collection. After having found out that the Bhojājānīyajātaka relates the tale of a thorough-bred Sindh horse, he connects the label with a small fragment of the coping-stone (Cunningham, *StBh.* Pl. XLV, 1; Barua, *Barh.* Vol. III (1937), Pl. LXXI, 90) where at the left corner the head and the forefoot of a horse are visible, and gives the Bhojājānīyajātaka as identified in his list of identified reliefs. But, according to Lüders, the restoration of the inscription as proposed by Barua is quite arbitrary. The n in niya is fragmentary and -iya at the end of titles of the Jātakas in the Bhārhat labels is common. It is found in about one-third of the total number of cases. So this identification is nothing more than an unfounded supposition.

---
* The treatment of Lüders of this inscription has not been recovered.
** The treatment of Lüders of this inscription has been lost. The reading is according to the eye-copy of Cunningham.
* E.g. Magnādevīya, Bhisaharaniya, Chhadamātiya, Isisimgiya, Viturapunakiya, Mugaphakiya, Yavamajhakiya.
B 81 (902)*; PLATE XXIII


TEXT:
1 (Ba)huhathika āsana
2 (bhaga)vato Mahādevasa

TRANSLATION:
The seat Bahuhathika (‘where there are many elephants’) of the holy Mahādeva.

This fragmentary inscription, of which only an eye-copy by Cunningham is known, stood on a sculpture the whereabouts of which are not known. The restoration at the beginning of each line can be regarded as certain.

Cunningham remarks that the relief depicted a throne (āsana) with a number of human hands (bahuhathika) on the front side. Bahuhathika, however, certainly does not refer to the hands, which are nothing else than the normal pañcakaṅgalikas. It must have the same meaning as bahuhathika of B 70 and B 71 where we found it as the name of the holy nyagrodha tree on mountain Naḍoda, and it is likely that the seat and the tree represent the same locality. Cunningham indeed does not say anything of a tree; but from his silence it cannot be concluded that a tree has not been present on the relief as stone seats usually are not depicted without a tree standing behind. Cunningham really did not intend to give a full description of the sculpture. He was only interested in the explanation of the word āsana and bahuhathika.

Bhagavat Mahādeva to whom the stone seat is here ascribed can scarcely be someone else than the historical Buddha who according to B 62 was qualified by this epithet. Therefore, if the identification of Bahuhathika āsana with Bahuhathiko nigodho is right, the person of the Buddha must have played also a role in the legends located on mountain Naḍoda.

B 82 (903 a)*; PLATES XXIII, XLVII


TEXT:
[rā]ma...

Barua-Sinha read the inscription as himan(i) and doubtfully restore it to himāni-chānkako “the snowy resort”. It is quite unintelligible how this restoration could be made.

---

1 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription is missing in the manuscript. Our explanation is based on his remarks i.e.
2 The readings given by Cunningham on p. 143 (Ba)huhathikasa and Mahe Deasas are only erroneous.
3 Ramaprasad Chanda wants to explain Mahādeva as a tree-deity. Now the attribute bhagavati is indeed applied also to lower deities, e.g. to a Nāga in the Mathurā inscription No. 85 of my List; by the Buddhists, however, it seems to have been given only to the Buddha.
4 Lüders’ treatment of this inscription has not been recovered. The text given below is based on his remarks i.e.
5 From the photograph in StBh.
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reading is very uncertain—on the photograph only ma can be made out clearly,—and the medallion represents evidently two men engaged in a wrestling match. The explanation as chaṭṭikama has been given up by Barua later on, and replaced by another one, not less queer. In Barh. II, p. 171, he explains the medallion as showing two men lying on the ground embracing each other, placing neck upon neck, and intertwining their upper legs. The background is filled with a number of lotus flowers. According to Barua these are snowflakes which signify that the men are sleeping on a snowy ground and embracing each other as a means of putting off the cold. ‘The scene, as it is, betrays only a decorative purpose’. I think it unnecessary to add any comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>687 A 1</td>
<td>724 B 43</td>
<td>761 A 74</td>
<td>798 A 25</td>
<td>834 A 93</td>
<td>870 A 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 A 2</td>
<td>725 A 21</td>
<td>762 A 61</td>
<td>799 A 46</td>
<td>835 A 31</td>
<td>871 A 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689 A 129</td>
<td>726 B 7</td>
<td>763 A 8</td>
<td>800 A 73</td>
<td>836 A 49</td>
<td>872 A 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 A 70</td>
<td>727 A 94</td>
<td>764 A 52</td>
<td>801 B 19</td>
<td>837 A 19</td>
<td>873 A 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691 A 57</td>
<td>728 A 22</td>
<td>765 B 78</td>
<td>802 B 53</td>
<td>838 A 18</td>
<td>874 A 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692 B 63</td>
<td>729 A 98</td>
<td>766 A 65</td>
<td>803 A 124</td>
<td>839 A 20</td>
<td>875 A 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693 B 69</td>
<td>730 B 47</td>
<td>767 A 6</td>
<td>804 A 54</td>
<td>840 A 76</td>
<td>876 A 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694 B 50</td>
<td>731 B 32</td>
<td>768 A 66</td>
<td>805 B 35</td>
<td>841 A 77</td>
<td>877 A 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695 B 42</td>
<td>732 B 33</td>
<td>769 B 52</td>
<td>806 A 43</td>
<td>842 A 67</td>
<td>878 A 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696 B 77</td>
<td>733 B 34</td>
<td>770 B 8</td>
<td>806a A 44</td>
<td>843 A 109</td>
<td>879 A 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697 B 64</td>
<td>734 A 95</td>
<td>771 B 9</td>
<td>807 B 59</td>
<td>844 A 108</td>
<td>880 A 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698 B 48</td>
<td>735 B 6</td>
<td>772 A 80</td>
<td>808 A 26</td>
<td>845 A 96</td>
<td>881 B 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699 B 68</td>
<td>736 B 4</td>
<td>773 A 59</td>
<td>809 A 7</td>
<td>846 A 105</td>
<td>882 A 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 B 41</td>
<td>737 B 5</td>
<td>774 B 40</td>
<td>810 B 51</td>
<td>846a A 111</td>
<td>883 A 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 B 54</td>
<td>738 A 62</td>
<td>775 B 21</td>
<td>811 B 12</td>
<td>847 A 101</td>
<td>884 B 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 B 65</td>
<td>739 B 23</td>
<td>776 B 22</td>
<td>812 A 17</td>
<td>848 A 88</td>
<td>885 A 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 B 46</td>
<td>740 B 24</td>
<td>777 B 18</td>
<td>813 A 33</td>
<td>849 A 110</td>
<td>886 A 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 B 45</td>
<td>741 B 25</td>
<td>778 A 29</td>
<td>814 B 20</td>
<td>850 A 64</td>
<td>887 A 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705 A 5</td>
<td>742 B 26</td>
<td>779 B 13</td>
<td>815 A 78</td>
<td>851 A 79</td>
<td>888 A 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 B 58</td>
<td>743 B 27</td>
<td>780 A 30</td>
<td>816 A 15</td>
<td>852 A 45</td>
<td>889 A 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 B 73</td>
<td>744 B 28</td>
<td>781 A 35</td>
<td>817 A 57</td>
<td>853 A 90</td>
<td>890 A 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 B 74</td>
<td>745 B 29</td>
<td>782 A 16</td>
<td>818 A 13</td>
<td>854 A 115</td>
<td>891 A 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709 B 56</td>
<td>746 B 30</td>
<td>783 B 15</td>
<td>819 A 11</td>
<td>855 A 92</td>
<td>892 A 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 B 67</td>
<td>747 B 31</td>
<td>784 A 32</td>
<td>820 A 10</td>
<td>856 A 56</td>
<td>893 A 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 B 75</td>
<td>748 B 60</td>
<td>785 A 49</td>
<td>821 A 120</td>
<td>857 A 55</td>
<td>894 A 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 A 34</td>
<td>749 B 61</td>
<td>786 B 55</td>
<td>822 A 114</td>
<td>858 A 41</td>
<td>895 A 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 A 38</td>
<td>750 B 38</td>
<td>787 A 60</td>
<td>823 A 118</td>
<td>859 A 55</td>
<td>896 A 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 B 14</td>
<td>751 B 39</td>
<td>788 B 66</td>
<td>824 A 81</td>
<td>860 A 28</td>
<td>897 B 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 A 68</td>
<td>752 B 36</td>
<td>789 A 39</td>
<td>825 B 44</td>
<td>861 A 23</td>
<td>898 A 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716 A 71</td>
<td>753 B 37</td>
<td>790 B 10</td>
<td>826 A 119</td>
<td>862 A 122</td>
<td>899 A 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717 B 11</td>
<td>754 B 71</td>
<td>791 B 76</td>
<td>827 A 102</td>
<td>863 A 91</td>
<td>900 A 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 A 42</td>
<td>755 B 70</td>
<td>792 A 58</td>
<td>828 A 84</td>
<td>864 A 82</td>
<td>901 B 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 A 14</td>
<td>756 B 72</td>
<td>793 B 2</td>
<td>829 A 85</td>
<td>865 A 83</td>
<td>902 B 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 A 12</td>
<td>757 A 136</td>
<td>794 B 1</td>
<td>830 A 86</td>
<td>866 A 106</td>
<td>903 A 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 A 50</td>
<td>758 A 123</td>
<td>795 B 3</td>
<td>831 A 72</td>
<td>867 A 57</td>
<td>903a B 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 B 16</td>
<td>759 A 40</td>
<td>796 A 27</td>
<td>832 A 89</td>
<td>868 A 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723 A 24</td>
<td>760 B 17</td>
<td>797 A 51</td>
<td>833 A 63</td>
<td>869 A 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A. Aṅguttaranikāya, ed. Morris, Hardy, PTS
Am. Amarakośa, ed. Chintamani Shastri Thatte, Bombay 1882
AO. Acta Orientalia
ASIAR = Archaeological Survey of India. Annual Reports
ASIM = Archaeological Survey of India. Memoirs
ASR. = Archaeological Survey Reports
ASSI. = Archaeological Survey of Southern India
ASWI. = Archaeological Survey of Western India
Avā. = Avadānaśātaka, ed. Speyer
       (I—Stone as a Story-Teller,  
       II—Jātaka-scenes,  
       III—Aspects of life and Art.) Indian Research Institute's Publications. Fine  
Barua = see Barh. and BI
BB. = Bezenbenchers Beiträge: Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen,  
      Göttingen 1877-1906
BEFEO. = Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient. Hanoi
Bhārh. = Lüders, Heinrich, Bhārutt und die buddhistische Literatur. Leipzig 1941  
       (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXVI, 3)
BhV. = Kala, Satish Chandra, Bharut Vedikā, Municipal Museum, Allahabad 1951
BI. = Barua, Benimadhab, and Sinha, Kumar Gangananda, Barhut Inscriptions, edited  
      and translated with critical notes. Calcutta 1926
Bu. = Buddhavāmaśa, ed. Morris, PTS
Cat. = Anderson, J., Catalogue and Handbook of the Archaeological Collections in  
      the Indian Museum, Pt. 1, Calcutta 1883
Chullar. = Chullavagga, ed. Oldenberg
CII. = Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum
CPD. = Critical Pāli Dictionary
D. = Dīghanikāya, ed. Rhys Davids, Carpenter, PTS
DA. = Suttavigalavilāsinī (Commentary to the Dīghanikāya), ed. Rhys Davids, Carpenter,  
      Stede, PTS
DhA. = Dhammapada Atthakathā (Commentary to the Dhammapada), ed. Smith,  
      Norman, PTS
DhsA. = Atthasālīna (Commentary to Dhammasaṅgāni), ed. Müller, PTS
Divy. = Divyāvadāna, ed. Cowell-Neil
El. = Epigraphia Indica
GN. = Nachrichten der Akademie (Gesellschaft) der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
Hal. = Halāyudha Abhidhānaratnamālā, ed. Aufrecht
Hariv. = Harivansha
Hem. = Hemachandra
Hem. An. = Anckārthasamāgra
Hem. Abh. = Ahñābhāñachintāmaṇī
HOS. = Harvard Oriental Series
IA. = Indian Antiquary
IHQ. = Indian Historical Quarterly
J. = Jātaka, ed. Faussbøll
JA. = Journal Asiatique
JAOS. = Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBS. = Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society
JPTS. = Journal of the Pāli Text Society
JPASB. = Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta
JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
Lalitav. = Lalitavistara, ed. Lefmann
M. = Majjhimanikāya, ed. Trenckner, PTS
Mahābodhi = Cunningham, A., Mahābodhi, or the Great Buddhist Temple at Bodhagaha, London, 1892
Mahān. = Mahāmāyūrī, ed. S. von Oldenburg
Mahān. = Mahāvagga, ed. Oldenberg
MASI. = Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India
Mbh. = Mahābhārata
Mil. = Millindapañha, ed. Trenckner
Mep. = Mahāvyutpatti, ed. Minayeff
Mev. = Mahāvastu, ed. Senart
P. = Pāli
PASB. = Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta
PD. = Childers, Pāli Dictionary
PTS. = Pāli Text Society
PTSD = The Pāli Text Society’s Pāli-English Dictionary
S. = Saññiyuttanikāya, ed. Feer, PTS
SA. = Sāratthapakāsīnī (Comm. to the Saññiyuttanikāya), ed. Woodward, PTS
Śīnuśī. = Sāntiśātaka, ed. K. Schönfeld, Leipzig 1910
SBE = Sacred Books of the East, ed. M. Müller
Ś. Br. = Śātapattra-Brāhmaṇa, ed. Weber
Sk. = Sanskrit
Sn. = Suttanipāta, ed. Andersen-Smith, PTS
SnA. = Paramatthajojākā (Comm. to Suttanipāta), ed. H. Smith, PTS
SFW. = Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
St Bh. = Cunningham, A., The Stūpa of Bhārhat: A Buddhist Monument Ornamented with Numerous Sculptures Illustrative of Buddhist Legend and History in the Third Century B.C., London 1879
Suttav. = Suttavibhāga, ed. Oldenberg
Th. = Theragāthā, ed. Oldenberg, PTS
Tovv. = H. Kern, Toevogeselen op ’t Woordenboek van Childers; 2 pts (Verhandelingen Kon. Ak. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam N.R. XVI, 4-5), Amsterdam 1916
Trik. = Trikāṇḍaśeṣa
Ud. = Udāna, ed. Steinhall, PTS
Vajj. = Vaijyantī, ed. Oppert 1893
Vim. = Visuddhimagga, ed. Rhys Davids, PTS
Vv. = Vīmānavatthu, ed. E.R. Gooneratne, PTS
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

VoA. = Vimāṇavatthu-Atthakathā, ed. Hardy, PTS
WZeM. = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII. = Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik
THE BHĀRHUT INSCRIPTIONS ALPHABETICALLY ARRANGED

Agirakhitasa Bhojakaṭakasa suchi dānāṁ A 23 (861)
Ajakālako yako B 3 (795)
Ajātasaṭu bhagavato vāṃdate B 40 (774)
Atimutasa dānāṁ A 81 (824)
Abode cātikṣāṁ B 69 (693)
aya-Apikinakasa dānāṁ A 67 (842)
aya-Isidinasa bhānakasa dānāṁ A 62 (738)
aya-Gorakhitasa thabo dānāṁ A 68 (715)
aya-Chulasasutaṁtikasa Bhogavadhaniyasa dānāṁ A 51 (797)
aya-Jātasa pēṭakino suchi dānāṁ A 56 (856)
aya-Nārinda . . . . A 69 (886)
aya-Nāgadevasa dānāṁ A 70 (690)
aya-Panṭhakasa thambho dānāṁ A 71 (716)
aya-Punavasuno suchi dānāṁ A 72 (831)
Arahaguto devaputo B 20 (814)
Alaṁbusā achhaṛā B 31 (747)
Avāśikā . . . . A 126 (887)
Avisanasa dānāṁ A 82 (864)
Avisanasa dānāṁ A 83 (865)
Aṣaṭā vadhū susāne sigālaṁati B 64 (697)
Asitamasāya Valamītasa dānāṁ A 36 (877)
Idasālaguha B 35 (805)
Isānasā dānā A 84 (828)
Isānasā dānā A 85 (829)
Isidatasa dānāṁ A 86 (830)
isimigo jataka B 48 (698)
Isirakhitasa dānāṁ A 88 (848)
Isirakhitasa suchi dānāṁ A 87 (868)
Iṣisirīgiya jata(ka)ṁ B 53 (802)
Ujjhikāye dānā A 114 (822)
utaraṁ disa tinī savagānissā B 25 (741)
udajataka B 46 (703)
usu(kāro) Janako rājā Sivala devi B 56 (709)
Erapato nāgarajā B 36 (752)
Erapato nāgarājā bhagavato vādate B 37 (753)
Kachulaya . . . . . . bhāriyāya dānāṁ A 115 (854)
Kāḍarikī B 60 (748)
Kanhiłasa bhānakasa dānāṁ A 63 (833)
Karahaṅkaṭa aya-Bhutakasa thabho dānāṁ A 8 (763)
Karahaṅkaṭa Uttaragidhikasa thabho dānāṁ A 7 (809)
Karahaṅkaṭa-nīgamasa dāṇā A 5 (705)
Karahaṅkaṭa Samikasa dāna thabho A 6 (767)
Kākaṁdiya Somāya bhīchhuniya dānāṁ A 37 (817)
kinarajātaikaṁ B 54 (701)
Kupirote yakho B 1 (794)
Koḍāya yakhiyā dānam A 116 (871)
Kosabakūti B 33 (732)
Kosabeyekaya bhikhuṇiye Venuvagimiyāya Dhamarakhitayā dānam A 52 (764)
Ko . . . dalākiye yo dana ṭanachakamāparirepo A 127 (903)
Gaṅgito yakho B 5 (737)
gajājātaika saso jātaka B 42a
gadhakūti B 34 (733)
Gāgamitasa suci dānam A 89 (832)
Golāyi Pārikniyā dānam A 49 (836)
Gosālasa dānam A 90a (853)
Ghosāye dānam A 117 (872)
Chakavāko nāgarājā B 6 (735)
Chadā yakhi B 2 (793)
Chāndā . . . A 128 (889)
chitupādasila B 67 (710)
Chudaṭhiliyā Kujarāya dānam A 10 (820)
Chudaṭhiliyā Nāgadevāyā bhukuniyā (dānam A 11 (819)
Chulakokā devatā B 11 (717)
Chuladhakasa Purikaya bhutudesakasa dānam A 17 (812)
Chulanaṇa dānam A 91 (863)
Chekulana Saghāmitasa thabho dānam A 40 (759)
chhadarāṇiya jātakam B 49 (785)
jaṭilasabhā B 65 (702)
jabū Naḍode pavaite B 74 (708)
Jethabhadrasa dānam A 92 (855)
Jetavana Anādhipedīko deṭi koṭisahathena ketā B 32 (731)
Tikoṭiko chakamo B 78 (765)
tiramitimidilakuchhimha Vasuguto māchito Mahadevānam B 62 (881)
Tis[a]yā Benākaṭikāya dān[a] A 49a
Tosālasa mātā A 90b (853)
dakhināṁ disa chha Kāmavacharasahasāni B 26 (742)
Daḍanikamo chakama B 77 (696)
Daḥṭiṇikāya Mahamukhiṣa dhitu Badhikaya bhichhuniya dānam A 42 (718)
Dighatapasi sice anusāsat B 63 (692)
Dusito giri dadati Na . . . B 75 (711 and 901)
Devarakhitasa dānam A 93 (834)
Dhanabhūtisa rājano putasa kamārasa Vādhapālasa dānam A 3 (869)
Dhamaguta-matu Pusadevaya dānam A 120 (821)
Dhamagutasa dānam thabho A 94 (727)
(Dha)marakhitaya dāna suci A 118 (823)
Dhamarakhitasa dānam A 95 (734)
Dhutasa suci dāno A 96 (845)
[Na]garakhitasa cha mātu cha Kamuchukaye dānam A 54b
Nādodapāde dhenachhako A 76 (781 and 791)
Nadagirino bhānakasā Selapurakasa thabho dānaṁ A 54 (804)
Nadutaraya dāna suchi A 119 (826)
Namdagirino dā(naṁ) A 97 (898)
Namdinagarikayā Īdadevāya dānaṁ A 45 (852)
nāgājātaka B 43 (724)
Nāgaye bhichhuniye dānaṁ A 74 (761)
Nāsika Gorakhitiya thabho dānaṁ Vasukasa bhāriyaya 46 A(799)
Paḍelakasa Pusakasa suchi dānaṁ A 47 (876)
Padumāvati acchharā B 30 (746)
Parakaṭikayā Sirimāyā dāṇaṁ A 48 (878)
Pāṭaliputā Koḍiyāniya Śaṅkaṭadevāya dānaṁ A 15 (816)
Pāṭaliputā Nāgasenāyā Koḍiyāniya dānaṁ A 14 (719)
Pāṭaliputā Mahādesasana dānaṁ A 13 (818)
purathimāṁ d jīsa Sudhāvāsā devā B 24 (740)
Purikāya Īdadevāya dānaṁ A 19 (837)
Purikāya dāyaśaka dānaṁ A 16 (782)
Purikāya Setakamātū dānaṁ A 18 (838)
Purikāya Śāmāya dānaṁ A 20 (839)
Pusadataye Nagarikayā bhichhuniye . . . . A 43 (806)
Pusadataye Nāgarikāye bhikhuniye A 44 (806a)
Pusasa thabho dānaṁ A 98 (729)
Phagudevāye bhichhuniye dānaṁ A 75 (870)
Bahaḍato Jahiranatuno Isirakhitaputasa Anamīdasa thabho A 50 (721)
(Ba)bhuhathika āsana (bhaga)vato Mahādevasa B 81 (902)
Bahuḥathiko B 71 (754)
Bahuḥathiko nigodho Nādoṭe B 70 (755)
bīḍalajatara kukuṭajātaka B 42 (695)
Bibikanadikāṭa Budhīno gahapatino dānaṁ A 21 (725)
Bibikanadikāṭa Suladhasa asavārikāsa dānaṁ A 22 (728)
Budharakhitasa pariha-nekāyikasa dānaṁ A 57 (867)
Budharakhitasa rupakārakasa dānaṁ A 55 (857)
Budharakhitaye dānaṁ bhichhuniye A 76 (840)
Bodhīgutasa dānaṁ A 99 (883)
Bṛhamadevo mānavako B 66 (788)
bhagavato īkraṁiti B 19 (801)
bhagavato Kakuśadhasa bodhi B 15 (783)
bhagavato Kasapasa bodhi B 17 (760)
bhagavato Konāgamenasa bedhi B 16 (722)
bhagavato dhāmachakaraṁ B 38 (750)
bhagavato Vipasīno bodhi B 13 (779)
bhagavato Vesaṭhunā bodhi sālo B 14 (714)
bhagavato Śakamunimo bodho B 23 (739)
bhadata-Kanakasa bhanakasa thabho dānaṁ Chikulaniyasa A 39 (789)
bhadata-Devasenasa dānaṁ A 64 (850)
bhadata-Budharakhitasa satṉpadānasa dānaṁ thabho A 58 (792)
bhadata-Mahilasa thabho dānaṁ A 65 (766)
bhadata-Samakasa thabho dānāṁ A 66 (768)
bhadata-Samikasa Therākūṭiyasa dānāṁ A 41 (858)
bhadata A-Isipālitasa bhānakasa navakamikasa dānāṁ A 59 (773)
bhadantasa Vālakasa bhanakasa dānāṁ thabho A 61 (762)
bhadantasa aya-Bhūtarakhitasa Khujatidukiyasa dānāṁ A 38 (713)
bhisharaniya jātakaṁ B 38 (706)
Bhutaye bhichhuniye dānāṁ A 77 (841)
Bhojakatākāya Diganagaye bhichhuniya dānāṁ A 24 (723)

Maghādeviyajataka B 57 (691)
Mahakoka devata B 12 (811)
Maharasa amtevāsino aya-Sāmakasa thabho dānāṁ A 73 (800)
Mahāsāmāyikāya Ṛāhaguto devaputo vokato Bhagavato sāsanī paṭisaṁādhi B 18 (777)
migajātakaṁ B 47 (730)
migasamadakarṁ chetaya B 68 (699)
Mitadevāye dānāṁ A 121 (875)
Mitasa suchi dānāṁ A 101 (847)
Mīsakosi achharā B 28 (744)
mugaphakīya jātakaṁ B 59 (807)
Mucchilido nāgarāja B 31a

Muḍasa dānāṁ A 102 (827)
Moragirami Jātamitasa dānāṁ A 26 (808)
Moragiririma Ghatīla-matu dānāṁ A 28 (860)
Moragiririma Nāgīlāyā bhikhuniyā dānāṁ thabhā A 29 (778)
Moragiririma Thupadāsāsa dānāṁ thabhā A 25 (798)
Moragiririma Pusāyā dānāṁ thabhā A 27 (796)

yam bramano avayesi jātakaṁ B 51 (810)
yakhini Sudasana B 10 (790)
Yakhilasa suchi dāna A 105 (846)
Yamāţasa sā . . . A 103 (873)
yavamaţhakīyaṁ jātakaṁ B 52 (769)
rājā Pasenāji Kosalo B 39 (751)
laţuvājataka B 44 (825)
Vijaji vijadharo B 61 (749)
Vijitakasa suchi dānāṁ A 104 (879)
Vitura-Punakīyasajātaka B 55 (786)
Viruţaţako yakho B 4 (736)
Vejaţatuto pāsāde B 22 (776)
Veţuko katha dohati Naţole pavate B 73 (707)
Vedīsa Ayamāyā dānāṁ A 33 (813)
Vedīsa Anurādhāyā dānāṁ A 32 (784)
Vedīsa Chāpadevāyā Revatimitabhāriyāya paţhamathabho dānāṁ A 34 (712)
Vedīsa Phagudevasa dānāṁ A 30 (780)
Vedīsa Vāsīthiya Velimitaṛā A 35 (885)
Vedīsato Bhūtarakhitasa dānāṁ A 31 (835)

Saţana raft . . . Agaraju . . . toranaṁ . . . A 2 (688)
Sagharaţhitasa māţpituna aţhāyā dānāṁ A 108 (844)
Saghilasa dānāṁ suchi d . . A 109 (843)
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(Sāṁ)ghamī (tasa dānāṁ) A 107 (895)
Sāṁghamītasa bodhīchakasa dānāṁ A 106 (866)
Satika . . . A 132 (890)
Śapagutaye bhūchhunīye dānāṁ A 78 (815)
Śabbhadā achcharā B 29 (745)
Samanāyā bhūkhnīyā Chudāṭha-blikāyā dānāṁ A 12 (720)
Samidāṭa yā dānāṁ A 122 (862)
sāḍikasamāyadhān turāṁ devānāṁ B 27 (743)
Sirimāsā dānāṁ A 110 (849)
Śīrāmā devatava B 8 (770)
Śīrasapada Isirakhiṭāya dānāṁ A 53 (859)
Śīhasa suchi dānāṁ A 111 (846a)
Suganāṁ rāja raṇo Gaṅiputasa Visadevasa pautenā Gopīputasa Āgarajasa puteṇa Vāchhiputena Dhanabhūtina kāritaṁ toranāṁ silaṁkārmaṁto cha upārōno A 1 (687)
Suchilome yakkho B 9 (771)
Sujato gahuto jāta A 50 (694)
Śudhaṁmā devasabhā bhagavato chūḍāmaho B 21 (775)
Supāvase yakkho B 7 (726)
Susupālo Koṣṭhio Vedūko arāmako B 72 (756)
sechhajata B 45 (704)
Sribā putasa Bhūránidevasa dānāṁ A 100 (874)
Sonāya dānāṁ thabhā A 123 (758)
hamsajātakaṁ B 41 (700)

Fragments

... kaya bhūchhuniyā dānāṁ A 79 (851)
... kasa dānāṁ atanā cha kata A 112 (880)
... kasa rāño bhayaye Nāgarakhitiyā dānāṁ A 4 (882)
... girino bhānakasa bhātū . . . A 54a
... tarasa . . . A 113 (893)
... tu rājano adhirajaka . . . . yata... A 130 (892)
... to bhūkhunīyā thabhō dānāṁ A 80 (772)
... da Hīmavate i . . . . . . . . . . . B 79 (884)
... niyajātaka B 80 (897)
... pachasa na A 133 (900)
Mahāda... A 131 (888)
... mikasa dānāṁ A 60 (787)
... yaya dānāṁ A 125 (899)
Yasika . . . A 136 (757)
... yasinā yāni . . . A 134 (894)
... rakatāyāyā A 9 (891)
rāma . . . B 82 (903a)
... sakāya thabhā dānāṁ A 124 (803)
... sā Kusū . . . A 135 (896)
... [sira]khi[tasa thabhā dānāṁ A 87a
lena . . . . . . torana cha . . . . . . kata A 129 (689)
# Word Index to the Bhārhut Inscriptions

Agara j conversed or Ágaraju—<Aṅgāradyut-1> A 2. See Ágarajusa below. § 6, IV, 13; 24a.  
Agrakhi tasa (<Aṅgirakhi-ta—<Aṅgirakshita—> A 23. § 13, I, 24, d, 37, d.  
achhará (<Achará—<Acharas-1) B 28, B 30, B 31. § 13, 34, f, I.  
Ajakālaka (<Ajakālaka—<Ajakālaka-1) B 3.  
Aljātasa (<Aljātasa—<Aljātasa-1) B 40. § 15, 30, I.  
ātthā (<Aṭṭhā—<Aṭthā-1) A 108. § 14; 25, IV.  
ātman— (<Aṭman—<Aṭman-1) A 112. § 5, I, 24, e, 34, b, II.  
Atrimukhtasa (<Atrimukta—<Atrimukta-1) A 81. § 18, d, 37, d.  
adhirajaka (<Adhirajaka—<Adhirajaka-1) A 130.  
Anandasa (<Ananda—<Ananda-1) A 50. § 6, IV; 24, d.  
Anādhapādikō (<Anādhapādikā—<Anādhapādikā-1) B 32. § 7, II, 12, d, 24, e.  
Anurādhāya (<Anurādhā—<Anurādha-1) A 32. § 26, IV.  
anusāsi (<Anusāsi—<Anusāsi-1) B 63. § 37, a, I.  
antvāsin (<Antvāsin—<Antvāsin-1) A 73. § 24, d, 34, d, II.  
Apikakasa see under aya-Apikinakasa below.  
Abode (<Aribo—<Aribo-1) B 69. § 2, II, 6, I, 12, d, 16, 24, e.  
aya-Apikinakasa (aya-Apikinaka—? <Arya-Apigiryaka—?) A 67. aya: § 6, I, 19, b.  
aya-Isidinasa (aya-Isidinna—<Arya-Rishidatta—) A 62.  
aya-Isipālita (<Arya-Isipalita—<Arya-Rishipālita—) A 59.  
aya-Gorakhita (<Arya-Gorakhita—<Arya-Gorakhita—) A 68.  
aya-Chulasa (<Arya-Chulla—<Arya-Kshulla or <Kshudra—) A 51.  
aya-Naṁda (<Arya-Naṁda—<Arya-Nanda—) A 69.  
aya-Pāṁthaka (<Arya-Pāṁthaka—<Arya-Pāṁthaka—) A 71. § 24, d.  
aya-Punāvasun (<Arya-Punāvasu—<Arya-Punāvasu—) A 72.  
aya-Bhutakasa (<Arya-Bhūtaka—<Arya-Bhūtaka—) A 8.  
aya-Bhutarakhita (<Arya-Bhūtarakhi-ta—<Arya-Bhūtarакhi-ta—) A 38.  
aya-Sūmakasa (<Arya-Sūmaka—<Arya-Sūmakā—) A 73. § 19, d.  
Ayyamāya (<Ayyamā—<Ayyamā—) A 33.  
Arrahagut (<Arrahagutta—<Aradhagupta—) B 18, B 20. § 23; 37, d.  
arāmako (<Arāmaka—<Arāmika—) B 72. § 6, IV.  
Alambu (<Alambu—<Alambushā—) B 31. § 15, 24, e, 26, I.  
avanati (<Avanati—<Avana-1) B 51. § 6, IV; 12, d, 37, b.  
Avāsā (<Avāsā<Avāsikā—?) A 126.  
Avanasa (<Avanasa—<Avanasa-1) A 82, A 83. § 24, e, 37, d.  
Asadā (<Asadā—<Ashadhā—) B 64. § 6, IV, 12, e, 15, 26, I.  
asvārika (<Asvārika—<Asvāraka—) A 22. § 5, I, 25, VI.  

---

1 In the index the words are first given as they occur in the inscriptions. In brackets we add the nominal stem or the verbal base of each word with its restored spelling. The restoration shows the never written double consonants, the omitted anusvāra, and the correct length of vowels. The Sanskrit equivalent in each case comes at the end.—This refers to the § in ‘The Language’ above pp. XIII-XXIX.
Asitamāśya (Asitamasā—?) A 36. § 26, III.
Agarajusa A 1. See Agaraju... above. § 5, I; 6, IV; 13; 24, a; 34, e, I.
āśana(th) (āśana—). See (B)ahuṭhakika-āśana(th) B 81 below.
Idadēvā (Indadevā—<Indrādevā—) A 19, A 45. § 6, II; 7, I; 20, d; 26, IV.
Isadālaghā (Irūdasālaghuḥ—<Indrāśalaghuh—) B 35. § 6, III; 20, d; 26, I.
Iīnasa (Iīnā—<Iīna—) A 84a, A 85b. § 8, VI.
Isidatasa (Isidatta—<Rishidatta—) A 86. § 1, II; 18, a; 37, d.
Iṣidinasa see under aya-Iṣidinasa above. § 37, d.
Iṣipālītasa see under aya-Iṣipālītasa above. § 1, II; 37, d.
Iṣumīgo (isumiga—<Rishyamūga—) B 48. § 5, III.
Iṣirakhitā— (Isirakkhitā—<Rishirakshitā—) § 1, II; 13, I.
Iṣirakhitasa A 87, A 88.
Iṣirakhitāya A 53
Iṣirakhitaputra (Isirakkhitauputra—<Rishirakshitatputra—) A 50.
Iṣīṣīnga(ī)ya (Iṣīṣīngīya—<Rishyasṛṅgīya—) B 53. § I, II; 5, III; 24, a.
Ujjhikēye (Ujjhihē—<Ujjhihē—) A 114. § 6, II; 18, a.
Uttaragidhikasa (Uttaragīdhikē—<Uttaragīdhikē—) A 7.
Uttarath (uttāra—<uttara—) B 25. § 26, II.
Udajajatka (uddajajatka—<udrjajatka—) B 46.
Upanna (uppanna—<uppanna—) A 1. § 18, f; 24, d; 37, d.
u[zu](kāro) (usukāra—<ushukāra—) B 56. § 7, IV.
ūkrahti (ūkrahti—<upakṛanti—) B 19. § 2, II; 6, I; 20, a; 24, d; 28, I.
Erapāto (Erapatta—<Erappatra—) B 36, B 37.
Kakusandha (Kakusandha—<Kakutsandha—) B 15. § 24, d.
Kachula[ya] (Karčulā—<Kaṭchulā—?) A 115.
Kaḍarikē (Kaḍarikē—<Kaṇḍarikē—) B 60. § 24, c; 27, I.
kāta (kāta—<kāṭa—) A 112, A 129. § 1, I; 25, II; 37, d.
Kathā (kāthā—<kāthā—) B 73. § 6, III; 24, d; 26, II.
Kanakasa see under bhadata-Kanakasa below.
Kanihāsa (Kanīha—<Krishnīha—) A 63. § 1, I; 24, c.
kamaṁsa (kumāra—<kumāra—?) A 3. § 9.
Kanuchukāye (Kanuchukā—) A 54b.
kaiṁsānta see under sitākaṁsānta below.
Karacakāṭa A 6, A 7, A 8. § 6, III; 25, V.
Karacakāṭa-nigama (nigama—<nigama—) A 5.
Kasaṣṭha (Kasṣṭha—<Kāṣṭha—) B 17. § 6, I; 19, d; 25, VI.
Kākaṇḍiya (Kākaṇḍī—<Kākanḍī—) A 37. § 8, II; 24, d.
Kāmāvcharasahasāni (Kāmāvcharasahasā—<Kāmāvcharasahasā—) B 26. § 20, g; 25, IX; 36.
kārītāna (kārīta—<kārīta—) A 1. § 25, II; 37, d.
kinarajatāka (kinarajatāka—<kinnarajatāka—) B 54. § 24, d.
kukutajātaka (kukutajātaka—<kukkutajātaka—) B 42. § 18, a.
kuchhimha see under tinimolakuchhimha below. § 13, II; 28, II.
Kujāroṣā (Kujāroṣā—<Kuṇjāroṣā—) A 10. § 6, II; 24, b; 26, IV.
kārī see under Kṣabakūṭī, gudhakārī below.
Kuḍipo (Kupira—<Kubera—) B 1. § 4, I; 12, e; 25, I.
chetaya (chetiya-<chaitya-) B 68. § 7, III.
chātiyaḥ (chetiya-) B 69.
chha (chha-<shā-) B 26. § 13, II; 36.
chhadaratiya (chhadaratiya-<shād-dantiya-) B 49. § 8, V; 24, d.
jaṭilasabhā (jaṭilasabhā-<jaṭilasabhā-) B 65.
jaṭaka see under jaṭakaṁ below. § 6, IV.
jāṭakaṁ see under jaṭakaṁ below. § 6, IV.
jātra see under jāṭakaṁ below. § 12, a.
Janak[a] (Janaka-<Janaka-) B 56.
jāmbu (jambū-<jambū-) B 74. § 24, e; 31, I.
Ja[hira]nātuno (Jahira-nattu-<nāptṛ-) A 50. § 1, III; 18, d; 32, I.
Jātasa see under aya-Jātasa above. § 37, d.
jaṭakaṁ (jāṭaka-<jāṭaka-) B 49, B 52, B 53, B 59; also cf., kinarajātakaṁ B 54, migajātakaṁ B 47. § 25, II.
jāṭaka B 48, jāṭakam B 51 for jāṭakaṁ; also cf. bhisaharaniya-jātakaṁ, Maghadēviyajātaka, Vītura-Punakṣiya-jātakaṁ, Sṛṣhhajātaka.
jaṭara for jāṭakaṁ see under bīḍaḷajāṭera below. § 12, a.
jaṭula B 42, B 50, B 80; also cf. udajāṭula B 46, kukaṭajāṭula B 42, nāgajāṭula B 43, laṇwajāṭula B 44, hanisajāṭula B 41.
jaṭalaka (for jāṭakaṁ?) B 42a. § 25, VII.
Jātamitasa (Jātamitta-<Jitāmitra-) A 26.
Jethabhadhara (Jēṭhabhadhara-<Jyeṣṭhabhadhara-) A 92. § 18, e; 20, d.
Jētavana (Jētavana-<Jētavana-) B 32. § 25, II.
ātī see under sigālāṅkati below.
ṭanachakamapariparaśa (ṭhānachāṇkamaparirepa-<sthānachāṇkramaparirepa-) A 127. § 6, IV; 12, e; 14.
tikoṭiko (tikoṭiko-<trikoṭika-) B 78. § 20, e.
(t)imi (t-<trī-) B 25. § 36.
timtimingilakukhinhā (timingilaku:kukhhi-<timingilaku:kki-) B 62. § 7, III; 24, a; 28, II.
Tv[ā]yā (Tisā-<Tishyā-) A 49a.
turum (tura-<turā-) B 27. § 10, I; 25, II.
toranaṁ (toraṇa-<torana-) A 2. § 12, e; 25, II.
torana A 129. § 25, II.
toranaṁ A 1. § 12, e.
Trālālaṣa mistake for Gōṣālaṣa, see above.
thaḥha- (thaḥha-<stambha-) § 18, d; 24, e.
thaḥha A 25, A 27, A 29, A 123, A 124. § 25, VIII.
thaḥha A 6, A 7, A 8, A 39, A 40, A 46, A 50, A 54, A 58, A 61, A 65, A 66, A 68, A 73, A 80, A 87a, A 94; also cf. pathamaṭhahha A 34. § 25, I.
thaḥha B 71, A 98. § 24, e; 25, I.
Thupaḍāśāsa (Thupaḍāśa-<Stūpadāśa-) A 25. § 5, I; 10, III; 18, d; 25, VI.
Therāk[i]ṭiyasa (Therākūṭiya-<Sthavirākūṭika-) A 41.
dakkhinā (dakkhinā-<dakṣhinā-) B 26. § 6, III; 13, I; 26, II.
Dādaniṇkama (Dādataniṇkama-<Dṛḍhanishkrama-) B 77. § 12, a; 12, e; 20, a.
dadati (dadā-<颏ā-) B 75. § 37, a, I.
dana see under dānāṁ below. § 6, IV.
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Dabhīṇikāya (Dabhīṇikā–<Darbhīṇikā–) A 42.

dāṇa– (dāṇa–<dāṇa–) 
  dāṇa A 5, A 6, A 84a, A 85b, A 105, A 114, A 118, A 119, § 25, II.
  dāṇah A 3, A 4, A 7, A 8, A 10, (A 11), A 12, A 13, A 15, A 16, A 17, A 18, A 19,
    A 20, A 21, A 22, A 23, A 24, A 25, A 26, A 27, A 28, A 29, A 30, A 31, A 32,
    A 33, A 34, A 36, A 37, A 38, A 39, A 40, A 41, A 42, A 45, A 48, A 49, A 50,
    A 52, A 53, A 54, A 54b, A 55, A 56, A 57, A 58, [A 60], A 61, A 62,
    A 63, A 64, A 65, A 66, A 67, A 68, A 70, A 71, A 72, A 73, A 74, A 75,
    A 76, A 77, A 78, A 79, A 80, A 82, A 83, A 86, A 87, A 87a, A 88, A 89, A 90a,
    A 91, A 92, [A 93], A 94, A 95, A 97, A 98, A 99, A 100, A 101, A 102, A 104,
    A 122, A 123, A 124, A 125. § 25, II.
  dāṇahī, dāṇa for dāṇah A 81, A 127. § 6, IV.
  dāṇā for dāṇa or dāṇah A 49a. § 5, III; 25, IX.
  dāṇo for dāṇah A 96. § 25, I.

dāyakana (dāyaka–<dāyaka–) A 16. § 6, III; 25, XI.

Dīghagāy[ṃ] (Dīṅgāgā–<Dīṅgāgā–) A 24. § 6, II.

Dīghatapassī (Dīṅghatapassī–<Dīṅghatapassin–) B 63. § 8, I; 8, III; 18, b; 21, e; 34, d, I.

dīsa (dīsa–<dīsa–) B 25, B 26. § 6, III; 26, II.
(d)ise B 24.

Dusito (Dūṣita–<Dūṣita–?) B 75. § 10, III; 37, d.

deti (de–<vādā–) B 32; also cf. dadati abovc. § 37, a, I.

deva– (deva–<deva–).
  de[v]ā B 24. § 25, VIII.
  devāṇah B 27. § 6, III; 25, XI.

devatā (devatā–<devatā–) B 11. § 26, I.

devata B 8, B 12. § 6, III; 26, I.

devaputro (devaputta–<devaputra–) B 18, B 20.

Devakakhatāsa (Devakakhatāsa–<Devarakkitāsa–) A 93. § 13, I.

devavabhā (devavabha–<devasabha–) B 21.

Devasesa see under bhadatta-Devasesa below.

devī (devī–<devī–) B 56. § 29, I.

dohati (dohā–<duhā–) B 73. § 37, a, I.

Dhanabhūti– (Dhanabhūti–<Dhanabhūti–)
  Dhanabhūtina A 1. § 6, III; 27, III.

Dhanabhūtisa A 3. § 27, V.

Dhamaguta-mātu (Dhamagutta-mātu–<Dharmagupta-mātrī–) A 120. § 18, d; 24, e;
  33, I; 37, d.

Dhamagutasa (Dhamagutta–<Dharmagupta–) A 94. § 18, d; 24, e; 37, d.

Dhamachakka (Dhamachakka–<Dharmachakra–) B 38. § 20, a; 24, e; 25, II.

(Dha)marakhitāya (Dharmarakkitā–<Dharmarakhitā–) A 118. § 13, I; 24, e.

Dharmarakhitāya A 52. § 5, II.

Dharmarakkhatāsa (Dharmarakkitāsa–<Dharmaraksha–) A 95. § 13, I; 24, e.

dhitu (dhitu–<duhitri–) A 42.

Dhitasa (Dhutta–<Dhūta–) A 96. § 10, I; 18, d.

Dhenachakka (Dhenuchchakka–<Dhenutsaka–?) B 76. § 13.

Nagarikaya (Nágárikā—<Nágárikā—) A 43. § 6, II; 26, IV. See nágárikāye below.
Ndōdō—(Ndōda—<Ndāvat—?)
Ndōda B 75.
Ndōde B 70, B 73, B 74. § 25, VII.
[Na]́dopādā (Ndōdopāda—<Ndāvat—?)—pāda—) B 76.
natuno see under Ja[hira]natuno above. § I, III; 18, d.
Ndututara (Nāmututtāra—<Nandottāra—) A 119. § 4, III; 6, II; 24, d; 26, IV.
Nitha see under aya-Nānda above. § 24, d.
[Na]́ndagirino (Nāndagirī—<Nandagiri—) A 97. § 24, d; 27, V.
Nadagirino A 54. § 24, d; 27, V.
Na[m]́dir[f]nagarikaya (Nāmdinagarikā—<Nandinarikā—) A 45. § 6, II; 24, d.
naukamikasa (navakamikā—<navakarmikā—) A 59, A 60(?). § 24, e.
nāgajātaka (nāgajātaka—<nāgajātaka—) B 43.
Nāgadevasa see under aya-Nāgadevāsa above.
Nāgadēvāya (Nāgadeva—<Nāgadevā—) A 11. § 6, II; 26, IV.
Nāgaye (Nāgā—<Nāgā—) A 74. § 6, II; 26, IV.
Nāgarakshitaṅgī (Nāgarakṣhitāṅgī—<Nāgarakshitāṅgī—) A 4. § 6, II; 13, I; 26, IV, 37, d.
nāgarājī (nāgarājā—<nāgarājā—) B 6, B 37. § 34, b, I.
nāgarājī A 31a. § 34, b, I.
[n]āgarājī A 36. § 6, IV.
nāgarikāye (nāgarikā—<nāgarikā—) A 44. See Nagarikaya above. § 6, II; 26, IV.
Nāgasenāya (Nāgasenā—<Nāga- senā—) A 14. § 6, II; 26, IV.
Nāgīlīyā (Nāgīlā—<Nāgīlā—) A 29. § 6, II.
Nārika (Nāsika—<Nāsika—) A 46. § 6, III; 25, V;
nāgamasa see under Karakahata-nigamasa above.
nigodha (nyagrodha—<nyagrodha—) B 70. § 5, III; 20, b; 24, d.
P[am]́chanakāyikasa (Paṁchanakāyikā—<Paṁcha-nakāyikā—) A 57. § 3, I; 24, b.
patisanndhi (patiṣāndhi—<pratisandhi—) B 18. § 14; 24, d; 27, II.
pañhamathambho (paṭhamathāmbha—<prathamastambha—) A 34. § 14.
Padelakasa (Paḍelakā—) A 47.
Pañathakasa see under aya-Pañathakasa above. § 24, d.
Padumāvat[i] (Padumāvati—<Padmāvati—) B 30. § 8, III; 24, e; 29, I.
par[repo] see under fanachakamopari[repo] above.
pavate (pavata—<pavata—) B 73, B 74. § 25, VII.
Pasenajī (Pasenaji—<Prasenajī—) B 39. § 16; 34, e, I.
Pāṭaliputā (Pāṭaliputta—<Pāṭaliputra—) A 13, A 14, A 15.
pādu see under Ndōdopāda above.
Pārīkṣikīyā (Pārīkṣi—) A 49. § 29, III.
pāśāde (pāśāda—<pāśāda—) B 22. § 20, e; 25, I.
pit-u see under m[a]ṭiputu below.
puta- (putta—<putra—) § 20, c.
putasa A 3, A 100; also cf. Gāḍiputa—, Gotiputa—, devaputa— above; Vāchhiputa— below.
puteṣa A 1. § 12, e; 25, III.
Punakīya— see under Vistu-Punakīyo-jatakārī below. § 10, I; 24, c.
Punāvasuno see under aya-Punāvasuna above. § 5, I; 21, b; 30, II.
purathima(n) (puratthima—<purasthima—) B 24. § 26, II.
Purikā– (Purikā–<Purikā–).  
  Purikaya A 17. § 6, II; 26, III.  
  Purikayā A 19. § 6, II; 26, III.  
  Purikāya A 16. § 6, II; 26, III.  
  Purikāyā A 18, A 20. § 6, II; 26, III.  

Pusakaka (Pussakak–<Pushyaka–) A 47. § 19, d.  
No additional entries follow.
bhānakasa see under bhānakasa below. § 6, IV; 12, c.

bhavya (bhavya—<bhārya—) A 4; § 6, I; 6, II; 19, b; 26, IV; also cf. bhāriyā— below.

bhātu (bhātu—<bhārtri—) 54a. § 32, I.

bhānakasa (bhānaka—<bhānaka) A 54a, A 54a, A 59, A 62, A 63. § 12, c.

bhānakasa A 39, A 61. § 12, c.

Bhāranidevasa (Bharanideva—<Bharanideva—) A 100. § 5, II; 8, IV.

bhāriyā— (bhāriyā—<bhāriyā—); § 19, b; also cf. bhavyaye above.

bhāriyāya A 46. § 26, IV.

bhāriyāya A 115; also cf. Rvamātīṣṭha-bhāriyāya below. § 6, II; 26, IV.

bhikhuñī— (bhikhuñī—<bhikhuñī—); § 13, I; also cf. bhikhunī— below.

bhikhuñīya A 52. § 29, III.

bhikhuñīya A 12, A 29, A 80. § 8, II; 29, III.

bhikhuñīya A 44. § 8, II; § 29, III.

bhikhuñīya A 11. § 29, III.

bhikhunī— (bhichchhunī—<bhikhuñī—); § 13, II; also cf. bhikhunī— above.

bhikhunīya A 24, A 37, A 42, A 79. § 6, II; 8, II; 29, III.

bhikhunīya A 43, A 74, A 75, A 76, A 77, A 78. § 8, II; 29, III.

bhishaharaniya-jataka[ni] (bhishaharaniya—jātaka—<bhishaharaniya—jātaka—) B 58. § 12, e.

Bhutakasa see under aya-Bhutakasa above. § 10, III; 37, d.

Bhutaye (Bhūtā—<Bhūtā—) A 77. § 6, II; 37, d.

Bhūtarakhaśa (Bhūtarakhaśa—<Bhūtarakhaśīta—) A 31. § 10, III; 13, I; 37, d.

Bhūtarakhaśīta[sa] see under aya-Bhūtarakhaśīta[sa] above. § 5, II; 10, III; 25, VI; 37, d.

Bhogavardhanīya (Bhogavardhanīya—<Bhogavardhanīya—) A 51. § 8, V; 14.

Bhogaṭakaṭaka (Bhogaṭakaṭaka—) A 23.

Bhogaṭakaṭaṭya (Bhogakṣṭaka—) A 24. § 6, II.

Magahādeviyajatuka (Magahādeviyajatuka—<Magahādeviyajatuka—) B 57. § 8, V.

matu see under Ghaṭila-matu, Dhamsaguta-matu above, Setaka-matu below.

māta A 90b mistake for mātu ? § 6, IV; 33, I.

Mahākaka (Mahākōka—<Mahākōka—) B 12. § 6, III; 6, IV; 26, I.

Mahānanuksa (Mahānuksa—<Mahānuksa—) A 42. § 6, IV; 34, d, II.

Mahārasa (Mahārāsa—<Mihira—?) A 73.

Mahādeva— (Mahādeva—<Mahādeva—)

Mahādevasa B 81. § 25, VI.

Mahādevanam B 62.

Mahāśāmaiṣṭikāya (Mahāśāmaiṣṭikā—<Mahāśāmaiṣṭikā—) B 18. § 12, b; 26, V.

Mahilasam see under bhadra-Mahilasam above.

Mahīndasena (Mahīndasena—<Mahīndrasena—) A 13. § 7, I; 20, d.

māta see under matu above. § 33, I.

māṭāpīṭha (māṭāpīṭha—<māṭāpīṭha—) A 108. § 1, III; 12, c; 32, II.

mātu (mātu—<māṭṛī—) A 54b. § 33, I.

mānavako (mānavako—<māṇavako—) B 66.

migajātaka (migajātaka—<migajātaka—) B 47. § 1, II.

migasamadaka (migasamadaka—<migasamadaka—) B 68. § 1, II; 24, e.

Mittadeva (Mittadeva—<Mittadeva—) A 121.

Mitra (Mitra—<Mitra—) A 101. § 20, c; 25, VI.

Mīsakasi (Mīsakasi—<Mīsakasi—) B 28. § 4, II; 20, g; 29, I.

mugapak[īya] (mugapakhikiya—<mukapakhikiya—) B 59. § 10, III; 12, a.
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Mucchiśā (Mucchilinda—<Mucchiśā>) B 31a. § 24, d.

Muccha (Muccha—<Muccha>) A 102. § 24, c.

mochita (mochita—<mochita>) B 62. § 4, IV; 37, d.

Moragiri- (Moragiri—<Mayūragiri—)
  Moragirami A 26. § 7, III; 25, VII.
  Moragirināhā A 25, A 27, A 28, A 29. § 24, e; 27, IV.

yah (ya—<yad—) B 51. § 35.

yakhi- (yakhi—<yakhi—)
  yakhi B 2. § 8, III; 13, I; 29, I.
  yakhiya A 116. § 8, II; 29, III.

yakhini (yakhini—<yakhini—) B 10. § 8, III; 13, I; 29, I.

Yakkha (Yakkhī—<Yakkha—) A 105. § 13, I.

Yakho (Yakho—<Yakho—) B 1, B 3, B 4, B 5, B 7, B 9. § 13, I; 25, I.

Yumita (Yumita) sā... A 103.

yavamajākhiya (yavamajākhiya—<yavamadhyakhiya—) B 52. § 8, V; 13; 25, II.

yā (ya—<yad—) A 127. § 35.

raja see under rāja below. § 6, I.

rajana see under rājā below.

raje (raje—<raje—) A 1. § 19, a; 25, VII.

raja for rājā (?) A 2. § 19, a.

raṣṇa see under rājā below.

rājā (rāja—<raja—)
  rajana A 130. § 34, b, III.
  rajana A 3. § 34, b, III.
  rājā B 39, B 56; § 34, b, I; also cf. nāgarājā B 6, B 37, [nā]garājā B 36.
  raṇa A 1. § 6, I; 24, b; 34, b, III.
  rāṇa A 4. § 5, I; 24, b; 34, b, III.

rupakāra (rupakāra—<rupakāra—) A 55. § 10, III.

Revatimitabhāryā (Revatimitabhāryā—<Revatimitabhāryā—) A 34. § 8, IV; 26, IV.

laṭuṣvājātaka (laṭuṣvājātaka—<laṭuṣvājātaka—) B 44. § 21, a.

vādat (vānd—<vānd—) B 37. § 24, d; 37, a, II.

vādat (vānd—<vānd—) B 40. § 24, d; 37, a, II.

vadhū (vadhū—<vadhū—) B 64. § 31, I.

Valakasa see under bhādira—Valakasa above.

Valamitasa (Valamita—<Valamitra—) A 36.

Vasakasa (Vasuka—<Vasuka—) A 46.

Vasuguto (Vasuguto—<Vasuguto—) B 62. § 18, d; 37, d.

Vāchhiputena (Vāchhiputena—<Vāchhiputena—) A 1. § 5, I; 8, IV; 12, c; 13; 25, III.

Vācchedpāla (Vācchedpāla—<Vācchedpāla—) A 3.

Vāsiṣṭhī (Vāsiṣṭhī—<Vāsiṣṭhī—) A 35. § 8, II; 18, c; 29, III.

Vījāhara (Vījāhara—<Vījāhara—) B 61. § 6, IV; 13.

Vijāpi (Vijāpi—<Vijāpi—) B 61. § 18, e; 34, d, I.

Vijitaka (Vijitaka—<Vijitaka—) A 104.

Vitura-Punakīya-jātakāḥ (Vitura-Punakīya-jātakāḥ—<Vitura-Punakīya-jātakāḥ—) B 55. § 12, d.

Vipasa (Vipasa—<Vipasa—) B 10. § 16, 34, d, II.
Virudaka (Virūḍaka—<Virūḍhaka—) B 4. § 10, III; 12, c; 37, d.
Visadevasa (Vissadeva—<Viśadeva—) A 1. § 21, c; 25, VI.
Vejayanta (Vejayanta—<Vaijayanta—) B 22. § 3, I; 24, d.
Veḍuka (Veḍuca—<Veḍuka—?) B 72, B 73.
Vedisa see under Vedīśa below. § 3, I.
Vedīśa (Vedisa—<Vaidīśa—) A 30, A 32, A 34, A 35, § 25, V.

Vedisa A 33. § 25, V.
Vedīśa A 31. § 25, V.

Venuvagimiyā (Venuvagāmiyā—<Venukagāmakā—) A 52. § 6, V; 12, a.
Vellimā[īrī] (Vellimīrī—<Vellimirī—) A 35.
Vesabhū (Vessabhū—<Viśabhū—) B 14. § 7, II; 10, II, 12, e; 21, e; 30, II.
Vokaka (vokkaka—<vyavakrānta—) B 18. § 2, II; 6, I; 19, e; 24, d; 37, d.

Sakṣatdevāyā (Sakṣatdevā—<Śakṣatdevā—) A 15. § 26, IV.
Sakṣamuni (Sakṣamuni—<Śākyamuni—) B 23. § 19, a; 27, V.
Śaṅgā (Śungha—<Śungha—) A 2; also cf. Suganaḥ below. § 6, III; 9, 24, a; 25, XI.
Śaṅgamitaśa (Śaṅgamitaśa—<Śaṅgamitaśa) A 40. § 24, a.
Śaṅgharakhitaśa (Śaṅgharakhitaśa—<Śaṅgharakhitaśa) A 108. § 13, I; 24, a.
Śaṅgharītā (Śaṅgharītā—<Śaṅgharītā) A 109.
Sa[m]ghamitaśa A 106. § 24, a.
(Sa[m]ghamitaśa) A 107. § 24, a.
saṭṭipādaśa (saṭṭiṣṭopādāna—<śrīṣṭotpādāna—) A 58. § 12, e; 18, e.
Satīka (Śatīka—<Śvātiśa—) A 132.
saṃbhutena see under koṭisamabhutena above. § 37, d.
Sapaṭugata (Sapaṭugata—<Sarpagupta—) A 78. § 6, II; 18, e; 37, d.
Sabhadā[va] (Sabhadda—<Sabhadrā—) B 29. § 20, d; 24, e.
śabhadā see under jatitasabhadha, denasabhadha above.

Samakasa see under bhadato-Samakasa above. § 6, IV; 7, III.
samadakāna see under migasamadakāna above. § 24, e.

Samanāya (Samanā—<Śramānā—) A 12. § 6, II; 12, e; 20, g; 6, IV.
Sāṃkasa (Sāṃkasa—<Śvāmkiṣa—) A 6; also cf. bhadato-Sāṃkasa above. § 6, IV; 21, c.
Samidatāya (Sāmīdatā—<Śvāmīdatā) A 122. § 6, IV.

samaddana see under sāḍikasaṃmadana below. § 24, e.
Sāvagānīśiṣa (Sāvagānīśiṣa—<Sāvagānīśiṣa—) B 23.

savo (sasa—<śasa—) B 42a.
saharāṇi see under Kāmāvaharāharaśasāni above. § 20, g; 36.
sāḍikasaṃmadana (sāḍikāsaṃmadana—<śaṭṭikasaṃmadana—) B 27. § 5, I; 12, e; 24, e.

Sāmakaśa see under aya-Sāmakaśa above. § 19, d.
Sāmāya (Sāma—<Śyāma—) A 20. § 6, II; 26, IV.
salo (śala—<śala—) B 14.
sáśasi (śasa—<śāsasi) B 18 for sāṣati, § 37, a, I.
sigalanaṭi (siglaṇaṭi—<śrīgalaṇaṭi) B 64. § 1, II; 24, b; 28, I.

Sirimāsa (Sirimāsa—<Śrīmat—) A 110. § 8, V; 16; 20, g; 24, a, I.

Sirimā B 8. § 8, V; 16; 20, g.
Sirimāyā A 48. § 6, II; 20, g.

Sirispada (Sirispadā—<Śrīśtrapadā—) A 53. § 8, VI.
sīla see under cītupādasīla above.
silākaṁmañña (silākaṁmañña—<śilākārmañña—) A 1. § 15; 24, d; 24, e.
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Sīvala (Śivala-) B 56. § 6, III; 26, I.

stis (sissa-<śishya-) B 63. § 15; 19, d; 25, X.

Śīkha (Śīka-<Śīkha-) A 111.

Śūrga (Śūrga-<Śūrga-) A 1; also cf. Sagāna above. § 6, III; 24, a; 25, XI.


Sūchiloma (Sūchiloma-<Śūchiloman-) B 9. § 16; 34, b, I.

Sūjata (Sūjata-<Sūjāta) B 50. § 6, IV; 37, d.

Sūtāntikā (sūtāntika-<sūtrāntika-) A 51. § 6, I; 10, I; 24, d.

Sūmai (Sūmaī-<Sūmā) B 10. § 6, III; 22; 26, I.

Sūdhāmā (Sūdhāmā-<Sūdhāmā-) B 21. § 24, e.

Sūdhārāśī (Sūdhārāśī-<Śuddhārāśī-) B 24. § 18, a.

Sūtapāsa (Sūtapāsa-<Śravatīshā-) B 7. § 1, I; 20, e.

Sūlādhāsa (Sūlādhāsa-<Śravatīshā-) A 22. § 18, d; 37, d.

Sūsanā (Sūsanā-<Śravatīshā-) B 64. § 5, IV; 24, e.

Sūlapāla (Sūlapāla-<Śrīpāla-) B 72. § 7, IV.

Seṭṭhakamāta (Seṭṭhakamāta-<Śravatīshā-) B 45. § 13, II.

Sēṭṭaka-mātā (Seṭṭaka-mātā-<Śravatīshā-mātī-) A 18. § 12, e; 18, e; 33, I.

Sērīya (Sērī-<Śrī-) A 100. § 7, II; 20, g.

Selaparakasa (Selaparakasa-<Śallaparakasa-) A 54.

Sonāya (Sonā-<Śravaṇa-) A 123. § 2, II; 6, II.

Sonāya (Sonā-<Śravaṇa-) A 37.

kāmamajātakāna (kāmamajātakāna-<kāmamajātakāna-) B 41.

Himavatī (Himavatī-<Himavatī-) B 79. § 34, a, II.

...... kaya A 79. The nun's name is missing.

...... kasa A 4, A 112.

...... girino A 54a.

...... tarasa .. A 113.

...... to A 80. The place-name is missing. § 25, V.

[d] ... A 109. Perhaps dañm? 

...... [n]jñajātaka B 80.

pachasa na A 133.

Mahā[du]... A 131.

...... yata .. A 130.

...... yaya A 125. Perhaps Ayaya?

yasika... A 136.

...... yasinisa yāni A 134.

...... rakaṣṭāyāya .. A 9.

[r]ma... A 82.

...... sakāya A 124.

...... sākṣu .. A 135.

B 74, B 75, B 80, B 81, A 2, A 3, A 7 from eye-copy
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