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INTRODUCTORY NOTE

When Professor Dr. Heinrich Lüders died in May 1943, his manuscript on early Brāhmī inscriptions, prepared for the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, was not yet finished. Moreover it was partly destroyed by post-war events. Particulars are stated in the Preface to Lüders’ edition of Bhārhut Inscriptions, supplemented and prepared for publication by myself in collaboration with Dr. Madhukar Anant Mehendale, Poona.¹

Besides the treatises on Bhārhut Inscriptions, published in the volume mentioned, Lüders’ fragmentary manuscript, when it came into my hands in 1946, consisted mainly of items on Mathurā inscriptions. At first I aimed at finishing a second fascicle for the Corpus containing these inscriptions, since in 1947 the then Director General of Archaeology had agreed to publish Lüders’ papers in different fascicles beginning with the Bhārhut inscriptions.

After handing the revised and supplemented manuscript on Bhārhut inscriptions over to the Indian authorities in 1954 there was, however, a delay of some years before the printing could start. By this time I became engaged in other publications and I had found out that the attempt to publish the intended fascicle on Mathurā inscriptions as a part of the Corpus would afford considerable supplementary work, because it seemed necessary not merely to fill in missing parts of Lüders’ manuscript but also to include Mathurā inscriptions discovered during and after World War II. Without continued travelling in India it appeared difficult to procure necessary estampages of such inscriptions, as well as to finish the work within reasonable time.

I decided to publish the remaining parts of Lüders’ manuscript on Mathurā inscriptions in its original form, also in view of the handicap which consisted in the absence of any documentary statement by the author of his views on chronological problems such as eras and dating of kings like Kaniska. Editing his unpublished papers as a part of the Corpus, one would have been compelled to attribute one’s own views more or less to the author or even to criticize Lüders here and there. From the manuscript it was obvious, indeed, that Lüders endeavoured to tackle the chronological problems on a palaeographical basis, classing every inscription according to four categories, viz. Ś (Śuṅga), Kṣa (Kṣatrāpa),

¹ Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Part II, 1, Brāhmī-Inscriptions from Bhārhut, edited by the late Heinrich Lüders, revised and supplemented by Ernst Waldschmidt, Göttingen, in collaboration with Madhukar Anant Mehendale, Poona.
K (Kuśāna) and G (Gupta) and numbering each item in its chronological order. Pencilled numbers like \( \bar{S}\, 2 \) etc., which have been printed in the headings of individual inscriptions of the present edition, were to be found on the first sheet of the manuscript of every inscription.\(^1\)

To Dr. Klaus L. Janert, formerly Assistant in the Indological Seminary at Göttingen University, merit is due for having prepared the manuscript for the press. Thanking him for his laborious and painstaking task, I am ending this 'Introductory Note' to clear the way for his Preface.

Göttingen, June 1960

E. Waldschmidt

\( ^1 \) A survey of this chronological order of inscriptions is given in Concordance II. Readers interested in chronological questions are expressly invited to make use of these tables. At any rate the numbers, though authentic, have to be considered as provisional.
PREFACE

Already in 1877, when he published the first volume of the “Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum”¹ (Aśoka Inscriptions), General (afterwards Sir) Alexander Cunningham had planned the edition of the next two volumes of the newly established series,² viz. II. “Inscriptions of the Indo-Scythians, and of the Satraps of Surashtra”, and III. “Inscriptions of the Guptas, and of other contemporary Dynasties of Northern India”. Only eleven years later the edition of the Gupta Inscriptions was brought out by J. F. Fleet,³ whereas the preparations for the second volume met with difficulties.

A. F. R. Hoernle, entrusted with the edition of the “Indo-Scythic” inscriptions, enlarged the collection of materials gathered by Cunningham, until in 1905 he turned over to H. Lüders his “collection of impressions, rubbings and drawings of inscriptions formed by him when preparing the second volume of the CII”.⁴ This work “would, no doubt, have comprised all the then known records of the period between Aśoka and the Guptas . . . Early in the present century the question of filling the gap was the subject of conversations, and . . . in the year 1907, . . . the Secretary of State for India agreed to arrange for a volume wherein Professors E. J. Rapson and H. Lüders were to collaborate as joint editors, Prof. Rapson undertaking the Kharoṣṭhī portion [as CII 2, 1]⁵ and Prof. Lüders the Brāhmi [as CII 2, 2]”⁶.

In 1904 Lüders made publicly known that he had begun to prepare “a list of the Indian inscriptions prior to about A. D. 400”⁷, i. e. his “List of Brāhmi Inscriptions (from the earliest times to about A. D. 400 with exception of those of Aśoka)”. Representing a necessary preliminary for such an undertaking as the intended edition of the CII 2, 2, the List (Part 1: Northern inscriptions, 2: Southern inscriptions) was published in 1912; in it Lüders had registered more than 1,400 records, each with an abstract of the contents together with its bibliography.

In the recently published edition of Lüders’ “Bhārhat Inscriptions”, E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale speak about Lüders’ work on

¹ It was James Prinsep who, in 1837, had indicated the necessity of this collective publication and suggested its name (cf. JASB 6. 1837, p. 663; CII 3, p. 1).
⁴ Ep. Ind. 9. 1907/08, p. 241. Cf. also below p. 62, n. 1; 65; 71; 99; 101; 211; 212.
⁵ “In 1922, when Prof. Rapson finally renounced his task, . . . Prof. S. Konow . . . was found willing to assume the duty” (Thomas, cf. n. 6 below).
⁷ Cf. Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 33.
the Brāhmi inscriptions and report on the history of the manuscript as well as on its post-war fate. They say in this connection: "Evidently Prof. Lüders intended to publish the northern and the southern Brāhmi inscriptions separately in two volumes, and it is 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... 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 of the language of the different groups of inscriptions as well as the various indices were missing in the manuscript. The bulk of the manuscript as it... existed (after the war) dealt with the Mathurā and the Bhār hut inscriptions..."

While working on the above mentioned volume of the Bhār hut Inscriptions (CII 2, 2, 1), Prof. Waldschmidt had also made preparations for the edition of Lüders' manuscript of the Mathurā Inscriptions. (See above p. 5f.)

In the winter of 1957/58 Prof. Waldschmidt handed the entire material, to which a typed copy of the Manuscript was attached, over to the editor, to whom he explained the subject. He was at all times ready to help and took great interest in the progress of the work. The editor is greatly indebted to Prof. Waldschmidt and wishes to express his thanks to him.

The Manuscript of the Mathurā Inscriptions is evidently complete, except for the introductory general discussions² (see above), the records from the Kānkāli Tīlā³, and the indices.


² Below, p. 136, the author referred to his Introduction, but one cannot conclude from it that it was already completed.

³ Only the treatises on six of the approximately 100 records from the Jaina Sanctuary are extant (cf. below §§14—17, 20—21), together with two (§§22—23) of which it is not quite certain whether they originate from the K. T. Of these eight treatises three have been cancelled by the author (§§14, 15, 23), but the revised copies are not extant. Two further records from the K. T., missing in the Manuscript, Lüders had treated in his above mentioned publication "Seven Brāhmi Inscriptions..." (List Nos 94, 103, cf. below §§18—19). As the author referred (below p. 51, p. 163) moreover to his articles on other epigraphs from the K. T. (List Nos 93, 78), which are missing now, it is to be assumed that the bulk of his treatises on inscriptions from the Jaina Sanctuary is lost, and that those articles just mentioned (i.e. §§14—17, 20—23) are preserved only by chance. — From the "Memoranda" of W. Lentz it follows that Lüders discussed 30 Jaina inscriptions in his circle of Indologists (cf. below p. 11f.). — It remains, however, doubtful whether the author had already treated all records from the K. T. for the intended volume of the CII and whether he had written the observations on the excavation site too.
Already in 1937 or 1938 Lüders had submitted some specimen treatises on inscriptions from Mathurā for publication in the Epigraphia Indica (viz. “Seven Brāhmī Inscriptions from Mathurā and its Vicinity”),¹ five of which are also contained in the Manuscript.² This publication shows that the author had once more revised his discussion of the five inscriptions, making some minor changes, but also adding larger passages as well as checking his readings once more.³

It is to be assumed that Lüders would have treated his manuscript of the Mathurā Inscriptions in the same way before publishing it. Of course, he would at the same time have put all into final literary form.

My editorial tasks in the publication of the Manuscript were as follows:

a) Correction of the above mentioned typewritten copy on the basis of the Manuscript.

b) Corrections of and supplements to registration numbers of museums. (Cf. also “Concordance III”, see below p. 24 ff.) In the case of antiquities from the Archaeological Museum (= Curzon Museum) at Mathurā, in the text below the registration numbers are mostly given together with the references to Vogel’s Catalogue.⁴

c) Verification of literary references. (Cf. also “Bibliography”, see below p. 240.) Corrections and literary supplements of the editor which are unimportant for the detailed argument of the author were not indicated. Uniform abbreviations were given. Literary references which could not be verified by the editor were marked by a circle after the year of appearance: ⁶ (e.g. 1865⁵).

³ In order to survey the readings of Lüders’ in the “Index of the words found in the inscriptions” of the present volume, the Tεxτ of the records published by the author is being repeated below. The same refers to the record List No 125 (= § 187) which is treated in Lüders’ Bhārhat Inscriptions (CII 2, 2, 1) and edited in full by E. Waldschmidt.
⁵ (The literary sources were not available to the editor.) As the remarks added by Lüders show, these literary passages were known to him mostly from the works of other authors.
In the case of observations of the individual excavation sites, Lüders often used formulations from the works of other authors without specially marking these as quotations.

d) Comparison of the transcriptions with the estampages and facsimiles respectively.

The author shows supplements with round brackets (); what is damaged or difficult to read, with square brackets [ ]. He was not always consistent in this, and at times he left out the [] in well-known words or parts of words even though they contained akṣaras, mātrkās or vowel-signs uncertain from the palaeographical point of view. The author’s readings were not altered in such cases, but square brackets and, if necessary, notes have been supplied. — In the Manuscript, Lüders transliterated the vocalic r (short or long), the palatal surd mutae, and the lingual sibilant according to the method employed in the CII and the Ep. Ind.; sometimes, however, he used the “international transcription”. The editor has taken the liberty of employing the international transcription throughout (i.e. now only: r̥, r̥; c, ch; ṝ).

Inscriptions for which neither a rubbing nor a published facsimile were available are provided in the present edition with an asterisk * behind the L.-number; cf. also “Mathurā inscriptions dealt with” (see below p. 13ff).

e) In the printer’s copy, the notes (which the author had placed between Text and Translation according to the method employed in the CII and in the Ep. Ind.) were transferred to the bottom of the pages as separate footnotes; paragraphs were rearranged where necessary; the pages 39—44 (“Kaṅkālī Tīlā”) inserted.

f) Arrangement of the inscriptions.

The inscriptions of Part I and Part III were arranged according to the individual excavation sites treated by Lüders in introductory

1 sh was retained in place-names.
2 Attempts to get estampages from India remained unsuccessful.
3 See Preface p. 10—11 (f).
4 I wish to thank Mrs. Stache-Rosen for being so kind as to read the work in typescript and make a number of valuable suggestions as to the English.
5 Cf. also the Introductory Note of Prof. Waldschmidt (see above p. 5—6).

There is no doubt that Lüders did not intend to arrange the Mathurā Inscriptions in the edition according to the numerical order of his List which is arranged mainly for practical purposes: The records from villages north, west and southwest of Mathurā are placed at the beginning (Nos 13—15 with apps. Nos 12a—15a), those from villages south and east of Mathurā, however, are right at the end (No 150 with apps. Nos 149a—c) of the Mathurā section. The inscriptions from Mathurā itself and from the old sanctuaries around Mathurā are placed in the middle, first epigraphs having dates of years (Nos 16—78 with apps. Nos 22a—69a), then records with fragmentarily preserved dates (Nos 78—89 with apps. Nos 81a—89c). The following Nos 90—91 with apps. Nos 91a—c contain
remarks. Part II contains the epigraphs on antiquities which were found in Mathurā City (including Isāpur) and in the Jamnā River, and Part IV the records whose place of discovery is no longer known. After being arranged in the present edition each treatise received a §-number.

To his own copy of the (printed) List, Lüders appended by hand the inscriptions which became known to him after 1912, giving them additional numbers which he also assigned to his treatises on the inscriptions. In the present edition these numbers were kept and put between ⟨⟩; cf. also “Mathurā inscriptions dealt with” (see below p. 13 ff).

All inscription numbers given by Lüders (i.e. those of the printed List as well as those of the author’s handwritten supplements) are marked by an L. placed in front of them, in so far as the inscriptions are treated in the present work; they are quoted according to the §- and the L.-numbers (e.g. § 50: L. 125w).

g) Compilations of the Indices, Concordances, and of the Bibliography.

h) Compilation of a survey map of the district around Mathurā.

i) Transcription of the “Memoranda” of W. Lentz.

In 1937—38 in his circle of Indologists (the Kränzchen)² in Berlin, Professor Dr. Lüders read and discussed inscriptions from Mathurā with his colleagues and friends. From the notes which W. Lentz (a member of the Kränzchen) has made,³ it is to be gathered that about 100 Mathurā inscriptions were studied,⁴ which Lüders had obviously selected and grouped according to different viewpoints.⁵ The few general remarks on historical questions which occur in

only numbers (no dates at all). Apps. Nos 125a—y are undated Buddhist inscriptions from different places of discovery, arranged partly according to palaeography, partly according to content.

¹ The India Office Library (London) kindly supplied the editor with the particulars.


³ In the “Memoranda” parts of the inscriptions are copied in ordinary writing from the hearing. Often parts of the translations are enclosed in shorthand (system Stolze-Schrey), as well as brief notes here and there.

⁴ The treatises on these inscriptions are kept in the Manuscript with exception of those from the Kankāli Tilā (see above p. 8, n. 3).

⁵ This conclusion is arrived at only from the order of the inscriptions in the “Memoranda”. So for example, the records in which certain terms occur, like kālavāda (cf. Lüders’ publication in the Ep. Ind. 24, see above p. 9, n. 1), viṇṇāsika, Vaḍjakṣa, are grouped together, further the inscriptions from the statues of Kuśāṇa princes, the epigraphs from the Jamālpur mound. (Like the group headings, summarized remarks are also missing in the “Memoranda”.)
the "Memoranda" throw no light on Lüders' attitude to the problems of the different eras.

A comparison of the "Memoranda" with the Manuscript shows that the author, after the discussion in his Kränzchen, once more revised his older treatises on the inscriptions¹ and this time giving them the wording² now found in the Manuscript.³

The photograph facing page 8, taken in 1937, shows the author (left) together with Prof. Konow (right) in Lüders' study in Berlin-Charlottenburg. (With acknowledgments to Prof. Waldschmidt. — Ed.)

¹ Besides the five older versions (cf. p. 9, n. 2) mentioned above (cf. p. 9) and the three cancelled treatises (cf. p. 8, n. 3), the revised versions of which are missing, there are several inscriptions found in the Manuscript in the older, as well as in the revised versions.

² The author, then, has taken into consideration, as occasion offers, also ideas of the members of his Kränzchen; thus from L. Alsdorf (see the next note), F. Gelpke (see below p. 177, n. 1), O. Hansen (see below p. 144, n. 2), S. Konow (see below p. 149, n. 1, p. 178, n. 1).

³ Lüders also published his article in the Ep. Ind. 24 (see above p. 9, n. 1, p. 11, n. 5) after he had explained the »Seven Brāhmi Inscriptions« in his Kränzchen, to which L. Alsdorf contributed his observations on paścavirāh (see § 113: L. 14; cf. also "Bibliography", p. 247).
MATHURĀ INSCRIPTIONS DEALT WITH

I. Inscriptions from Ancient Sanctuaries in the Environs of Mathurā

1. Kaṭrā Mound ........................................ p. 29
   §1: L.125a  §4: (L.143c)*
   §2: L.125c  §5: (L.88a)
   §3: (L.89e)  §7: (L.149f)*
   §8: (L.78e)

2. Bhūtēsār Mound ...................................... p. 36
   §11: L.91a  §19: L.103
   §12: L.52a  §20: L.99
   §13: (L.149j)*  §21: L.111

3. Kaṅkāli Tīlā .......................................... p. 39
   §14: L.45a  §17: L.107b  §22: (L.149k)*
   §15: L.56  §18: L.94  §23: L.89c
   §16: L.80

4. Caubārā Mounds .................................... p. 54
   §24: L.38  §40: L.133 (= 134)
   §25: L.98  §41: L.89

5. Jamālpur Mound .................................... p. 57
   §26: L.79  §31: L.62
   §27: L.85  §32: L.62a
   §28: L.33  §33: L.62b
   §29: L.52  §34: L.63
   §30: L.60  §35: L.64 (= 61,64a)
   §31: L.62  §36: L.125y
   §32: L.62a  §37: L.65
   §33: L.62b  §38: L.139
   §34: L.63  §39: L.132
   §35: L.64 (= 61,64a)  §40: L.133 (= 134)
   §36: L.125y  §41: L.89
   §37: L.65  §42: L.90
§50: L. 125w
§51: L. 131 (= 125v)
§52: L. 125m
§53: L. 125n
§54: L. 125r
§55: L. 125k
§56: L. 135
§57: L. 125x
§58: L. 125o
§59: L. 129 (= 130?)
§60: L. 127
§61: L. 141
§62: L. 128
§63: L. 125q
§64: L. 82
§65: L. 140
§66: L. 125d
§67: L. 146
§68: L. 136
§69: {L. 91j}
§70: L. 91b
§71: {L. 91i}

6. Mound on the Circular Road ................................ p. 105
§72: L. 88

II. Inscriptions from Mathurā City

1. §73: {L. 29a} .................................................. p. 109
§74: {L. 31a}
§75: {L. 91e}

2. From the Dhūnsārpārā Quarter ............................ p. 111
§76: L. 89a

3. From the Gōpālpur Quarter ............................... p. 112
§77: L. 125i

4. From the Dasāvatāri Gali ................................ p. 113
§78: {L. 149h}*

5. From the Mātā Gali .......................................... p. 114
§79: {L. 97c}

6. From the Gau-Ghāṭ Well ................................ p. 115
§80: {L. 97b}

7. From the Dalpat-ki-Khirki Mohalla ...................... p. 116
§81: {L. 23b}

8. From the Bharatpur State Mound ......................... p. 119
§82: {L. 143j}*
§83: {L. 143f}

9. From the Gāyatrī Tīlā .................................... p. 120
§84: {L. 143g}

10. From the Dig Gate ....................................... p. 120
§85: {L. 143i}*
11. From the Bharatpur Gate .................................. p. 121
   §86: <L.97d>
12. From the Sitalā-Ghāṭi ........................................ p. 121
   §87: <L.143a>*
13. From the Arjunpura Mohalla Mound ...................... p. 122
   §88: L.92
14. From the Jamnā Bāgh ........................................... p. 122
   §89: <L.97a>
   §90: <L.97e>
15. From Īsāpur ...................................................... p. 124
   §91: <L.124r>
   §92: <L.124t>
   §93: <L.149z>*
   §94: L.149a
16. Records on Antiquities found in the Jamnā near Mathurā ........................................... p. 126
   §95: <L.85a>
   §96: <L.85b>

III. Inscriptions from the Mathurā District

1. Māṭ ............................................................... p. 131
   § 97: <L.78b>
   § 98: <L.80d>
   § 99: <L.80e>
   §100: <L.80f>
   §101: <L.80g>
2. From the Mound of Rāl-Bhaḍār ............................... p. 148
   §102: <L.21b>
   §103: L.13a
   §104: L.13b
3. Koṭā Mound .................................................... p. 150
   §105: L.15a
   §106: L.15
4. From the Brindāban Road ................................... p. 152
   §107: L.41a
5. From Ghosnā ................................................... p. 152
   §108: <L.102c>
   §109: <L.102d>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§110</td>
<td>(L.102e)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§111</td>
<td>(L.102e 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>From Saknā</td>
<td>p. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§112</td>
<td>L.14c*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mōrā</td>
<td>p. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§113</td>
<td>L.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§114</td>
<td>L.14a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§115</td>
<td>(L.82a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§116</td>
<td>(L.14aa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gaṇēshrā</td>
<td>p. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§117</td>
<td>(L.14d 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§118</td>
<td>(L.14d 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§119</td>
<td>L.14d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§120</td>
<td>(L.14d 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>From Naugavā</td>
<td>p. 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§121</td>
<td>L.14b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Giridharpur Mounds</td>
<td>p. 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§122</td>
<td>(L.91d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§123</td>
<td>(L.77a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§124</td>
<td>(L.92c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pālikherā</td>
<td>p. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§125</td>
<td>(L.143d)</td>
<td>§129: (L.143i)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§126</td>
<td>(L.41b)</td>
<td>§130: (L.143h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§127</td>
<td>(L.143e)</td>
<td>§131: (L.143n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§128</td>
<td>(L.21c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>From Salempur</td>
<td>p. 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§132</td>
<td>(L.143l)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>From the Mahōlī—Usphār Road</td>
<td>p. 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§133</td>
<td>L.14e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Anyōr</td>
<td>p. 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§134</td>
<td>L.12a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§135</td>
<td>L.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>From Sonkh</td>
<td>p. 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§136</td>
<td>(L.31b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>From Chārgāon</td>
<td>p. 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§137</td>
<td>L.149b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§138</td>
<td>L.149c*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mathurā Inscriptions Dealt with

17. From Parkham .................................................. p. 175
   §139: L.150
   §140: (L.150a)*
   §141: (L.150b)*

18. From Gukharauli ................................................. p. 180
   §142: (L.135b)*

IV. Mathurā Inscriptions — Place of Discovery Unknown

1. Antiquities in the Mathurā Museum ....................... p. 183
   §143: L.125b §149: L.125h §155: (L.135c)*
   §144: L.81a* §150: (L.24a) §156: (L.135d)*
   §145: L.125j §151: (L.149g)* §157: (L.79b)
   §146: L.125f §152: (L.135a)* §158: (L.143p)*
   §147: L.125g §153: (L.143b)* §159: (L.91f)
   §148: L.91c §154: (L.21a) §160: (L.91h)

   §161: (L.149u) §167: L.125e
   §162: L.89b §168: L.92a
   §163: (L.143o)* §169: (L.149m)*
   §164: L.124a §170: (L.149o)*
   §165: (L.124z) §171: (L.124m)
   §166: (L.149q)*

   §172: (L.80b) §176: (L.92d)
   §173: (L.92b) §177: (L.138a)*
   §174: (L.35b) §178: (L.85c)
   §175: (L.143m) §179: L.148

4. Pedestal of a Statue in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay ................................................. p. 205
   §180: L.43

5. Stone in the Patnā Museum .................................. p. 206
   §181: (L.93a)

   §182: L.23

7. Antiquities lost ................................................. p. 210
   §183: L.138
   §184: L.145
   §185: L.147
   §186: L.149
   §187: L.125

OTHER INSCRIPTIONS MENTIONED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List No</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>p. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>p. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>p. 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>p. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>p. 41; 43, n. 2; 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>p. 42, n. 5; 43, n. 2; 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>p. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>p. 59, n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>p. 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>p. 97; 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>p. 42, n. 4; 50; 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>p. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>p. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>p. 48; 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>p. 54, n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>p. 54, n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>p. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>p. 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>p. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>p. 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>p. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>p. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>p. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>p. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>p. 50; p. 118 (edition!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>p. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>p. 55; 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>p. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>p. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>p. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>p. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>p. 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CII 2, 1 No</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>p. 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>p. 96; 100; 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 1</td>
<td>p. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>p. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>p. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>p. 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>p. 95; 97; 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>p. 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>p. 95; 171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CII 3 No</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p. 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>p. 35, n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p. 29, n. 3; 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>p. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>p. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>p. 163, n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>p. 163, n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>p. 163, n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>p. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>p. 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>p. 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ep. Ind. 12. 1913/14, 317, 6: Mandasor inscr. from the time of Naravarman → p. 118, n. 3
16. 1921/22, 237.ff.: Gaḍha (Jasdan) inscr., S. 127 → p. 118, n. 3
18. 1925/26, 158ff.: Masharja inscr. → p. 178
21. 1931/32, 55ff.: Mathurā inscr., S. 28 → p. 136, n. 4; 137; 145
21. 1931/32, 97ff.: Nālandā inscr. of Vipulaśrimitra → p. 118, n. 4
24. 1937/38, 146 ff.: Kōsam inscr. of the year 107

IHQ 6. 1930, 45 ff.: Copperplate dated in S. 188

ASI Ann. Rep. 1915/16, 2. 1918, p. 105 ff.: Pāwāyā inscr. on the pedestal of a statue of the Yakṣa Māṇibhadra

→ p. 119, n. 2

→ p. 118, n. 1

→ p. 176, n. 1
CONCORDANCE I

Lüders’ inscription numbers¹ and §§ of the present work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(92c)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>64a</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(92d)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(93a)</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(77a)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(78b)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(97a)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(78c)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(97b)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14aa)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(97c)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(79b)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>(97d)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(97e)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14d</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>(80b)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14d1)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(80c)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14d2)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(80d)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(102c)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14d3)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(80e)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(102d)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14e</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(80f)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(102e)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81a</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(102e2)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21a)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>107b</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21b)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(85a)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21c)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>(85b)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>124a</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>(85c)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>(124m)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23b)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(124r)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24a)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(88a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(124t)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29a)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(124z)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31a)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89a</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31b)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>89b</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>125a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89c</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>125b</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35b)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(89e)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125c</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>125d</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>125e</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125f</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41b)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>91b</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125g</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>91c</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>125h</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(91d)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125i</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(91e)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125j</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(91f)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>125k</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(91h)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>125l</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(91i)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>125m</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(91j)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>125n</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>125o</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62a</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92a</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>125p</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62b</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(92b)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125q</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125r</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Cf. above Preface p. 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>§</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125t</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(133a)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125u</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125v</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>149a</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125w</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>149b</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125x</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(143a)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>149c</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125y</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(143b)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>(149f)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(143c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(149g)</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(143d)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>(149h)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(143e)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>(149i)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(143f)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(149j)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(143g)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(149k)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(143h)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(149l)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(143i)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(149m)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(143j)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>(149o)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(143k)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(149q)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(143l)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(149r)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135a)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(143m)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(149s)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135b)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(143n)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>(149t)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135c)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>(143o)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135d)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>(143p)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(150a)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>(150b)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCORDANCE II

Lüders’ palaeographical numbers¹ and §- + L.-numbers.

(Š = Šuṅga, Kṣa = Kṣatrapa, K = Kujāna, G = Gupta)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd cent. B.C.</th>
<th>§116: L.14aa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd cent. B.C.</td>
<td>§91: L.124r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 2</td>
<td>§88: L.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 4</td>
<td>§168: L.92a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 9</td>
<td>§159: L.91f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 10</td>
<td>§160: L.91h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 11</td>
<td>§173: L.92b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 13</td>
<td>§89: L.91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 14</td>
<td>§108—§111: L.102, c,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d, e, e2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 15</td>
<td>§83: L.143f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š 16</td>
<td>§159: L.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kṣa 2          | §64: L.82   |
Kṣa 3          | §115: L.82a |
Kṣa 4          | §113: L.14  |
Kṣa 8          | §123: L.77a |
Kṣa 9          | §25: L.98   |
Kṣa 12         | §178: L.85c |
Kṣa 16         | §72: L.88   |
Kṣa 17         | §162: L.89b |
Kṣa 27         | §123: L.91d |
Kṣa 28         | §75: L.91e  |
Kṣa 30         | §176: L.92d |
Kṣa 31         | §80: L.97b  |
Kṣa 32         | §86: L.97d  |
Kṣa 36         | §1: L.125a  |
Kṣa 37         | §155: L.135c|

K 7            | §154: L.21a |
K 8            | §102: L.21b |
K 9            | §128: L.21c |
K 14           | §150: L.24a |
K 20           | §73: L.29a  |
K 24           | §74: L.31a  |
K 25           | §136: L.31b |
K 27           | §25: L.33   |
K 33           | §24: L.38   |
K 35           | §45: L.40   |
K 37           | §107: L.41a |
K 39           | §180: L.43  |
K 49           | §29: L.52   |

K 57           | §12: L.52a  |
K 58           | §30: L.60   |
K 59           | §31: L.62   |
K 60           | §32: L.62a  |
K 61           | §33: L.62b  |
K 62           | §34: L.63   |
K 63           | §35: L.64 (=61, 64a) |
K 64           | §126: L.41b |
K 65           | §37: L.65   |
K 80           | §97: L.78b  |
K 81           | §26: L.79   |
K 83           | §124: L.92c |
K 86           | §157: L.79b |
K 88           | §172: L.80b |
K 89           | §99: L.80c  |
K 90           | §98: L.80d  |
K 91           | §100: L.80e |
K 92           | §101: L.80f |
K 94           | §144: L.81a |
K 97           | §69: L.91j  |
K 100          | §27: L.85   |
K 101          | §95: L.85a  |
K 102          | §96: L.85b  |
K 103          | §71: L.91i  |
K 106          | §5: L.83a   |
K 107          | §41: L.89   |
K 108          | §76: L.89a  |
K 109          | §3: L.89e   |
K 110          | §42: L.90   |
K 111          | §43: L.91   |
K 112          | §11: L.91a  |
K 113          | §70: L.91b  |
K 114          | §148: L.91c |
K 115          | §79: L.97c  |
K 116          | §90: L.97e  |
K 122          | §164: L.124a|
K 132          | §171: L.124m|
K 163          | §165: L.124z|
K 164          | §143: L.125b|
K 165          | §2: L.123c  |
K 166          | §66: L.125d |
K 167          | §146: L.125f|

¹ Cf. above Introductory Note p. 6.
| K 168 | §147 : L.125g |
| K 170 | §149 : L.125h |
| K 171 | §77 : L.125i |
| K 172 | §145 : L.125j |
| K 173 | §55 : L.125k |
| K 174 | §44 : L.125l |
| K 175 | §52 : L.125m |
| K 176 | §53 : L.125n |
| K 177 | §58 : L.125o |
| K 179 | §63 : L.125p |
| K 180 | §54 : L.125q |
| K 181 | §47 : L.125r |
| K 182 | §137 |
| K 183 | §48 : L.125s |
| K 184 | §49 : L.125t |
| K 185 | §51 : L.131 (= 125v) |
| K 186 | §50 : L.125w |
| K 187 | §57 : L.125x |
| K 188 | §56 : L.125y |
| K 189 | §46 : L.126 |
| K 190 | §60 : L.127 |

| K 191 | §59 : L.129 (= 130f) |
| K 192 | §39 : L.132 |
| K 193 | §40 : L.133 (= 134) |
| K 194 | §56 : L.135 |
| K 195 | §142 : L.135b |
| K 196 | §68 : L.136 |
| K 197 | §156 : L.135c |
| K 203 | §38 : L.139 |
| K 204 | §61 : L.141 |
| K 205 | §87 : L.143a |
| K 206 | §153 : L.143b |
| K 207 | §4 : L.143c |
| K 208 | §125 : L.143d |
| K 209 | §127 : L.143e |

| K 211 | §84 : L.143g |
| K 212 | §130 : L.143h |
| K 213 | §129 : L.143i |
| K 214 | §82 : L.143j |
| K 215 | §6 : L.143k |
| K 216 | §132 : L.143l |
| K 217 | §175 : L.143m |
| K 218 | §131 : L.143n |
| K 219 | §163 : L.143o |
| K 220 | §158 : L.143p |
| K 221 | §94 : L.149a |
| K 222 | §137 : L.149b |
| K 223 | §138 : L.149c |
| K 224 | §7 : L.149d |
| K 225 | §151 : L.149e |
| K 226 | §85 : L.149f |
| K 227 | §13 : L.149g |
| K 229 | §169 : L.149h |
| K 231 | §168 : L.149i |
| K 234 | §93 : L.149j |
| G 3  | §8 : L.78a |
| G 4  | §167 : L.125e |
| G 5  | §65 : L.140 |
| G 6  | §67 : L.146 |
| G 7  | §78 : L.149h |
| G 9  | §161 : L.149i |
| G 10 | §162 : L.135a |
| G 11 | §185 : L.147 |
| G 12 | §179 : L.148 |
| G 13 | §186 : L.149 |
| G 14 | §10 : L.149g |
| G 16 | §170 : L.149i |
| G 17 | §174 : L.35b |
| G 18 | §9 : L.149v |
CONCORDANCE III

Registration numbers of museums and §- + L.-numbers.¹

Archaeological Museum at Mathurā²

| A 1 = §1: L.125a |
| A 2 = §135: L.13 |
| A 5 = §67: L.146 |
| A 21 = §87: L.143a |
| A 49 = §28: L.33 |
| A 50 = §121: L.14b |
| A 56 = §143: L.125b |
| A 64 = §76: L.89a |
| A 65 = §134: L.12a |
| A 66 = §2: L.125c |
| A 71 = §103: L.13a |
| B 31 = §23: L.89c |
| C 1 = §139: L.150 |
| C 13 = §137: L.149b |
| C 16 = §133: L.14e |
| C 21 = §12: L.52a |
| C 28 = §104: L.13b |
| E 20 = §114: L.14a |
| E 25 = §107: L.41a |
| G 10 = §66: L.125d |
| G 39 = §144: L.81a |
| G 42 = §119: L.14d |
| G 43 = §106: L.15 |
| G 47 = §112: L.14c |
| J 1 = §11: L.91a |
| J 7 = §25: L.98 |
| J 13 = §145: L.125j |
| J 15 = §42: L.90 |
| J 21 = §146: L.125j |
| J 36 = §147: L.125g |
| J 41 = §70: L.91b |
| J 48 = §148: L.91c |
| J 52 = §149: L.125h |
| J 58 = §105: L.15a |
| J 68 = §77: L.125i |
| N 1 = §68: L.136 |
| P 20 = §33: L.62b |
| P 21 = §47: L.125s, 137 |
| P 22 = §46: L.126 |
| P 23 = §44: L.125l |
| P 24 = §51: L.131 ( = 125v) |
| P 25 = §48: L.125t |
| P 26 = §49: L.125u |
| P 27 = §52: L.125m |
| P 28 = §53: L.125n |
| P 29 = §59: L.129 ( = 130?) |
| P 30 = §63: L.125q |
| P 31 = §55: L.125k |
| P 32 = §54: L.125r |
| P 33 = §58: L.125o |
| P 34 = §38: L.139 |
| P 35 = §37: L.65 |
| P 36 = §57: L.125x |
| P 37 = §50: L.125w |
| P 38 = §32: L.62a |
| P 39 = §36: L.125y |
| Q 1 = §113: L.14 |
| Q 4 = §138: L.149c |
| Q 13 = §94: L.149a |

¹ Cf. above Preface p. 11.
² Cf. V. S. Agrawala, Cat. Brahm. Images 1951, p. 106, note: "Antiquities with Nos like C 1, C 3, C 4, were included in Dr. J. Ph. Vogel’s Catalogue of the Arch. Museum at Mathurā 1910, and Nos like 122, 123, 124 in the... [handwritten] Accession Register of the Mathurā Museum."
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| 1566 | §127 : L.143e         | 2798 | §129 : L.143i          |
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I. INSCRIPTIONS FROM ANCIENT SANCTUARIES
IN THE ENVIRONS OF MATHURĀ
I. INSCRIPTIONS FROM ANCIENT SANCTUARIES
IN THE ENVIRONS OF MATHURĀ

1. Kaṭrā Mound

The first regular archaeological exploration at Mathurā was carried out by General Cunningham in 1853 and again in 1862.¹

The Kaṭrā, or market place, is situated to the west of Mathurā City. It is an oblong enclosure measuring 804 feet in length by 653 feet in breadth. Once a magnificent temple of Kesavadeva stood on a high mound in the midst of the Kaṭrā. J.B. Tavernier ranks it with Jagannāth, Benares and Tirupati among the most celebrated pagodas in India.² The temple was pulled down in 1670 by Aurangzeb, who built a masjid in its stead which has survived to the present day. The date of the erection of the Kesavadeva temple is not known, but Cunningham's excavations proved that before that time the site was occupied by a Buddhist sanctuary.³

The finds made in 1862 included a standing figure of Buddha discovered in clearing a well at the north-west corner of the temple. It bears an inscription in Gupta characters (§8: L.78c) and seems to be dated in the year 232 of the Gupta era (A.D. 551/552), or in the year 280 (A.D. 599/600).⁴ It records that the statue was the gift of the Śākya nun Jayabhaṭṭā at the Yaśāvihāra. As Yaśā occurs as a female name in the Mathurā inscription §14: L.45a, Yaśāvihāra has probably to be interpreted as the vihāra founded by a lady of the name Yaśā.

But there appears to have been a Buddhist vihāra on the Kaṭrā site already at the beginning of the second century A.D. There is a statuette of a Bodhisattva in the Mathurā Museum purchased by Pandit Radha Krishna from a Brahman who is said to have found it in digging a well on the Kaṭrā site. A Prakrit inscription (§1: L.125a) in characters of the early Kuśān period on the pedestal states that the image was set up by a certain Amohāśi, the mother of Buddharakkhita, in her own

³ A stone with a fragmentary inscription of the time of the Gupta king Candra-gupta II (CII 3, p. 25ff. No 4) was found already in 1853, but nothing can be made out about the purport of the record.
⁴ [Cf. below p. 35, note 3.]
vihāra. Whether Amohāśi's vihāra was replaced by the Yaśāvihāra or whether the two vihāras existed side by side cannot be decided. —

In 1896 excavations on the Katrā site were resumed by Führer who reported to have discovered fragments belonging to a Buddhist Stūpa and a portion of the procession-path on the pavement of which there was an inscription stating that the Stūpa had been repaired in S. 76 by the Kuṇān king Vasuṣka. This inscription was never published nor are there estampages or photographs of it in existence. In 1911/12 Pandit Radha Krishna tried to recover it, but his endeavours were in vain. On the spot indicated only the remains of a brick Stūpa came to light, but according to Vogel this monument cannot be assigned to a date earlier than about the sixth century A.D. The numerous sculptural fragments also that were recovered in the course of the excavation are mostly of a late date and appear to belong to the Keśavadeva [Kesab Dev] temple. Considering the well-known untrustworthiness of Führer's reports, there can be no doubt that the Vasuṣka inscription is only a product of his imagination. — During the last years only few objects with Brāhmī inscriptions have been acquired from the Katrā mound.

The inscriptions §3: L.89e, §4: L.143e, §5: L.88a, §6: L.143k, §7: L.149f belong to the time of the Kuṇān rule; §8: L.78e, §9: L.149v, §10: L.149l are of the Gupta period. All of them originate or may originate from some Buddhist establishment, with the exception of §9: L.149v, which is engraved in Gupta characters on the pedestal of a statuette of Rṣabha, the first Tīrthamkara. It is, of course, not impossible that in Gupta times there was also a Jaina shrine on the Katrā site, but considering that the statuette is the only Jaina object that has turned up at that place until now, the possibility that the statement about its place of discovery is erroneous, or that it was transferred in later times from the Kaṅkāli Tīlā, does not seem to be beyond question.

125a

Facsimiles: below p. 261

§ 1

Inscription on the pedestal of the statue of a seated Bodhisattva in black sandstone, said to have been found by a Brahman in digging a well on the Katrā site, now in the Mathurā Museum. The first two lines are engraved on the upper rim, the third on the lower rim.


2 ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 1. 1914, p. 16f.; ditto, 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 131f.
by him in the Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 47f. (A 1), where also a phototype of the statue is given (pl. 7), and again ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2. 1914, p. 63f., with reproductions of the statue (pl. 23a), and of lines 1 and 3 of the inscription (pl. 29, 1a—b). The statue was figured also by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 81, by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 26a, etc.

TEXT

1 Budharakhitasa mātare Amohāsiye Bodhisaco patiṭhāpito
2 sāhā mātāpitihi sake vihāre
3 savasatvānā[ṃ]1 hitasukhāye

TRANSLATION

By Amohāsi (Amoghādasi²), the mother of Budharakhta (Buddharakṣita), the Bodhisattva was set up together with her parents in her own vihāra for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

125c

Facsimile: below p. 261

§ 2

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a seated Bodhisattva, now in the Mathurā Museum. The image was obtained by Pandit Radha Krishna from a shrine known as Galatēsva Mahādev Maṭḥ near the Kaṭrā where it was inserted in a wall. It is said to have been dug up from a small mound in the neighbourhood.

Of the image only the left leg with the left hand resting on it and the lower part of an attendant standing on the left side remain. The pedestal was divided into three compartments. Only the proper left half of the central compartment, showing a female worshipper turned to the right and a winged lion, and the proper left outer compartment are preserved. The inscription was incised on the upper (line 1) and lower (line 2) rims of the central compartment and continued on the two upper rims (lines 3 and 4) and the middle portion (lines 5 and 6) of the outer compartment.

It was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 63 (A 66), and ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2. 1914, p. 65f. with reproductions of the image on p. 66, fig. 2, and of the inscription on pl. 29,4.

¹ On the reverse of the impression a vertical line can be discerned on the edge of the rim a little to the right of the nā and nearly touching the i-sign of the following hi. It may be meant for the anusvāra.

² [In the Manuscript Lüders wrote Amohādasi. — Compare his remarks § 88: L. 92.]
TEXT
1 ///... kaye Naṁdāye kṣatrapa[sa]///
2 ///(Bo)dhisat[v]a visa .. t[a] .. e ///
3 savasatānam 4 hitasu(khā-)
4 rtha(m)
5 Śāvasthidiyānaṃ 5
6 prarīgahe 6

TRANSLATION

..... (the gift) of the ..... Naṁdā, of (?) the kṣatrapa ..... a Bodhisattva ..... for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings for the acceptance of the Śāvasthidiyas (Sarvāstivādins).

Owing to the mutilated state of the inscription, no coherent translation is possible, but it probably recorded the gift of a statue of a Bodhisattva. The meaning of the last word of the second line escapes me.

The spelling of the last two words is uncommonly faulty. They appear to be an attempt to Sanskritise the Prakrit formula Sāvatthi dīyānaṃ parīgahe. Such bad Sanskrit is rarely found in inscriptions previous to Kuśān times.

The characters are of the archaic type, but not quite as neat as usual in inscriptions of the Kṣatrapa period.

⟨89e⟩

Facsimile: below p. 261

§ 3

Fragmentary inscription on the proper left side of a pedestal of a Buddha image with three standing figures and a defaced lion, from the Kāṭrā mound well, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 416).

1 Vogel restores the word as [upāsi]kaye, but what is left of the akṣara preceding the ka does not agree with si.
2 The last letter may have been sya.
3 The dot to the right of vi is probably accidental. Vogel reads visa—ta[re], but the reading [re] is very doubtful, and there was certainly at least one more akṣara, possibly to, at the end of the line. [The reproduction of the pedestal in the Ann. Rep. (fig. 2) shows a few injuries of the stone immediately after visa. To the right of the so there seems to be engraved a long vertical stroke with a curved line over it and, on its lower part, probably a stroke to the right straight down. — It seems possible that the two strokes to the left above the following t[a] are not accidental. Judging from fig. 2 the last akṣara was ke, damaged a little only in its left part. From the above mentioned reproduction it appears that after .e the rim is damaged by knocking off a small piece of the stone.]
4 Vogel: savasatānāṃ.
5 Vogel: Śāvasthi[v]a dīyānaṃ.
TEXT

1 ///... Śāk[y](a)[s](i) ///
2 t. sārvv[a]satāna
3 h[i]tasukhaye

TRANSLATION

..... (an image of) Śākyasi(ha) (Śākyasimha) (?) (was set up) for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

§ 4  

Fragmentary inscription on the upper and lower rims and on the proper left side of the pedestal of a Buddha image of which only the feet are preserved. The sculpture comes from the Kaṭrā mound and is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 270).

The inscription was edited by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 4 No 5.

TEXT

1 bhagavato Ś[ā]kyamunisyā pratiṁ pratiṣṭhāpitā
24 ...... nā.................................
3 pitramātrabha

TRANSLATION

The image of the holy Śākyamuni has been set up by (the monk)......

§ 5  

Fragmentary inscription on a pedestal from the Kaṭrā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 272). It is almost entirely obliterated. Lines 1 and 2 are engraved on the upper rim, lines 3 and 4 on the lower rim.

TEXT

1 ///.[nta]mās[e 2 di]///
2 ///.m .si.............///

---

1 On the reverse of the impression traces of a tripartite subscript -ya are visible. The i-sign is not certain. May we restore Śākyasihasya?
2 There seems to be no anusvāra on the top of the na.
3 The ā-sign of the first aksara is not certain.
4 With the exception of one letter the line on the lower rim is now illegible.

The inscription appears to have been dated, and the date of the month may have been the 2nd month of winter. Nothing can be said as regards its contents.

§ 6

Inscription on a sculpture showing an attendant with a big belly wearing a garland, from the Kaṭrā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 133).

Text
dakṣi

No sense can be discerned.

§ 7

Fragmentary inscription on a small piece of stone from the Kaṭrā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 132).

The record was edited by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10.1937, p.4f. No 7c.

Text

...sya pṝavāri...

Pravāri is certainly to be restored to some form of pṝavārika, probably pṝavārikasya 'of the cloakmaker'.

§ 8

Facsimile: below p.262

Inscription on the pedestal of a standing figure of Buddha discovered by Cunningham in clearing out a well at the Kaṭrā mound. The statue is now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 10).

The inscription was first noticed by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 1. 1871, p. 238. It was edited by Dowson, JRAI 5. 1870, p. 185 No 9 + pl., by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 37 No 23 + pl.16, by Fleet, CII 3. 1888, p. 273f. No 70 + pl. 40D.

1 There was probably a second line of writing.
TEXT

1 deyadharmo-yam Yahsavihāre Śakyabhikṣunyār1, Jayabhāttā-
yār-yad-atra punya[m] tad-bhavatu sar[v]vāsa. 2
2 tvya[n]a[m-an[u][t]arajñānāvāptaye — sanvatsaraḥ 200 [80] — 3

TRANSLATION

This is the pious gift of the Śākya nun Jayabhāttā at the Yaśavihāra. What merit there is in this (gift), let it be for the attainment of supreme knowledge by all sentient beings. The year 280.

Perhaps Fleet was right in referring the date of the inscription to the Gupta era. Although the script would seem to be earlier than A.D. 599/600.

§ 9

(149v)*

Inscription on the pedestal of a Jaina Tirthankara, said to have been found in the Kaṭrā mound 4, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 268). The record is engraved in Gupta characters to the right and left of a wheel.

TEXT

1 siddham — Rṣabhasya pratimā . Samu[d]r[a]. 5
2 Sāgarābhyaṁ Saṅgārakasya
3 dattī — Sagarasya 6 pratimā

TRANSLATION

Success! An image of Rṣabha, the gift of Saṅgāraka to Samudra and Sāgara. The image of Sāgara (Sāgara?).

1 Fleet: -bhikṣunyar-, but the ā-sign is quite distinct.
2 The first -va- in the ligature reva is not quite certain.
3 Dowson and Cunningham, taking the last horizontal stroke as the symbol J, read the date as 281. Fleet was of the opinion that the numerical symbols were 200 30, followed by the sign of punctuation.
4 As the horizontal stroke undoubtedly is used to mark the end of the inscription, it is probable that it serves the same purpose also after the date. But I am by no means sure that the second figure is meant for 30. There is a distinct semicircle attached to the right of the supposed symbol for 80 in the Udayagiri cave inscription dated from the year 82 (CII 3, p. 21ff. No 3). The only difference is that the left loop, by omitting the bottom line, is turned into a hook. But exactly the same alteration has taken place in the ya of deyadharmo and Jaya as compared with the rest of the ya-signs. Under these circumstances I have ventured to read the figure as 80.
5 After pratimā there is a dot. There may have been an ā-sign at the top of the sa in Samu[d]r[a]. The da- of [d]r[a] is discernible on the reverse of the impression.
6 The sa has no ā-sign.
Although the letters of the inscription are pretty clear and the words can hardly be translated differently, the text is puzzling. Who are Samudra and Sāgara to whom Saṅgāraka gave the image of Rśabha, the first Tirthamkara, and why is the image in an additional note stated to be the image of Sagara who, in spite of the slight difference in the spelling of the name, appears to be identical with the Sāgara mentioned before? I am unable to answer these questions.

§ 10

Inscription on a piece of stone originating from the Kaṭrā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 419).

This is a most peculiar inscription. It consists of four exceptionally large letters placed between two horizontal lines which, judging from the bead at the left end of the lower line, originally were joined at both ends in such a way as to form a sort of cartouche for the writing.

The first two letters are almost completely destroyed. Then follows an aksāra which looks like kṣā, but with the subscript -ṣa attached to the left side of the ka. This position of the -ṣa suggests at once that the inscription is incised in reversed writing, and on this supposition the next enigmatical letter would also become intelligible. It would be a ma of the Gupta period with the o-sign. The mo was followed by two more letters which can hardly be deciphered.

We thus arrive at the reading [. . . kṣā mo . . . , i. e.:]

. . . mokṣi . . .

If my explanation of the nature of this writing is accepted, the stone would seem to have been used as a stamp or die.

2. Bhūtēsar Mound

There is a hill south of the Kaṭrā which is generally named the Bhūtēsar mound after the modern temple of Bhūtēsar situated on its southern side.

In the season 1871/72 Cunningham acquired five of the famous railing pillars from the verandah of a dharmśālā near the temple. They are ornamented on the obverse with female figures standing on dwarfs and on the reverse with reliefs representing Jātakas and scenes of Buddha’s life.1 Cunningham states that they were believed to have been discovered

1 ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 20f. A sixth pillar has been presented already before 1847 by Colonel L. R. Stacy to the Asiatic Society’s Museum, Calcutta (Kittoe, JASB 16, 1. 1847, p. 335; cf. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 142) and a seventh was discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna inside the Mahōli Gate of Mathurā City; see Vogel, op. cit., p. 157 (J 71). — There are also some fragments
in the Bhūtēsar mound, and it is indeed very probable if the mound is
the site of a Buddhist Stūpa of which those railing pillars formed part.

A railing pillar of unusual large dimensions stood on the top of the
hill in front of the entrance to the temple. It was removed by Growse
and is now in the Mathurā Museum (J 1). The pillar is carved in front
with a female figure and a bas-relief probably representing some Jā-
taka. — On one side of it there is a sign (inscription §11: L.91a) which
Cunningham took to be “the Arian letter ḫ, which was the figure for
100, in use at Mathurā during the Indo-Scythian period”, and he inferred
from it that there must have been no less than a 100 of these large pillars.—
Granting that there is a certain resemblance of the sign to a Kharoṣṭhī
ha, there is not the slightest evidence for the use of that letter as the
symbol for 100. Vogel (Cat. Mus. Math., p. 141 J 1) is inclined to look
at the sign as the numeral 30. I do not see how that would be possible,
the sign in question showing little likeness to the ordinary figure for
30. If it is a letter at all, it may be ḫe. It is probably a mason’s mark
that has no connection with the number of the pillars.

There are only two objects with inscriptions in Kuṣān characters
which are supposed to originate from the Bhūtēsar mound, but neither
of them seem to have been found in situ and neither of them is Buddhist,
so they cannot tell anything about the age of the Buddhist structure.

The inscription §12: L.52a is engraved on the base of a Nāga statuette
which was acquired from a shrine in Mathurā City, but is said to have
been found in the Bhūtēsar mound. That means that there may have
been a Nāga shrine on the spot.

The inscription §13: L.149j, according to information by the Curator
of the Mathurā Museum, also comes from the Bhūtēsar locality. It is
on the pedestal of a Jina image. The wording of the inscription is exactly
the same as that of the Jaina records from the Kaṅkālī Tilā, and although
it cannot be proved, I have little doubt in this case that the image
originally was set up in the Jaina sanctuary in the immediate vicinity
of the Bhūtēsar Stūpa.

91a
Facsimile: below p. 262

§ 11

Inscription on a railing pillar from the Bhūtēsar mound, now in the
Mathurā Museum (J 1).

of pillars that may have belonged to the Bhūtēsar railing, and Vogel (op. cit.,
p. 142) thinks it possible that the fragment J 52 bearing the inscription §149:
L. 125h is one of them. But this is rather doubtful, since no inscription is found
on any of the complete Bhūtēsar railing pillars.

1 Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 21f.; Growse, Mathurā 1880,

[te]
The reading is very doubtful; see the remarks above.

52a
Facsimile: below p. 262

§ 12

Inscription on the base of a statuette of a standing Nāga, which was being worshipped as Dhāuji, i.e. Baladeva in a shrine near the Jama Mosque in Mathurā City and is said to have been found in the Būtēsar mound. The image is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record was mentioned by Vogel, JRAS 1911, p. 150f. who edited it, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 91 (C 21), and ASI Ann. Rep. 1908/09. 1912, p. 161 + pl. 54a. The image was figured by him in his Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 41d.

TEXT

— sam 50 2 v[a] 3 d[i] 20 5 bhagava[to] 1

TRANSLATION

In the year 52, in the 3rd (month) of the rainy season, on the 25th day, (the image) of the holy one.

§ 13

Fragmentary inscription engraved on the upper rim and on the lower rim of a broken pedestal of a quadruple Jina image, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 276). [Of the upper rim (with line A of the inscription) only the front face (with A 2), a portion of the proper right face (with A 1), and of the proper left face (with A 3) are preserved. The legible portion of the inscription on the lower rim (B) is incised on the proper right side of the pedestal.]

The stone is said to come from the Būtēsar locality, but as the Būtēsar mound is close to the Kaṅkālī Tilā, there can be little doubt that it originally belonged to the Jaina establishment of the Kaṅkālī Tilā. 2 The inscription was edited by Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 1. 1914, p. 17, ditto, 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 133, 3 and by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 1 No 1.

1 Vogel reads bhagava[to], but the o-sign of /ō/ is probable. Mr. Dikshit states that there was no more writing.
2 [Cf. above p. 37.] 3 The first of the two editions yields the better reading.
A 1 ... khāto\textsuperscript{1} vāca[ka]-
2 [s]ya aryya-Ṛṣidāsasya\textsuperscript{2} nirvarttanā\textsuperscript{3} Ābhisārakasya\textsuperscript{4} Bhaṭṭidāmasya mā\textsuperscript{5}
3 ... kā\textsuperscript{6}
B ... sa ... s[v]at ... ... ...

**Translation**

A. At the request of the preacher, the venerable Ṛṣidāsa out of the ... śākhā (the quadruple image of Jina was given by) ... ... the mother (?) of Bhaṭṭidāma, the Ābhisāraka (native of Abhisāra).

As regards the country of Abhisāra, I refer to Stein’s Translation of the Rājatarāṅgini (1900), note on Taraṅga 1, 180, and the literature quoted there.

---

3. Kaṅkāli Tīlā

\textsuperscript{7} About a quarter of a mile south of the Bhūṭēsar mound is the Kaṅkāli Tīlā, which was explored at different times by Harding,\textsuperscript{8} Cunningham, Growse, Burgess, and by Führer from about 1870 to 1896.

Cunningham, excavating there especially in 1871, gave a description of the hill,\textsuperscript{9} the higher portion of which at that time “had been repeatedly burrowed for bricks”: The “mound (was) 400 feet in length from west to east, and nearly 300 feet in breadth, with a mean height of 10 or 12

\textsuperscript{1} Agrawala: vr̥to. The khā is quite distinct. Restore: (śā)khāto.

\textsuperscript{2} Vogel and Agrawala: āryya. The first letter has no sign of length. — Agrawala: Ṛṣadāsasya. The i-sign of śi is distinct.

\textsuperscript{3} Agrawala: nirvarttanā. The third akṣara is clearly rtta.

\textsuperscript{4} Vogel: nā ... rakasya; Agrawala: Ābhisārikasya. There is no i-sign on the top of the ra.

\textsuperscript{5} Probably to be restored to some form of mātṛ.

\textsuperscript{6} Agrawala read: kī ... ... [and placed it at the beginning of the line]. I cannot determine how many letters are lost between mā and kā. If kā stands at the end of the line [!], the passage is probably to be restored to (pratimā sarvatobhadri)kā.

\textsuperscript{7} Together with most of the author’s treatments of inscriptions from the K. T., his preface to the present chapter is also missing in the Manuscript (cf. above p. 8 with notes). — The following remarks have been supplied by the editor. They are above all intended as a brief survey of the history of the archaeological operations at the K. T. site, with references to the principal editions of the inscriptions found there, etc.

\textsuperscript{8} (After excavating in the Jamālpur mound,) “Mr. Harding, Magistrate of Mathurā, ... dug a trench right across the Kaṅkāli mound from north to south, which yielded some mutilated Buddhist statues, both life-size and colossal [cf. below p. 40, n. 4]”, Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{9} ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 19.
feet above the fields. At the eastern end it (rose) to a height of 25 feet, with a breadth of 60 feet square at top, and about 150 square at base."

Growse, who trenched the Kaṅkālī Tīlā in 1873/74, reported that "a fragment of a carved Buddhist [] pillar (was) set up in a mean little shed on its summit and (did) duty for the goddess Kaṅkālī, to whom (the mound was) dedicated". He mentioned that occasionally the hill was called the Jainī Tīlā without giving further references.

That this second name was not an accidental one was proved by all excavations in the mound, which yielded hitherto almost without exception pure Jaina monuments, and it appeared, as was expressed already by Cunningham, that under the mound was once the site of an ancient and very important Jaina establishment.

In January and February 1888 at Bühler's request, Burgess began the principal explorations of the Kaṅkālī Tīlā. The excavations were resumed by Führer in Jan./Febr. 1889, continued in Jan./Febr. 1890, and finished by him for the time being in the period from Nov. 1890 to Febr. 1891. He worked again at the Kaṅkālī Tīlā in the spring of 1896.

The interesting results of the former explorations, yielding important Jaina antiquities and inscriptions, were by far surpassed by those of the extended excavations carried out from 1888 to 1896. In the course of these operations the remains of several buildings, especially of two Jaina temples and of a great Jaina Stūpa, were exposed. The great

---

1 At that place later on Führer discovered the Jaina brick Stūpa (cf. below p. 41).
2 Cf. below p. 255, Map 2 (G).
3 Growse, Mathurā 1874 Pt 1, p. 76f., Pt 2, p. 175f., Mathurā 1880, p. 108.
4 (Cf. also Lüders, below p. 60, n. 3; 179; 180; 189. —) Growse, Mathurā 1874 Pt 1, p. 76, reported that two colossal Buddha statues had been discovered in the K. T. [cf. above p. 39, n. 8], "which are now in the grounds of the Agra Museum". He repeated the same passage in Mathurā 1880, p. 108, where without further comment he corrected himself, writing: which "are probably now in the Allahabad Museum". Showing in this way his uncertainty as to the whereabouts of the statues, Growse did not mention the name of the discoverer. Reading his next sentence one may feel inclined to doubt whether these Buddha statues had been really discovered in the K. T.; Growse continued as follows: "Whatever else was found was collected on the same spot as the remains from the [Buddhist sanctuary at the] Jamālpur mound, and it is therefore possible, as no accurate note was made at the time, that some of the specimens referred to the latter locality were not really found there [and vice versa, cf. i. g. below p. 59, p. 1]; but there is no doubt as to the inscriptions, and this is the only point of any importance."
quantity of architectural pieces, mostly beautifully carved, and the numerous Jaina statues, stone slabs, etc., often inscribed, which were unearthed at the site, were for the most part forwarded to the Lucknow Provincial Museum, or placed in the grounds of the Mathurā Museum. Unfortunately no record of all these operations has ever been published, so there is almost no proof as to the exact finding places of the objects of the Kaṅkālī Tilā.

Führer, who had already announced a monograph on the Jaina remains at Mathurā in an advanced stage of preparation, left only 102 plates without a word of explanatory text when he quitted the service of the Government in 1898. It was V. A. Smith who, in 1901, edited these plates after being consulted by Sir Antony MacDonnell, “with a concise descriptive text, a short introduction, and references to... previous publications in which the subjects of them had been treated”. Smith published as Plate I “a General Plan” of the excavated part of the Kaṅkālī Tilā, showing the remains of a great number of buildings. These, however, can not be identified with exception of the foundations of the great Jaina brick Stūpa, situated at the eastern end of the site. — That there was within the precincts a Jaina Stūpa already in very ancient times seems to be expressed by the inscription List No 47, 1

1 The discoveries of the work done in 1890 which were sent to the Museum at Lucknow, Führer seems to have counted especially by their weight; Bühler reporting on a letter of Führer’s in The Academy 37. 1890, p. 270f. (WZKM 4. 1890, p. 169) stated that there had been forwarded to that museum “(608 maunds or) about a ton and a quarter of archaeological specimens”.

2 Cf. i. g. Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 106f., and below note 6.


4 Bühler in his editions of inscriptions from the K.T. in the Epigraphia Indica 1. 1892 made brief and mostly vague notes concerning the places of discovery of the objects bearing the records.

5 Cf. also The Academy 37. 1890, p. 271a, WZKM 4. 1890, p. 169. — In his Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (1891), p. 105f., Führer dedicated a short paragraph to the K.T. which, however, is not free from inaccuracies. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. VIII, mentioned an “Abstract from an unpublished report on (the) Mathurā excavations (carried out by Führer)”, published by the latter in: Journal of Indian Art and Industry 5. 1894, p. 58 + pl. 85—87.

6 Cf. p. III of the edition: V. A. Smith, The Jain Stūpa and other Antiquities of Mathurā, 1901. — The book was reviewed by Foucher, BEFEO 1. 1901, p. 375f. (He stated that he himself saw in the Museum at Lucknow the archaeological specimens figuring on the plates. Cf. also Smith, loc. cit.)

7 Cf. below p. 42, n. 5, end.

8 Cf. above p. 40, n. 1.

9 “The materials for preparing a key to the plate are not now in existence” (Smith, op. cit., pl. I). In the letter just mentioned (cf. above note 1) Führer wrote to Bühler that to the west of the Stūpa, i.e. in the centre of the site, there were situated the remains of what he called the Śvetāmbara temple, and that to the west of these remains there was a second large temple which in Führer’s opinion belonged “to the Digambara sect”.
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dated by Lüders in S. 49 (of the King Huviṣka\(^2\)). This Stūpa was described in the record as ‘built by the gods (or: by a god)\(^2\), “i. e. (it was) so ancient at the time when the inscription was incised (that) its origin had been forgotten”\(^3\).

From the inscriptions, found at the site, it appears that at the Kaṅkālī Tīlā there was a Jaina sanctuary from the period of the Śuṅga dynasty\(^4\);\(^5\) up to the time after the sack of Mathurā by Mahmūd of Ghaznī.\(^6\)

Most of the epigraphs from the Kaṅkālī Tīlā site\(^7\) had been treated by Bühler\(^8\) who published, together with his editions in the Epigraphia

\(^{1}\) Cf. Ep. Ind. 9. 1907/08, p. 245.

\(^{2}\) thupe d[e]van[e]r/mīt[e]; cf. the facsimile in Ep. Ind. 2. 1894(, p. 204) No 20.


\(^{4}\) For palaeographical reasons the inscription List No 93 (see also below p. 50) was assigned by Bühler “to about 150 B.C.” (WZKM 5. 1891, p. 175; Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 195), written in the “Śuṅga type of the ancient Brāhma” (Bühler, Ind. Palaeographie/Ind. Paleography, 1896/1904, § 15, 5; § 18 + pl. II, 20). (Cf. also the inscription below § 20: L. 99.)

\(^{5}\) J. E. van Lothuizen-de Leeuw, referring in her book “The ‘Scythian Period’, 1949, p. 147, to »the first proof of the existence of Jainism« did not discuss the inscription List No 93 (and L. 99). In her opinion the earliest Jaina record is the record List No 59 (from the K. T.), dated se[ñ]maja maḥakṣat[t]ropasa Śoddasasa sa[ñ]ja[vastre] 72. — Incised on a stone slab, showing a beautiful lady with female attendants in relief, the record List No 59 states: ...[Ā]mohniye...Ārya-vati pratīthāpitā...Ārya[vat[i] araṭṭapujāye. Mrs. van Lothuizen took ārya-vat[1] not as the personal name of the lady, but — ad hoc inventing an ārya-aga-vati, — she identified the word with āyāgapaṭa! »For when the verb [Skt.]: pratīthāpay[1] is used and the object is an image of some god or the Buddha [or the like], the word [Skt.]: pratimā is always added.« This statement can also not be accepted; cf. pl. 19, 32 of the book in question showing the inscription List No 125a (= § 1 of the present work) with the words: Bodhisacca patīthāpi, also op. cit., pl. 21, 34 with L. 88 (= § 72), L. 38 (= § 24), etc., etc. — It must be stated here that there are some more errors on p. 147 of van Lothuizen’s “The ‘Scythian Period’”; e.g.: note 8 (wrong; Pischel, Gramm. § 149[1] = Schwund von ya und va!); a number of āyāgapaṭas have been found again by V. Smith at K. T. near Mathurā, together with many other Jainistic relics (wrong; Smith published the plates[1], which were prepared by Führer, after being consulted by the Lt.-Gov. of the NW. Prov. and Ch. Commr. of Oudh; cf. also above p. 41 with notes 2, 3, and 61).

\(^{6}\) Cf. Smith, The Jain Stūpa 1901, pl. 96: Colossal image of a seated Tīrīṭhakara with a record, dated in V. S. 1134. On the lower portion of a Jina figure from the K. T. (Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 72 B24) there is a Nāgārī inscription parts of which are preserved; the inscription seems to be dated in V. S. 1234; cf. Growse, Mathurā 1880, pl. facing p. 114, line 3 (= Ind. Ant. 6. 1877, p. 219, No 10 + pl.).

\(^{7}\) For the older editions of inscriptions from the K. T. cf. WZKM 4. 1890, p. 314. The complete bibliography of every record (up to the year 1912) was published by Lüders in his List of Brāhma Inscriptions.

\(^{8}\) Based on the readings of inscriptions found at the K. T. site (A.), Bühler investigated a number of treatises on “the Authenticity of the Jain Tradition”
Indica, vol. 1—2, facsimiles of nearly all impressions \(^1\): \(^2\) forwarded to him by Burgess and Führer.\(^3\)

In the Museums, especially at Lucknow and Mathurā, there are numerous (often inscribed) Jaina antiquities from Mathurā of more or less uncertain origin which may belong in the majority of instances also to the sanctuary of the Kaṅkāli Tīlā site. They may partly have been excavated in the course of the above-mentioned operations, partly carried off by the inhabitants of the region (after the decay of the ancient sanctuary) from the Kaṅkāli Tīlā to their recent places of discovery in the City or in the environs of Mathurā. Examinations of the collections especially of the Lucknow\(^4\) and the Mathurā\(^5\) Museums yielded several inscriptions just characterized.\(^6\)

Lüders, preparing his List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, revised inter alia also several of the previously edited records from the Kaṅkāli Tīlā and published his results as “Epigraphical Notes” in the Indian Antiquary 33. 1904. Dealing occasionally since that time with inscriptions from the site, he apparently made use of his materials collected for the intended volume of Brāhmī Inscriptions.

and came to the conclusion that these records prove “the correctness of a not inconsiderable part of the [y]larger list[es] of teachers and schools (etc.), preserved in the Śthavirāvali of the Kalpasūtra” (B.). — [A.:ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 29ff. + pl. 13—15 (Bührer was also furnished with original rubbings of Cunningham), and WZKM 1—4 (cf. also 5, 10, Ep. Ind. 1). B.: WZKM 1. 1887 (p. 168f.), and 2—4 (cf. also 5, 10, Ep. Ind. 1—2; — Schubring, Lehre der Jainas 1935, p. 35.)]

\(^1\) Bührer excepted “either very small fragments . . . or (rubbings) not readable with any certainty” (Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 195, n. 1).

\(^2\) Using the facsimiles just mentioned, the following words of Fleet (JRAS 1903, p. 327) must be borne in mind. When he compared the lithograph of the inscription List No 47 in the Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 204 No 20 with the plate showing the base of the image, op. cit., pl. opposite p. 321 (cf. also Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik 1929, p. 87) he came to the following statement: “And it must be incidentally remarked that a comparison of the lithograph with the photographic reproduction raises at once considerable doubt as to whether, in the lithographs of this series, we have actual facsimiles of the ink-impressions or only results which have been modified by manipulation of the ink-impressions or of the proofs from them . . .” — Cf. also (List No 59 =) Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 199 No 2 + pl., line 3: the name of the donatrix was transcribed by Bührer in correspondence with the facsimile in the Ep. Ind. as Amohiniye. But, examining the photograph of the slab itself (cf. Bachhofer, op. cit., pl. 74), the name seems to be written as Āmo-hiniye; compare the initial ā with the ā in the two other instances of Āryavarta (see above p. 42, n. 5).

\(^3\) “Dr. Führer, ‘Progress Report’ for 1890/91, p. 13, states that [by him?] in all 110 Jain inscriptions were collected at Mathurā” (Smith, Jain Stūpa 1901, p. 6). — In The Academy 35—39 (cf. also WZKM 3—5) Bührer made known that (only) in the years 1889—91 he had obtained from Führer “more than” 111 impressions of (Mathurā) inscriptions (for the most part from the K. T.).

\(^4\) Cf. e.g. R. D. Banerji (= R. D. Bandyopādhyāya), Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 106ff. (His inaccurate editions were corrected by Lüders, JRAS 1912, p. 153ff.)

\(^5\) Cf. e.g. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 66ff.

\(^6\) Cf. also below § 9: L. 149v, § 13: L. 149j, and p. 59, n. 1 (List No 69).
Unfortunately most of his treatments of records from the Kaṅkāli Tīḷā, written for this edition, are missing now.¹

Only eight treatments of inscriptions for the present chapter are preserved in the Manuscript, including § 14, § 15, § 23 which had been crossed out by the author.² For the records List No 94 and 103, the transcripts of which had been taken from the author’s previous publication, compare below § 18f.]

45a
Facsimile: below p. 263

§ 14

Inscription on the upper and lower rims of the base of a seated Jina, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 19). Nothing is known about the place where the image was found, but it may be safely assumed that it originates from the Kaṅkāli Tīḷā at Mathurā.

[Lüders treated the inscription in his List of Brāhmi Inscriptions 1912, p. 165: It was edited by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji]³, JPBAS 5, 1909, p. 274f. No 5, and again, now under the name of R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 112 No 5 + pl. 1 (inscription) and pl. 3 (image). Lüders corrected the reading of the name of the gaṇa in the JRAS 1911, p. 1084 (= Kolīye) and edited the whole record again, JRAS 1912, p. 158f. No 5.]

TEXT

1 mahārājasya Huveks[rsa]ya ⁴ saṃ[carā] ⁵ 40 8 v[a] ⁶ 2 d[i] ⁷ 10 7 etasya puvāyaṃ K[o] [i]ye gaṇā ⁸ [Bajma(dā) ⁹

¹ Cf. above Preface p. 8 with note 3; p. 11, n. 4.
² The revised versions of the treatments of § 14, § 15, § 23 are missing now. The publication also of these paragraphs seems to be justified as they contain the transcripts of the author with notes, etc.; the rubbings of the records are preserved in the Lüders collection.
³ [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241 n. 1.]
⁴ The e-sign of va is quite distinct. [The third letter may be read as ksā.]
⁵ [The second letter may be read as vā.] The a-sign of rā is certain.
⁶ [The akṣara may be read as vā.]
⁷ The i-sign is denoted in this case by an almost straight line to the right [i.e. the letter may be read as dā, cf. the first letter of dāndā in line 3].
⁸ [The vowel-sign of the la is shaped exactly like the vowel-sign described in note 7; cf. Ep. Ind. 10, pl. 3.] There is a short vertical stroke at the top of the horizontal e-sign of the ye, and a small akṣara which may be read ta [or tā] appears above the first line between ye and the following ga. It seems therefore that at first the engraver had written Kolīye gaṇa, or perhaps gaṇe, and then intended to correct this to Kolīyāto gaṇāto, but gave up the task half-way. Read: gaṇe.
⁹ The ma is missing in the impressions, but distinct on pl. 1 (inscriptions) in the Ep. Ind. [It is discernible also on pl. 3 (images) where it appears as the last akṣara of the first line. In connection with the first two letters of the second line, which formerly were read as [s]iye or [s]iye, it was first proposed by Bandyopādhyāya to restore the whole word as Bama(dā*)/[s]iye. But what was read as
3 B(u)dh[i]kasya8 vādhuye Śavātrātapṭ[ī]ya9 Yaśāya dānā
Sa(m)bh[a]vasya10 prodima11 pra-
t[a]ṣ[th]apītā12

[śi] or [si] would be an aksara the left side of which would have disappeared alto-
gether and its right side would have been almost completely destroyed by the broad
vertical fissure which has caused the damage of the first letters of the first line:
ma (upper rim), and of the third line: b(u) (lower rim) as it is shown by the fac-
simile in the Ep. Ind., pl. 1 and in the impressions. However, that fissure seems to
be of later date as it is not to be seen on the photograph of the image (Ep. Ind.,
pl. 3): the just mentioned ma (l. 1, aks. 1) and the portion of the upper rim below
it are visible there yet undamaged, i.e. the first aksara of the second line is to be
read on pl. 3 as: ye and nothing seems to have been engraved before it. — If
these observations are accepted, from the purely graphical point of view, the
reading of the whole word would be: [ba]ma/ye or perhaps [ba]m[i]/ye. Cf.
below p. 46, n. 1.]

1 The ku or rather ka or ko is very small and seems to have been inserted
afterwards. [The supposed e-sign of the second aksara is attached below the top
of the la, and it seems not impossible that it is meant only as an elongation to the
right of the cross-bar of the foregoing ka. Therefore, from the purely graphical
point of view, the word may be read as k[u]j[a].]

2 The e-sign of ce is distinct. Read: Ucenāgariya.

3 The word intended is undoubtedly sākhāya, but the first syllable is written
as ēi; cf. the ēi in ēiśin[i]ya and on the other hand the śā of Yaśāya. The second
letter originally was written as ka or kā, but it seems to have been corrected to khā.

4 Banerji: Dhujaṭcvalas[ya]. The readings of the first two syllables of this word
and the first aksara of the following Dṭ[a]nīṣiriya are not certain. The prol-
gression of the vertical line of the two dha may denote -u as it certainly does in
vādhuye of the third line. The same prolongation, however, is found also in the
dha of B(u)dh[i]kasya where it cannot have any meaning at all. The nā of
Dṭ[a]nīv[a]laṣya shows a little curved line at the top which I formerly took as
ā-sign. But it is certainly the ī-sign, which in the ī of the following name Dṭ[a]nī-
ṣiriya is attached to the middle of the letter. Whether we have to read Dṭaṇi-
valasya or Dṭuṇivalasya, can be decided only on the base of the etymology of
the word which is not clearly established. [Later on Lüders remarked in the
Manuscript:] Of the two readings I have preferred the former as dhaṇi can be
traced back to Sk. dhāṇya, whereas dhuṇi appears to be meaningless. — [The third
aksara of the word may be read as vā.]

5 [The third letter may be read as nā.]
6 For the first two aksaras see the remarks in note 4.
7 The small r-stroke of rea is clearly visible on the back of the impression. The
third letter may be read as tā.
8 [The broad fissure mentioned above (note 9) has caused the loss of the left
side of the māṭka ba together with the supposed u-sign of the letter.] As regards
the second aksara [which shows besides the ī-sign also the u-sign] see the remarks
in note 4.
9 Apparently śivatātaptriya was the intended reading. [Below the top of
the aksara read as trā there is a stroke to the left which seems to be accidental.]
10 [The second letter may be read as bhā.]
11 In di the curve denoting the -i is attached to the middle of the da.
12 [For the last four aksaras which are written in the middle of the fourth line,
cf. also Ep. Ind., pl. 3. The first letter shows no ī-sign. The second aksara may be
TRANSLATION

(In the year 48 of mahārāja Huvekṣa, in the 2nd (month) of the rainy season, on the 17th day, on this date, at the request of Dh[a]ṇīṣiri, the female pupil of Dh[a]ni[v][a]la in the Koliya gaṇa, the Bama[dāsi]ya kula, the (U)eenāgari śākha, an image of Śambhava was set up as the gift of Yaśā, the daughter-in-law of B(u)dhika, the grand-daughter of Ś(i)vatrāta.)
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Facsimile: below p. 263

§ 15

Inscription on the pedestal of a large figure which has been destroyed. It was found in the west of the Kaṅkāli Tilā and is now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 26).

The record was edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind. 1.1892, p. 386 No 8 + pl. The reading of the date of the year was corrected by Bühler, Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 204, note 61, and the reading of the name of the śākha by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 105 No 18.

TEXT


read only as s[i]tha or as s[i]tha. As the lower margin of the stone is a little vaulted only the upper portion of the small circle denoting -tha or -tha is copied in the impressions and it is therefore impossible to decide whether the dot, distinguishes the two letters, was written in the centre.

1 [As in several of the Jain inscriptions from the Kaṅkāli Tilā there are mentioned members out of the Koliya gaṇa, the Brahmadāsika (or -dāsiya) kula, the Ueenāgari śākha (with v. l.), it is highly probable that also in this inscription the reading of the name of the kula as given above (cf. p. 44, n. 9) is to be understood as Brahmadāsiya. Perhaps the missing portion of the word was written on the rim of the proper left side of the pedestal.]

2 [Cf. above p. 29.] 3 [Cf. Lüders, JRAS 1912, p. 159.]

4 Before s[i]ddham there is a small horizontal stroke which is perhaps not accidental. [The first aksara may be read as s[i]. The ddham is written as a compound letter.]

5 [The first aksara may be read as me.]

6 [The second aksara being blurred in the impressions was read using the plate in the Ep. Ind.]

7 Throughout the inscription the horizontal stroke or hook which distinguishes the ha from pa is very small and especially so in the first aksara of this word, but there can be practically no doubt about the reading of the name.

8 Bühler: Kottiyel, but cf. Lüders, JRAS 1911, p. 1084].

9 Bühler: ayya-/Vṛṣīyāṇa, but the r-stroke on the top of the yya and the anusvāra above the na are quite distinct. There is a horizontal stroke added at the bottom of the initial a, which in my opinion denotes the length of the vowel
2 šisyasya¹ gaṇ[i]syasya² āryya-Kharṇ[n]asya³ a[r]lyya-M. n... (s)[y](a)⁴...

.........................sy[a]⁵ [V]r.[dh]u[m](i)t[a]kasya⁶ kā[r]ppās[i]-
kasya⁸ k(u)ṭumbiniye Dattāye danadharmmo⁸ mahābhogatāya
priyatāṃ-bhagavān-Rṣabha[r]jih⁹ —

TRANSLATION

Success! In the year 60 of mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Huvaśa, in
the 4th month of winter, on the 10th day, on this date, (at the request)
of the ganin the venerable Kharṇa (the companion?) of the venerable
M.n... (and) pupil of the preacher, the venerable Vṛddhahastin in the
Koliya gana, the Sthānikiya kula, the śākha of the venerable V(ai)riyas,
(this) religious gift (was made) by Dattā, the wife of the cotton-dealer...
Vr. dhum(i)ataka (?), for the sake of great happiness. May the holy (and)
glorious Rṣabha be pleased!

Owing to the lacunae of the text it remains doubtful in what relation
Kharṇa stands to the monk named after him and whether it was
really Kharṇa who made the request.

The venerable Vṛddhahastin is also mentioned in the inscription
List No 47 as making a request. From the wish at the end of the inscription
it appears that the image represented the Tīrthaṅkara Rṣabha.
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Facsimile: below p. 264

§ 16

Fragmentary inscription on the base of a standing Jina from Mathurā
(Kaṅkālī Tīlā), now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

It was edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind. 2.1894, p. 206 No 25 + pl.

[cf. below p. 196, n. 3]. The vowel-sign at the top of the mātya va has been
destroyed. It was probably the sign for -ai.
1 Bühler: šisyasya; but the second akṣara is distinctly sya.
2 [Liders corrected later on his first reading ni into ni.]
3 The reading of the name is not quite certain. Bühler has noted already that
the first sign read above as kha might be ve and that the lower portion of the
second akṣara is blurred.
4 Bühler: puyyama[na]/ ..... The first sign is certainly an initial a.
5 Before the sy[a] about twelve akṣaras are destroyed.
6 The reading of the name is very doubtful, of the first three letters only the
lower portions being preserved. [The akṣara before the ka may be read as tā.] Bühler read only .... [va]takasya. As a double name is unusual and as the dona-
trix is often characterized first as the daughter-in-law and than as wife, we should
expect ... ... sya vadhu Mitakasya kārppāsikasya kūṭumbiniye, but the reading
vadhu is impossible, the subscript -ra being perfectly distinct.
7 In the impressions before me the reading appears to be certain. Bühler:
[ka]/ ... sakasya.
8 Bühler: ... nadharmmo: The first akṣara is distinctly da.
9 There is a distinct vertical stroke above the line a little to the right of nr,
so that it would be possible to read bhagavā ru. But it is probably just as acci-
dental as the hook to the left of ś/[r]jih.
TEXT

///(de)[va]putrasya Huvishkasya sa[m]/

TRANSLATION

In the year ... of ... devaputra Huvishka ... ...
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Facsimile: below p. 264

§ 17

Fragmentary inscription on a Jaina tablet from the Kankali Til, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

It was noticed by Buhler in his description of the tablet, Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 311 + pl. 1b (the tablet), and edited by R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 120 No 18 + pl. 3 (the inscription).

TEXT

1 .......... Dhana[m]i[tra][sa]² dh[it][u A[ra]//

TRANSLATION

The tablet of homage was set up by ... ... the daughter of Dhanimitra ... ... the daughter-in-law of ... ...

The inscription is much decayed, and the reading is therefore somewhat doubtful. I admit that, judging from the traces of the letters, Banerji's reading Danami[trā]ye dhiṭu would be possible. On the other hand, it is quite uncommon in these inscriptions, in stating the descent of a female donor, to give the name of her mother instead of that of her father. As far as I can see, there is only one exception.

The inscription List No 121 records a gift of the daughter of Varmā, [Gulhā], the wife of Jayadāsa (Varmaye dhiṭu [Gulhā]ye Jayadāsasya kutumbiniye). Once, in the very copious inscription List No 122, the names of both parents and even of both parents-in-law are registered (Varna[ṇ]ahastīsya ca) Deviya ca dhiṭa Jayadevasya vadhuko Mośiniye vadhun), and it might be assumed that the same practice was followed in our inscription and that the name of the father stood at the beginning of the first line which is entirely illegible. But this is not very likely as,

1 Bühler: sa, but a trace of the anusvāra is preserved.

2 Banerji: Danamitrāye. The last aksara is uncertain, see the remarks above.

3 Restore: pa(tīṭhāpito) or a similar form.
on account of the limited space on the tablet, the present inscription is only a short record.

Under these circumstances I prefer to read Dhanamitrasa. What is still visible of the last aksara of the word may just as well be a remnant of sa as of ya.

§ 18
Facsimile: below p. 264

1 Inscription on a sculptured stone-slab from the Kaṅkāli Ṭīlā, now preserved in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

The following transcript of the author was taken from his treatment of the record in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 202ff. No 3.

TEXT
1 [na]mo arahato Vardhamānasya Gotiputrasa Pothayaṣa[ka](sa) kālavālāsa
2 3 (bhāryāye) Kośikiye Śimitrāye āyāgapaṭo pra(t)i(ṭhāpito)

§ 19
Facsimile: below p. 264

1 Inscription on a sculptured stone-slab from the Kaṅkāli Ṭīlā, now preserved in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

The following transcript of the author was taken from his treatment of the record in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 205f. No 4.

TEXT
namo arahato Māhāvirasa — Māthuraka(sa kā)lavālāsa [sā](hā) bhayāye (Śī ?)vara[kh]itāye āyā[gapaṭo]

§ 20
Facsimile: below p. 265

Inscription on the back of a broken sculptured Torana from Mathurā (stated to have come from the Kaṅkāli Ṭīlā), now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

It was edited by Bühler, The Academy 39. 1891, p. 373ff., WZKM 5. 1891, p. 176; Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 199 No 4 + pl.

1 [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with note 3.]
Text

1 bhadata-Jayasenasya āṃtevāsiniye
2 Dhāmagoṣyaye dān[o] pāśado

Translation

The temple (is) the gift of Dhāmagoṣa (Dharmagoṣa), the female disciple of the venerable Jayasena.

Jayasena is called bhada(n)ta, which elsewhere in the inscriptions is exclusively only an epithet of Buddhist monks and Ājīvika ascetics. In the Jaina scriptures, where bhante is frequently used in addressing laymen and monks, bhadanta as far as I can see never occurs as the designation or title of a monk.

The term is so exceptional for a Jaina monk that one almost feels inclined to doubt if the stone bearing the inscription really came from the Kānkhālī Tīlā, all the more so as it cannot be traced in the Lucknow Museum among the finds from the place. There is nothing in the inscription to prove that it belonged to a Jaina building, and a mistake in the statement about its origin would not be unprecedented. On the other hand, it is of course not impossible that in the pre-Kuṅā period, to which our inscription is to be referred, the terminology was not quite as rigorous as in later times, and for the present we can hardly refrain from treating the inscription as a Jaina record.

That ecclesiastical terms were occasionally exchanged between the adherents of different creeds is shown by antevāsini, which in our inscription (āṃtevāsini) is applied to Dhāmagoṣa. As a rule, the female pupil of a monk or nun is called antevāsini in the Buddhist inscriptions and sīṣīni in the Jaina inscriptions, but Ugahakā, who is called the sīṣīni of a nun in the Deorīya inscription List No 910 (cf. below p. 118), was a Buddhist nun, and in the Jaina inscription List No 67 (Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 204 No 21), dated in S. 81, antevāsikīnī appears instead of sīṣīni.

Antevāsin also, though it is commonly used with regard to Jaina monks in such texts as the Therāvali, denotes in the inscriptions almost exclusively the pupil of a Buddhist monk, while the Jaina term in epigraphic records is invariably sīgya. The only Jaina record where antevāsin occurs, is the ancient Mathurā inscription List No 93 (Ep. Ind. 2.1894, p. 198 No 1), but there it is used in a slightly different meaning. While generally the person who is called the pupil of a monk belongs to the clergy himself, Uttaradāsaka, the pupil of the ascetic Māharakhita, expressly states that he is a lay-hearer (sāvaka).

1 This is Bühler’s reading [in the Ep. Ind.], but no is not quite certain; it is possibly nā. [In The Academy and in WZKM Bühler transcribed the word as dānāṃ.]

2 In Buddhist inscriptions sīgya occurs only rarely at Kanhāri and Amarāvati.
Bühler (Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 199, 17) was therefore probably right in supposing that also in our inscription \( \text{ānte}v\text{āsini} \) means that Jayasena was Dhāmāghōsa's spiritual director, not that she was an ascetic. It is therefore not improbable that in the pre-Kuśān period \( \text{ante}v\text{āsina} \) and \( \text{ante}v\text{āsini} \) were preserved for Jaina lay-hearers in contradistinction to \( \text{śiṣya} \) and its feminine counterpart which were used for Jaina ascetics.

As regards my translation of the last two words, I am by no means sure that it correct; compare the remarks on the inscription List No 93.1

II

Facsimile: below p. 265

§ 21

Fragmentary inscription on a fragment of a large slab from the Kaṅkāli Tīlā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum.

It was edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind. 2. 1894, p. 200 No 7 + pl.

**Text**

1 \( ///y.\{nu\}kṣ.\) ///
2 \( \cdot r. k\ldots \text{sy}a^{3} \) ca yo ma[no]///
3 \( ///[ā]\text{yatana[ṇ] dhanasya mahataḥ} ///
4 \( ///\text{ce-py-akṣayaṃ = 4}^{4} \)

It is impossible to give a continued translation of the inscription. Bühler has already recognised that it contains the fragments of some Sanskrit stanzas in the \( \text{Śārdūlavikridita} \) metre. In line 2 we have the beginning of a \( \text{pāda} \), in line 3 the middle portion of another, and \( \text{ce-py-akṣayaṃ} \) are the last words of a fourth stanza. Too little has been preserved of the text to say anything about its contents, but as the

1 [The Manuscript does not contain the treatment of that inscription.]
2 Bühler: \( \text{ya} \ldots \text{kṣa} \).
3 Bühler: \( \text{ra[ktatva]}\text{sy}a \). The remainder of the first \( \text{aksara} \) is probably a subscript -\( \text{r} \). The second letter is a ligature, the first element of which is certainly \( \text{ka} \), but the subscript member cannot have been -\( \text{ta} \). The sign looks more like \( \text{kṣa} \) or \( \text{kṣu} \). Bühler’s reading of the third \( \text{aksara} \) is quite improbable. It may possibly be \( \text{dra} \). I fail to see which word was meant.
4 Bühler reads the last two signs \( \{\text{na}\} \) \( \text{kiṃ} \), but he remarks himself that the bracketed letter looks almost like \( \text{ki} \) and that the lower part of the vertical is faint, and the top so damaged that the apparent \( i \)-stroke may have been only a serif. Moreover he admits that the \( \text{anuvdra} \) of his reading \( \text{kiṃ} \) is doubtful. — There is certainly no \( \text{anuvāra} \), and the last sign is distinctly the numeral sign for \( 4 \). Since \( \text{aksayaṃ} \), as is shown above, must be the last word of the inscription, the sign after \( \text{yan} \) and before \( 4 \) cannot be a letter. It is the sign of the full stop consisting of two horizontal strokes. It appears to have been corrected from the numeral sign for \( 4 \), which originally was engraved immediately after \( \text{aksayaṃ} \), the last word of the text.
inscription dates from the Kṣatrapa period, there can be little doubt that the verses were added to a donation record according to a custom prevailing at that time. Similarly the inscription on the Mōrā slab (§113: L.14) concludes with a Sanskrit stanza in the Bhujangavijṛmbhīla metre and [. . . . . .]1

(149k)*

§ 22

Inscription on the pedestal of an image from the Katholi Kūśa in Mathurā City, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1349). As the donor belonged to the Jaina sākhā of the Rājapāliyakas, it may be surmised that the image originally belonged to the sanctuary on the site of the Kaṅkāli Tilā.

TEXT

1 Maha[śa]bhas[y]a 2 [i]ya 3 prat(i)-
2 mā pratathapit[ā] 4 Ādiha-
3 [ke]na Rājapāliya-
4 kena priya dev[o] 5

TRANSLATION

This image of Mahaśabha (Maharshabha?) has been set up by Ādihaka, the Rājapāliyaka (member of the Rājapāliyā sākhā). May the god be pleased (?).

As the donor was a Jaina, it is probable that the image represents some saint of his creed, and I feel therefore inclined to take Maha[śa]bha as a misspelling for Maharṣabha and to look at it as the name of the first Tīrthaṅkara, who generally is called Rṣabha or Vṛṣabha only. Ādihaka does not sound like a personal name, and it is tempting to look for the personal name in the last line of the record. But the reading Priyadevena is rather unlikely, the fourth akṣara being either vo or vā, but not ve. Moreover there is nothing to show that it was followed by na. On the other hand, if we take priya dev[o] as the familiar phrase

1 [The author did not finish the last sentence.]
2 The third akṣara looks as if it had been inserted as an afterthought. I take it to be śa, although in that case the hook at the bottom of the letter would be left unexplained. Perhaps the sign is the result of correcting the original ša to rṣa. Of the subscript -[ya] of s[y]a only the vertical stroke is visible. After s[y]a one akṣara seems to have been erased.
3 The reading i/[ya] (for iyāṁ) appears to be certain, but the right half of the second letter has not been engraved.
4 The reading vo is not quite certain. The left stroke of the o-sign is not distinct and the akṣara may be read vā.
at the end of donative inscriptions, we have to face two difficulties, the omission of tām after priya and the designation of the Tirthamkara as deva. Both are not unsurmountable. Omissions of syllables are frequent enough in such carelessly engraved inscriptions, and devādhideva is according to Hemacandra, Abhidhānacintāmaṇi 25, a name of one of the Tirthamkaras. Under these circumstances the sense of priya dev[ō] will hardly be settled before the meaning of Ādihaka has been ascertained.
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Facsimile: below p. 265

§ 23

Fragmentary inscription on the upper and lower rims of the pedestal of an image of a seated Jina, now in the Mathurā Museum. Till 1907 the sculpture was preserved in the Delhi Municipal Museum. The place of discovery is unknown. From the style and the kind of stone used, Vogel thinks that the pedestal belongs to the Mathurā school, and it is at any rate possible that it originates from the Kaṇkāli Tīlā.

Lüders' preliminary reading of the inscription was published by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 74 (B 31). [The pedestal is figured in: van Lohuizen, The 'Seychian' Period 1949, pl. 38, 65.]

TEXT

1 ///(saṃ)vvat(1 [90 7]vvaš[ā]m[a]ś 1 Koṭeyagaṇa Vairaśakhi. . . . .
2 ///ddharm[mapa]ṭnya [D]ā[m][i][n][i] ... [i]yeś [Vardha]m[a]na-
maṇḍavikā pratiśṭh[ā]pit[ā]

TRANSLATION

In the year 97, in the 1st month of the rainy season, (at the request of) . . . . . belonging to the Vaira (Vajra) sākhā of the Koṭeya gaṇa . . . a small pavilion for Vardhamāna was erected by Dāmini . . . (?), the first wife of . . . .

The characters are of the later Gupta type, and the date must therefore be referred to the Gupta era.

1 The t is almost entirely effaced.
2 The first figure is certain, only a small portion having disappeared on account of a crack in the stone. Only a vertical stroke of the second figure is left which seems to be the remnant of ?.
3 The ā-sign of r̥[ā] is a little blurred, but certain.
4 The e-sign of the te is quite distinct.
5 There are traces of one more akṣaras after khi. It may have been ya.
6 The bracketed letters are more or less uncertain, whereas the vowel-signs are distinct. The fourth akṣara and the mātrkā of the fifth are illegible.
7 The first two akṣaras of the word are almost entirely effaced.
4. The Caubārā Mounds

About a mile to the south-west of the Katrā is a group of some twelve circular mounds known as the Caubārā mounds from a resthouse (caubārā) that once stood there.\(^1\)

In 1868, when a new road to Sonkh was carried through the mound marked D [in the ,,Map of Mathurā”\(^2\)], a gold reliquary came to light. In 1871/72 Cunningham made trial excavations in three more of these mounds. In mound A he found bricks of a Stūpa and a steatite relic casket which is now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, in mound B the capital of a large pillar preserved now in the same Museum (M 14), in mound C a colossal head\(^3\) and the right knee of a seated colossal draped figure which presumably is identical with No A 24 of the Mathurā Museum. These fragments evidently belong to a large Buddha statue. The finds prove that the mounds A and D were Buddhist Stūpas and that mound C was certainly the site of a Buddhist sanctuary. From small fragments found about mound B, Cunningham came to the conclusion that B also was Buddhist, and there is nothing in the large capital extracted from the mound to contradict this opinion.

Subsequently Growse explored the Caubārā mounds and discovered in one of them, apparently A, among other sculptures the head of a colossal Buddha statue which Vogel has identified with No A 27 of the Mathurā Museum, the railing pillar bearing the inscription §25: L.98, and the lower part of a seated Bodhisattva with the inscription §24: L.38.

From §25: L.98 it appears that the Stūpa existed already in the middle of the first century A.D., the characters showing the transitional forms from the Kṣatrapa to the Kuśān times. §24: L.38 is dated in S. 33 during the reign of Huviśka, and it gives Madhuravānaka as the name of the Stūpa.

Growse mentioned also\(^4\) that in mound A he found a small stone fragment with the letters budhānam\(^5\) and, in another mound on the margin of a dry tank in the neighbourhood, another stone with the letters dānam cha [!]\(^6\).

Facsimile: below p. 266

§ 24

K 33

Inscription on the broken pedestal of the image of a seated Bodhisattva from the Caubārā mound A (?), now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 2).

---

3 [Vogel mentioned the head Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 54, supposing that it is identical with No A 28 of the Museum.]
4 [Mathurā 1874 Pt 2, p. 176, 2nd ed. 1880, p. 115.]
5 [List No 142.]
6 [List No 143.]
It was published by Growse, Mathurā 1 1874 Pt 1, p. 105; Pt 2, p. 172; Ind. Ant. 6. 1877, p. 217 No 2 + pl.; Mathurā 2 1880, p. 114 + pl. Growse did not succeed in making out more than the date and a few single words of the text. Cunningham also mentioned only the date, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, p. 109. From the imperfect reproduction in the Ind. Ant. 6. 1877 Lüders tried to decipher the inscription, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 39f. No 9. The correct reading of two of the names was established by Vogel, Ep. Ind. 8. 1905/06, p. 173 with note 3, and ibid., p. 181f. + 2 plates (showing the pedestal and the inscription), the whole record was edited again by Bloch.

TEXT

1 mahārajasya devaputrasya Huv[e]ṣkasya2 sam 30 3 gr 1 di 8 bhī-
kuṣusya Balasya [t]repiṭakasya antevā[si]n(i)y(e) [bhi]kuṇiye tre-
(piṭi)[kā]ye Buddhas[m]trāy[e]3

[Ma]dh(u)ravāṇake5 sahā mātāpitihī .......... [h] ..........6

TRANSLATION

In the year 33 of mahārāja devaputra Huveśka, in the 1st (month)
of the hot season, on the 8th day, a Bodhisattva was set up at Madh(u)ravāṇaka by the nun Dhanavati, the sister’s daughter of the nun Buddhamitrā, who knows the Tripiṭaka, the female pupil of the monk Bala, who knows the Tripiṭaka, together with her father and mother .......

The monk Bala is mentioned again in the Sahēṭh-Mahēṭh inscription List No 918 and the Sārnāth inscriptions List No 926 and 927 and to-
gether with the nun Buddhamitrā in the Sārnāth inscription List No 925.
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Facsimile: below p. 266

§ 25

Inscription on the reverse of a railing pillar from the Caubārā mound A (?), now in the Mathurā Museum.

1 The upper part of the tra shows a peculiar form. From the impressions before me the reading devaputraṣya would not be impossible[, but the plates in the Ep. Ind. show the reading given above].

2 Huv[e]ṣkasya seems to be more probable than Huv[i]ṣkasya adopted by Bloch.

3 The e-stroke is written similar to an i-sign.

4 Bloch: pratitāvīto. What has been preserved of the fourth aksara is more in favour of pi.

5 Bloch: Mādh[u]ravāṇake. I cannot discover the sign of the length on the first aksara.

6 After mātāpitihī about nine aksaras are almost completely destroyed. [Restore probably: (sarvasatva) [h] (itasukhāye).]
The record was edited by Growse, Ind. Ant. 6. 1877, p. 219 No 6 + pl., JASB 47. 1878 Pt 1, p. 118 with a photolithograph of the pillar on pl. 18 (cf. pl. 20); Mathurā² 1880, p. 114 + pl. It was edited again by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 152 No 29, and by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 143f. (J 7), where also a photograph of the stone is published (pl. 22). [The image was figured also by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 98 (cf. pl. 99), by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 21b, etc.]

**TEXT**

abhyaṃ[t[a]r[o]pasthāyakasa¹ Kaṭhikasa dānaṃ

**TRANSLATION**

The gift of Kaṭhika, the servant in the royal harem.

As to the meaning of *abhyaṃtaropasthāyaka*, I refer to the term *ābhyaṃtaro ganaḥ*, ‘the host of the residents of the royal harem’ (Nātya-śāstra 24, 17), and *avpasthāyikanirmundāḥ*, ‘the eunuch servants’ (ibid. 24, 51).

The vocation of the donor seems to have determined the choice of the figure represented on the obverse of the pillar.² It is unique among the sculptures of Mathurā.

The figure, which is well preserved down to the knees, represents a young man standing under a mango-tree in blossom. Over the tree there is a rail or balcony. The apparel of the youth and his attitude are such as to make it easily understood how Growse came to call him a dancing girl. He wears a magnificent turban, large ear-rings, a necklace of beads and another elaborate necklace round his shoulders. Both wrists are adorned with bracelets and a sash is tied round his waist. His right hand is raised and two fingers are placed in a coquetish way on the

---

¹ The dot in the centre of the subscript -tha is not clear, but probable. [At the top of the third *aksara* there is a stroke slanting to the right which is distinctly visible on the plates in Ind. Ant. 6. 1877, in Mathurā and on some of the impressions. Therefore Lüders formerly (Ind. Ant. 33. 1904) read: *abhyaṃti*-.. But as the *sthā* has a similar slanting stroke to the right, which is also distinctly visible in the rubbings, it would be possible to transcribe the beginning of the word as *abhyaṃt[ā]-*. At the top of the fourth *aksara* the s-sign is not distinctly written; from the purely graphical point of view it would be possible to read *r[ā]j* instead of *r[o]j.*]

² On the reverse there are three panels enclosed between Persepolitan pillars. In the upper panel a tree is surrounded by a railing and worshipped by two men who offer garlands and lotus flowers. The middle panel shows a seated man and another behind some indefinite object on which two birds are perched. A third person appears in the background. The lower panel is nearly completely destroyed. The inscription is engraved on the lower rim of the upper panel, but refers undoubtedly to the whole pillar.
chin of the head slightly bent. His left arm is hanging down. Judging from the photographs, I consider it probable that some object which he held in his left hand has been broken off.

The figure probably represents one of the minor deities, but it seems to me that this half feminine being was selected on purpose by the 'servant of the royal harem' for the carving of his pillar, just as at Bhārhut the horseman (asavārika) Suladha had his pillar adorned with the figure of a horseman accompanied by his horse and his groom; see my remarks on the inscription List No 728 [edited in CII 2, 2, 1].

5. Jamālpur Mound

The first archaeological discoveries on a larger scale appear to have been made in 1860 in digging the foundations of the Magistrate and Collector's new court-house on the site of an extensive mound to the south of the City. As the old jail was located there, the mound was at first generally referred to as the Jail mound. The name, however, was misleading as the new jail was at some distance to the south-east and had another mound which does not seem to have been explored. Growse therefore proposed to call the Court-house mound the Jamālpur mound from the adjoining hamlet, and this name has since been adopted.¹

The most important finds for the history of the place were a number of bases of pillars partly inscribed which enabled General Cunningham already in 1860 to determine correctly the name of at least one of the original buildings.² In the first volume of the ASI, containing the Reports made during the years 1862—65,³ he stated that about 30 bases were unearthed of which 15 bore inscriptions. In the ASI Reports for the year 1871/72⁴ Cunningham states that the excavation of the "Jail mound" was carefully continued by the late Mr. Harding, Magistrate of Mathurā, without any further results. But during the following years Growse seems to have made occasional discoveries, and after his transfer from the district, in 1877/78 the mound was completely levelled, the work having been sanctioned as a famine relief operation. Unfortunately no record of these excavations was ever published.

The finds made in the Jamālpur mound are scattered among the Museums of Mathurā, Calcutta, and Lucknow, and a good deal of them would seem to be lost entirely.

¹ Anderson, Catalogue and Handbook of the Arch. Coll. in the Ind. Mus. 1883, Pt 2, p. 492.
³ ASI [Ann.] Rep. 1. 1871, p. 239.
The stones bearing the inscriptions No 33, 52, 60, 62, 62a, 62b, 63, 64, 61, 64a, 82, 85, 126, 127, 128, 141, 146[,] are said to have come from the Jamālpur mound, but we may confidently add to the list No 129—135, 137 and 139, as these inscriptions are found on pillar-bases exactly like the bases with the inscriptions No 62, 63, 64, 65, 126—128, 141. Here then we apparently have to add the records of the fifteen ‘inscribed’ bases mentioned in Cunningham’s Report (ASI [Ann.] Rep. 1. 1871, p. 239) augmented by two.

One of the inscriptions, §31: L.62, states that the base was dedicated to the vihāra of mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Hāv[i]śka, which proves that the Jamālpur mound was the site of King Hūviśka’s vihāra. From the name of the vihāra we should naturally conclude that it was founded by the king himself, and this is confirmed by §29: L.52 which records the donation of a Buddhist image in S. 51 during the reign of mahārāja ṛṣabha d(e)vaputra Hūviśka at the mahārāja-ṛṣabha (putra-v)ihāra. In S. 51 therefore the vihāra certainly existed. — The inscriptions No 62, 62a—b, 63—65, 139, 132 (§ 31—§ 35, § 37—§ 39), however, are dated in a year which I read as 77, and therefore at a time when Hūviśka was no longer alive. But I do not think that on that account we should be compelled to read the date of the year as 47 as advocated by other scholars. I see no difficulty in assuming that the vihāra founded by the king was enlarged by the erection of a hall some years after his death.

Hūviśka’s vihāra was not the only Buddhist monastery on the site of the mound. In his Report for 1862—65 (ASI [Ann.] Rep. 1. 1871, p. 238f.) Cunningham said that in 1863 he found the name of the “Kunda-Suka-Vihāra” on a large flat slab of stone unearthed from the “Jail mound”. The inscription referred to, registered as No 140 in my List (= § 65), was never published. It was mentioned by Dowson in JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 28, as having been so damaged that no coherent sense could be made out. The slab then seemed to have disappeared until in 1910 R. D. Banerji accidentally received an impression of it from the Lucknow Provincial Museum which he published in Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 118f. In the inscription the slab is designed as the cooking stone of the Kakaṭikas in their own vihāra at Śrīkunda in some park the name of which is lost (///.opavane Śrīkundē sv[ava]ke vihāre). There can be no doubt that Cunningham (loc. cit.) took his “Kunda-Suka-Vihāra” from this inscription, and it is therefore certain that the slab was found in the “Jail mound” and that the vihāra of the Kakaṭikas was situated close to Hūviśka’s vihāra.

---

1 According to Growse, Mathurā1 1874 Pt 2, p. 173 and Mathurā2 1880, p. 106 discovered by himself in the Jamālpur mound.
2 I am now convinced that No 64 of my List is really identical with No 61 [cf. below p. 71f.].
3 The first record of Vāsudeva (§ 30: L. 60) is dated in S. 74.
Under these circumstances it is impossible to decide whether the two Buddhist images bearing the inscriptions No 79⁴ and 146 (§ 26 and § 67) are to be assigned to the royal vihāra or to the vihāra of the Kakaṭikas, and the same remark applies to the inscription on a Buddhist image dated in 135 of the Gupta era (A.D. 454/455, CII 3, p. 262ff., No 63).

Besides the Buddhist monasteries, the “Jail mound” covered also a non-Buddhistic sanctuary. In 1890 Führer found an inscribed slab lying loose on the pavement of the court near the brick Stūpa adjoining the two Jaina temples of the Kaṅkālī Tīlā.² Neither Führer nor Bühler, who edited the inscription (§ 27: L. 85), recognised that this was the same slab which Growse already in 1878³ had mentioned as being found in the Jamālpur mound⁴ and which accordingly later on must have been accidently deposited in the place where it was found by Führer. The inscription states that the slab was set up in the temple of the holy lord of snakes, Dadhikarṇa. Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā (1930, p. 23), is of the opinion that the site selected for the royal vihāra was originally dedicated to the snake deity, and he is inclined to find here an interesting example of the replacement of primitive cults by Buddhism. Now, it is true, the inscription on the slab may be a little earlier than the inscriptions on the pillar bases, and Dadhikarṇa’s shrine may therefore have been older than the Buddhist vihāra, but there is no reason to assume that it was removed when the vihāra was built. On the contrary there seem to have been friendly relations between the Buddhist monks and the worshippers of the shrine, as from the inscription § 34: L. 63 it appears that one of the pillar bases of the vihāra was the donation of the priest in the temple of Dadhikarṇa.

There is another inscription from the Jamālpur mound which is of importance for the topographical questions. In § 64: L. 82 it is stated

---

1 [Cunningham (ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 31 No 5) assigned the inscription List No 79 (§ 26) to the “Kankali Mound”; as is shown by the author (cf. below p. 60, n. 3) this heading apparently is a mistake for “Jail Mound”. — That is not the only error in the just mentioned publication. Doubtless in Cunningham’s No 17 (op. cit., p. 34) — concerning the inscription List No 69 — the heading “Jail Mound” and the notice “seated Buddha” are also mistakes which are to be corrected to “Kankali Mound” and “seated Jina”. These corrections are justified not only by Vogel’s statement (Cat. Mus. Math., p. 66 No B 3) that the inscription in question is incised on the pedestal of a Jīna image with the śrīvatsa symbol in the centre of the chest, but also by the fact that both, the impression of the record on Vogel’s just mentioned No B 3 as well as the original rubbing of Cunningham’s No 17 (facsimile: [Ann.] Rep. 3, pl. 15, 17), which are preserved in our collection, without doubt are taken from the same stone. As there was no Jaina establishment on the site of the “Jail” or Jamālpur mound the Jaina inscription List No 69 — edited by Cunningham (op. cit.) together with 21 other records coming either from the Jamālpur mound or from the Kaṅkālī Tīlā — apparently originates from the last mentioned site, as was supposed already by Vogel (Cat. Mus. Math. p. 67). Cf. also i. g.: p. 40, n. 4.)


3 JASB 47, 1. 1878, p. 130ff. No 3.

4 “the mound adjoining the Magistrate’s Court-house”.
that a Brahman of the Śaigrava gotra, the treasurer of svāmin mahākṣa-
trapa Ṣomḍāśa, presented a tank, the western tank of the twin tanks,
a reservoir, a grove, a pillar, and a stone-slab. There is no evidence
that the donation was made in connection with some religious establish-
ment, and it may simply have served the purpose of embellishing the
grounds. Considering that the inscription §64: L.82 is about a hundred
years earlier than §65: L.140 [cf. above p. 58], it is tempting to identify
the Śrīkuṇḍa and the park (vana or, probably upavana) mentioned in
§65: L.140 with one of the tanks and the ārāma presented by the
Brahman of the Śaigrava gotra. At any rate the Śrīkuṇḍa would seem to
be the large tank immediately to the east of the former mound, and I am
inclined to identify it with the large dried up pond mentioned by Hūan-
tsang in his description of Mathurā, as adjoining the Stūpa on the spot
where the Buddha was offered honey by the monkey. Hūan-tsang
further tells us that to the north of the pond, not very far from it, there
was a large wood in which there were footsteps left by the four former
Buddhas walking up and down. This would agree very well with
the mentioning of the wood in connection with the Śrīkuṇḍa in §65:
L.140. — If these identifications suggested already by Growse (Mathurā
1874 Pt 1, p. 76) should prove correct, they will help us perhaps to
determine the site of the famous cave-monastery of Upagupta. According
to the Chinese pilgrim, the Monkey Stūpa lay 24 or 25 li, i.e. about 5
miles, to the south-east from it.¹

The dated, but fragmentary inscriptions No 33 and 60 (§ 28 and § 30) do
not give any clue as to the nature of the sanctuary to which they belonged.

[Later remarks by Lüders in the Manuscript:] Vogel states² that the
findplace of §68: L.136 was presumably the Jamālpur site, but there
is nothing to show it. — Probably the railing pillar with the symbol
discussed under No 91 b (§ 70) and inscription No 125 d (§ 66) are to be
classed with the Jamālpur inscriptions as they were found in a well
at the village. [The two antiquities were made over to the Mathurā
Museum by Lieut. Col. W. Vost, cf. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. p. 120 and
150, resp.]

---
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Facsimiles: below p. 267

§ 26

Fragmentary inscription on the base of a headless image of Buddha
from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 1). It
originates almost certainly from the Jamālpur mound.³

¹ [Cf. Watters, On Yuan Chwang’s Travels in India, vol. 1.1904, p. 306ff.]
³ The present record was published by Cunningham (loc. cit.) under the heading
“Kankali Mound”, but ibid., p. 16, the inscription appears in a list of records from
The inscription was published by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 129 No 16 + pl. 6, and by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 31 No 5 + pl. 13. Lüders tried to read the text from Cunningham's facsimile and showed that Raj. Mitra's facsimile is absolutely untrustworthy, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 149f. No 25.

**TEXT**

1 .. tra ... Mitraśarmo Ghoṣako Paroḥaśāliko
    Cikkakasa pitā m[ā]ṭā Idrad[a]ṭā 2 .......... rṣa
    Idradu ... ika[t] ... b[im].

2 (mahārā) jasya rājāṭirājasya Kanīṣkasya saṃvatsare 3

I am unable to give a coherent translation of the record. The first line seems to contain a string of personal names: [. . tra ... .], Mitraśarma, Ghoṣaka, Paroḥaśāliko, the father of Cikkaka, (his?) mother Idradatā (Indradattā), but the reading is partly doubtful.

The second line contains the date: in the year of mahārāja rājāṭirāja Kanīṣka.

---
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Facsimile: below p. 268

§ 27

Inscription on a stone slab from the Jamālpur mound, 4 now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (E 5).

the 'Jail mound' [cf. above p. 57]. Considering that the Kanālī Tīlā has only yielded Jaina sculptures, whereas the present inscription is engraved on the base of a Buddhist statue and totally different in style from the Jaina records, I have no doubt that the heading "Kankali Mound" is a mistake which will be conceivable if we see that the same heading is given to the preceding three and the following two inscriptions of Cunningham's paper. I have therefore classed the present record with the inscriptions from the Jamālpur mound.

1 The first akṣara is pretty distinct, but I am unable to say what it is meant for. The third akṣara seems to be ta, but may possibly be śa. The fourth akṣara is quite indistinct. Perhaps the four letters are an abortive attempt to write mitraśarma, which on that account was repeated. The second word of the record, mitraśarmo, is separated by a blank from the preceding .. tra ... as well as from the following ghoṣako.

2 About ten akṣaras are obliterated after idrad[a]ṭā.

3 This line has been taken from Cunningham's two rubbings ([I and II]. In both of them are some letters traced in ink, the others showing yet the original readings: (I) [jasya] rājāṭirājā; (II) [ja] ....... [n]i[s]k[a].]

4 As pointed out by Vogel, Führer's statement quoted by Bühler that the slab was found "on the floor of the brick stūpa, 47 feet in diameter, to the east of the first Jaina temple, on the east of the Tīlā", is palpably wrong. Growse expressly states that the stone was found excavating the Jamālpur mound in 1878, twelve years before Führer began his excavations at Mathurā.
The record was partly read and published with a facsimile by Growse, JASB 47, 1. 1878, p. 130f. No 3 + pl. 21, and Mathurā 2 1880, p. 108 + pl. (p. 106). Bühler edited it Ep. Ind. 1. 1892, p. 390 No 18 + pl. (cf. also p. 381). Bühler’s reading was reproduced, with some corrections, by Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1908/09. 1912, p. 159f. It was referred to by Ramaprasad Chanda, Mem. ASI 5. 1920, p. 171f, and by Lüders, Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur 1941, p. 86, 2.

TEXT

1 — siddhaṃ [sa 20 6 va 3] d[i] 51 etasya[m] 2 pūr[vvayam] 3 ne ṣīl[a]paṭṭio pratiṣṭāpito Māthurā[ṇa]m 5
4 śailālakānaṃ C[ā]ndak[ā] bhrāṭr[kā] 6 iti v[i]jñ[a]-
5 yamānānaṃ 7 teṣaṃ putrehi Nandibalapra-
6 mukhehi dārakehi mātāpitṛṇaṃ 8 agra-
7 pratyaśatāye bhavatu sarvvasatvānaṃ [hita]-
8 sukhā[rtha]m 9 bhavatu

TRANSLATION

Success! In the year 26, in the 3rd (month) of the rainy season, on the 5th day, on this date, the stone slab was set up at the shrine of the

1 Already in 1878 the first line of the inscription was damaged a little by peeling off of the surface of the stone, but, as pointed out by Vogel, the number indicating the year was apparently still intact, the first words of the record being clearly visible in the handcopy published by Growse: — siddhāṃ sa 20 6 . . . . d . . . .
2 In the photolithograph of the Ep. Ind. — siddhāṃ and d[i] 5 are still quite distinct; the date of the year and month is blurred but appears to be sa 20 6 va 3. Judging from the estampage before me, the writing seems to be in a much worse state at present, the words siddhāṃ sa 20 6 va being nearly effaced. Fortunately the Hoernle collection contains an old rubbing the value of which is impaired by pencilling the outlines of the letters, but which leaves not the slightest doubt that the reading of the first words was as stated above.
3 The last aksara may have been syāṃ.
4 Bühler: pū[rvyaṃ], Vogel: pū[ryyaṃ]. There seems to be no a-sign at the top of the second aksara.
5 Perhaps the reading is [nā]g[en]drāsyā Dadhiḵārṇāsyā. The bracketed letters are damaged at present.
6 The last aksara is probably nam, not nāṃ, although the shape of the na is not quite the same as in lines 2 and 6.
7 Bühler: viṣṭūjyamānānu, Vogel: viṣṭūyamānānu. The second aksara is distinctly jū. The vertical stroke above the nam seems to be accidental.
8 Bühler, Vogel: -pīṭṛṇaṃ. There is a horizontal stroke to the right of the r-sign which in my opinion indicates the length of the vowel as in medial -ā.
9 The anusvirā is doubtful.
holy lord of Nāgas Dadhikarṇa by the boys, chief among whom is Nandibala, the sons of the actors of Mathurā, who are known as the Čândaka brothers. May it be for the sharing of the principal lot by their parents. May it be for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

As remarked by Vogel, the date of the inscription proves that the spot was associated with the worship of the Nāga Dadhikarṇa previous to the foundation of the Huviṣka vihāra.

§ 28

Facsimile: below p. 267

Inscription on the fragment of a seated Buddha discovered in the courtyard of the Magistrate’s Court-house probably brought to light in 1860 when foundations of the building were laid. The fragment is now in the Mathurā Museum.

Growse edited the inscription in Mathurā¹ 1874 Pt 2, p. 173 (2nd ed. 1880, p. 106 + pl.), and Índ. Ant. 6. 1877, p. 217 No 1 + pl. It was treated again, chiefly with regard to the restoration of the mutilated name of the king occurring in the date, by: Fleet, JRAS 1903, p. 330f.; Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 38f. No 8; Fleet, JRAS 1905, p. 358; Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 60 (A 49), JRAS 1910, p. 1314; Fleet, ibid., p. 1315ff.

TEXT

//(Vā)/[s]/(i)/skasya rājyasāṃvatsare 20 8 hemanta 3 d[i] ...///

TRANSLATION

In the year 28 of the reign of ...... Vāsiṣṭha, in the 3rd (month) of winter, on the ... day ......

The credit of having recognised the correct restoration of the king’s name is due to Fleet who, relying on the Śānci inscription List No 161 and the present inscription, advocated already in 1903 the existence of a king named Vāsaśka, Vāsiṣṭha or Vāseśka between Kaniṣka and Huviṣka. His presumption was finally proved by the discovery of the Isāpur inscription §94: L.149a dated in the year 24 in the reign of Vāsiṣṭha.

As pointed out by Fleet (JRAS 1903) and later on by Vogel (JRAS 1910) the remnant of the akṣara preceding skasya can only be the bottom part of a sa and the name of the king must therefore be restored to (Vā)/[s]/(i)/skasya as it is done above.

¹ [Cf. above p. 58, n. 1.]
Inscription on the base of a Buddha image of which only the feet remain. It was found in the Jamālpur mound and is now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 3).

The inscription was first brought to notice by Growse, JASB 47, 1. 1878, p. 130 No 2. He referred to it again in Mathurā² 1880, p. 107. Growse deciphered only the date to which Cunningham also confined himself when he noticed the inscription, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, p. 108. The full text was edited by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji¹], JPASB 5. 1909, p. 243f., and again, now under the name of R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 112f. No 6 + pl. 1. [The formula of benediction (line 2) was read by Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 24.]

The inscription seems to have suffered a good deal since 1908 when Banerji's estampages were taken. In the last line, which is nearly complete in the reproduction in the Ep. Ind., now only the upper portion of the letters remain. My reading of this line is based on the photolithograph and an old rubbing.²

**TEXT**

varmaṇa⁸ [bhagava]ṭah [Śak]y[a]m[u] . .⁹

2 pratimā pratiṣṭāpita¹⁰ sarva[p]uddhahapūjārt[th]a[m]¹¹ anana¹² d[e]ya-

---

¹ [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
² [The rubbing is lost now.]
³ Banerji: deva-, but there is no e-sing.
⁴ Banerji: Huveśkasya. The e-sing of ve is quite distinct.
⁵ Banerji: kamaṇta. The e-sing of he is short, but certainly intended.
⁶ Banerji: [a]sy[a] [p∪rva]yā. From the estampage only the reading given above can be made out.
⁷ Banerji: [bh]ipsu[nā]. The [nā] is not certain, it may be [nā], but not no.
⁸ Banerji: -varma[nah]. The nā is distinct.
⁹ Banerji: [Śak]ya[t], omitting bhagavataḥ, of which only the last syllable is quite distinct. Restore probably: [Śak]y[am]u[neh].
¹⁰ Banerji: pratiṣṭāpita[ā]. There is no ā-sing on the ta.
¹¹ Banerji: sarva-Buddhahapūjartha[m]. The reading given above is certain. [Cf. Banerji, loc. cit., note 4. — The mātrkā of the third akṣara is comparatively small; at the top of its left part there seems to be marked a short stroke to the right. The engraver may have intended to write bu but failed to finish the letter completely.]
¹² Banerji: an[ē]na, but the first na has no e-sing. [The word begins with an initial a.]
dharmaparītyagena[ ] upadhyāyasya1 Sahgadāsasya2 [n]irvānahā-[va]ptaye-[s]t[u]3 mātāpit[ ] .................
3 Buddh[a]varmas[y]a sarvād(u)khopāsamāya sarvasatvahitasukh[ā]-r[th]a4 mahārājad[a](v)a(putralv)ihāre5

TRANSLATION

In the year 51 of mahārāja devaputra Huveśka, in the 1st month of winter, on the ... day, on this date, an image of the holy Śākyamuni was set up by the monk Buddhavarman for the worship of all Buddhas. Through this bestowal of the religious gift6 let there be attainment of Nirvāṇa by the teacher Sahgadāsa (Sāṅghadāsa), for the cessation of all unhappiness of (his) parents ... of Buddhavarman, for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings. In the vihāra of mahārāja devaputra.
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Facsimiles: below p. 269f.

§ 30

The inscription is engraved on an oblong stone slab found by Cunningham in the Jamālpur mound. The right upper corner is broken off and near the bottom a large piece of the surface of the stone has peeled off. The slab seems to have disappeared soon after its discovery.

Among the materials collected by the late Professor Hoernle for the second volume of the CII there is an impression of the inscription which bears a note on the margin probably written by Cunningham himself: “The only impression now available. The stone has been lost at Agra.” Besides this impression the Hoernle collection contains two facsimiles. The one is an eye-copy in red and blue pencil on a slightly reduced scale, made according to a marginal note by Captain Watts, Royal Engineers, the other is a pencil-tracing on transparent paper, perhaps made from

1 The ḍa-sign seems to have been attached to the middle of dha. [Cf. the ḍa-sign of mā in hemantamāso.]
2 Banerji: Sa[m]gha-, but there is no anusvāra.
3 Banerji: [nirvānava]ptaye-stu. The third and fourth aksaras cannot be nāvā. Spellings such as avapya, avaptam, avaptu- are frequent in the Mss. of the Kuśān and early Gupta times.
4 Banerji: -sukhrtha[m]. There is no anusvāra. Perhaps the reading was -rtham, the final m being broken off [cf. above p. 64, n. 11 with Banerji’s note 4]. [In the reproduction in the Ep. Ind. there is no dot in the centre of the last aksara, i. e. the letter looks there like rth.]
5 Banerji: De[ vaputra]-, but there is probably no e-sign attached to the da.
6 [Cf. Lüders, loc. cit.]
the stone itself, but afterwards gone over with China-ink, blue and red pencil, and practically of little value.

The inscription was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 129 No 15 + pl. 6 (cf. also p. 123), by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 183 No 4 + pl., by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 32 No 8 + pl. 15.


Lübners treated the inscription Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 106f. No 20, and edited it again from the materials described above, which have served also as the basis of the present edition, in Ep. Ind. 9. 1907/08, p. 241—246 + pl. [with a treatise on the symbol for 70 in the Northern Brāhmi inscriptions coming from Mathurā or its neighbourhood. Rapson, who read the sign as 40, gave detailed arguments for his opinion in: Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman 1929, p. 49ff. Lübners in his answer (Acta Orientalia 10. 1931, p. 118ff. = Phil. Ind., p. 721ff.; cf. also p. 789) is convinced that he could settle the question using new materials from the manuscript remains found in Eastern Turkestan. There (p. 119f. = p. 722f.) he mentioned the present inscription again.]

TEXT

1 mahārajasya
2 ra(........)
3 sya devaputrasya Vāsu (......)
4 savatsare 70 4 varṣam[ā]
5 se prathame divase
6 tri[še] 30 asyaṃ purvvayaṃ
7 Talakiyi[e] mahadāṇḍa-
8 nāyakasya Va-

1 I formerly read mahārajasya, but the vertical attached to the middle bar of the ja which appears in the impression as well as in Capt. Watts' eye-copy and in the drawing cannot be accidental.
2 The ā-stroke is probable. Restore: rā(jāṭirāja)/sya.
3 As regards the restoring of the name, I refer to the remarks given in the following text.
4 As stated already in my former edition, the sign has the shape of a plain St. Andrew's cross. As such it appears also in Capt. Watts' eye-copy and in the drawing. Owing to a flaw in the stone, a small portion of the lower left cross-bar of the symbol has disappeared. In the impression somebody has tried to restore the missing portion by adding in pencil a hook turning upwards, but there is nothing to warrant this restoration.
5 The upper portion of the ma and the sign of the length are indistinct.
6 The e-sign is indistinct.
7 The e-sign is not very distinct and the reading Talakiyan would be possible.
8 \text{lānas[y]a}^{1} \text{K[s]aṇḍamihi}^{2}.
9 (\ldots )^{3}

\ldots \text{[mahāandaṇḍa]}^{4}

\textbf{Translation}

In the year 74 of mahārāja rā(jātirāja) devaputra Vāsu(deva), in the first month of the rainy season, on the thirtieth -30- day, on this date, at Talakiya (or: Talakā) \ldots \ldots of the great general Valāna \ldots \ldots Kṣa-
ṇḍamihi(ra) \ldots \ldots

The problem of restoring the king’s name occurring in the date has been discussed in my previous paper. It is true, there seems not to be sufficient space for the three aksaras devasya at the end of line 2 and the lacuna would better be filled by ṣkasya, but there is no evidence that there ever was a Kuśān king by the name of Vāsuska. The Mathurā inscription mentioned by Führer as being dated in S. 76 in the reign of Vāsuska\textsuperscript{5} has never turned up, and I consider it almost certain that it never existed. For the present, therefore, it will be safer to restore the name as Vāsu-
(devasya). As the writing of the record is not very regular, it is after all not impossible that devasya was engraved in smaller and more com-
pressed characters than the rest of the line.

Owing to the mutilated state of the inscription, its general purport cannot even be conjectured.

Valāna, the name of the mahāandaṇḍanāyaka is certainly a foreign and probably an Iranian name. In the inscription § 119: L. 14d, incised on the pedestal of the statue of some foreign chief, the name of the person represented by the statue is called Ulāna. The two names are so similar that I am inclined to look at them as different spellings of the same name, and as Ulāna also is styled mahāandaṇḍanāyaka it is not unlikely that the Valāna of the present inscription is the very person that was represented by the statue.

K[s]aṇḍamihi is probably to be restored as K[s]aṇḍamihi(ra), and this appears to be another personal name, evidently, just like Vakamihira,

---

\textsuperscript{1} I formerly read the name Vālinas[y]a, but the apparent elongation of the serif of \text{ca} is probably due to a fissure in the stone and so is the stroke which gives the \text{ā}-sign of \text{lā} the appearance of the \text{i}-sign.

\textsuperscript{2} My former reading k[ṣe]ṭ[re] is wrong. The subscript -ṣa of kṣa is damaged, but certain. There is no \text{ṣ}-sign added to kṣa. What I took to be t[re] or t[ro], appears to be \text{ṛda}.

\textsuperscript{3} This line has entirely disappeared.

\textsuperscript{4} Of this word only faint traces are visible in the impression. The reading rests almost entirely on Capt. Watts’ eye-copy which shows the upper portion of the letters. [Referring to this line Watts remarked on his copy: “On a lower piece of the stone and much broken; the red appears to be traces of characters.”] Instead of \text{da} Capt. Watts gives \text{de}. It is hardly necessary to say that under these circum-
stances the reading of the word is very doubtful.

\textsuperscript{5} [Cf. Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 106, note 55.]
V[akamih]ira or Vv[a]gamihira in §60: L.127, §61: L.141, and §62: L.128 (in B or A), of Iranian origin. Perhaps the original reading was Kṣandamihirapurasya, for, although the statement of the descent generally precedes the personal name, the preserved order would not be without parallel as is shown by the inscriptions §133: L.14e and §137: L.149b.

Talakiya or Talakī seems to designate some locality.

§ 31

Faæsimile: below p. 270

K 59

Inscription around the circular torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2d).

It was edited by Rajendralalalal Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 127 No 1 + pl. 4, and by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 182f. No 1 + pl. Cunningham corrected the reading of the last word, ibid., p. 195, and edited the whole inscription ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 33 No 12 + pl. 14. The text published by Growse, Mathurā1 1874 Pt 1, p. 74 note and Pt 2, p. 172 No 5, is based on the previous editions. A correction was made by Raj. Mitra, Buddha Gayā 18782, p. 187 note a. The inscription was edited again by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 101 No 11 [who subsequently referred to it Ep. Ind. 24. 1937/38: 1942, p. 200].

TEXT

saś 70 7 gr 4 di 4 mahārājasya rājātirājasya devapūtrasya Hu[va]-
ṣkasya v[i]hāre dānaṃ bh[i]ksusya1 Jivakasya2 Odīyanakasya kumb-
bhako 20 5 sarvvasatvahitasūkha3 bhavatu saghe4 c[a]jurdīše

TRANSLATION

In the year 77, in the 4th (month) of summer, on the 4th day, in the monastery of mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Huviśka the gift of the monk Jivaka (Jivaka), the Odīyanaka (native from Uḍḍīyāna), (consisting in) pillar-base 25. May welfare and happiness of all sentient beings prevail. To the community of the four quarters.

The last two words are apparently supplementary. Their proper place would be before or after kumbhako 20 5.

1 To judge from the reverse of the impression the first akṣara is possibly bhī.
2 In ji the sign of the short -i seems to be certain.
3 There seems to be no anusvāra above the kha.
4 Here again there is no anusvāra above the sa. [But there is a distinct stroke above the ghe which may be meant for an anusvāra. In that case we would have to read saghe which may be explained as a clerical error for the expected sanghe. The engraver seems to have marked the anusvāra not above the sa, but above the following akṣara.]
62a
Facsimile: below p. 271

§ 32

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription, cut on the face of the square basement, was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 38). It is in a very bad state of preservation.

TEXT

........ [s]ya\(^1\) ........

2 ........

TRANSLATION

In the year 77, in the 4\(^{th}\) (month) of summer, on the 20\(^{th}\) day, on this date, (the gift) of the monk ........

62b
Facsimile: below p. 272

§ 33

Two inscriptions on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, preserved in the Public Library at Allahabad until 1907 and now in the Mathurā Museum.

They were edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 175f. (P 20). The writing is utterly clumsy. The record A runs around the top of the torus, and B is cut on one side of the base.

TEXT

A dan[ā]ṃ Buddh[i]śreṣṭhasya\(^2\) caturvvi(d)yas[a]\(^3\) bhaṣa(ṇa)-
[k]asya\(^4\) saṃghe caturḍ[i]ṣe] sam 70 7 gr 4 di 20 5\(^{5}\) ........
B dan[a]ṃ Buddh[i]śreṣṭhasya bhaṣaṇa[kasya]

\(^1\) The name may have been Dharmmadevasya or Dharmmadattasya, but this is quite uncertain. The rest of the line and the whole second line are obliterated.

\(^2\) There is a distinct dot in the centre of the circle denoting tha.

\(^3\) Of the last but one akṣara of this word only the subscript -ya is tolerably clear. The (d)- is conjectural; also the readings ṭya, ḍhya, ṳya would be possible.

\(^4\) Vogel reads: bhaja ....... kasya. That the second akṣara is ṣa is proved by the second inscription (B) where the reading ja instead of ṣa is impossible. The ṣa is very badly shaped.

\(^5\) It is just possible that after that date something like asyāṃ pūrṇāṃ was added, but it is quite obliterated.
TRANSLATION

A The gift of the monk Buddhiśreṣṭha (Buddhiśreṣṭha), a preacher who knows the fourfold scriptures, to the community of the four quarters, in the year 77, in the 4th (month) of summer, on the 25th day (...).

B The gift of Buddhiśreṣṭha (Buddhiśreṣṭha), the preacher.

It will be noticed that the length of the a-vowel is not expressed in writing in this inscription, and perhaps even in the wrongly spelled bhaṣaṇa[k]āṣya, the ā-stroke is after all merely accidental.

I take bhaṣanaka, bhaṣanaka to stand for bhāṣāṇaka and consider it a synonym of bhāṇaka, bhāṇaka or bhanaka occurring in the inscriptions of Sāṇei, Bhārhat and Kārle.

Caturvidya, provided my reading is correct, would seem to refer to the knowledge of the four Āgamas of the Buddhist Canon, the Dirgha-, Madhyama-, Saṃyukta- and Ekottara-Āgama, and it was probably used in imitation or rather in rivalry with the Brahmanical terms caturvīdiya, caturvīdyā, caturvaidya, caturveda, caturvedin, 'one who knows the four Vedas'.
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Facsimile: below p. 271

§ 34

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2f).


TEXT

dānaṁ Devilasya Dadhikarṇa-devakulikasya saṁ 70 7 gr 4 divaśe 20 [9]3/3

TRANSLATION

The gift of Devila, the priest at the shrine of Dadhikarṇa, in the year 77, in the 4th (month) of summer, on the 29th day.

1 [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
2 The last figure of the date is not quite distinct, but the reading 9 is probable.
Two inscriptions on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2e).

There can be no doubt that the inscriptions edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 130 No 17 + pl. 6, No 18 + pl. 7, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 183 No 5 + pl., by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 33 No 11 + pl. 14, are all identical with the following inscription A, although Raj. Mitra strangely misread the date and Dowson’s and Cunningham’s facsimiles show distinctly gra 3 (transcribed as Gri 3 by Dowson and as Gr. 3 by Cunningham) instead of va 1 and Dharmmadevasya (transcribed as Dharmma devasya by Dowson and as Dharma Devasya by Cunningham) instead of Dharmmadatasya. That these divergent readings owe their existence only to the imagination of the editors is proved by an old rubbing of the inscription A in which the letters are traced in ink. This tracing agrees in every respect with Dowson’s and Cunningham’s facsimiles. Lüders tried to establish the text of the inscription Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 101f. No 12, but failed, being mislead by the untrustworthy facsimiles. The first reliable reading of the inscription A was published by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji], JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 238 No 2a + pl. 10.

He was also the first who edited the inscription B, which is engraved on another face of the pillar and was left unnoticed until then, JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 239 No 2b + pl. 10.

· Text


---

1 [Cf. above p. 58 with note 2.]
2 Raj. Mitra’s No 17 and 18 are apparently facsimiles of the same original.
3 [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
4 There is a stroke to the left on the top of the va which makes the aksara look like ve, but it is probably accidental. As regards the numeral, the impression shows only one horizontal stroke keeping the line with the rest of the writing, but there is above that stroke a slightly slanting line which I take to be an accidental scratch just as the square dot immediately to the left of it. Bandyopādhyāya took it as part of the numeral and thus arrived at the reading va 2.
5 There can be little doubt that dānam is the intended reading, but it must be admitted that the na is quite abnormal.
6 [The kṣa shows besides the u-sign also the ā-sign.] The da is very badly shaped.
B 1 d[i]nnaṃbh[i]ksusya Dharmmadattasya dharmakathikasya sam-
ṅge ē[a]tudiseśsavat.a
2 [re 70] ... [r..] ...ā[nāhi]tasukhaye bhavat[u]

**Translation**

A In the year 77, in the 1st (month) of the rainy season, on the 5th
day, on this date, the gift of the monk Dharmmadata (Dharmadatta).
B The gift of the monk, the preacher Dharmmadatta, to the community
of the four quarters ....... May it be for the welfare and happiness (of all
sentient beings).

125y

**Facsimile:** below p. 273

§ 36

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the
Mathurā Museum. It is cut on the face of the square basement.
Vogel noticed the inscription as obliterated, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910,
p. 179 (P 39).

**Text**


**Translation**

The gift of the monk Dharmadata (Dharmadatta), the ........
Compare §35: L. 64 (A and B).
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**Facsimile:** below p. 274

§ 37

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the
Mathurā Museum. The inscription is cut on the face of a square base-
ment. The left corner is missing.

---

1 The i-sign looks more like an ā-sign, perhaps owing to a fissure in the stone.
2 The seeming e-sign on the top of the ca is probably accidental.
3 Bandopādhyaṁ read sa(ṁ)vate(ra) ......., but the subscript sign of the
third akṣara can hardly be -sa. The akṣara looks like tra [or tca], and there was no
more writing at the end of the first line. In the beginning of line 2 there are faint
traces of letters which may have been re 70 7, but the reading is quite uncertain
and there is not room enough for the date of the month and the day. Under these cir-
cumstances it is extremely doubtful whether the date was repeated in this inscription.
4 Restore: (sa)[r]svatavā[nā]ṁ.
5 Apart from details in the spelling, the first two words may be called certain,
the reading of the name is possible, the last word is illegible. [In the rubbing of
our collection the last two akṣaras of the inscription, i.e. ... sya, are missing.]
It was edited by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 184 No 7 + pl., by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 34 No 14 + pl. 14, by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 35).

**Text**

1 Dattas(y)a² :³ 20 6 [sa]m⁴ 70 7 va 1⁵ d[i] 10 1⁶

**Translation**

(The gift of the monk) Datta, (the pillar-base No) 26, in the year 77, in the 1st (month) of the rainy season, on the 11th day.

The reading and translation of this inscription, which is of consequence for the question of the size of the building to which the pillar belonged, will be discussed in connection with the following inscription.

139

Facsimile: below p. 274

§ 38

K 203

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It is cut on the face of the square basement. The right corner is missing.

The record was edited by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 27, and by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 34).

**Text**

1 danam bhikṣusya Dattas(y)a⁷ 30 7⁸ saṅhe cātu-
2 (rd)[i](še) sām [70 7]⁹

**Translation**

The gift of the monk Datta, (the pillar-base No) 37, to the community of the four (quarters), in the year 77 (…….)⁹

---

1 [At the beginning of the inscription below the line there is in the impression a hook to the right with a horizontal stroke at the top and a cross-bar in the middle. It is perhaps not quite impossible that the sign is meant as ku, the abbreviation of kumābhako.]

2 The upper ta of tua in Dattas(y)a is much clearer in a rubbing of Cunningham than in the impression. As for the rest see the remarks under the next inscription.

3 [After the first word there are two dots which seem to have been engraved on purpose; cf. below p. 74 f. But similar dots appear in § 40: L. 133 B, and § 63: L. 125 q.]

4 The sa though practically certain is quite blurred.

5 Dowson and Cunningham read the sign as i, Vogel as j.

6 There may have been a second line of writing.

7 See the remarks in the following text.

8 The reading of the figures is perfectly certain.

9 Of this line which has not been noticed previously only the sām is tolerably clear. There seems to have been no more writing in this line.
In the impression the aksara following Datta looks like su, but the reading would be void of sense. Nor can the character be taken as the figure for 100, as after the words danam bhikṣusya the name of the monk is necessarily in the genitive case. Under these circumstances there can be no doubt that the original reading was Dattasya and that the disappearance of the lower portion of the subscript -ya is due to the peeling off of the surface of the stone.

The established text of this inscription is of importance for the reading and interpretation of that part of the inscription §37: L.65 which precedes the date. Dowson (JRAS 5.1870, p. 184 No 7) read it datta stambha, followed by three figures which he took as 100 20 6. The mbha was of course meant as supplementary, and Cunningham in his reprint of Dowson’s text (ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 34 No 14) wrote more correctly datta sta(mbha) 126. Dowson translated the words: presented pillar 126. But the use of datta is uncommon in the donation inscriptions, and quite apart from the very improbable abbreviation of the word, stambha is out of place here, as in these pillar-base inscriptions, wherever the object of the gift is mentioned at all1, it is the base (kumbhaka) and not the pillar itself that is said to have been presented. After the supposed sta two dots or small strokes, which are possibly the remnants of a vertical line, are visible in the impression. Dowson converted them rather arbitrarily into the sign for 100 in a form that has never existed in reality. Vogel seems to have taken no account of those dots, but his reading datta 126 shows that he also tried to establish the number 126 in the record by interpreting the character after datta as the figure for 100. However, this interpretation, though perhaps not impossible from the palaeographical point of view, would entail serious difficulties.

As remarked above, the use of datta is, to say the least, unusual, but the absence of an ending would be inexplicable. Secondly the number would seem to be too high. From a comparison with the text of §31: L.62 and §63: L.125q it appears that the numbers in the inscriptions §37: L.65 and §38: L.139 are the numbers of the pillar-bases. Until now 47 bases of the hall in the Huviṣka-vihāra have been recovered. There may have been a few more, but it is quite unlikely that 79 should have disappeared or escaped notice as would be implied by reading “126” in §37: L.65.

I am therefore convinced that what was taken hitherto as the letter sta or the figure for 100 in §37: L.65 is a sya with the lower portion of the subscript -ya crumbled off similarly as in §38: L.139. The donor mentioned in the two inscriptions was no doubt the same person and dānam bhikṣusya has probably to be added at the beginning of §37: L. 65.

As regards the dots between Dattas(y)a and 26 in that inscription, I would suggest that they are a mark of insertion and that the word to be inserted, kumbhako, stood below 26. [Cf. above p. 73, n. 1]
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Facsimile: below p. 275

§ 39

K 192

Two inscriptions, one on the square base and the other around the torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2b).

Comparing the impression of the inscription on the square base (B) with the facsimile published by Rajendralala Mitra in connection with the edition of his No 19 (JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 130 + pl. 7), it appears that the two records are identical. Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 No 40, Lüders tried to restore the inscription from the aforesaid facsimile.

The inscription round the torus (A), engraved in the interstices between four maṅgala symbols¹, is edited here for the first time.

TEXT

2 ... di 20⁵
A dānām +¹ Buddh[a] rakṣi + tasy[ā]⁶ + V[a]ḍa kṣasy[ā]⁷ +

TRANSLATION

B The gift of the monk Buddhakṣita, the Va[ḍ]akṣa, to the Community of the four quarters, in the year 77, ...... on the 20th day ......

¹ [In the transcript of the text the four maṅgala symbols are marked by: +. But there are two more interstices without such symbols. These are given also to show that the engraver always wrote two akṣaras side by side.]
² The first letter is blurred and the ā-sign is uncertain.
³ It is not quite impossible that there was an anusvāra above the va. The ṃa shows the later form. [Concerning this akṣara, later on Lüders wrote “da” on the margin of his manuscript; for the akṣara itself see Bühler, Palaeographie, Tafel III, 18, 6 (ḍa) or 23, 4 (ḍa).]
⁴ The ā-sign of cā seems to be certain.
⁵ There seems to have been some more writing after 20, but it is quite effaced.
⁶ In buddha the second akṣara looks like ṝṭhā, but the seeming ā-stroke may be just as accidental as the horizontal stroke above the ta which has the appearance of an anuvāra. [The same horizontal stroke appears above the ṃa of the next word, in both instances before the same group of sounds s[y][ā]. From the purely graphical point of view it would be not impossible to read Buddh[ā]rakṣi-tāṃsyā and Vṛḍakṣamsyā.]
A The gift of Buddhakṣaṇa, the Vaḍakṣa.
As regards the epithet of the monk, see the remarks under §40: L. 133.

133 (= 134)
Facsimile: below p. 276

§ 40
K 193

Two inscriptions, one on the square base and the other around the torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum Calcutta (M 2).

The inscription on the square base (B) appears to be identical with the inscription (List No 133:) published by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 10 + pl. 5, and by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 17, although instead of Vaḍakṣaṇa Dowson read ca bhikṣusya, and Raj. Mitra in his transcript and in the facsimile mabhikṣusya. The writing has evidently been altered in the facsimile just as in §39: L. 132, where Raj. Mitra in his transcript gave mabhikṣusya instead of Vaḍakṣaṇa.

I have little doubt that also the inscription (List No 134:) published by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186 No 14, and by Raj. Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 7 + pl. 5 is identical with the present inscription B, although in this case Vaḍakṣaṇa was replaced by Śākyabhikṣusya in Dowson’s and by Śākya bhikṣusya in Raj. Mitra’s transcript. The facsimile shows something like śākyabhikṣasya, but in every other respect it closely agrees with our inscription. Raj. Mitra stated that the base bearing his inscription No 7 was deposited in the Museum of the Asiatic Society. In that case it ought to be now in the Indian Museum, but among the pillar-bases in the Museum there is none with an inscription containing the term Śākyabhikṣu. So we may rest assured that the reading Śākyabhikṣusya is due merely to arbitrary alteration.

The inscription B was treated by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 with notes 4—8, and edited again by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji\(^1\)], JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 241f. No 7 + pl. 11.

The inscription around the torus (A), which is engraved in the interstices between four maṅgala symbols, is edited here for the first time.

**Text**

B 1 danam\(^2\) bhikṣ[u]ṣya [:]\(^3\) Buddhakṣṇitaṣya\(^4\) Vaḍakṣṇaṣya\(^5\) sam-
[ūgh][e]

\(^1\) [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
\(^2\) Bandyopādhyāya: dānam, but there is no sign of the length on the da.
\(^3\) The second akṣara shows besides the u-sign also the i-sign, so we may read it as kṣ or as kṣi. [After the sya two dots, one below the other, seem to be engraved. Cf. above p. 73, n. 3.]
\(^4\) The fourth letter is distinctly kṣi, not kṣi, as read by Bandyopādhyāya.
\(^5\) Bandyopādhyāya read the first akṣara as bha, but it is distinctly va as in the other passages where the word occurs.
2 cātūrdis[e]\(^1\)
\(a\) dānam\(^2\) + \(a\) × + × × + Buddha r[ā]ksi tasyā\(^4\) + Va[ṃ]ḍa kṣasyā\(^5\)

**Translation**

B The gift of the monk Buddharaķṣita (Buddharaķṣita), the Vaṇḍakṣa, to the community of the four quarters.
A The gift of Buddharaķṣita, the Vaṇḍakṣa.

The epithet Vaṇḍakṣa, Vaṇḍakṣa or: Vadakṣa [or Vadakṣa, cf. p. 75, n. 3], as it is probably spelt in §39: L.132, seems to refer to the native place of the donor as Oḍīyanaṅka in §31: L.62. Is there a connection between Vadakṣa and Baḷaṅkṣān, Afghan Baḷaṅkṣān?\(^6\) Or between Vadakṣa and Vaḷukṣa, which in the Mahāvastu 3, p. 310, 14 is mentioned as the name of the town where Trapura and Bhallika erected the Nail-Stūpa (nakhastūpaṁ kārāpitaṁ)? According to Hūan-tsang the Stūpas erected by the two merchants were in the neighbourhood of the capital of Balkh.\(^7\)

\(^1\) Bandyopādhyāya: catudiše. The ā-sign is highly probable, the i-sign and the r- are quite clear, and only the e-sign is indistinct.

\(^2\) The ā-sign of dā is not quite certain. [The first māṅgala symbol after dānam represents a sitting figure; cf. the māṅgala symbol between kṣasyā[ā] and dānam in §39 : L. 132, A.] There was possibly some more writing between dānam and the following name, but if so, it has been entirely obliterated. It is true, there are some strokes above the second māṅgala symbol (a svastika), which might be taken as traces of letters, but they are probably accidental as this is just the place where we should least expect any writing. Moreover, the corresponding inscription §39 : L. 132 has only the three words given above. [Concerning these seeming traces of letters, Lüders later on remarked in his manuscript:] bhikṣoḥ above svastika?

\(^3\) In the transcript the four māṅgala symbols are marked by: + .

\(^4\) The ā-sign of syā is distinct.

\(^5\) The va is certain and the anusvāra very probable.

\(^6\) Horn, Neupersische Schriftsprache § 22, 5 (Grundriß der iran. Philologie 1898—1901, 1,2,p. 57). In Chinese the name occurs as Pa-ţo-şan, in Tibetan as Ba-to-šan (taken from the Chinese) and Ba-dag-šan, Ba-dag-štä, Ba-thag-šad; see F. W. Thomas, Tibetan literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan, Pt 1 (1935), p. 158.


\(^8\) [Raj. Mitra called it “a flight of stone steps” (cf. op. cit., p. 119 note, p. 121), and Dowson “a stone ladder”; it was described by Bandyopādhyāya as “a row of niches on the opposite side of which is a sculptured panel, now almost worn away. Only two niches and the following fragments of the inscription still remain”.]
side was cut off, which caused the loss of the greater part of the inscription engraved on that side. The left margin (with line 3) is lost altogether. The exact place where the stone is found is not known[,] but the inscription was published by Raj. Mitra (see below) as one of the finds made in 1860 by Mr. Best, Collector of Mathurā, in clearing away the earthen mound for the site of the new court-house (cf. JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 117ff.), i. e. the Jamālpur mound (cf. above p. 57).]

The inscription was edited by Rajendralal Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870 p. 129 No 14 + pl. 6, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 183 No 3 + pl., by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 150 No 26, by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji], JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 240f. No 4 + pl. 10.

TEXT

1 sam .... [r]. 2 .............. diva-
2 se 10 3 asyā pūrvvay[e] 4 dānam 5 bhikṣusya Buddhanaṃndi-
   (s)[y][a] 6
3 (..............................)

TRANSLATION

In the year ......., on the 10th day, on this date, the gift of the monk Buddhanaṇḍi (Buddhanaṇḍin) ....... May it be for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

90

Facsimile: below p. 277

§ 42

Inscription on a railing pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It is incised on the obverse to the left of the head of a carved male figure in Indo-Scythian dress standing under a tree.

1 [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
2 Only the lower part of the ra is preserved. Restore: sam(vata)ra(e). [The [r]-
   is not represented in our facsimile, cf. below p. 277.]
3 There seems to be no unit following 10.
4 [As Lüders remarked later on in his manuscript it is possible to read the last
   akṣara as ye or as yam; the stroke to the left does not touch the top of the letter.]
5 The first akṣara looks like do, but the stroke to the left is probably accidental.
6 Of the last akṣara only part of the subscript -ya is preserved.
7 The first letter is doubtful.
8 The first two akṣaras are disfigured by several strokes which to judge from
   the reverse of the impression are accidental.
9 The ha has the form of the later Eastern script; the i-sign is quite indistinct.
   The r- of rtha also is indistinct, and there seems to be no vowel-sign at the top of
   the letter.

**TEXT**
\[d[i] 108\]

**TRANSLATION**
On the 18th day.

The real purport of the inscription is not apparent.

---

§ 43

Inscription on a railing pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 91).


**TEXT**
\[d[i] 209\]

**TRANSLATION**
On the 29th day.

The real purport of the inscription is not apparent.

---

§ 44

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It runs along the top of the torus and was evidently incised by a person who was only imperfectly acquainted with writing. The inscription shows a strange mixture of forms of the Kuśān and the Gupta alphabets, and the difficulty of reading is enhanced by the bad preservation of the stone.

---

1 Cunningham read the first sign as 100. Instead of \(d[i]\) it may be read as \(de\).

2 Cunningham read the first sign as 100 and in the JRAS the last sign as 7 (probably misprint). — The first akṣara may be read as \(de\).

[The text contains eight maṅgala symbols which are engraved generally after the seventh akṣara irrespective of the meaning of the words. These symbols are marked below by: +; cf. §39: L. 132 and §40: L. 133.]

TEXT

+ [dā[na]m\(^1\) bh[ik]sus[y]a\(^2\) B ... + ... m[i]strasya\(^3\) V[o]jya + [vaśi]ka-


bhavatu sa[dhy]yivi + hariṣya\(^6\) Dharma[d]ev[a]s[y]a + ar[o]g[a]dāksi-

ṇ[a]y[e]\(^7\) [bha]vat[u]\(^8\)

TRANSLATION

The gift of the monk ...... m[i]tra\(^3\), the Vojyavaśiṣka (?). Let it be for the worship of (his) deceased parents. Let it be for the bestowing of health on (his) companion Dharmadeva.

---

\(^1\) Of the dā only the upper portion is preserved. From the reverse of the estam-

page it appears that the second akṣara which at first sight might be taken as dā

really is na with the serif elongated to the right as frequently in the script of this

record. The anusvāra is quite distinct.

\(^2\) The reading of the word omitted by Vogel is perfectly certain.

\(^3\) I am unable to make out the first three syllables of the name. The first akṣara

may be: ba, bu or bo, the second looks like yr. The third letter may be ja, as as-

sumed by Vogel, or jya, but I fail to see which word was meant. The following m[i]

was read as [mi] already by Vogel. It seems to be certain, although the ma shows

the form of the Gupta script, whereas later on the Kuśāṇ form is used twice.

\(^4\) This is Vogel’s reading. The reading vojya seems pretty clear, but the reading of the following two akṣaras is doubtful. [A horizontal stroke is engraved after the word V[o]jya [vaśi]ka\(\text{syā}\).]

\(^5\) Instead of [mātap]i[ṛ]ŋa [abhya]jatikalaga[tā]nām Vogel reads: .... hica-

vāṣya śitakalagatānām, but, with the exception of some of the vowel-signs our

reading may be called certain, although some of the letters are badly shaped and

others blurred. The [ṛ]j has a horizontal stroke on the right limb which makes it

look like hi. The ā-sign of [ṛ]f] seems to have been formed by doubling the

r-sign of the Gupta script. Below the ya, which shows the form of the Gupta script,

there seems to be another letter which Vogel took to be ṇa, and I am ready to

admit that from a purely graphical point of view the reading ṇa would be possible,

but grammatically a form mātapitṛṇa for Sk. māta[pitṛṇa] can hardly be accounted

for. Perhaps the seeming letter is after all only due to a scratching in the stone. —

There is no anusvāra above the ya. The two letters [abhya] and the māṭrka tā

of [t]i are much blurred, but practically certain.

\(^6\) [Cf. p. 81, n. 4.] Vogel: sadhyāvānārya, but the ha has no a-sign. The māṭrka

dha of [dh]y of a vertical line at the top [which perhaps may be meant as a

superscript r]-. The hook at the bottom of the māṭrka ya of vi is made angular.

The sya is quite misshapen.

\(^7\) The vowel-signs of y[a]y[e] are doubtful. The māṭrka ya shows the form

of the Gupta script.

\(^8\) For want of space the last akṣara has been added below the line.
Vojyavaśika (?) probably refers to the native place of the donor. The term abhyatitakālagata ‘deceased’ has been taken over from the language of the canonical texts (abhattita-kālakata; -kālmukata). It occurs also in a Buddhist formulary for the announcing of gifts to the Order from Eastern Turkestan (SPAW 1930, p. 16 = Phil. Ind., p. 609: B verso 2: abhyatitakālagata-).
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Facsimile: below p. 279

§ 45

Fragmentary inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2j).

The inscription has been edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 127 No 3 + pl. 5, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 185 No 10 + pl., by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji²], JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 241 No 5 + pl. 10.

TEXT

1 [ku] ²² dānaṃ bhikṣusya Buddhādāsasya Saṅghamitra-
sadeviḥ[a]arpa⁴ pa[catriṇa]sya³ ..

2 (...............) ..[d]ā ..e[t]ai[v]ast[avya]sya⁶

---

² [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
³ All the three editors have hitherto ignored the two signs preceding dānaṃ, although the two horizontal strokes are quite clear. They can denote only the numeral 2. The akṣara before 2 is almost entirely effaced in the impression before me, but in Dowson’s facsimile it is a distinct ku, and as Dowson himself did not recognise the value of the sign, it may be assumed that it is a faithful reproduction of the original. Moreover the traces of the letter still visible in the impression agree with the reading ku.
⁴ Bandyopādhyāya: -sadeviḥārīṣa, but the ri is certain, although the two strokes of the i-sign are somewhat shorter than in bhi, mi and tri. [For the expression itself cf. List, p. 223, where Lüders gave several examples for different readings of equivalents of *sadhyagvihārin ‘(travelling-)companion.’]
⁵ Bandyopādhyāya: paṇcariṇaśa, which is quite unfounded. There is a stroke above the s which may be meant for the anusvāra. There may have been another akṣara at the end of the line.
⁶ At the beginning of the second line about six akṣaras are entirely effaced. Of the next five letters only the upper portions are more or less preserved, and also the last four akṣaras are not perfectly clear. The sta looks like stā, but the seeming ṃ-stroke is apparently due to a fissure in the stone. Raj. Mitra’s facsimile may be transcribed: śandāra .. petraivvas[t]ayasya, Dowson’s facsimile: śaṁ-
dālape.aīvra vyasya, but I am unable to make any sense out of these readings. Bandyopādhyāya’s reading: .aīvra sāṃghasya is absolutely impossible. [Instead of [v]e[va] the sixth akṣara may be read also as deva even as ddha.]

TRANSLATION

Pillar-base 2, the gift of the monk Buddhadāsa, the companion of Saṅghamītra (Saṅghamitra), the thirty-fifth ……

*Ku* I take as the abbreviation of *kuṁbhako*. I cannot explain the meaning of *pucatrisasya*, but it does not seem to refer to the date. Nor dare I decide whether the last word is *vastavyasya* ‘to be inhabited’ or *vāstavyasya* ‘dwelling’.

126

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It is cut on the face of a square basement.


TEXT

1 ayaṁ ku[m]bha[s]o1 danaṁ bhikṣun[a] machyasya2 Buddharakṣitasya ca prāhaṇik[ā]n[a] m3 an[e]n[a]

2 deryadharmanmaparityāyen[a]4 sarvves[a] m5 pr[a]haṇikaṇ[a] m6 arogya-dakṣ[a]n[a]7 bhavat[ā]m8

1 There is a distinct stroke to the right attached to the top of the *ku* which is probably meant for the *anuvāra*.
2 The *śu* is perfectly clear.
3 As the impressions show, *prā* was the intended reading. The last two *aṅkaras* of the word have been damaged by knocking off a small triangular piece of the stone. A rubbing of Cunningham as well as the plates published with the papers of Dowson and Growse show that this had not yet happened when the rubbing was taken.
4 The *r*-stroke in *derya* is quite distinct.
5 It seems not impossible that the last *aṅkara* to be read as *ṣaṃ*.
6 Here the second letter may be *hā*.
7 The horizontal stroke above the *nā* is probably accidental[, but it seems noteworthy that such a stroke is visible also above the second *na* in *an[e]n[a]* and above the *na* in *-tyāgen[a]*).
8 The last *aṅkara* is distinctly *tāṃ*, not *tu* as read hitherto.
TRANSLATION

This pillar-base is the gift of the monks Śuriya and Buddharakṣita, the practisers of meditation. May this surrender of a pious gift⁠¹ be for the bestowing of health on all practisers of meditation.

The correct Sanskrit form of prāhaṇika or possibly prāhāṇika would be prādhāṇika. In Pali we have padhāṇika ‘practising padhāna, or meditation’. In Buddhist Sanskrit pradhāna occurs in its regular form, but more often in the form derived from the Eastern Prakrit as prahāṇa.²

The lengthening of the i in prāhaṇika is the same as in Śuriyasya and -parityāgena.

The writing deryadharmma- has a parallel in seryathā = p. seyyathā frequently found in manuscripts of Buddhist Sanskrit texts.

125s and 137

Facsimile: below p. 280

§ 47

Inscription of two parts engraved on two faces of the square basement of a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The first part (a) was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 176 (P 21). The second part (b) alone was noticed by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 22, and by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, p. 108 No 3. Of this part Vogel, loc. cit., deciphered only two words.

TEXT


..... [syā]⁵

2 Dharmap[r]iyas[y]a⁶ Saṅ[gham][it][r][as][ya]⁷..... pri ..⁸///

¹ [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia.]
² See i.g. Mahāvastu 2, p. 124,1; p. 238,4ff.; Divyāvadāna p. 208,8; Vajra-cchedikā p. 43,7; Lalitavistara p. 246,8; p. 248,11f.; p. 261,4.
³ The o-sign is doubtful. The last akṣara is perhaps ka as read by Vogel.
⁴ [There is a vertical stroke, apparently an accidental cut, touching the right end of the upper part of the ligature nd[a] or perhaps ndā.]
⁵ Dowson gives this name as Singha-ghuta. At present the two akṣaras after saṅgha are illegible.
⁶ The reading is certain. It is not dharmadeya as read by Vogel. [There is a curved line above the ya of p[r]iyaya which seems to be only a fissure in the stone.]
⁷ Dowson and, apparently independently, Cunningham also give Saṅhambhūta which agrees with the remains of the letters visible in the impression. As nobody would be able at present to recognise the name on the stone, it appears that the lower rim of the base has crumbled off since Cunningham examined it.
⁸ Both, Dowson and Cunningham give the last name as Dharmapriya. Possibly the original reading was Dharmapriyasya followed by about four akṣaras, but only the pri and faint traces of a following letter can be recognised at present.
TRANSLATION

This pillar-base is the gift of the commissioners of the Community headed by Bhadraghoṣa, of Saṅghadāsa, Buddhāṇānda (Buddhāṇandā), Saṅghadeva, Saṅgha...; Dharmapriya, Saṅghamitra, ... pri...

As appears from §65: L. 140 the saṅghapraṇātas were laymen. The literal meaning of the term is: ‘employed by the Saṅgha’. They would therefore seem to have been a body of laymen who were charged by the Buddhist monks with the support of the monastery. The second inscription (b) is obviously the list of the members of that body which in the first inscription (a) is briefly designated as saṅghapraṇātas headed by Bhadraghoṣa (cf. §48: L. 125t and §49: L. 125u).

125t
Facsimile: below p. 279

§ 48

Inscription cut on the face of the square basement of a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 177 (P 25).

TEXT

aya[m kum]bh[akō dā]nām saṅghapraṅtān[ā]m Bh[ad]raghoṣapramukhā(nām)

TRANSLATION

This pillar-base is the gift of the commissioners of the Community headed by Bhadraghoṣa.

Compare §47: L. 125s and §49: L. 125u.

125u
Facsimile: below p. 280

§ 49

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It is cut on the face of the square basement the right corner of which with the concluding portion of the inscription is lost.

The record was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 177 (P 26).

TEXT

aya[m [kumbha]k[o]1 dānān saṃghapraṇāt[ā]nām Bhadraghoṣa-[ṣa]-
(pramukhānanām)

1 The o-sign is doubtful.
TRANSLATION

This pillar-base is the gift of the commissioners of the Community (headed by) Bhadraghoṣa.

Compare §47: L.125s and §48: L.125t.

125w

§ 50

Facsimile: below p. 281

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record, which is cut on the face of the square basement, was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 37).

TEXT

2 [sukhāye][4] . . . . . ///

TRANSLATION

Success! The gift of the commissioners of the Community headed by Bhaddila for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings . . . .

Perhaps Bhaddila is only a shortened Prakrit form of Bhadraghoṣa mentioned in §47: L.125s — §49: L.125u. Compare §51: L.131.

131 (= 125v)

§ 51

Facsimile: below p. 281

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. It is cut on the top of the torus.

As proved by the facsimile, the impression is identical with the inscription published by Rajendralala Mitr, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 8 + pl. 5, although he read it dānāṃ saṅhe putra . . . It may also be the same as the inscription of which Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186

1 I think that traces of the word can be discerned, but the reading is by no means certain.
2 Vogel read here and in the next two words the last aksara as nāṃ, but nam is more likely.
3 [In the rubbing of our collection the centre with bhaddila is missing.]
4 sukha is tolerably certain. Perhaps the next two aksaras were sarva, but the rest of the line is illegible.
No 15 published the first words as dānam Sangha ... Lüders tried to correct Raj. Mitrā's reading Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 No 39, but his restoration of the text is wrong.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 177 (P 24).

**TEXT**

....1 d[a]na² samghaprakr̥it[ā]naṃ³ Bh[a]d[ī]lapramukhana

**TRANSLATION**

.... the gift of the commissioners of the Community headed by Bhadila.

Compare §50: L. 125w.

125m

Facsimile: below p. 281

§52 /

Inscription cut on the face of the basement of a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.


**TEXT**

Siddham —⁴ da[naṃ]⁵ bhikṣuno⁶ Bhadrasya Bhadrāg(o)ṣasya⁷ ca —

1 At the beginning there are traces of one or two aksaras not noticed by Vogel. The reading siddham is unlikely.

2 The top-stroke of the da shows an elongation to the left, but the reading dena is hardly intended.

3 The r-vowel is written here by attaching the signs for -r and -i to the ka. The a-stroke of tā is not quite certain. In nam the anuvāra is placed above the line to the right of the sa, whereas naṃ seems to have been expressed here by putting a small stroke to the right of the na in the middle of the line; cf. the naṃ of §58: L. 125c.

4 The d- is indicated by a slight curve of the upper vertical. [The m is written at the right side of the ddha not separated from this ligature on the upper part of which by the side of the d- there is a horizontal stroke to the right; cf. §55: L. 125k.]

5 The reading danam is only tentative. The second aksara looks like an archaic na with the vertical line slightly curved. If no value is attached to the jutting to the left of the upper and lower verticals, one might even read ja as Vogel does. But neither danā nor daja, if taken as an independent word or in combination with bhikṣuno, yields a plausible meaning. So I would explain the character as a na with the same uncommonly long top-stroke that appears in kṣu, no and ca, and the stroke denoting the anuvāra attached to the middle of the vertical. For a similar mode of writing naṃ see §53: L. 125n.

6 The last aksara of this word differs so much from the last letter of the word just mentioned that here apparently no is intended.

7 [Probably the third letter was originally written as sa, but than corrected to gха. There is no o-sign at the top of the aksara.] The engraver seems to have forgotten to incise the middle line of the mātrkā sa.
Translation

Success! The gift of the monk Bhadra and of Bhadrargoṣa.

Compare §53: L. 125n. Bhadrargoṣa is a layman; see §47: L. 125s — §49: L. 125u.

125n
Facsimile: below p. 282

§ 53

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record, cut on the face of the square basement, was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 178 (P 28).

Text


Translation

The gift of the monk Bhadra and of Bhadrargoṣa.

Compare §52: L. 125m.

125r
Facsimile: below p. 282

§ 54

Inscription on a pillar-base, cut on the face of the square basement. It was found in the Jamālpur mound and is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 178 (P 32).

---

1 Vogel reads [siddham] at the beginning of the inscription before the dā[nam]. I can find no traces of it in the impression, and Mr. Agrawala states that it is not on the stone. — The nam shows here a form that is even more curious than in the preceding inscription. I think it quite possible that the engraver wanted to incise the form used in § 52: L. 125m, but neglected to cut the right end of the top-stroke.

2 The kṣa has a distinct o-sign at the top, whereas the u-stroke is less distinct. The visarga is not very clear and close to the kṣa, and in the void space between bhikṣo[h] and the next word there are traces of a letter which may have been no. Probably the original reading bhikṣuno was corrected to bhikṣoḥ.
TEXT

.. ayan² kubhak[o] dānā bhik[ṣu]sya Saṅghavarm[m]a[ṣya]³ Vṛddhasya⁴ ca

TRANSLATION

The pillar-base is the gift of the monk Saṅghavarmma (Saṅghavarman) and of Vṛddha.

125k
Facsimile: below p. 282

§ 55

Inscription on a pillar-base. The place where it is found is not stated, but there can be no doubt that it came from the Jamālpur mound. It is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record, which is cut on the face of the square basement, was first read by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, p. 108 No 1, and edited again by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 178 (P 31).

TEXT

1 dānāṃ bhikṣo[h] Saṅghadevasya⁵ Vākuḍātev[ā]sikasy[ā]⁶
2 siddham —⁷

---

¹ Before ayan there is a distinct sign which was read as ja by Vogel. It resembles the strange sign in § 52: L. 125m which I have tried to interpret as nam. A similar sign apparently representing nam is found in § 53: L. 125n. In both cases the signs are used to denote the last syllable of dānam, but here the reading dānam cannot be thought of, as there is no letter visible at the beginning of the line and besides this dānam occurs afterwards in the inscription. I am unable at present to account for the existence of the sign. [Badly shaped abbreviation for:] siddham? [= Later remark by the author written on the margin of his manuscript.]

² The anuvāra consists of a long curved line touching the top-stroke of the ya.

³ The subscript -ma has no bottom-line and the sya is a mere scrawl.

⁴ The r-sign is indicated by a line curved to the right. [The ddha is written similarly as in siddham of § 52: L. 125m, but here the -dha is not closed in its upper part.] The sign for sya is just as bad as in the preceding word.

⁵ Vogel read Saṅghadevasya, but the a-stroke is quite distinct.

⁶ Vogel read Vākuḍātev[ā]sikasya, but the elongation of the top-stroke to the right on the va and the da points to length of the vowels. In sy[a/] the length of the vowel seems to be expressed by an upward stroke as in Saṅghadevasyā.

⁷ The word written in smaller characters has not been noticed by Cunningham and Vogel. [There are two strokes to the right of the ddha, by the side of the superscript da it is a horizontal, and below by the side of the subscript -dha, a vertical one. It is quite possible that the lower is meant for m; cf. § 52: L. 125m.]
TRANSLATION

Success! The gift of the monk Saṅghadeva, the pupil of Vākudā.

The name of the teacher occurs as Vakkali in Pali\(^1\). In Buddhist Sanskrit we find Bakkula\(^2\), Vakkula\(^3\), and Vatkula\(^4\).

135
Facsimile: below p. 282

\(§ 56\) \(K 194\)

Fragmentary inscription on the square base of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2c).

The record was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1.1870, p. 128 No 4 + pl. 5, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186 No 11, by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji\(^5\)], JPAS 5. 1909, p. 241 No 6 + pl. 11.

TEXT

dānāṃ bhikṣusya\(^6\) Buddhaghoṣasya\(^7\) Phala[pha]\(^8\)///

TRANSLATION

The gift of the monk Buddhaghoṣa (Buddhaghoṣa), the Phalapha\(^9\)… (?)

The meaning of the last mutilated word is uncertain. It may be an epithet of the monk Buddhaghoṣa, or the name of another person who associated with him in the donation.

\(^1\) E. g. Samyuttanikāya 3, p. 124.
\(^2\) E. g. Saddharmapundarika p. 2; p. 207.
\(^3\) E. g. Mahāvyutpatti 47, 37; Lalitavistara, p. 2, 2.
\(^4\) E. g. Divyāvadāna, p. 396.
\(^5\) [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n.1.]
\(^6\) The first letter is distinctly bhī, not bhī, as read by Bandyopādhyāya.
\(^7\) Both, Raj. Mitra and Dowson, read the name Buddhaghoṣasya, which of course is a mistake, but I do not believe that Bandyopādhyāya was right in reading Baudhaghoṣasya. He thought [JPAS 5, p. 240] that -au was expressed here by "a straight downward stroke below and two curved strokes to the right" (recte: two straight strokes slanting to the left) on the top of the letter. In support of his view he referred to the form of gau in Gauridāsasya in some of the Basārā seals [discovered by Th. Bloch], cf. ASI Ann. Rep. 1903/04. 1906, p. 114 (No 74b) + pl. 41 No 28. But there the right-hand part of -au consists of a curve or hook attached to the bottom of the letter, and this is clearly the same curve which, as was pointed out by Bloch [Ann. Rep. 1903/04, p. 102], occasionally is used to express the long -ā in the Eastern Gupta script. [Cf. below p. 161, n. 3.] It bears not the slightest resemblance to the long stroke attached to the mātrkā ḫa in the present inscription, and there can be no doubt that the true reading of the aksara in question is bu and that the two strokes to the left are nothing but flaws in the stone.

\(^8\) The last aksara is doubtful. It may be ha.

\(^9\) [Cf. § 57: L. 125x.]
§ 57
Facsimile: below p. 283

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamálpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum. The record, cut on the face of the square basement, is now almost entirely obliterated.

It was noticed, but not read by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 36).

TEXT

//lapalasya [bh]i ...... ///

Perhaps the name was the same as in §56: L.135 where the beginning is preserved as Phala[pha]

§ 58
Facsimile: below p. 283

Inscription cut on the face of the square basement of a pillar-base from the Jamálpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

It was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 179 (P 33).

TEXT

[dā]nam¹ bhikṣ(u)s[y]a Buddhamītras(y)a ···/²

TRANSLATION

The gift of the monk Buddhamītra (Buddhamitra) ...

§ 59
Facsimile: below p. 283

Inscription on a pillar-base from the Jamálpur mound, preserved in the Public Library at Allahabad until 1907 and now in the Mathurā Museum. The concluding portion of the inscription, which is cut on the face of the square basement, is missing.

¹ The stroke denoting the anusvāra stands after the na in the middle of the line; cf. the nam of § 51: L. 131, note 3.
² The peeling off of the surface of the stone has caused the disappearance of the u-sign of kṣu and the two subscript -ya and the rest of the inscription of which only the upper portion of one akṣara is still discernible.
It was edited by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 21, by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 No 37, by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 178 (P 29). Perhaps the record is identical with the inscription List No 130, published by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 9 + pl. 5, and by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186 No 16.

Raj. Mitra read the beginning as danaṃ saṅghapraṇavirasya ..., his facsimile shows danaṃ saṅghapraṇavirasya pu ..., which agrees with Dowson's reading (No 16): danaṃ Sangha-pravirasya pu ... As remarked by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 No 38, saṅghapraṇavirasya was evidently misread for saṅghasthavirasya. Considering the arbitrary way in which Raj. Mitra's and Dowson's facsimiles are often altered, I think it not impossible that their readings are based on a disfigured facsimile, although, of course, there may have been a second inscription beginning with danaṃ saṅghasthavirasya which now would be lost.

**TEXT**

danaṃ saṅghasthavirasyā bhadāṁ[t]a¹...///

**TRANSLATION**

Gift of the elder of the Community, the venerable ...
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Facsimiles: below p. 284

§ 60

Two inscriptions, one on a square base and the other around the torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2a).

The inscription on the square base (A) was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 6 + pl. 5, and by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186 No 13. Lüders tried to correct the reading from the published facsimile, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 154f. No 36. The record was re-edited by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji²], JPAS 5. 1909, p. 242 No 8 + pl. 11. It was treated again by Lüders, SPAW 1913, p. 422f. = Phil. Ind., p. 250f., who subsequently published the record, beginning with the word imena, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 24].

The inscription around the torus (B) has not been noticed before and is edited here for the first time.

¹ [The akṣara following danaḥ seems to be the ligature nta. Therefore the word may be transliterated as bhadāṁ[nta]. It was followed immediately by the name of the monk.

² [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
TEXT
2 [na] devadhar[m]apa[r]jit[y]āgenā 5 [a]c[a]la[m-ai]ś[va]ry-
[y]ām 6 bhav[a]t[u]
B  d[a]nam 7 Vakamihiraputrasya Horamu[r]d[d]apharasya 8

TRANSLATION
A The gift of the viśvasika Vakamihira (Vakamihira) together with (his) son Horamurṇḍaga. By this donation of a pious gift 9 let the sovereignty be unshaken!
B The gift of Horamurddaphara, the son of Vakamihira.

See the remarks below (§62: L.128).

§ 61
Façsimiles: below p. 285

141
K 204

Two inscriptions, one on the square base and the other around the torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2h).

The inscription on the square base (A) was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 130 No 20 + pl. 7. Lüders tried to correct the reading from the published facsimile Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 155 note 100. The record was re-edited by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji 10], JPAS 5. 1909, p. 242f. No 9 + pl. 11, and treated again by Lüders, SPAW 1913, p. 422f. = Phil. Ind., p. 250f., who subsequently edited the second line of A, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 24.

The inscription around the torus (B) has not been noticed before and is edited here for the first time.

1 [At the right side of the ś- there is a distinct stroke to the right. Therefore the second aksara may be meant as eva.]
2 The sign of the long -i is distinct in [hī], but doubtful in [mi].
3 The fourth aksara is distinctly rṇā. The fifth letter was read te by Bandyopādhyāya, which would not be impossible, the aksara being neither a clear te nor a clear ge. I prefer to read ge for linguistic reasons and because in § 61: L. 141 the sign appears to be ge. The last aksara is undoubtedly meant to be na, though it looks more like ta.
4 Bandyopādhyāya read only ma, but the initial i is quite distinct.
5 The ā-sign of tā/yā is distinct.
6 The reading is certain. Bandyopādhyāya: bha(a)c[a]la Sukhayē.
7 The da has no ā-sign. [The aksara looks almost like de.]
8 The r-sign is not distinct. It can be read only by assuming that the slanting line on the top of the da is meant for the r-stroke. It is probable that there was a subscript -da.
9 [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia.]
10 [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
I. Ancient Sanctuaries: 5. Jamālpur Mound

TEXT

2 [ime]n[a d]ēvvardhamapa(r)i(tyāg)e[na]m acalam-aiśvarya-tayam bh[a]vva-tu⁵
B danaṁ⁶ Vakamihiraputrasya Horamurddapharasya⁷

TRANSLATION

A The gift of the viśvasika Vvagamihira (Vagamihira) together with (his) son Horamurdvaga⁴. By this donation of a pious gift⁸ let the sovereignty be unshaken!
B The gift of Horamurddaphara, the son of Vakamihira.

See the remarks below (§62: L.128).
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Façsimiles: below p. 285

§ 62

K 190

Two inscriptions, one on the square base and the other around the torus of a pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (M 2g).

Both inscriptions (A and B) were edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128 No 5a and b + pl. 5, and by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 186 No 12. Lūders tried to correct the reading from the published facsimile in connection with the just mentioned editions, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 154f. No 34 and 35. A new edition of both inscriptions was pub-

1 There was probably an āksara before [d]ānaṁ.
2 The reading is certain. Bandyopādhyāya: Vata(ka)mihirāsya.
3 The last āksara is probably ṃ, not na as read by Bandyopādhyāya.
4 The fourth letter, read ḍha by Bandyopādhyāya, is doubtful. [In the transcript of the record Lūders corrected his former reading [ṛ]ḍva later on into [ṛdva] but did not convert the -ṛ- into -ṭ- in the translation also, which has been done now.] The r-stroke on the top of the āksara is uncertain, and the subscript -ṛ has a tail to the left which makes it look almost like ḍha. However, from the reverse of the estampage it becomes probable that it is only a flaw in the stone. The next letter is probably ge, not te, as read by Bandopādhyāya. The last āksara is very badly shaped so that at the first sight it seems to be no letter at all. But as the ending of the name originally must have been -ena, there can be little doubt that the āksara in question was meant as na.
5 The reading of the second line may be called certain. The anuveṣṭas above na and ya are quite distinct. Instead of ḍha the reading ḍhā would be possible, but the seeming ṛ-stroke may be accidental. Bandyopādhyāya’s reading is so much out-of-the-way that it needs not to be quoted here.
6 There seems to be no ḍ-sign on the da.
7 The vertical stroke at the bottom of ḍh appears to be accidental.
8 [Cf. Lūders, Acta Orientalia.]

TEXT

B d[ā]nam⁹ Vakamihiraputra bha H[ar]amarddaphara[s]ly[a]¹⁰..

TRANSLATION

A The gift of the viśvasika Vakamihira together with (his) son Horamūnadhvara(?). By this donation of a pious gift let the sovereignty be unshaken!

B The gift of Haramarddaphara (Horamurddaphara), the son of Vakamihira.

---

¹ [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
² Here again dānam is preceded by a sign two horizontal strokes of which are pretty distinct. It is perhaps not quite impossible that it was ku, the abbreviation of kumabhako.
³ Bandyopādhyāya: viśvasikasya, but here the vowel-sign of the first letter seems to be -ai.
⁴ [The first letter has a top-stroke to the left. From the purely graphical point of view it may be read as ve.]
⁵ Bandyopādhyāya: sahā, but there is no ā-stroke attached to the ha.
⁶ Bandyopādhyāya: Horamudakharena. The reading of the name is extremely difficult. The o-sign of h[o] is blurred, but certain, and the ā-sign of [mū] is probable. The fourth akṣara can be read only as va, and there is no r-stroke visible on the top of the letter. The next akṣara is a ligature, the lower part of which is clearly -va. The upper letter may possibly be ĝha [or pha, cf. Bühler, Indische Palaeographie, Tafel III 19, 3–4 and 27, 1; 5]. No less doubtful is the sixth akṣara. It may be read as ra instead of re; there is no hook at the bottom of the vertical and the e-sign is indistinct.
⁷ The stroke which gives the va the appearance of vā may be an accidental flaw. The r- of rma is expressed by two r-signs placed one above the other [de-v[ā]ddharmma-?]. Bandyopādhyāya read -parityagena, but the reading tyāke seems to be certain, although the lower portion of the ka has partly disappeared owing to the peeling off of the stone. The last akṣara, which is no doubt meant for na, looks more like ta.
⁸ Bandyopādhyāya read doubtfully acala hita sukhaye which, of course, is impossible. The writing is here so much blurred that it can be deciphered only with the help of the corresponding passage in § 61: L. 141. Under these circumstances the reading maśā instead of the correct maśā cannot be called certain.
⁹ The top-stroke of the da is so much lengthened to the left that the akṣara looks almost like de.
¹⁰ Here the ha and the ma seem to have no vowel-signs, but apparently only by fault of the engraver. Bandyopādhyāya’s reading Horamudkhapharasya is imaginary.

¹¹ [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia.]
The inscriptions §60: L. 127, §61: L. 141, and §62: L. 128, as far as they are incised on the square bases, present extraordinary difficulties partly due to the extreme slovenliness of the engraving and partly due to the faultiness of the language increased by singularities in spelling. If instead of deyadharmaparityāgena we find devadharmaparityāgena, devadharmapa(r)i(tyā)genaṃ, deviddharmaparityākena [¬rrma-.], I am convinced that the substitution of deva, devva or even devād for deya has to be accounted for only by the writer’s ignorance of the language.¹ In §60: L. 127 the sentence concludes correctly acalamiśvārpara bhavatu, but in §61: L. 141 the words have been replaced by acalamiśvaryatayam bhavatu and similarly in §62: L. 128. Probably the writer wanted to say acalamiśvaryatāyai bhavatu. I suspect that these linguistic imperfections have to do with the fact that the donors were of foreign extraction. The father’s name proves him to be of Iranian descent. Vakamihira is naturally to be divided into vaka and mihira, and mihira of course corresponds to Persian mihr. The spelling mihira in §60: L. 127 and §61: L. 141 is due to a tendency of writing the long vowel, observable also in other inscriptions of this time.² The first constituent vaka is spelled vvega in §61: L. 141 with that strange doubling of v which is found in the same inscription also in deeva- and bhavatu, and with ga instead of ka which has its counterpart in the spelling -parityākena in §62: L. 128. Perhaps voga is the more accurate spelling, and this voga is identical with the first constituent of the personal name Vagramareg(r)a, Vag(r)amareg(r)a, Vagramariq(r)a- in the Wardak Vase inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 170 No 86). That this name is a compound of vagra and mareg(r)a is proved by the occurrence of the second member not only in the name Haṣṭhunā Mareg(r)a in this inscription, but also as a separate personal name in the Kharoṣṭhī documents³ of Caḍ’oda⁴ No 431 and 432.

The appellation of Vakamihira’s son is also distinctly Iranian. In each of the three inscriptions on the square bases it is spelt in a different way. Only the reading in §60: L. 127 is perfectly clear and reliable, and this form has therefore to be taken as the base of explanation. In the paper I have quoted above (SPAWN 1913, p. 420ff. = Phil. Ind., p. 249ff.), I have identified Horamunḍa with horamurta occurring in the Mānikiāla inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 149 No 76). There the general Lāla is called the horamurta of the ksattrapa Veṣpaṣi, the horamurta in the Kṣattrapa’s own vihāra.⁵ In the Taxila Copper-plate (CII 2, 1, p. 28 No 13) Patika,

³ ... discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan Pt 2 (1927), p. 156ff.
⁴ [Cf. Lüders, op. cit., p. 35ff.]
⁵ Veṣpaṣiśa ksattrapasa horamurt[o] sa tasa apanage vihare horamurto.
the son of the ksatrapa Liaka Kusuluka, is called mahadanapati (i.e. mahādānapati). It thus becomes probable that horamurta, which is certainly no Indian word, is an Iranian equivalent of dānapati, and this agrees well with the fact that in the Saka language of Khotan hora is the ordinary word for 'gift'. Moreover, in the Mathurā Lion Capital inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 48 No 15) the queen Ayasia Kamuia is said to have made some donations together with the harem and the retinue of horakas (horakaparivarena) where horaka seems to be an abbreviated form of horamurta.1 As hora is not a common Iranian word, but confined to the Saka language, horamurta would have to be considered a Saka term, which is quite in harmony with its occurrence in inscriptions dating from the time of the rule of the Sakas as well as of the Kuṣāns who, whatever their nationality may have been, certainly to a large extent used the Saka language.

As regards the second member of the compound horamurta, no such word as murta in the sense of pati has turned up hitherto in the Saka language itself. However, in Sanskrit we find a word, evidently taken from the Saka language, similar in sound which has the meaning of 'lord', i.e. murunḍa. Murunḍa occurs several times as the name of a dynasty or of a tribe in Indian literature and also in Greek and Latin works, but a passage in the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta (CII 3, p. 1 No 1, line 23), where Sakamurunḍa appears in a compound with daiva-patraśāhīśāhānusāhī, leaves no doubt that murunḍa originally was a title used by Saka princes. Konow (SPAW 1916, p. 791), is of the opinion that Sai-wang, which in the Han Annals is the typical term for the Sakas,2 is the Chinese rendering of Sakamurunḍa. Moreover, Lévi3 has shown that moa-lun, which in a Chinese encyclopedia is mentioned as a title of an Indian king of the third century A. D., is a transliteration of murunḍa, and Konow has identified murunḍa with muroḍa, the title given to Kaniṣka in the Zeda inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 145 No 75; cf. p. 142f.). On the other hand, in the Brāhmī inscriptions the usual title both of Śoḍāsa and of the Saka rulers of Western India is svīmin, and we can hardly help looking on this term as the Sanskrit equivalent of murunḍa, which in that case would have the meaning of 'lord'.

The conclusion we have arrived at so far would seem to be confirmed by the occurrence of Horamurunḍa in §60: L. 127, murṇḍa and murunḍa being obviously identical. The variant found in §61: L. 141, Horamurudvaga, provided it is read correctly, I cannot satisfactorily explain at present and I can only draw attention to some facts which may be apt to elucidate them in future. The strange insertion of va has a parallel

---

1 [Cf. Lüders, JRAS 1909, p. 650f.]
in such spellings as svarṣa- for sarva-, arahatvanam for arahatānām, svavaccharasvate for saṃvatsaraśate, svāvikā for sāvikā (ṣrāvikā) in the Mathurā inscription List No 78, and perhaps it is not by mere chance that this inscription also originates from persons of whom were certainly foreigners. It is quite possible also that the second sound rendered in the Brāhmī script by ṇḍa had a peculiar timbre in the Saka language. At any rate, it is noteworthy that, as pointed out by Hoernle (JRAS 1911, p. 460)\(^1\), all the syllabaries of the Saka alphabet invariably write ṇḍa in the place of the simple ḍa which would seem to show that ṇḍa denoted a somewhat modified ḍa. Under these circumstances it would not be surprising if ḍva also was used to render this sound, as it appears to have happened in Horamurdeva in §61: L. 141, and if instead of ṇṛḍa also the simpler spelling ṛḍa or ṛḍḍa was chosen as in Horamurddpharasya, ᴨ(ο*)ṛam(u*)ṛḍḍpharasya of the torus inscriptions (B of §60: L.127, §61: L.141, §62: L.128) or even ṛṭa as in horamurta of the Māṇikiśāla inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 149 No 76). The spelling Horamūṇḍhvara in §62: L.128 (A) may be left out of consideration, the reading being very uncertain.

Unfortunately the difficulties are not at an end here. That the base inscriptions (A) and the torus inscriptions (B) were incised by different persons is proved already by the diversity of the script. But there are inconsistencies also in their statements. Whereas according to the base inscriptions (A) Vakamihira was the principal donor and his son only his associate, the torus inscriptions (B) ascribe the donation to the son alone. Evidently one of the two sets of inscriptions was engraved after some change in the apportionment of the shares of the gift had taken place.

Of more importance is the difference in the designation of the son. I was formerly inclined to take horamurṇḍaga as a title.\(^2\) Impressions of the torus inscriptions were not accessible to me at that time, but now it is perfectly clear from them that the name of the son was Horamurda-phara, phara being the word which is frequently found at the end of Iranian names, as e.g. in Guduvhara in the so-called Takht-i-Bāhi inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 62 No 20, 1) and which corresponds to Avestan hvarṇa. But in that case Horamurṇḍaga cannot be anything but an abbreviated form of Horamurṇḍaphara,\(^3\) which may be reflected also in the doubtful Horamūṇḍhvara in §62: L.128. Now it cannot be denied that a personal name meaning ‘having the splendour of a lord of gifts’\(^4\) sounds a little unusual, and so the question arises whether

---

\(^1\) [Cf. below p. 100, n. 1.]
\(^2\) [SPAW 1913, p. 421ff. = Phil. Ind., p. 250ff.]
\(^3\) [In a paper, published in 1940 (Acta Orientalia 18, p. 24), Lüders, referring to the inscriptions §60: L.127, §61: L.141, §62: L.128, called Vakamihira’s son Horamurṇḍapharṇa or Horamurṇḍaga.]
\(^4\) [Compare: Lüders, Phil. Ind., p. 787 note on p. 252.]

not after all horamurnda, horamurda is identical with the name of the god Ahura Mazda, np. Hormuzd, although the substitution of ṝd or ṛd for Iranian zd could hardly be paralleled at present.

Viśvasika (§60: L.127), also viśvaśika (§61: L.141), and possibly vaisvāsika (§62: L.128), is the title of some functionary of high rank during the Kuśān period. It occurs again in the Mathurā inscription §63: L.125q as the title of Aśyala (or Suśyala1) who is apparently a foreigner, and in the Gaṇēšrā inscription §119: L.14d it is given to the mahādamaṇḍanāyaka Ulāna who by his name is shown to be an Iranian like Vakamihira in §60: L.127, §61: L.141, and §62: L.128.2

In §119: L.14d the form of the word seems to be viśvasaka. In the Divyāvyadāna the term occurs in the Svāgatāvidāna (p. 188) where it is said of a certain Brahman: sa rājñā Prasenajitā Kauśalena hastimadhyaṣyospari viśvāsikah sthapitaḥ. The correct form is probably viśvāsika, though also in the Divyāvyadāna it is not warranted by the manuscripts which write either visvāsikah or visvāśikah.3

---

125q
Facsimile: below p. 286

§ 63

Inscription on a pillar-base, cut on the face of the square basement, apparently from the Jamālpur mound.4 It is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The record was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 178 (P 30).

TEXT

(dā)na[m :]5 viś[v]asikasya [A]śylasya6 kubhako ..7 sabharyyak[a]syas[pu](trakasya)8

---

1 [Cf. below note 6.]
2 [Lüders stated in his later on revised version of the remarks on *viśvāsika (cf. below p. 158), Ep. Ind. 24. 1937/38. 1942, p. 207: "It will be noticed that the title is only borne by persons who by their names are shown to be of foreign descent."]
3 Perhaps the term is identical with vaisvāsika occurring in the Saddharma-panḍarika, p. 116 (40): etādṛṣaṁ karma karoma tāyīnaḥ sanprakṣamānā iva dharma-kośaṁ prakāśyantaś ca jinātmajānāṁ vaisvāsikas tasya yathā narah saḥ.
4 [Vogel, loc. cit.: "The stone was noticed ... at the entrance of the Tahsil gate in Dec. 1907."]
5 The first aksara is almost entirely effaced. [After the second letter there are two dots which seem to have been engraved on purpose. Cf. above p. 73, n. 3.]
6 The first aksara is more probably a than su. Vogel reads Sūṣyalasya. There was no writing between this and the next word, but perhaps a vertical stroke.
7 The character that stood here is no longer legible. It was probably a figure, perhaps 20.
8 The reading pu is probable. The rest of the inscription is destroyed.
TRANSLATION

The gift of the viśvasika Aśyala, the pillar-base (No) ..., together with his wife and his [sons].

As regards viśvasika, see the remarks on p. 98.

82

Facsimile: below p. 286

§ 64

Kṣa 2

The slab bearing this inscription was discovered by Cunningham in the Jamālpur mound. It has since been lost, but there is a good impression in the Hoernle collection. The record seems to be nearly complete. Whether the letters that have to be supplied stood at the end of lines 1 and 2 or at the beginning of lines 2 and 3 can now not be made out.

The inscription was published by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 29 + pl., by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.]Rep. 3. 1873, p. 30 No 1 + pl. 13, and by Growse, Mathurā 1874 Pt 2, p. 172 No 2. Bühler corrected the reading of the name of the mahākṣatrapa, The Academy 39. 1891, p. 374, WZKM 5. 1891, p. 177f. After an attempt to establish the text from the published facsimiles, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 149 No 24, Lüders edited the inscription from the impression mentioned above, Ep. Ind. 9. 1907/08, p. 246—248.

TEXT

1 svāmisya mahākṣatrapasya Śomādāsasya 1 gamjavareṇa brāhma- 

nena Śegravasagotreṇa [p]. 2 (....)

2 raṇi imāsam yamaḍapuṣkaranaṇinām paścima puṣkaraṇi udapāno 

ārāmo stambho i 3 (..)

3 [śilā]paṭṭo 4 ca —

1 In the impression before me there is a distinct dot or short stroke above the śo. It can hardly be accidental. As pointed out already in my previous paper, it was recognised also by Dowson and Cunningham, the former reading Sāndāsasya (for Śomādāsasya) and the latter Saudāsasya (for Saudāsasya) although the facsimiles do not show an anusvāra or an au-sign. The sign cannot be the stroke denoting -au, as it does not touch the upper line of the śo, but is separated from it by a distinct blank space. It can only be an anusvāra of the same shape as that in gamjavareṇa, etc.

2 What is visible of the letter may have been the left vertical of pa. Perhaps the original reading was puṣka.

3 The initial i is quite clear. May we restore i(yam) (= Sk. ayaṁ)?

4 The reading śilā is certain, although the letters are entirely spoiled by being gone over with pencil.

7*
By the treasurer of svāmin mahākṣatra pa Śomḍāsa, a Brahman of the Śegrava (Saigrava) gotra, a tank, the western tank of these twin tanks, a reservoir, a grove, a pillar, and this (?) stone-slab (were caused to be made).

The reconstruction of the sentence requires some additional words, such as kūritis; and as the personal name of the Brahman also is missing, the lost portion of the inscription may be larger than assumed above.

The spelling of the name of the mahākṣatra pa, which I take to be Śomḍāsa, is peculiar. In the record List No 59 the correct reading is undoubtedly Śoḍāsasasa, in §115: L. 82a we read Śoḍā[sa](sy)a. On the Mathurā Lion Capital (CII 2, 1, p. 48 No 15) we have Śuḍase and Śuḍise, and as regards coin legends, Ranson has stated (JRAS 1903, p. 289, note 3) that, whenever the name is legible, the first akṣara seems to be so. However, I think that on that account the reading Śomḍāsasya in the present inscription need not be given up. The mahākṣatra pa certainly bears a Saka name, and in the Saka language the ḍa appears to have had a nasal timbre, as in all syllabaries of the Saka alphabet invariably ṇḍa takes the place of the simple ḍa. It is therefore quite possible that the inherent nasal twang of the ḍa was here expressed by the anusvāra.

The correct Sanskrit name of the gotra would be Saigrava. According to the Gaṇapāṭha the Saigrava gotra is referred to by Pāṇini in 2, 4, 67 and 4, 1, 104, and H. Kern has identified Saigrava with Pali Siggava, the name of the patriarch who conferred the upasampadā ordination on the great Tissa Moggaliputta.

The designation gañjavara, Persian ganjwar, occurs in the form of gaṃñavara in No 310 of the Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan (Oxford 1920, p. 113), and later in the Rājatarāṅgini 5, 177 and Kṣemendra’s Lokapraṅkāśa.

Fragmentary inscription on the rim of a large rectangular slab one corner of which is broken off, doubtlessly from the Jamālpur mound (cf. above p. 58) and now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (E 4).

1 [Cf. above p. 97.] Hoernle, JRAS 1911, p. 460. Ibid., p. 464 Hoernle quotes from Saka texts vaiṇḍarya = vaiḍārya, gaṃṇḍa-graha = garuḍa-graha, vaiṇṭāṇḍāi-ṇḍākāni = vėtėdi-ḏākāni. [Cf. also Lüders, SPAW 1913, p. 422, 5 = Phil. Ind., p. 251, 5.] For a different explanation of ṇḍa see Konow, SPAW 1912, p. 1130.


In the Hoernle collection there is an impression which shows that at the time when it was taken, the inscription was more complete than it is at present.

As stated above (cf. p. 58), Cunningham refers to the inscription ASI [Ann.] Rep. 1. 1871, p. 238ff. Dowson mentions it JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 28, but he is unable to decipher more than a few words.

The inscription was edited for the first time, but without a translation by R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 118ff. No 13 + pl. 2, and again by Lüders, JRAS 1912, p. 154ff.

Text

A ///.opavane Șrikuṇḍe s[va]ke² vihāre Kakaṭikānaṃ pacanaḥ niyataka —³ nāṇatra vāṣtusmi⁴ saṃkkālayitavyah saṃ- ūghapr[a]kitehi vyavahārīhi upaṭhapito yesam a[na.i]⁵


---

1 It is impossible to say how many letters are missing at the beginning of the inscription. The letter before pa is now completely lost, but in the older impression the right half of the o-sign is visible.

2 The ke touches the preceding and the following letter, svake vihāre seems to have been corrected from an original svavihāre or perhaps sve vihāre.

3 I formerly read niyatakaḥ, but what I took to be the visarga is more probably the sign of punctuation and a fissure in the stone.

4 The reading vastussi must be given up. The a-sign of vā is distinct, and from the older impression it is almost certain that the last aksaṇa was smi, not ssi.

5 The right half of tha and the following letters have now disappeared, but are quite distinct in the older impression with exception of the last two aksaṇas. The first letter of the last word looks like ni, but it is just possible that the upper portion of the vowel-sign is merely a fissure in the stone and that the letter was nd. The last but one aksara is blurred and very doubtful. It may have been pa, or ha, or possibly ma, as the original reading was perhaps yeṣaṃ nāmāmi. The older impression shows at the beginning of line B a curved line which I was formerly inclined to take as the rest of ya, but which is more likely an i-sign belonging to the writing in line A.

6 Six letters, from sthā to b[u], are now missing. In the older impression the reading of the first four aksaṇas is certain. Instead of ta I formerly read tra as the last aksara of the first word, but now I consider it more likely that the apparent subscript -ra is merely due to a corrosion of the stone which has caused also the partial loss of the u-sign of b[u] and the complete loss of the subscript -dha of Buddharaṇaṭa.

7 [In the impression the i-sign of ks[i] is faintly visible. At the top of the third and fifth aksaṇas, read by Lüders as ra and ta, there are long strokes slanting to the right which the author apparently took as being accidental.]

8 [In the older impression the va is distinctly visible.]

9 I formerly read akhila, but the first aksara is more probably su as was assumed already by Banerji.
The cooking stone of the Kakaṭikas, which is permanently fixed in their vihāra in the ... park at Śrīkūṇḍa (Śrīkūṇḍa) (and) which is not to be transferred to another dwelling place, has been put up by the commissioners of the Community, the merchants, whose [names are] (?) Sthāvarajāta, Buddhakṣitā, Jīvaśīri (Jīvaśīri), Buddhādāsa, Saṁghakhā- rakṣita (Saṁghakhākṣita), Dhārmavarmma (Dhārmavarmman), Buddhadeva, Sukhila ... ...

Kakaṭika seems to be the name of a local Buddhist school. As regards the term saṁghapradikete, see the remarks on p. 84.

125d

Facsimile: below p. 289

§ 66

Inscription on the base of a fragmentary image found in clearing a well at the village of Jamālpur.¹ It is at present preserved in the Mathura Museum. The fragment consists of the lower portion of a corpulent person seated in front, with another corpulent male figure of smaller size squatting between its feet. Vogel is apparently inclined to take the large figure as representing a male person, but judging from the photograph, it wears anklets, which would point to its being some female goblin.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 120 (G 10).

TEXT

[Ś]r(i)gataparā² Buddhadarśav[īy](a)³

Vogel took the two words to be the names of the donors, but they have not the appearance of being ordinary personal names, and for that reason it is also unlikely that they are the names of the sculptors. The inscription probably refers to the sculpture and will have to be interpreted in connection with it. At present, however, I cannot suggest any explanation that would satisfy myself.

¹ [Cf. above p. 60.]
² Vogel reads the first akṣara as [su], but the supposed u-stroke has a distinct hook to the left and can therefore only be meant for a subscript -ra. The upper portion of the akṣara is much defaced. From the traces that are visible the reading śrī is probable [but the i-sign is uncertain].
³ Vogel reads Buddhadarśava. I think that an i-sign was attached to the va [but it may be also only the sign for -i]. After the last but one akṣara the left half of the ya is still preserved.
Inscription on the base of the image of a standing Buddha from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Growse, JASB 47, 1. 1878, p. 130 No 1 + pl. 21, and Mathurā² 1880, p. 107, p. 155 + pl. facing p. 106, by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 50 (A 5), with a reproduction of the image on pl. 9. The statue is figured also in G. Le Bon, Les Civilisations de l’Inde 1887°, fig. 94; ASI Ann. Rep. 1922/23, pl. 39b, Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 32, etc.

**TEXT**

1 deyaḥdharma-yaṁ Śākyabhikṣo Yaśadinnasya yad-atra punyam tad-bhavatu mā-
2 tāpīttrā ācāryopāddhyāyānāṁ ca sarvvastvānuttarajñāna-vāptaye

**TRANSLATION**

This is the religious gift of the Śākya monk Yaśadinna (Yaśodatta). Whatever religious merit there is in the (gift), let it be for the attainment of supreme knowledge by (his) parents and (his) teachers and preceptors (and) all sentient beings.

The inscription is written in Gupta characters of the fifth century A.D.

---

Inscription on the dome of a miniature Buddhist Stūpa, presumably from the Jamālpur site,² preserved in the Allahabad Public Library until 1907 and now in the Mathurā Museum. A photograph of the stone was reproduced by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, pl. 4, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 5a.

The inscription was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 129 No 13 + pl. 5, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 20 + pl., by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 166 (N 1).

**TEXT**

N[u]śāpriyāye⁴ Śūrāṇāsyā⁴ ditu

---

¹ Apparently meant for: sarvvasatvānāṁ-anuttarajñānāvāptaye.
² [Cf. the later remarks by Lüders above p. 60.]
³ I think Vogel is right in reading the first aksara as nu, though the u-sign is not very distinct.
⁴ Vogel: Śūranāsyā, but the ā-strokes on the top of the r and the n are pretty clear.
TRANSLATION

(The gift) of Nuṣāpriyā, the daughter of Śurāna.

Śurāna appears to be an Iranian name.

\(91j\)

Inscription on the front (a) and on the reverse side (b) of a railing pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 88).

TEXT

a śirāha\(^1\)
b ///vasa///\(^2\)

I fail to see the meaning of the inscription (a) which seems to be complete.

91b

In his Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 150 (J 41), Vogel describes the fragment of a railing pillar, now in the Mathurā Museum, which was found in clearing a well at the village of Jamālpur.\(^3\) It is figured in Vogel’s Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 21d.

On one side the fragment is carved with a prostrate dwarf on whose back a female figure is standing of which only the feet remain. On the obverse is a panel enclosed between pilasters. It shows an owl seated on a stool and two monkeys pouring water on its head. Vogel has shown that the scene probably represents the Ulūkajātaka (cf. BEFEO 9. 1909, p. 530; offprint p. 21f.).

Below the panel is a symbol which Vogel (Cat. Mus. Math.) takes to be the numeral 30. I can detect no resemblance of the sign to that figure. It is distinctly the letter hā

\(^1\) The reading of the second akṣara is doubtful. The i-sign too is not quite certain.

\(^2\) [Concerning this line Lüders later on wrote on the margin of his manuscript: dana, i. e. he then took what he formerly understood as sa as two akṣaras. In this way we would have to read (b) as ///vadana///.]

\(^3\) [Cf. above p. 60.]
and I would suggest that it refers to the sculptor who has marked his work with the first letter of his name, since on other railing pillars, in exactly the same place, we find inscriptions which apparently are the signatures of the artists.¹

§ 71

Facsimile: below p. 289

On a railing pillar from the Jamālpur mound, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 92), there is incised the figure

6. Mound on the Circular Road

Growse states² that in 1874 he proceeded to explore a very large mound³ situated about a quarter of a mile to the south-west of the Jamālpur mound, but the excavations yielded only a mass of broken bricks of very large size, a massive stone slab and the rounded pedestal of a pillar.

Close to it, about half a mile due west of the Jamālpur mound, on the border of the Circular Road there is a smaller mound⁴ which seems to have been the site of a Buddhist sanctuary. Here were found, only half buried in the soil, the lower portions of two large figures, the one a seated Bodhisattva, the other a female figure with a child in her lap. The pedestal of the Bodhisattva figure bears the inscription §72: L. 88 noticed below. It is in pre-Kuṣāṇ characters, and if the spot where the figure was found was really its original place, the sanctuary which once stood on the site of this mound must date from pre-Kuṣāṇ times.

§ 72

Facsimile: below p. 290

Fragmentary inscription on the upper rim of the pedestal of a Bodhisattva image from the mound on the Circular Road, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 18).

¹ Cf. § 77: L. 125i, § 145: L. 125j, § 146: L. 125f, § 147: L. 125g, § 148: L 91c, § 149: L. 125h.
² Growse, Mathurā¹ 1874 Pt 1, p. 78; Pt 2, p. 175; Mathurā² 1880, p. 106.
³ Marked “a” in the Map of the Environs of Mathurā: Growse, Mathurā¹ 1874 Pt 1, facing p. 72. [Cf. below p. 254.]
⁴ Marked “b” in the Map.
The date of the inscription was read by Growse, Mathurā¹ 1874 Pt 2, p. 175 (cf. also Pt 1, p. 78), Ind. Ant. 6. 1877, p. 219 No 9 + pl., Mathurā² 1880, p. 106 + pl. facing p. 108, and by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, p. 108. A reading of the whole inscription, as far as it is possible, was published by R. D. Bandyopādhya [ = R. D. Banerji¹], JPBAS 5. 1909, p. 272f. No 2, and again, now under the name of R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 109 No 2 + pl. 1. [The pedestal is figured in: van Lohuizen, The ‘Seythian’ Period 1949, pl. 21, 34.]

**TEXT**

```/\² [va]ṛśāmāse 2 divase 6 [a]³ .............. [ṇena] B[o]disāto⁴
p[r]atis[th]āpito mi r.ā .[i].. [h]ā .e [y]e .... [va v]o⁵ ....///
```

**TRANSLATION**

..... in the 2nd month of the rainy season, on the 6th day ..... a Bodhisattva was set up by ...ṇa ......

¹ [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]
² About 12 akṣaras seem to be lost at the beginning.
³ Of this letter only faint traces are preserved and the reading is not certain. There are no signs of the anusvāra above the next akṣaras, which are almost completely destroyed, and the reading a[ṣyāṁ pūrvvāyām] suggested by Banerji is therefore doubtful.
⁴ This is the reading of the word as far as it is preserved, but it is possible that the original reading was bodhīsūṭva, the subscript letters -dha and -va being broken off, just as in the following word the subscript -ra of pra and the subscript -tha of sthā have completely disappeared and can be inferred only from the down-strokes of the mātrkās pa and sā.
⁵ The words after p[r]atis[th]āpito were read māṭtā pitihī saṭhā by Banerji. This is mere fancy. I am unable to make out the meaning of the passage, but the reading of the signs which are not enclosed in brackets may be called certain. — There was no second line of writing.
II. INSCRIPTIONS FROM MATHURĀ CITY
II. INSCRIPTIONS FROM MATHURĀ CITY

1.

〈29a〉

Facsimile: below p. 290

§ 73

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a statue of a seated Bodhisattva of which only the right leg and left foot are preserved. The stone was discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna in the City of Mathurā and is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1558).

The inscription consists of three lines, two being incised on the upper rim and the third on the lower rim of the pedestal, but as the proper left half of the base is missing, only the first half of the three lines is preserved.


TEXT

1 (ma)harājasya Kāṇ[i]kṣasaya\(^2\) savachare 20 hematam[ā]∩e\(^3\) 4 divāse\(^4\)//

2 [de]v[a]la ye\(^5\) Bodhisat[v]o\(^6\) p[r]atith[ā]pito\(^7\) Goṭi\(^8\)//

3 …… [mā]tap[i]t[i]na[m] saha tapi [pata]\(^9\)//

\(^1\) Cf. also: ASI Ann. Rep. Northern Circle, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, for 1918/19\(^9\), which is not accessible to me.

\(^2\) [In the impressions which are now in our collection the i-sign of the second aksara is not discernible. According to these stampages we would have to transliterate the letter as na or ν(ι).]

\(^3\) Sahni: māsa. The ā-sign of mā is doubtful, but the e-sign of ē is distinct.

\(^4\) As the second aksara may be read as rea Lüders later on wrote on the margin of his manuscript:] divāse.

\(^5\) Sahni: devacaya. I am not sure if the first aksara is de, the first letter of divāse showing a different shape and the e-sign being very faint. The aksara looks more like an initial u. The third letter seems to be la [or bha].

\(^6\) The dhi is badly shaped and the subscript -va of the fourth aksara is uncertain.

\(^7\) Sahni: patithapito, but part of the subscript -ra is preserved, and there seems to be an ā-sign to the right of the tha.

\(^8\) Sahni: Goṭhi. The second aksara may be ta or ti, but not thi.

\(^9\) This line is much less distinct than the first two lines, and the reading is very difficult. Sahni reads the first word as mātap[i]t[ī]. The i-signs of pi and ti are very faint, but possible; the last letter, however, is certainly not hi, but na. The
TRANSLATION

In the year 20 of mahārāja Kānikṣa (!), in the 4th month of winter, on the day, ....... the Bodhisattva was set up at the temple (?) by ...... of (his) parents together with ......

(31a)

\[\text{Facsimile: below p. 290} \]

\[\text{§ 74} \quad K \, 24\]

Fragmentary inscription on the lower rim of the pedestal of a headless image of a seated Buddha which was found in the City of Mathurā\(^1\) and acquired by Pandit Radha Krishna in 1918/19 for the Mathurā Museum (No 1557).


TEXT

2 ...... s[y]a dhi⁶ ................................

TRANSLATION

Success! In the year 22, in the 2nd (month) of summer, on the 30th day, on this date, the image of Buddha was set up in the Prāvārikavihāra (vihāra of the cloakmakers) by ...... the daughter (?) of ......

\(^{anuṣvāra}\) above the \(na\) is uncertain. — After \(saha\), which is certain, Sahni reads: \(napī\), but the first \(aṅkāra\) seems to be \(ta\). Perhaps the original reading was: \(saha tehi prati(thāpito)\), but the first two letters after \(saha\) look more like \(ta\), and the subscript -ra of the third \(aṅkāra\) and the i-sign of the fourth are very doubtful.

\(^{1}\) [Cf. V. S. Agrawala, Buddha and Bodhisattva Images in Mathurā Museum, JUPHS 1948, p. 45 (1557). He states that “the present image was found at Madhubana-Mahōli”.

\(^{2}\) Sahni transliterates the horizontal stroke by: \(oṅ\), but I doubt that this meaning was attached to it.

\(^{3}\) Sahni: \(pūrvvāyam\), but there is no ā-sign at the top of the \(ya\).

\(^{4}\) Sahni: \(pratiṣṭāpitya\), but the \(anuṣvāra\) is quite distinct.

\(^{5}\) In this line only the top-lines of some letters are preserved. Sahni reads: \(\ldots /samādhī/\), but the dot over the \(sa\) is probably accidental, and there seems to have been a subscript -\(ya\) attached to the \(sa\). Perhaps \(dhi\) is to be restored to \(dhi(tā)\), but there seems to be an \(anuṣvāra\) above the letter following \(dhi\).
II. Mathurā City

§ 75

Inscription on a slab from Mathurā City, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2789).

The record, which is engraved in very large characters, was edited by V. S. Agrawala JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 3 No 3.

TEXT

rājanāpitasya Jāḍasa

TRANSLATION

Of the king’s barber Jāḍa.

I see no reason why rājanāpita should be taken in the sense of “the chief of barbers”, as suggested by Agrawala. Jāḍasa seems to be the genitive of the personal name, although it is a little strange that the ending should here be -sa, whereas in the preceding word it is -syā. Agrawala thinks that the slab was a sign-board marking some building which belonged to Jāḍa, probably his house or shop.

2. From the Dhūnsārpārā Quarter

§ 76

Fragmentary inscription of four lines on the upper (l. 1—2) and lower (l. 3—4) rims of the pedestal of a seated Buddha figure of which only the lower portion is preserved with indication of the legs of an attendant. The stone was acquired from the Dhūnsārpārā Quarter in Mathurā City and is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 62 (A 64).

TEXT


1 Agrawala: Jārasa, but the second letter cannot be ra.
2 The two aksaras are dimly visible.
3 The last letter may have been syam or syām.
2 (pūrvāyāṃ) .................. ye1 [Phal][gu][ya]ṣa[sya]2 va-
dh[ūy]e3 Devarakṣi[t].4...
3 .................................. [sa]r[va]sat[v]ahita.5
4 ........

TRANSLATION

(In the year ...) in the first – 1st – month of ... ..., on the 30th day, on this (date,) ... (the gift) of ..., the daughter-in-law of Phalguyaśa (Phalguyaśas), the ... of Devarakṣita ... for the welfare (and happiness) of all sentient beings.

The date of the year is illegible. The abbreviation pratha is the same as in List No 22. Devarakṣita occurs in the inscriptions as the name of several men. Here also the donatrix would seem to be qualified in her relation to some Devarakṣita, probably as his daughter, but it is not impossible that we have to restore Devarakṣi[t], not as Devarakṣi-
[t](asya), but as Devarakṣi[t](āye), and that Devarakṣitā was the name of the donatrix.

3. From the Gōpālpur Quarter

125i

Facsimile: below p. 291

§ 77

Inscription on a railing pillar obtained from a māṭh in the Gōpālpur Quarter in Mathurā City and now in the Mathurā Museum. According to Vogel the pillar is carved on one face with a male figure standing in front under a balcony. He holds a bunch of flowers in his right hand which is raised to the shoulder. The reverse is decorated with two complete and one half lotus-rosette. Above the latter is the inscription.

It was first read by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 156f. (J 68).

TEXT

Rama

1 The ye is certain.
2 Vogel read only pa śa. Although all letters are more or less damaged with the exception of śa, the reading of the name may be called certain. An examination of the reverse of the impression clearly shows that the hook below the śa is only an accidental cut.
3 Vogel: vadhu[ye], but the ū-sign is highly probable.
4 The last sign is very indistinct.
5 Supply: sukḥāye or sukhaṛtham in the next line.
From the position of the inscription it appears that it cannot possibly refer to the person represented on the obverse, and as the name, which undoubtedly in correct spelling would be Rāma, is put down without the ending of the genitive, I feel sure that it is not the name of the donor, but of the sculptor who did the carving.

4. From the Dasāvatāri Gali

§ 78

Fragmentary inscription on a lintel obtained from the Dasāvatāri Gali in Mathurā City, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2124).

The inscription was first brought to notice and published by Hirananda Sastri, ASI Ann. Rep. 1930—34, 1. 1936, p. 208. It was edited again by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 5f. No 10.

TEXT

...... [t]rayasya¹ Mittravarmmaputra² Nagarakiyasya yad-attra pu-ṇyaṃ mātā[p]tra sya³ kālānuvarṭtamānasaṃvatsare⁴ saptate 70⁵ Bhādravadādiveṣe saptāvinśe⁶ 20 7

TRANSLATION

...... of ....[t]raya, the son of Mittravarmman, the Nagarakiya (native from Nagar or Nagarak). What merit (there is) in this (gift), let it be for (my) parents. In the current seventieth – 70th – year, on the twenty-fourth – 24th – day of Bhādrava (Bhādrapada).

The preserved portion of the inscription seems to be only the conclusion of a longer record, but it is impossible to say how much is lost in the beginning. V. S. Agrawala is probably right in identifying the native place of the donor with Nagara (Nagarahāra) near Jalalabad.

¹ The first aksara was not noticed by Agrawala, but the reading given above is not quite certain.  
² Here and in the following text Agrawala reads tra instead of ttra, which is everywhere quite distinct.  
³ Agrawala: māto, but the second aksara is distinctly tā. The last two letters can hardly be anything but ttrasya; although the reading intended, of course, is mātāpittroḥ syāt.  
⁴ Agrawala: kālēna vartamāna. The third aksara is clearly nu.  
⁵ Agrawala: saptātīthe.  
⁶ Agrawala: saptāvinśe.  
5. From the Mātā Gāli

§ 79

Facsimile: below p. 292

This inscription is incised on a stone fragment found in the debris of a house which fell down in 1917 in the Mātā Gāli of Mathurā City. It is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1350).

The fragmentary inscription was edited by D. R. Sahni, Ep. Ind. 19. 1927/28, p. 68f. No 7 + pl.

TEXT

1 ///[i]jito\textsuperscript{1} Cut[a]kavihāre\textsuperscript{2} vyāstā///
2 ///[h](ā)sāṅghikan[a]\textsuperscript{3} dharmāvala[m]\textsuperscript{4}///
3 ///rṣānā\textsuperscript{5}... k[ṣ]āraṇika ...\textsuperscript{7}///

TRANSLATION

...... (there was) set up for the Mahāsāṅghikas\textsuperscript{8}, the supporters (?) of the Buddhist religion, ...... residing (?) in the Cutakavihāra (Cūtakavihāra), ...... a ḫāraṇika.

The inscription presents sundry difficulties, and I am by no means sure that I have hit upon the right meaning. Only so much is clear that it records the setting up of some object as a gift to the Mahāsāṅghika monks in the Cutakavihāra, which D. R. Sahni has interpreted as Cūtakavihāra, i.e. the Mango monastery. Sahni may also be right by explaining

\textsuperscript{1} To be restored as (pratiṣṭhā)p[i]jito or a similar form.
\textsuperscript{2} [At the top of the second aksāra there is a stroke slanting to the left which may be accidental, otherwise the letter is to be read as te.]
\textsuperscript{3} [Of the first letter only the right part is preserved; to be restored as (ma)k(h)(ā). The last aksāra may be read as n[ā].]
\textsuperscript{4} Sahni: dharmava(ba)la-, but the a-sign of rma is quite distinct. The anusvāra is not quite certain, but probable.
\textsuperscript{5} Sahni: [de]ṛṣānā, but the a-sign of rṣā is unmistakable. It is not quite impossible that there is an anusvāra above the ṇā, although on the reverse of the impression it is quite indistinct.
\textsuperscript{6} Regarding this sign see the remarks in the flowing text.
\textsuperscript{7} Sahni: kāraṇika. The subscript -ṣa of k[ṣ]ā, though somewhat damaged, appears to be certain. On the other hand, the u-sign of the second aksāra is extremely doubtful and apparently only a flaw in the stone. After k[ṣ]āraṇika three dots are faintly visible. They possibly represent an initial i, or if one of them should be accidental, the visarga, but they may after all be meaningless. [One of the rubbings of our collection (cf. below p. 292) shows after the dots the remnants of an aksāra which may be read as [m]. or as [m].[n]. Therefore the reading i[m]([a]/[m] seems to be not impossible.]
\textsuperscript{8} [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 19.]
vyāstā/// at the end of the first line as a misspelling for vāsta- and supplying (-vyānām).

But I cannot follow him in restoring the last four akṣaras at the end of the second line as dharmava(ba)la-[vṛddhyartham*], “for the increase of the religious merit and strength”. Apart from the fact that the second akṣara is rmā and the fourth probably lam, dharma can hardly mean “religious merit” and the misspelling vala for bala is, at any rate, unusual at this time. I would suggest to restore the word as dharmāvala[m](bānām) and to consider it as qualifying (Ma)[h](a)sāṅghik(ā)n(ām), although such an epithet does not seem to occur in literary sources.

The last line is even more puzzling. Kṣāraṇiṇa I take to mean the object of the grant. The word is unknown, but, as Sahni states, the stone on which the inscription is engraved probably formed part of a channel for carrying off water and, as we should naturally expect the inscription to record the gift of this channel, we may perhaps venture to assign the meaning of ‘channel’ to ksāraṇiṇa. From the etymological point of view this would not be unlikely, ksāraṇiṇa being evidently derived from the root kṣar ‘to flow’.

Before kṣāraṇiṇa there is a most peculiar sign. It has the appearance of a quadrangle with a cross in the middle and a long vertical line added to the right. Sahni takes it to be the symbol for 91 and restores the preceding syllables ///rṣāṇā as (va)rṣāṇā. Sahni’s interpretation, of course, cannot be called impossible, although the sign for 90 generally is more rounded and the sign for 1 ought not to be joined to the sign for 90, but I cannot believe that 91 years should have been mentioned here and that this should be the date of the inscription, as suggested by Sahni, as a date would seem to be quite out of place in the context. We might rather expect that rain-water should be spoken of in connection with the channel, but I am unable to offer a satisfactory explanation of this passage. Would it be possible that the strange sign was a letter that was crossed out by the engraver?

6. From the Gau-Ghāṭ Well

〈97b〉

Facsimile: below p. 292

§ 80

Kṣa 31

Inscription on a stone slab from the Gau-Ghāṭ well in Mathurā City and now in the Mathurā Museum (No 461). The slab is roughly dressed on three sides. The inscription is engraved on the fourth side.

It was edited by D.R. Sahni, Ep. Ind. 19. 1927/28, p. 67 No 5

+ pl.

s*
TEXT

1 Bodhisatvo s[a]hā¹ mātāpitihi s[a]hā¹ upajhāyena Dharmakena
2 saha átevāsikehi² s[a]hā¹ átevāsinihi Śirivihāre
3 ācariyān̄a³ Samitiyāna parиграhe sarvabudhapujāye

TRANSLATION

The Bodhisattva (was set up) together with the parents, together
with the preceptor Dharma ka, together with the male pupils, together
with the female pupils, at the Śirivihāra (Śrīvihāra) for the acceptance
of the Samitiya teachers for the worship of all Buddhas.

The inscription has the outward appearance of being complete, but
from the context there can be no doubt that the beginning, which con-
tained the name of the donor, must be lost. This part of the inscription
was probably engraved on the pedestal of the statue to which the slab
was attached.

7. From the Dalpat-ki-Khiṅki Mohalla

〈23b〉

Façsimile: below p. 293

§ 81

Inscription on the base of the image of a standing Buddha of which
only the feet and lower parts of the garment are preserved, discovered in
an elevated part of the Dalpat-ki-Khiṅki Mohalla in Mathurā City, now in
the Patnā Museum.

The record was edited by D. R. Sahni, Ep. Ind. 19. 1927/28, p. 96f. + pl.
(showing the stone with the inscription).

TEXT

1 mahārāja-devaputrasya Kanishkasya⁴ samvatsare 10 4 Pauṣamāsa-
divase⁵ 10 aṣmn̄ divase pravarika⁶-Hā[s]th(is)y(a)

---

¹ [In three instances of this word the sa is written at the top of its left part
with a short but distinct stroke to the right.]
² There is a distinct horizontal stroke below the right foot of the te. It
cannot be accidental. I would not deem it impossible that it is meant for a sub-
script -na and that the whole aksara is an attempt of writing nte. But it is perhaps
more natural to join the sign as anuvāra with the na of the next line in ācariyān̄a.
³ The second aksara is rather ca than cā.
⁴ Sahni: Kanishkasya, but the second aksara seems to be ni.
⁵ This is Sahni's reading. There is a horizontal stroke below the sa which I
cannot account for.
⁶ Sahni: Pravarīka-. There is hardly an ã-sign attached to the pra.
2 bharyyā¹ Samghilā bhagavāto Pitāmahāsyah svamatasya devasya pūjārthāhṃ¹ pratimāṃ pratiṣṭhā-3 payati sarvvādukkhaprahānārtthāṃ³—

TRANSLATION

In the year 14 of mahārāja devaputra Kaniska, on the 10th day of the month Pauṣa, on this day, Samghilā, the wife of the cloakmaker Hāsthī (Hastin), sets up the image for the veneration of the holy Pitāmaha, the Supremely Enlightened, the god who holds his own tenets, for the cessation of all misery.

The inscription is peculiar in several respects.

The writing agrees in some points with that of the Mathurā inscriptions of the Kuśān period. The na shows the form with the curved base-line, which as a rule appears in the Mathurā inscriptions, not the later looped form which sporadically is found there. — For sa the form with the hook and the form with the loop are promiscuously used just as in the Mathurā inscriptions List No 122 (probably from the beginning of the Kuśān era), List No 32 (S. 25), §24: List No 38 (S. 33), List No 74 (S. 93). — The ma, however, appears in the form which it has assumed in the Gupta period. The letter is exactly the same as the ma in a Mathurā inscription of the time of Candragupta II (CII 3, p. 25ff. No 4).⁴ — But the greatest surprise is caused by the letters la and ha, which show the typical forms of the eastern Gupta script. The central bar slants down to the base-line, but the left part of the base-line is not yet rounded off and attached as a loop to the central bar. I quite agree with D. R. Bhandarkar (Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 1ff.) when he asserts that we have no longer the right to speak of an eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet. Our inscription definitely proves that the letters la and ha existed in the eastern forms already in the first half of the second century A.D. and that the eastern sa began to develop at the same time. On the other hand we cannot overlook the fact that the great majority of the inscriptions which

¹ [In the inscription the anuvāra is written in two different ways — either as a horizontal stroke or as a dot above the respective akṣara. — Judging from the plate in the Ep. Ind. all instances of the superscript rā show at the top a horizontal stroke to the right, which was read by Sahni as rā only in bharyyā. Reading in line 2 pūjārthāṃ, he apparently took it as the sign for the anuvāra, although his reproduction distinctly shows that the stroke just mentioned is connected with the r- and that it is followed by a dot, certainly indicating the anuvāra, which for want of space is written in this case to the right of the akṣara. From the purely graphical point of view the akṣara is to be transcribed as rithāṃ, just as the last akṣara of the whole inscription where the anuvāra is written as a horizontal stroke to the left of the superscript rā.]

² Sahni: pitāmahasya, but the ā-sign of hā is distinct.

³ Sahni: -prahānārthāṃ, but nā is distinct. [For the last akṣara read by Sahni as rithāṃ, cf. above note 1. The same applies to the reading rādā.]

⁴ I see no reason why D. R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 2, considers this form of ma as belonging to the eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet.
show the peculiar forms of the three letters śa, la and ha come from the east,¹ and it is therefore in all probability that part of the country which was the original home of the new mode of writing. There are only two records from the western region which are written in the eastern variety of the script, an inscription at Udayagiri of the time of Candragupta II (CII 3, p. 34ff. No 6) and the inscription of Candra on the iron pillar at Meharauli (CII 3, p. 139ff. No 32), but this anomaly can be sufficiently explained. The Udayagiri inscription was caused to be engraved by a minister of Candragupta II who calls himself expressly a native of Pātaliputra, and the inscription on the iron pillar, which originally stood elsewhere, possibly near Harwār,² is probably due to some officer of Candragupta II.³

Perhaps the use of the eastern characters in our inscription may be accounted for in a similar way. It is not improbable that Saṃghilā, who dedicated the image, hailed from the east. At any rate the inscription is couched in terms which are never found in the Mathurā inscriptions, but recur in the Buddhist inscriptions in the eastern part of the country. The strange designation of Buddha as bhagavān Pitāmahaḥ is found again in an inscription from Deōriyā (List No 910), where also the concluding benedictory phrase is the same as in our record: bhagavat(o) Pitāmahasa pratimā pratiṣṭhāpit(ā) arya-Tlädiye (?) śiśiniye Ugalakaye dukhaprahāṇarthā(ṁ). Deōriyā, a small village on the right bank of

---

¹ A complete list of the inscriptions in the eastern script known up to 1926 will be found in my edition of the Kalpaṇāmanḍitikā of Kumāralātā, p. 4. Since that time another copperplate dated in S. 188 has turned up at Gunaighar. It has been edited by D. Ch. Bhattacharyya, IHQ 6. 1930, p. 45ff. I cannot agree with D. R. Bhandarkar, when he assigns the characters of the Mathurā inscription of Candragupta II (CII 3, p. 25ff. No 4) to the eastern script (cf. Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 1ff.). Not only the text letters śa, la, ha, but also na, sa, sa appear here in the western forms. The only peculiarity consists in the use of the ma in the form of the Kuśān inscriptions.


³ As pointed out by D. R. Bhandarkar (Ep. Ind. 21, p. 2), in the very carelessly engraved Gadhā (Jasdan) inscription (Ep. Ind. 16. 1921/22, p. 237ff.), dated in the year 127 or 126 (A. D. 205 or 206), ha is written four times in the western, twice in the eastern fashion, in ma[ha]kṛṣa[tra]*pasya in 1.4 and in Rudrākhā-[putra]*fasya in 1.5. Evidently the engraver endeavoured to show his acquaintance with different alphabets. For ma also he has promiscuously used the older and the later forms. [For the ma in the ‘Southern alphabet’ which has retained its ancient form, but with a base-line which in certain cases has bent downwards, cf. also:] Ep. Ind. 12. 1913/14, p. 317, 6 [= Mandasor inscription from the time of Naravarman].

⁴ In 1873 Cunningham published a first reading of the inscription, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3. 1873, p. 48 No C.) Pitāmaha seems to have survived as a name of Buddha until later times. As pointed out by Hirananda Sastri (ASI Ann. Rep. 1928/29. 1933, p. 115ff.) a stone inscription of the eleventh century A. D. unearthed at Nālandā mentions the decoration of the monastery of Pitāmaha at a place called Coyaṇḍaka [= Nālandā inscription of Vipulasrimitra, ed. by N. G. Majumdar, Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 97—101, line 8: ... Coyaṇḍake ... Pitāmahasya vihārikāyāṃ navakarmma citraṇ ...].
the Jamnā, about ten miles to the south-south-west of Allahābād, is situated within the domain of the eastern script, which accordingly also is used in the inscription. About a mile to the south-east of Dēōriyā, near the village of Mankuwār, Bhagvanlal Indraji discovered a seated statue of Buddha, which on the pedestal bears an inscription in eastern characters dated in S. 129 in the reign of Kumāragupta (CII 3, p. 45ff. No 11). Here again the terminology to a large extent agrees with that of our inscription: ...bhagavato samyaksambuddhasya svamatāviruddhasya iyaṁ pratimā pratiśṭhāpitā bhikṣu-Buddhamitraṇa sambat 100 20 9 mahārāja-sri-Kumāraguptasya rājye Jyeṣṭhamāsa di 10 8 sarveduḥkkha-prahānārtham.

The term svamatāviruddha- 'who was never refuted in respect of his tenets' helps even to understand the curious epithet svamatāsya devasya assigned to the Buddha in our inscription. It means probably not 'of her own favourite deity' as suggested by Sahni, but 'of the god who holds his own tenets'. The epithet deva as applied to the Buddha is unique, but already in the Bhārhut inscriptions List No 881 and 902 Buddha is called Mahādeva and the Mahāvyutpatti (1, 16) cites Devatideva as one of his names.

There is another remarkable difference between the present epigraph and all other Brāhmī inscriptions of the Kuśān period as regards the date. Our inscription is the only record of that time which quotes the month by its Hindu solar name instead of the season name. The reason for this deviation from the common practice is not apparent.

8. From the Bharatpur State Mound

§ 82

\((143j)^*\)

\(K 214\)

Fragmentary inscription on a broken pillar from the Bharatpur Statemound just behind the Mathurā Museum building, now deposited in the Museum. At the top of the pillar are four winged lions, one of which is broken.

**Text**

1 \(\ldots \ldots \text{ṣṭ}[i]cchātram\)\(^3\)

2 \(\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots\)

**Translation**

\(\ldots \ldots\) post (?) and an umbrella.

---

1 [Cf. Lüders, Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur, 1941, p. 77ff.; CII 2, 2, 1.]

2 [Cf. the Kössam inscription of the reign of mahārāja Vaiśravana of the year 107, ed. by N. G. Majumdar, Ep. Ind. 24. 1937/38, p. 146—148, line 11f.: ...bhagavato Pitāmahasya samyaksambuddhasya ...]  

3 The i-sign of śta is not certain. May we restore (ya)ṣṭīcchātram?

TEXT
Kachipasa

TRANSLATION
Of Kachipa (Kāsyapa).

9. From the Gāyatri Ṭilā

§ 84 Fragmentary inscription on a sculpture showing a sitting male figure with big belly and two standing figures of females, from the Gāyatri Ṭilā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1346). The inscription is engraved on the upper rim of the sculpture.

TEXT
1 Dasasya vadhū[ye] ///
2 Vṛdhisya bhāgin[iye]///

TRANSLATION
..... by the daughter-in-law of Dasa (Dāsa) ... by the sister of Vṛdhi (Vṛddhi).

Dasa and Vṛdhi are perhaps only the second members of compound names.

10. From the Dig Gate

§ 85 Inscription on the upper rim of a pedestal showing a Dharmacakra with a worshipping seated figure and a sejant lion turned outward on either side. The pedestal was obtained from the Dig gate of Mathurā City. It is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2605).
II. Mathurā City

TEXT
Dāsasya kuṭu[bini]ye . . . [ma]s[i]ye¹

TRANSLATION
By . . . masī, the housewife of Dāsa.

I dare not decide whether the pedestal belongs to a Buddhist or a Jaina image.

11. From the Bharatpur Gate

(97d)
Facsimile: below p. 293

§ 86

Kṣa 32

Fragmentary inscription on a pedestal found at the Bharatpur gate. It is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1612).

TEXT
Ālānake vihāre Mahāsaghiyānām parigahe sarvabudhap(u)[ja](y)e

TRANSLATION
(Something was dedicated) at the Ālānaka convent for the acceptance of the Mahāsaghiyas (Mahāsāṅghikas)² for the worship of all Buddhas.

12. From the Sītalā-Ghāṭi

(143a)*

§ 87

K 205

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of the statuette of a seated Buddha which was set up near a shrine at Sītalā-Ghāṭi in Mathurā City. Vogel, who discovered the image and acquired it for the Mathurā Museum, gave a detailed description of it and mentioned the inscription which is incised on the proper left side of the pedestal, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 53 (A 21).

[The statuette was figured by Vogel, op. cit., pl. 16, ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2, 1914, pl. 23c (cf. p. 66), by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Indian Sculpture 1929, pl. 84(l.), by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 27a, etc.]

¹ The first two letters of the name are obliterated. The third aksara seems to be ma, although the bottom-line is not visible. If there was more writing on the stone, it is lost now.

TEXT
\[//\text{nām}^1\text{ hitasukhārtha}[\text{m}]\]

TRANSLATION

…… for the welfare and happiness (of all sentient beings).

13. From the Arjunpura Mohalla Mound

92

Facsimile: below p. 293

§ 88

The inscription was discovered by Cunningham on the Arjunpura Mohalla mound (to the north-west of Sitalā-Ghāṭi) on what he called a small “Buddhist” pillar which seems to be lost now.

A transcript of the inscription together with an eye-copy was published by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 20. 1885, p. 36 + pl. 5,1.

According to the just mentioned eye-copy:

TEXT

1 Āmoghaṁra-
2 khitaye$^2$
3 dānaṁ

TRANSLATION

The gift Amoghāraḥkhita (Amoghāraḥkhita).

14. From the Jamnā Bāgh

(97a)

Facsimile: below p. 294

§ 89

Inscription around the outer upper edge of a hemispherical stone bowl supported on the broken head of a male figure. The stone was lying in the Jamnā Bāgh on the right bank of the Jamnā just outside Mathurā

---

$^1$ Probably to be restored as (sarvasatvā)nām.

$^2$ In his transcript Cunningham gave: Amogha-Rakhitaye dānaṁ. For grammatical reasons the length of the initial a of the name is improbable. Whether the reading was Amoghārakhitaye or Amoghārakhitaye, cannot be decided with certainty, but it tells in favour of the former that in § 1: L. 125a we find the name Amohāsī = Sk. Amoghaḍāsī.
City, where it was used for watering cattle. Pandit Radha Krishna acquired it for the Mathurā Museum (No 260).


TEXT

d[e]sak[a]n[am]6 parigahe

TRANSLATION

The gift of Ayala, the son of Imḍrasama (Indraśarman), for the worship of all Buddhas in the Suvaṇakāravihāra (Suvaṇkaśaravihāra) for the acceptance of the Mahopadesaka (Mahopadeśaka) teachers.

Sahni takes the last word of the first line (Sk. mahopadeśakānām) as an epithet qualifying the preceding word, in my reading: ācariyāna, ‘of the teachers who were great preachers’. But as in the corresponding phrase in other inscriptions the genitive of ācārya is invariably connected with the name of the Buddhist school, Mahopadeśaka also must be considered to be the name of a school, although in literature it does not seem to have turned up until now. Under these circumstances it is all the more to be regretted that the reading of the name cannot be thoroughly relied upon.

---

1 Perhaps the first aksara is to be read i, not im. [But cf. p. 207, n. 3.] — On the top of the ta there is a stroke which looks like the ō-sign, but from the reverse of the estampage it would seem to be accidental. [— The estampage is lost now.]

2 The da is a little blurred, but there seems to be no sign of the length. On the other hand it is not quite impossible that there was an anuvāra after na.

3 Sahni: -būdhanaṃ, but the ō-sign of dhā is distinct.

4 Sahni: Suvaṇakara-. The na is certain and the ō-sign of k/ā/ at any rate not improbable.

5 Sahni: ācariyana. The ō-sign of y/ā/ is highly probable. In the estampage there is no anuvāra visible at the end of the word.

6 Sahni: /maḥopadeśakana. The reading is ingenious and may be right, although it presents several difficulties. The first aksara can be read as ma only if it is assumed that the upper half of the letter has been destroyed; what is visible of the letter looks like ca or vā. The second aksara may be ha, but just as well pa or even sa; the supposed o-sign is anything but clear. The third letter has a middle-bar which gives it the appearance of gha, but this bar may be accidental. The e-sign of d/e/ is very problematic; it would be easier to read d/ā/. The -a of k/ā/ and the anuvāra appear to be probable.

7 Cf. § 80: L. 97b, and List No 12, 918, 919, 923, 929a, 929b, 987; cf. also List No 5.
§ 90

Inscription on the pedestal of a standing image, found in the Jamnā Bāgh in Mathurā City and now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1351). The inscription was edited by V.S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 4 No 6.

**TEXT**

1 bhikhusa Budhav[ā]lasa¹ dān[a]² māt[ā]-
2 pit[r]in[a]³ pujāye savasav[ā]n[a]⁴ ca⁵

**TRANSLATION**

The gift of the monk Budhavāla (Buddhapāla) for the worship of his parents and all beings.

15. From Īsāpur

§ 91

Fragmentary inscription on a round stone, recovered from the well Bagaci Birhal, Īsāpur⁶, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 976).

**TEXT**

///tāñyo⁷ e .///

The characters are those of the second century B.C., and the writing ſ̄y, apparently for ſ̄n̄o, is not without interest.

§ 92

Fragmentary inscription on the upper and lower rims of a broken pedestal from the Shah Quazi well, Īsāpur, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 790).

---

¹ Agrawala: Budhavalasa, but the ā-sign of the third akṣara is very probable.
² Perhaps we ought to read the last akṣara as nā.
³ Agrawala: mātu/pituna. The ā-sign of t[ā] is not quite certain, but probable on the reverse of the stampage. The last but one akṣara is to be read as t[ṛj]. [For the last akṣara see note 2.]
⁴ The fourth letter is v[āj] or possibly va, but certainly an error for either tā or tva. [For the last akṣara see note 2.]
⁵ Agrawala: bha. The reading ca is certain.
⁷ [To judge from the obverse of the impression the first akṣara seems to be ri, but from the reverse the reading given above is quite certain.]
II. Mathurā City

TEXT
1 ///... va [eke] ///
2 ///...........dānaṃ

Apparently the inscription recorded the gift of the image.

§ 93

Inscription on the pedestal of a fragmentary Jina image, found in a well in a garden at Isāpur, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 972).
The inscription, which is much worn out, was edited by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 3 No 4.

TEXT
1 [siddha¹ Na]ganandisyā² śīsya³.........syā⁴ [nirvva]tana⁵......
2 ....syā dhit[u] Bhavana[nda]syā⁶ kutumbi[ni]ye ma..
3 ..syā Devilasya⁷ mātu ... ye ....

TRANSLATION
Success! (?) At the request of ..., the pupil of Naganandi (Nāganandin), (the gift) of ..., the daughter of ..., the housewife of Bhavananda, the mother of .... Devila.

149a

Facsimile: below p. 295

§ 94

Inscription on one of the two sacrificial posts discovered in 1910 by Pandit Radha Krishna in the bed of the Jamnā river at Isāpur, now in the Mathurā Museum.
The record was first published, with the assistance of D. R. Sahni, by Vogel, JRAS 1910, p. 1311–14. Fleet added some remarks with reference to the date, ibid., p. 1315–17. Vogel edited the inscription again, Orien-

¹ The reading is not certain.
² Agrawala: nāga, but the na seems to have no ā-sign.
³ Agrawala: hari sya. The reading śīsya appears to be certain.
⁴ Agrawala reads rddhilasya. I cannot follow him, but I cannot suggest a reading that would satisfy myself. The name seems to end in -gasya.
⁵ Agrawala: nirvartana, but there is no r-sign on the top of the ta.
⁶ Agrawala: bhavanakasya. The fourth aksara may be nda.
⁷ Agrawala: dātilasya. The reading given above is certain. The following letters were not read by Agrawala.
⁸ The last word was probably dānaṃ.
talishes Archiv 1. 1910, p. 86ff., Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 189 (Q 13),
and, after having briefly referred to it, JRAS 1912, 118f., once more,
pl. 23–24 (illustrating the two posts and the inscription).

**Text**

1 siddham || mahārājaśya rajātirājaśya¹ devapu-
2 trasya śāher-vVāsiśkasya rājyasamvatvatsare² [ca]-
3 turvi[m]še³ 20 4 grśmāmāse caturt[th]e 4 diva[s]e
4 tri[m]še³ 30 asyāṁ pūrvvāyāṁ Rudrilaputtrenā Droṇa-
5 lena brāhmaṇena Bhāradvājasagottrenā Mā-⁴
6 nācchandogena is[tv]ā sattreṇa a⁵ dvā[d]aśār[i]ttrenā
7 yupaḥ pratiśṭhā[p]itaḥ priyant[a]m⁶aṃagnaya(h)⁷

**Translation**

Success! In the twenty-fourth – 24th – year of the reign of mahārāja
rājātirāja devaputra śahi Vāsiśka, in the fourth – 4th – month of summer,
on the thirtieth – 30th – day, on this date, Droṇa, the son of Rudrika,
a Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāradvāja gotra (and) a Māṇacchandoga (Māṇa ?
of the Sāmaveda), having performed a sacrifice lasting twelve days, has
set up the sacrificial post. May the (three) Fires be pleased!

The stone yūpas are apparently copies of the wooden posts that were
actually used in the sacrifice and were set up to commemorate the
performance of a large sacrifice. The meaning Māṇacchandoga has not
yet been ascertained.

16. Records on Antiquities found in the Jamnā near Mathurā

(85a)

Facsimile: below p. 295

§ 95 K 101

Inscription on the pedestal of a headless Nāga statuette, found in
the Jamnā near Mathurā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1610).

---

The reading given above is certain.

² [The subscript -sa is written in its looped form.]

³ The anusvāra is uncertain.

⁴ There seems to have been no more writing after mā.

⁵ [Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math.: sattreṇa, ASI: sattrena. Only the right part of the
third akṣara is preserved, but the reading given above seems to be certain.]

⁶ Vogel: priya-. The i-sign of pri is distinct. [The ā-sign of the third akṣara
is uncertain, the letter may be read as nīa.]

⁷ [The right part of the ya is lost. The visarga is conjectural.]
The inscription was published by D. R. Sahni, ASI Ann. Rep. 1924/25.
1927, p. 149f. + pl. 40a.

Text
Dadhika[r]ṇṇ[o]\(^1\)

The inscription shows that the figure represented the Nāga Dadhi-kaṃṭha who, according to §27: L. 85 and §34: L. 63, had his shrine on the site of the Jamālpur mound, but, as pointed out by D. R. Sahni, it cannot be affirmed at present whether this is the very image that was worshipped in that shrine.

(85b)
Facesimiles: below p. 296

§ 96 \(\overline{\text{K 102}}\)

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a small Buddha statuette seated cross-legged of whom only the legs remain. The sculpture was found in the Jamnā and is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2094).

The inscription was published by K. N. Dikshit, ASI Ann. Rep.
1930—34, 1. 1936, p. 227.

Text
mah[a]r[a]j[ā]\(^2\)

[The word is written in a cartouche.]

\(^1\) The o-sign is not absolutely certain, but probable.

\(^2\) [Dikshit: Mahārāja. According to our two impressions (cf. below p. 296) the supposed a-signs of the second and third akṣaras are quite uncertain. The reading j[ā] is more probable than ji[a] as there is a slanting stroke attached to the middle-bar of the letter.]
III. INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE MATHURĀ DISTRICT
III. INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE MATHURĀ DISTRICT

1. Māṭ

The village of Māṭ is situated about 9 miles north of the City of Mathurā, on the left bank of the Jamnā. About three quarters of a mile to the north-east of the village there is a flat mound known as Tōkri Tīlā, which was excavated in the spring of 1912 under the supervision of Pandit Radha Krishna. A short account of the excavation was given by Sir John Marshall, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 1. 1914, p. 14—16 §37—43, and a more detailed one by Vogel, ibid., 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 120—127 (with a Plan of Excavations, Māṭ Site, 1912, on pl. 51).

Of the building, which once stood on the site of the mound, only scanty remains are left, the walls having been destroyed by the neighbouring villagers in digging for bricks. The pieces of walling that have come to light appear to belong to a rectangular plinth measuring about 100 feet from east to west and about 59 feet from north to south. The building which was erected on the plinth has now completely disappeared. From the nature of the walling in the middle of the western half of the mound, where some scanty remains of a circular structure can be distinguished, it may be concluded that it stood in this part of the plinth, facing the east where remains of a flight of steps, leading up to the plinth, were found.

On the south, at some distance from the plinth, there are remnants of masonry foundations. Vogel takes them to mark an enclosure, rectangular in shape, which may have contained rows of dwelling rooms.

To the west of the plinth is a tank which was partly excavated. As it is built of large bricks of exactly the same size as those used in the plinth, it must be contemporary with the building.

Two inscriptions found on the site disclose the history of the buildings. From the inscription §98: L.80d, which for palaeographical reasons cannot be later than the first years of Kaniska’s reign and which records the construction of a temple (devakula)1, a tank (puṣkariṇī), a hall (sabhā), and a gateway (dārakotaka), we can infer that the temple

1 Grierson, JRAS 1921, p. 286 [briefly noticed a shorter article of Gauri Śaṅkara Hīrāchand Ojhā on devakulas in connexion with Bāṇa’s reference to Bhāsa in the Harṣacarita and the latter poet’s Pratimāṇaka in]: Nāgaripracārini Patrikā[, the (Research) Journal of the (Benares) Nāgari Prachārini (1) Sabhā (N.S.) 1.1920*]. [Cf. below p. 176, n. 2.]
with all its accessories as revealed by the excavation\(^1\) dates from the beginning of Kaniśka’s reign or even a little earlier time.

The inscription §99: L. 80c is considerably later; from the text it appears that it was incised during the lifetime of Huvīśka. It mentions again the temple (devakula) and the tank (talāga), but its proper object apparently is to record the restoring of the temple which in the meantime must have gone out of repair.

On the supposed temple site stood the lower half of a colossal statue of a Kuśān king seated on his throne. The inscription §98: L. 80d is engraved between his feet. The upper half of the statue was discovered at some distance to the west at the tank where it was worshipped as Baran, i.e. Varuṇa, the god of the waters.\(^2\) As pointed out by Vogel (ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 123), the statue seems to have been wilfully broken, the break showing a series of holes as if made with some sharp tool. As regards the original position of the image, Vogel (op. cit., p. 121) remarked: “At first sight it might appear that it was placed inside the temple as an object of worship. The circumstance, however, that sculptured fragments belonging to this statue were found further east within the plinth area militates against such an assumption. The following is perhaps a more acceptable explanation… I presume that the person who found the image tried in the first place to remove it bodily to the tank, but after moving it some little distance towards the west found it too heavy and gave up the attempt. He then broke the image in two and removed only the upper half.”

A little to the south of the supposed temple, remnants of three images were found. The first is a life-sized standing figure of which the head and the arms are lost. According to the inscription, §97: L. 78b, it is a portrait statue of Kaniśka. The second is the lower half of a standing image almost life-size, accompanied by a dwarf or Yakṣa on his right side and a lion carved on the back of the sculpture (cf. below p. 144, n. 1). Of the third image only the pedestal with the inscription §99: L. 80c is preserved. On the top of it traces of the left foot of the statue are visible and, as stated by Vogel (op. cit., p. 126), from the position and shape of this foot it would seem that the statue to which it belonged had the same boots as e.g. the image of Kaniśka. The person represented was therefore probably another Kuśān prince which, as we shall see later on, is quite in agreement with the facts to be derived from the inscription.

---

\(^1\) Details will be discussed below.

\(^2\) This is the account given in Vogel’s Report, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 121, line 39ff. It is contradicted by the statements on p. 123, line 30ff., but these are apparently erroneous. The sentence on pl. 51, 6 “Lower part of a standing figure”, appears to be a mistake for “Upper part of a sitting figure”, and the red figure 6 seems to be put in the wrong place, the tank being situated to the west, not to the north of the plinth.
Vogel thought it possible that the pedestal just mentioned formed part of the same image as the torso which was found at a little distance further south of the plinth and which by its dress is shown to have belonged to the portrait statue of another Kušān prince. In my opinion the supposed connection between the pedestal and the torso is precluded by the inscription on the torso, §100: L. 80e, which is in considerably later characters than the inscription on the pedestal. But there has been another piece of sculpture showing part of a neck with a torque,¹ and Vogel’s alternative suggestion that this fragment belonged to the lost statue is very plausible.

There were probably some more portrait statues at the site and to one of them belongs the detached head with the monogram treated under §101: L. 80f.

\section*{78b}

\begin{quote}
\noindent Facsimile: below p. 296
\end{quote}

\section*{97 √}

Inscription on a standing figure, discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna in 1911/12, from the Tökri Tilā near the village of Māṭ, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 213).

The head and the arms of the statue are missing. The figure wears a tunic reaching below the knees, held round the loins by means of a girdle, and a long overcoat. The feet are shod with very heavy boots. The right hand rests on a mace placed on the ground. The left hand clasps the hilt of a sword, the sheath of which is fastened by means of two straps to the overcoat. The inscription is engraved across the lower portion of the upper and lower garments. [As Vogel remarked,² it was evidently incised last of all, as some of the lines indicating the drapery run through the akṣaras.]


The statue is figured also by Codrington, Ancient India 1926, p. 44 + pl. 21E, by Coomaraswamy, History of Ind. and Indones. Art/Geschichte

¹ ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 126 + pl. 56.
d. ind. u. indones. Kunst 1927, pl. 18, fig. 65, by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 76, by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 1 (cf. p. 22), etc.

TEXT

mahārājā rājātirājā devaputro Kāṇiśka

TRANSLATION

The mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Kāniśka.

§ 98

Inscription between the feet of a colossal seated figure of a king, discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna in 1911/12, from the Tōkri Tīlā near the village of Māṭ, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 215).

The king is seated in European fashion on a throne supported by two lions on either side. In the right hand he apparently held a sword of which only the hilt is partially preserved. The left hand is broken; Vogel thinks that it rested on the scabbard laid across the knees. The head and the upper portion of the throne are lost and the knees are much damaged. The dress consisting of an upper and a lower garment and heavy top boots is similar to that of the Kaniśka statue (cf. above p. 133).


The designation of the king mentioned in the inscription as Kuṣāṇa-putro was commented upon by von Staël-Holstein, JRAS 1914, p. 80 note 1; p. 87 note 1; p. 755; by Fleet, JRAS 1914, p. 369—371 + pl. and p. 1000—1002; by Konow, Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 59ff.

The statue is figured also by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 77—78 (l.), by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 2 (cf. p. 22), etc.
**TEXT**

1 mahārāja rājātirāja¹ devaputra
2 Kuśānapuṭ[a]r[o² śā]hi³ [Vema]⁴ Ta[kṣu]masya⁵
3 b[a]kanapatina⁶ Hu[maspal. na]⁷ devakula[m]⁸ kāritā⁹
4 ārāmo puṣkariṇi udapān[am]¹⁰ ca sa[bh]ā dā[ra]koṭhako¹¹

**TRANSLATION**

The mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra, the scion of the Kuśāns, śāhi Vema (?). By the bakanapati of Takṣumā (?), Humaspala (?), a temple was caused to be made, (moreover) a garden, a tank, and a well, an assembly hall, a gateway.

The translation does not pretend in the least to be final. It is based on the assumption that the inscription first gives the titles and the name of the person represented by the statue and then proceeds to record the erection of a temple, the laying out of a garden and the construction of several minor buildings by some bakanapati. As the record of these

---

¹ The o-sign at the end of the first two words was first recognised by Fleet.
² The dot above the mātrkā na is apparently due to damage to the stone and does not represent the anustava as assumed by v. Staël-Holstein. The o-sign is blurred, but practically certain.
³ The first aksara is not quite distinct, but hi is certain and the reading śāhi is undoubtedly correct.
⁴ The second aksara is probably ma. The first aksara was read va by Vogel and v[e] by Jayaswal. The mātrkā may be va and there may be an e-sign at the top of the letter, but the reading vema cannot be called certain.
⁵ Vogel (ASI Ann. Rep.) read [takṣa]masya and Jayaswal calls this reading absolutely correct and certain. In my opinion this statement is true only as far as the last two letters masya are concerned. The first aksara may be ta, and if the second is a ligature, it may be ks or, more probably, kṣu [cf. Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2, p. 125]. But in that case the kṣa or kṣu would seem to be separated by an unusually wide space from the following ma. Moreover, between the two letters there is a pretty distinct line which would make it even possible to read takaḍamasya. As the meaning of the word is perfectly obscure, I consider it unnecessary to enlarge upon the reading which, as matters stand, can be only tentative.
⁶ The reading is certain. The stroke above ba is accidental and can by no means denote an r- as assumed by Jayaswal.
⁷ The second aksara was read kṣa by Jayaswal, which is impossible. My own reading cannot be called certain.
⁸ The reading tam seems to be certain.
⁹ The last aksara appears to be tā, not tam.
¹⁰ Jayaswal read udapānā, but the supposed ō-sign of the third letter is not distinct and may be accidental. The anustava is not certain.
¹¹ Vogel: sa ha dā — thena (ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 1), sa — da [koṭhako] (ibid., 1911/12, 2). — The reading bhā is not quite certain, but probable, whereas the reading dā[ra]koṭhako is certain. Jayaswal’s reading sa[m]va-6 [stop] saṭhako [full stop mark] is quite impossible.
donations is inscribed on the statue, it may be assumed that the statue also was included among the gifts.

The combination of the three titles mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra is frequently used in inscriptions in connection with Kaniṣṭha, Vasiṣṭa, Huṣiṣṭa and Kaniṣṭha II, and it is probably only by chance that the third title has not yet turned up in connection with Vasiṣṭa.

The triad of titles was borne also by some of the earlier Kuśāṇs. On a coin dug up at Sirkap¹ the slightly varying legend is mahārayasa rayarayasa devaputrasa Kuyula Kāra Kapṣasa, and the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription of the year 136 (CII 2, 1, p. 77 No 27) records a donation maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa Kuṣaṇasa arogadakṣīnae.

The term Kuṣaṇaputra does not occur anywhere else, neither in inscriptions nor in coin legends. Jayaswal (op. cit., p. 17ff.) holds that it means the son of Kuṣaṇa and that Kuṣaṇa is a personal name. He finds the name again in the just quoted Taxila Silver Scroll inscription and in the Panjār inscription of the year 122 (CII 2, 1, p. 70 No 26) which is dated maharayasa Kuṣaṇasa raja. In conformity with this view, Jayaswal explains the epithet Guṣaṇasasamvartdhaka applied to general Lala² in the Menikāla inscription of the year 18 (CII 2, 1, p. 149 No 76) as meaning ‘one who carries further the family of Kuṣana’, ‘a descendant of Kuṣan’. — The significance of Kuṣaṇa has formed the subject of a long controversy which will be exposed at length in the Introduction³. Here it may suffice to state that I agree with Fleet (JRAS 1914, loc. cit.) and Konow (Ep. Ind. 21. 1931/32, p. 59f.), who maintain that Kuṣaṇaputra means ‘the scion of the Kuṣan’⁴. In my opinion Kuṣaṇaputra is a mere synonym of Kuṣaṇa, Guṣaṇa used in the Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions.

Kuṣaṇaputra is followed by sahi which in inscriptions occurs as a title of Kaniṣṭha (List No 21), Vasiṣṭha (§ 94: L. 149a, List No 161), and Vasiṣṭa (List No 69a and 72). Everywhere it stands immediately before the personal name, and we should naturally expect that here also the name of the king should be given after sahi.

However, [Vema]ta[kṣu]masya, of which the last two syllables at any rate are certain, appears to be a genitive, whereas all the titles show the nominative endings, and even if we admit that in the epigraphical language of this time it is perhaps not impossible that the titles should have been joined in the nominative to the name appearing in the genitive, we have to face the serious difficulty that we know

---

¹ [Cf. CII 2, 1, p. LXV, line 1.]
² Not to Kaniṣṭha, as stated by Jayaswal.
³ [Not preserved in the Manuscript.]
of no Kuṣāṇ king whose name bears the slightest resemblance to the supposed name of the inscription.

Jayaswal therefore proposed to split up the reading of the difficult passage vematakṣumasya, into two words (op. cit., p. 17: V/fe Jma Takṣa-
masya) and to take the first two syllables as the name of the king who on his coins is called Oeemo Kadphises and, in the Kharoṣṭhī legends, where the genitive is used, Vima Kathphisiṣa.

It is true, a more correct form of the name would seem to be Vimo, but as in Kharoṣṭhī¹ and Brāhmi² inscriptions the names of Kaniṣka, Vāsiṣka, and Huviṣka also are occasionally spelt with e instead of i and as the bare stem may have been used instead of the inflected form, Vema may be accepted as the name of the king; it cannot be seriously objected that hitherto neither devaputra nor Kuṣāṇa nor śāhi have turned up as titles of Vima Kadphises, the materials available at present being too scanty.

Nevertheless the name of the king cannot be considered to be fully established as long as the true reading and meaning of the following three akṣaras have not been made out. Jayaswal’s interpretation of takṣumasya, as he read, and of bakanaapatina need not be discussed as they are based on a misunderstanding of the transliteration of Avestan taṣma and an absolutely impossible explanation of Old Persian hauman-
varga. Bakanaapat occurs as vakanapati in the Mathurā inscription of the year 28.³ Konow thinks⁴ that the term may mean ‘the lord of Wakhan’. But as the name of the country is Vokkāna in the Divyā-
vadāna (p. 580, 5), I would prefer to look at bakanapati, vakanapati as an Iranian word denoting some functionary. I have ventured to join it to the genitive Ta[kṣu]masya, but I confess that it is only a makeshift, which I am ready to give up if anything more plausible should be suggested.

Bakanaapatina seems to have been followed by a personal name. It may have been Humaspala, but the reading is by no means certain.

The rest of the inscription also presents some difficulties, but they are of minor importance. Kāritā seems to be the nominative of the plural used with reference to all the objects of donation enumerated in the list. The devakula is undoubtedly the building where the three statues of the Kuṣāṇ kings were set up. The meaning of the term will be discussed in the note on the following inscription. Puṣkariṇi evidently refers to the tank excavated to the west of the building. Perhaps the well (udapāna)⁵ was constructed in connection with this tank, and it may

¹ CII 2, 1, No 72, 76, 85, 86.
⁴ [Konow, op. cit., p. 60.]
⁵ Or, perhaps udapāna; see above p. 135, n. 10.
be for this reason that the two terms puṣkarnī and udapoṇā are linked in the list by ca.

The sabhā was probably the building the masonry foundations of which were excavated to the south of the plinth. From the following inscription we may infer that it was used for feeding Brāhmaṇas. The gateway (dārakotthaka) was probably erected over the flight of steps which led up to the plinth on the eastern side.

As regards the date of the inscription, we have only the palaeographical evidence to depend on. The characters closely resemble those of the Sārnāth inscription List No 925, which is dated S. 3 of Kaniska’s reign; compare especially the initial अ and the curved forms of the medial ि-signs. But they may just as well be assigned to a little earlier time, and it is not impossible that the inscription was engraved during the reign of Vima Kadphises.

<80c>
Facsimiles: below p. 297

§ 99

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a statue from the Tōkri Tīlā near the village of Māṭ, now in the Mathurā Museum.

As stated above (p. 132), the statue represented some Kuśān prince. The pedestal is badly mutilated. The proper right side is missing altogether, and the extant portion has come down to us in fourteen pieces of different sizes which were pieced together by Vogel.

The inscription was first brought to notice by Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 125f. It was edited by D. R. Sahni, JRAS 1924, p. 402f.

TEXT

1 ///mak[a]ra[s]ya1 satyadhā(r)[m]asth[i]tasya(ṣ)nanayat- Sarva-Śca[m]davīrātisṛṣṭar[ā]jya[ṣya]2///<

1 The first preserved akṣara was read ṇa by Sahni, but comparing the letter with the यa in -viśrṇya<ṃ> in line 3, brāḥ<ma>ṇehṛyaḥ in line 6 and, on the other hand, with the ma in -dha(r)[m]a- in line 1, maḥāraja- in line 2, ma[k]. in line 3, ma[h]/(a)- in line 4, I think it more likely that it is ma. The second letter may be k/u/, but the seeming u-sign may be an accidental stroke.

2 Sahni read: [ṣ]hitasya-āṇ[ u]nayat-sarvas caṇḍa-virātisṛṣṭa-rājya[ṣya]... The ॐ-sign at the top of the first sya is very problematic and there is certainly no u-sign attached to the following na. There is a stroke slanting from the right to the left on the left side of the ॐ and a horizontal stroke on the right side of the letter. A comparison with the certain νḍa of (da)ṇḍa[jyaka]- in line 5 makes it very improbable that the akṣara was meant for νḍa. Both strokes are probably accidental, but the slanting stroke may be meant for the anuṣṭra. The reading vi is more probable than vi.
III. Mathurā District: 1. Māṭ

2 ///. (de)[va]kulaṁ¹ mahārajā²-rājātirāja-devaputrasya Huvi-
[ṣ]ka[ṣ](y)a³ [p]itamahasya⁴///
3 ///(ta)[lā]gaś⁵-c[a] (da)[ttal]h⁶ [ta]taś⁷-ca devakal[am⁸] bha]gnapatita-
viśrṇa[m⁹ d[ṛ]ṣya¹⁰ ma[h]¹¹///
4 ///[m[ah]ā]rājā-[rā]jātirāj[a-d]evapu(trasya) Huviṣkasya āyu-
ba[lav](r)d(dhy)artha¹² cakkra .¹³ ///

¹ Before kulaṁ is a blank which is due to the carelessness of the engraver. It seems that he started the line close to the first line and then, to avoid the collision with the ra[ṣ]ya of the first line, left a blank space and continued the writing about ¾" lower down. He has done exactly the same thing in line 3. Sahni, who edited the text from the stone itself, read kulaṁ, and I think that he was right. The horizontal stroke above the māṭkā ka appears to be not connected with the letter, but to belong to the subscript -ya of [ṣ]ya in the first line. The u-sign, although partly coinciding with a flaw in the stone, is discernible. From the reverse of the impression it is clear that the following aksara is lāṁ, not le. The restoration of kulaṁ as devakulaṁ is practically certain from the context, and it is quite possible that the last letter of the higher portion of the line was va and that de has disappeared in the deep flaw to the left of the va. Faint traces of a letter to the left of the flaw may be interpreted as sya.

² The reading is certain, although the letters are distorted a little in piecing together the stone. The third aksara is ra, not rā, as read by Sahni.

³ Of the last aksara only the upper portion is preserved.

⁴ This is Sahni's reading, and although only the upper portion is preserved of [p]jī, and sya is very indistinct, I am convinced that the reading is right.

⁵ Sahni: [lā]gaś, but the second letter is lā. The ta is almost entirely obliterated.

⁶ Sahni: kṛtaḥ. Owing to a large fissure in the stone the first aksara is destroyed, but there is nothing to indicate that it was kṛ, and the second letter seems to be tta. I would suggest to read (da)[ttal]h, but I cannot account for the two vertical strokes which are pretty distinct above the supposed tta.

⁷ The first tta was apparently inserted above the line.

⁸ There is no u-sign attached to the ka, though, of course, devakulaṁ is the intended word.

⁹ Sahni: -patitam, but the anusvāra is uncertain.

¹⁰ Sahni read daśya and corrected it to dṛṣya. The r-sign seems to have been actually engraved.

¹¹ The ha is so much damaged that it cannot be called certain.

¹² The word was read by Sahni who thought that the last aksara was rtham, but there appears to be no anusvāra.

¹³ Sahni: ca ku (t), but the second aksara is distinctly kkra. The following letter seems to have been ma. May we restore ca(m)kkra(ma)?

¹⁴ Sahni read: [Mahāda]ndoṇa[yaka-]Maṣa ...[pu]kle[tre]na Ba[kana]-patina(ā). The syllables mahāda are conjectural, but certain. The second ma is not quite distinct, but probable. The next aksara is illegible, but there is nothing to show that it was sa. It is followed by an aksara containing a subscript -sa, probably kṣa. Then follow two aksaras which are entirely destroyed and a letter of which the bottom-line is preserved and which may have been na or ya. It is tempting to restore the word as [ma][hak][ṣ][a](atrape)[n][a], but it is not likely that a person should have borne at the same time the titles mahādanāyanāyaka and mahākṣaprapa. — Of the next word the syllables na ... patina are perfectly clear, i.e. the 3 letters preceding patina cannot be bakana. The aksara read by
Šāu.e\(^1\) ......... p[u]kasya\(^2\)///
6 ///[s]y[a]t[i]\(^3\) [nai]ty[a]k[a]th[i]bhyaś\(^4\)ca brā[hma]ṇebhyaḥ kāri-
ṣya(ti) ................. [m].///

**Translation**

(line 1:) .... of the ...maker, who is steadfast in the true Law, on
whom, on account of his devotion, the kingdom was conferred
by Sarva and Ścāndavīra (Cāndavīra), ....
(line 2:) .... the temple, the ... of the grandfather of mahārāja rā-
jātirāja devaputra Huviṣka ....
(line 3:) .... and a tank was given. And later on, having seen that
the temple was broken, fallen down and in a ruinous state....
(line 4:) .... and for the increase of the life and strength of mahārāja
rājātirāja devaputra Huviṣka ....
(line 5:) .... by the great general, the ..., the lord of ..., Šāu.e....
(line 6:) .... and for the Brāhmaṇas, who are regular guests, will be
made ....

The inscription is divided into two parts, the first ending with the
words (ta)[lā]gaś c[a] (da)/t[a]ḥ, ‘and a tank was given’.

As proved by the concluding words, the first part mentioned several
gifts which must have been enumerated in the preceding line 2. It is
therefore probable that we have to supply pratimā after [p]ītāmaha(sya),
and that it was stated that an image of the grandfather of mahārāja
rājātirāja Huviṣka was caused to be made. As remarked in the notes
on the text (n. 1), kulaṃ in the beginning of line 2 has certainly to be
restored as devakulam. The donation therefore must have included a
temple. But the temple mentioned here is obviously the same as the
devak(u)l[a]m which in line 3 is spoken of as having been in a ruinous
state. It therefore cannot have been the real object of the inscription
to record the erection of that temple; what is intended to record is

Sahni as ba can hardly be anything but pā, and it is followed by one letter only
which is probably ka. Probably also the aksara preceding na (see above) belongs
to the word. To judge from the faint traces that are left of it, it may have been
ma. We thus arrive at the reading (ma)na[pāka]patina, which may be some title,
but it is hardly necessary to add that the reading is extremely doubtful.

\(^1\) Sahni read: Šāukre ... , but the last sign is certainly not kre. All that can
be said is that the letter certainly had an e-sign.

\(^2\) Sahni: ...syakas... The first letter is pa, probably with the u-sign. The hook
to the right of the u-sign seems to belong to the writing of the lower line. [It seems
also probable that the whole aksara was meant as pya with a tripartite ya; see
below note 4.]

\(^3\) Sahni: syate, but the i-sign is distinct.

\(^4\) The reading of the word is due to Sahni. I differ from him only in reading
ty[a] instead of tyā. The a-sign of k[a] is doubtful. [Instead of thi the reading
thi would be possible.] Here and in the following word, bhya is written with the
tripartite -ya [as in [nai]ty[a] and probably in kāriṣya(ti) of the same line].
apparently the restoration of the temple by the great general, which must have been mentioned in the lost portion of the second part of the inscription, and the first part has to be taken as an introductory account of the construction of the temple and its belongings at an earlier time, the words [ta]jtaś ca being used in the sense of ‘later on’.

Now there can be no doubt that the temple (devakula) and the tank (talaγa) mentioned in our inscription (§99: L.80c) are the same as the temple (devakula) and the tank (puskarini) the construction of which by a bakanaβati is recorded in the inscription §98: L.80d; and as that inscription is incised on the statue of a Kušān king, it is almost certain, although it is not clearly stated, that the statue also belonged to the donation of the bakanaβati. It is therefore tempting to identify that statue with the image of the grandfather of Huviška which in all probability was mentioned in our inscription together with the temple and the tank; and if we were sure that the statue represented Vima Kadphises, we might further conclude that he was the grandfather of Huviška. However, it must be borne in mind that, owing to the defectiveness of the records, this conclusion has been arrived at only by a combination of probabilities and that in particular the name of the king in the inscription §98: L.80d cannot be relied on as long as the obscure ta[ksa]-masya or, more probably, ta[ksu]masya has not been explained.

Under these circumstances I consider it unnecessary to enter here into a discussion on the relations existing between the two Kadphises and Kaniska and his successors. Even if it were true that Kaniska was a king of the Little Yüe-chi and started his career from Khotan, as assumed by v. Staël-Holstein (SPAW 1914, p. 643ff.) and Konow (CII 2, 1, p. LXXVIf.), this would in my opinion not preclude the possibility of Huviška being a grandson of Vima Kadphises. On no account can I accept Sahni’s suggestion that the grandfather of Huviška was Vājheška as I cannot agree with Banerji’s theory of the identity of Kaniska and the king of that name mentioned in the Ārā inscription as the son of Vajheška (CII 2, 1, p. 162ff. No 85).

Unfortunately the first line of our inscription also affords no help in this respect. It contains three epithets of a king of which two, the first and the second, are unknown. The first is perhaps to be restored as (kṣe)mak[a]ra, but this is, of course, quite uncertain.

The second epithet, satyadhav(r)i/masth[i]ta, occurs in the coin legends of Kujūla Kadphises, where we find the exact counterpart in Kušaṇasa yaṇṣa Kuyula Kaphṣasa sacadhrāmataḥdasa and a shortened form in Kuyula Kasasa Kuṣaṇa yaṇṣa dhrāmataḥdasa.1 But the same

epithet is borne also by the Krorain ruler Áµgoka. The Kharoṣṭhī
document No 579¹ is dated saṃveatsare 441 maharayarayatirayaṣa
mahatasa jayaṃtasa dharmiyaṣa sacadhamaṣṭhidaṣa | mahanuva
maharaya aṁkvaṣa devaputraṣa ēh'unaṃmi, and the wording of the date
of No 581² is materially the same.³

Under these circumstances it would be hazardous to conclude from
the epithet of our inscription, satyadharmaṣṭhita (line 1), that the king
mentioned in the first line was Kujûla Kadphises. The same epithet may
have been borne also by Vima Kadphises or even by one of his successors.

A parallel of the third epithet, nanayat-Sarva-Śce[ṃ]ḍavirāṭis-
ṣṭar[ā]jya-, occurs in one of the Bhītā seals: śri-Vindhyabedhanama-
harājasya Maheśvara-Mahāsenāṭisṭarājasya Vṛṣadhvajasya Gautami-
putraṣya.⁴ As remarked by Sahni,⁵ the symbols of the seal resemble
those of the Andhra and Kṣatrapa dynasties, and the characters of the
legend belong to the third or fourth century A.D. The legend was trans-
lated by Sahni: “Of the illustrious Mahārāja Gautami-putra Vṛṣadhvaja,
the penetrator of the Vindhyas,⁶ who had made over his kingdom to
the Great Lord Kārttikeya”. With regard to the appellation Maheśvara-
Mahāsenāṭisṭarājasya he says: “It seems to indicate that in ancient
times there may have existed a pious custom, according to which rulers
on the occasion of their accession entrusted their kingdom to their
iṣṭadevaṭā and considered themselves as mere agents. Mahāsena,
whom Vṛṣadhvaja made over his rājya, is the well known god Kārtti-
keya, a son of Śiva and Pārvati; and the name Vṛṣadhvaja would seem
to be only a second name assumed by the king on the occasion of his
coronation in respect to the god Śiva.” In support of his explanation
Sahni refers to a similar ceremony which was actually performed by a
Mahārāja of Trancore in the middle of the 10th century A.D. Never-
theless I am convinced that the compound is to be dissolved not as
Maheśvara-Mahāsenāṭiṣṭarāṃ rājyaṃ yena, but as Maheśvara-Mahā-
senābhyaṃ atiṣṭarām rājyaṃ yasmai.⁷ Maheśvara cannot be taken as
qualifying Mahāsena, as it is a typical name of Śiva and never applied
to Kārttikeya. The meaning of the epithet would therefore be: ‘on whom
the kingdom was conferred by Maheśvara and Mahāsena’.

¹ Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein, Pt 1. 1920 (Niya Site).
² Konow (CII 2, 1, p. LXXIV) is of the opinion that in these dates the year refers
to a ‘king of kings’, who is different from the mahārāja Áµgoka. I cannot agree
with him. From the ‘Tables of kings and regnal years’, Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions
discovered by Sir Aurel Stein, Pt 3. 1929, p. 326ff., it appears that the records
of Áµgoka as well as most of his successors Mahiri and Vaṣmana are dated in
their own regnal years.
⁴ [Cf. ibid., p. 43 note 2.]
⁵ I prefer to take Vindhyabedhana as the name of the territory ruled over by
Vṛṣadhvaja.
⁶ Cf. the classical example upahṛtapasū Rudraḥ, Vārtt. 19 on Pāṇini 2, 2, 24.
A similar sense must certainly be looked for in *nanayat-Sarva-Śca[m]-
davirātisṛṣṭar[ā]jiya[ṣya] of our inscription (line 1). Sahni, by ingen-
iuously correcting *nanayat to -ānunayat, arrived at the translation:
"who had restored (their) kingdoms to fierce heroes when they entreated
mercy," but this translation is unsatisfactory: *anunayat, even if it
should be correct, can hardly mean "entreating mercy"; *sara does not
very well suit the context, whether it is taken as an adverb qualifying
*scamda or as an adjective qualifying *scamdavira; and *atisṛj does not
convey the meaning of "restoring".

In my opinion *atisṛṣṭarōjyasya has to be taken here in the same sense
as in the legend of the Bhūta seal, and we should therefore expect the
preceding words to be the names of the deities to whom the king owed
his dignity. Now, *Ścamdadavira is apparently the same as *Caṇḍavira, the
name of a god mentioned in the Naipālīyadevatākalyāṇapañcavimśā-
tika. The spelling of the name in the inscription is peculiar. The * seems
to have been added to *camda in imitation of *scandra which occurs
instead of *candra as the second member of a compound name even in
classical Sanskrit. At any rate, *scamda is not a mistake of the engraver.
It is found again in *Ścaṇḍeśvarahastin, the name of a Kulūta king in
an inscription of the 4th century A. D. at Sāhri near Salānu in the territ-
ory of Mandi. The mahārāja Ścaṇḍeśvarahastin is called the son of
the mahārāja Īśvarahastin, and there can be no doubt that, just as
Īśvara, Ścaṇḍeśvara also is a name of the god Śiva, probably in a special
form. Kālidāsa calls the god in the Mahākāla temple at Ujjayini:
Caṇḍīśvara. *Ścaṇḍavira/Caṇḍavira may have been a lesser deity, but his
name sufficiently indicates that he belonged to the circle grouped round
Śiva, Caṇḍa occurring as the name of Śiva himself, of Kārttikeya, of
one of the servants of Śiva, and Caṇḍa or Caṇḍi being a common name
of Śiva's consort Durgā.

It is more difficult to account for the words preceding *Śca[m]\davira-
. They are probably to be divided into *nanayat and *Sarva, the latter
being the name of Śiva which in this spelling is frequently found in the
Mahābhārata and already in the Śatapathabrahmaṇa. Thus two gods,
Sarva and Caṇḍīśvara, would be mentioned as the patrons of the king

1 "May the divinities Hevajra, Samvara, Caṇḍavira [i. e. Caṇḍavira], Triloka-
vira and Yogāmbara, with their train ... be propitious to you"; Wilson, Selected
2 ASI Ann. Rep. 1907/08. 1911, p. 265 + pl. 35, line 1—2. The reading mahārāja-
śri-Ścaṇḍeśvarahastinā is quite distinct on the Plate.
5 Mbh. 3, 14631.
6 Vyaṇi on Hemacandra, Abhidhānacintāmaṇi 210, cf. ed. Böhtlingk and Rieu,
p. 312: Mahācaṇḍa.
7 See PW s. v. Caṇḍa.
just as two gods, Maheśvara and Mahāsena, were the patrons of King Vṛṣadhvaja.¹

As regards nanayat, I am inclined to accept in principle Sahni's explanation, but as anuni cannot well be said of the action of a god towards a man, I should prefer to correct nanayat to anunayat (abl. sgl.) and to refer it to the king² [i.e. to read: *-sthitasyanunayat Sarva-].

Although it is impossible to establish with certainty the connection between the first and second lines, I consider it improbable that the inscription was dated and that the three epithets formed part of the date. It is far more likely that the genitives are dependent on (deva)-kulam and that the temple was designated as the devakula of the king referred to in the first line. If this suggestion is accepted, the king can hardly be anybody but the grandfather of Huviska.³

If a building is called: the temple of a king, it would be natural to infer that the temple was founded by that king. But as in this case we know that the temple was erected not by a king, but by a bakapati, the term can only mean that the temple was dedicated to the king or erected in his honour. Thanks to Mr. Jayaswal we are now able to understand the expression.

There can be little doubt that the devakula at the Māṭ site, similarly to Bhāsa's devakula,⁴ served chiefly as a hall for the statues of members of the royal Kuśāṇ family, although, as proved by the life-size image found together with the Kaniṣka statue, images of gods were mixed up with them. In one respect, however, the collection of the Kuśāṇ statues seems to have differed from the gallery described by Bhāsa. Bhāsa tells us that only deceased kings were honoured by setting up their images. This restriction does not seem to have prevailed in the case of the Kuśāṇ devakula. The present inscription was engraved on the

---

¹ Perhaps Caṇḍiśvara is represented by the image two copies of which were found together with the portrait statues. Unfortunately in both cases only the lower half of the figure is preserved. The larger one was a male figure with a dwarf to the right and a lion on its back; cf. ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 125 – pl. 55, 9—10. The second torus is figured on pl. 56. Vogel compared the larger statue with the Bodhisattva statue of Sārnāth, which has a lion figure between his feet, and he thought that there, as in the present instance, the lion indicated that the statue represents Śākyasimha, the Lion among the Śākyas. The explanation is apparently correct as far as the Sārnāth image is concerned, but it leaves the dwarf of the Māṭ figure unexplained, and as the lion also appears here in quite different an attitude, the figure probably is meant for some deity.

² Mr. O. Hansen has suggested to me that nanaya might be the name of the goddess which on the coins of Kanerke appears as NANAIA [cf. P. Gardner, The Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings . . ., p. LXf.; p. 129 + pl. 26, 3], but in that case it would be difficult to account for the following tsarva.

³ This is also the opinion of Sahni, but on account of the intervening devakulam it is impossible to join grammatically the genitives of the first line with pitāmahāsya, as Sahni seems to do.

pedestal of a statue, and we may reasonably assume that, in addition to the repair of the devakula, the gift of this statue was recorded in the inscription. The statue cannot have represented the grandfather of Huviśka, nor is it likely that it was a second image of Kaniśka. As the donation was made for the increase of the life and strength of Huviśka, it becomes very probable that it represented that king, but that benedictory phrase shows at the same time that the statue was set up during the lifetime of Huviśka.

From the last line we learn that something was done 'for the Brāhmaṇas who were regular guests'. We are reminded at once of the Mathurā inscription of the year 28,¹ where it is laid down that at the punyāśālā of the Prācinikas one hundred Brāhmaṇas were to be fed on the 14th day of the bright half of the month. Probably similar arrangements were made here in connection with the sabhā attached to the devakula. At any rate, the mentioning of provisions for Brāhmaṇas shows that the devakula had nothing to do with the Buddhist religion and favours my suggestion that the image accompanied by the lion and the dwarf (cf. above p. 144, note 1) does not represent the Bodhisattva, but a Brahmānical deity worshipped by the Kuśān kings.

As regards the person to whom the repair of the temple and the other donations are due, we can gather from line 5 only that his name probably began with Śā, e, and that he had the titles of (mahāda)nā[yaka] and perhaps, if our reading is correct, of (ma)n[a]pāka/pati.

(80e)

§ 100  
Facsimile: below p. 298

Fragmentary inscription on a standing figure from the Tōkri Ŭlā near the village of Māṭ, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 212).

The image is a torso, the head, the arms, and the lower portions of the legs having disappeared. The dress consists of a tunic, which is adorned across the chest and along the lower border with a broad band in imitation of embroidery. The figure wears a thin torque round the neck and a beautiful belt formed by series of highly decorated plaques. A strap slung round the right hip evidently carried a sword, which hung down from the left thigh, and probably the figure clasped the hilt with the left hand. From what remains of the right leg, it appears that the figure wore top-boots. The inscription is engraved on the lower portion of the robe.

It was edited by Vogel, Journal of the Panjab Hist. Soc. 2. 1913°, p. 39ff. + pl., Verslagen en Mededeelingen d. Kon. Akad. van Wetensch., Afd. Letterkunde, 4, 12. 1914, p. 298 + pl. 3 showing the figure, ASI

¹ [Cf. above p. 136, n. 4.]

---

Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 1. 1914, p. 16, ibid., 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 125 + plate 55, 7—8 showing the front view and the back view of the statue. JBORS 5. 1919, p. 511, K. P. Jayaswal announced that Benoytosh Bhattacharyya had discovered the name of the satrap Caśāna in the inscription, and JBORS 6. 1920, p. 51—53, B. Bhattacharyya published his reading of the label with a showings the inscription in original size.

The statue is figured also by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 78 (r.), by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 3 (cf. p. 22), etc.

**TEXT**

Mastana . . .

This is Vogel's reading.

B. Bhattacharyya takes the first aksara to be śa. He tells us that he had a great deal of doubt as to the identity of this letter, but that Dr. D. B. Spooner, Pandit Gaurishankar Hirāchand Ojhā, Mr. K. P. Jayaswal and Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Sāstrī, all endorsed his view in reading it as śa. I regret that even this galaxy of authorities cannot prevent my disbelief as I have never seen a śa of this period with the left vertical bent inward to such an extent as it would be here and with the horizontal middle bar rising to the right, the tendency since the Kuśān times being on the contrary to convert it into a slanting line downward. In my opinion the letter cannot be anything but a ma of the transitional type between the ma of the Kuśān period and the Northern Gupta ma.

The second aksara appears to be ṝta, the slanting line crossing the vertical bar of the ṝa, being probably an accidental cut of the chisel and not meant for a vowel-sign.

The third aksara is na.

After na there is a horizontal stroke a little above the writing line, which B. Bhattacharyya takes to be a stop line. To me this appears somewhat doubtful, the stop line being generally not put above, but in the middle of the writing line. Moreover, although the surface of the stone has splintered off almost immediately after that horizontal stroke, traces of what would seem to be lettering are visible below and after it. I consider it also unlikely that the statue should have been labelled with the bare name, and if for some reason no titles were added, why was the name placed on the right side of the statue and not in the middle? I therefore think that Vogel was right in calling the inscription fragmentary.

Under these circumstances the meaning of the three syllables remains uncertain. All that can be said is that they probably are part of the designation of the person represented by the statue and that this de-
signation was of foreign, probably Iranian, origin, which would agree
with the style of the statue.

The three syllables can on no account represent the name of the
mahâkâsatrapa Cašṭana, even if B. Bhattacharyya’s reading Šastana
should be accepted. In the inscriptions at Gûnda (List No 963), Junā-
gâdh (List No 965; 966), and Gadhâ (List No 967) the name of the
satrap is Cašṭana, in the inscription at Andhau (List No 964 a) Câšṭana.
The legends on the coins are Cašṭanas in Brāhmi, Cañhanasa in Kha-
roṣṭhi, [CI]/AST(A)NCA in Greek characters.1 Ptolemaeus (7, 1, 63)
calls him Tiaστενης, τια being clearly an attempt to render ca in Greek
letters.

There is not the slightest evidence for B. Bhattacharyya’s assumption
that the name was ever pronounced or spelt Šastana. How the alleged
mispronunciation “Cinivâsa” instead of ‘Srinivâsa’ can prove anything
in this respect, I fail to see. Nor can it be of any consequence if some
villagers pronounce the name of the village that really is Belçe as
Belçe.

The identity of the statue with the satrap Cašṭana, which B. Bhatta-
caryya declared to be absolutely certain, cannot be upheld neither from
a linguistic nor from a palaeographical point of view.

§ 101

Façsimile: below p. 298

In the Mathurâ Museum there is a detached head with a conical cap
(No 1252), which was obtained from the village of Mâṭ and almost
certainly belonged to the portrait statue of some Indo-Scythian prince
set up in the devakula of that site.

The head with its inscription is figured in Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurâ
1930, pl. 4a—b. The cap has a richly decorated border, apparently
imitating a ribbon studded with precious stones, and on its right a
monogram, in the original probably formed by gems being stitch-
ed on.

Just as the monogram on the cap of the Pâlîkheŕâ head (§127: L.143e),
this also consists of three Brâhmi letters placed one below the other and
interlaced. In this case the reading is distinctly

Nâyasa

As to the meaning of these monograms, I refer to the note on §127:
L.143e.

1 E. J. Rapson, Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, etc. (in the
British Museum) 1908, p. 72—75.
Inscription on the pedestal of the image of a Nāga, accompanied by
two Nāgīs\(^1\) from the mound of Rāl-Bhaḍār (about 8 miles north-west
of Mathurā), now in the Mathurā Museum (No 211).

The record is incised on the base below a group of worshippers con-
sisting of five males, five females, and two boys. Y. R. Gupte states
that on the upper rim of the pedestal also, beneath the feet of the deities,
there were short inscriptions, now much defaced, which probably con-
tained their names. But Mr. Agrawala doubts if the upper part was
inscribed at all and considers the lines which are visible there to be
parts of carving only.

The inscription was edited by Y. R. Gupte, Ep. Ind. 17.1923/24,
p. 10ff. with plates showing the image and the inscription.

---

1 Y. R. Gupte states that the pedestal is mentioned Ann. Progr. Rep. of the
ASI, Northern Circle, for the year 1908/09\(^5\). This publication is not accessible to me.
2 Gupte: mahārājasya, but the ha has no ā-sign. The ā-sign of the third aksāra
is doubtful, it may be read as ra.
3 Gupte: [śahi]. The sa seems to have no ā-sign.
4 Gupte: Kāṇikkhasya. The first letter has no ā-sign and is distinctly ka.
5 As remarked by Gupte, the engraver first cut sya, but afterwards found out
his mistake and deeply engraved only sa.
6 Gupte: gri. As often the r-sign is here combined with the i-sign.
7 Gupte: as[yā]/n. The last aksāra is distinctly only sya.
8 Gupte: p/ārve/āyāf/ān. The subscript -va of rv[v]ā is probable. [For the -v-
which forms the middle part of the ligature, cf. the plate in Ep. Ind.]
9 Gupte: bhagavatāh. The o-sign is a little blurred, but there is certainly no
visarga.
10 Gupte reads: [Bhūmi-nāga]sya, but adds in a note: “There can be little
doubt about the reading Śvāmi-nāgasya”. The reading of the name of the Nāga is
difficult. The first sign seems to be bha with an u-sign attached to the lower part
of the vertical. The second letter is distinctly ma with the ā-sign hanging down
from the right bar of the letter, but probably the vertical stroke above the line
which touches the left bar of the mā belongs to the letter, and the aksāra is really
mo. A very similar mo occurs in aramo in the same line.
11 Gupte: ā[r]ā/mo. There is a flaw in the stone at the top of the first aksāra,
but it is improbable that it has caused the loss of the sign of length as the stroke
denoting it is generally attached to the lower part of the vertical in the script of
the Kuṣāṇ times. Therefore the letter is to be read as a.
3 [g](ra)ho\(^1\) …………… [t]ra[s](y)[a]\(^2\) Māthurasya\(^3\) niyavaḍ[ā]kisya\(^4\) sa(rv)[va]satahida[s](u)-
4 (khaye)\(^5\)

**Translation**

In the year 8 of mahārāja rājātirāja śāhi Kaṇikkha (Kanishka), in the 4\(^{th}\) (month) of summer, on the 5\(^{th}\) day, on this date, a tank and a garden (were caused to be made) for the holy Nāga Bhumo (as) the donation of … … tra,\(^2\) the niyavaḍaki of Mathurā, for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

The name of the Nāga, which is not quite certain, is apparently given in the nominative case. The term niyavaḍaki I cannot explain; it seems to be a title like kālavāda.\(^6\) In the “Additions and Corrections”,\(^7\) H. Krishna Sastri proposed to take Niya as the name of the carpenter (vaḍaki) who made the gift. But this suggestion is not convincing.

**13a**

Facsimiles: below p. 299

§ 103

Fragmentary inscription on the sculptured pedestal of a seated Buddha figure from the mound of Rāl-Bhadar, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription, which is engraved on the upper rim, was noticed by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 65 (A 71).

**Text**

Huvīśkasya\(^8\) [s](aṃ) 30 1 [he 4]\(^9\) d[i] 20 dana bh(i)[k][śu]niy[e]\(^10\) Dinnaye ant(e)yāsīm[āṃ] Khudāye [Gra].///

\(^1\) Gupte: pra[tī/sthāpiṭa], but the second aksara of the third line is undoubtedly ho and the first letter, which has become nearly illegible, was apparently, as suggested by Konow, gra. [What is to be seen of this aksara in the impressions may be taken as the right part of ga.]

\(^2\) Gupte: …putras[y]/a. The reading pu is not warranted[, but the reading of only the māṭrkā as p. seems not impossible].

\(^3\) Gupte: …purasya. The reading given above is certain.

\(^4\) Gupte: niya/mada/kisya, for which niyavaḍakisya was suggested by H. Krishna Sastri in the “Additions and Corrections” (cf. below note 7). The third aksara is undoubtedly va, the following letter may have been du.

\(^5\) Gupte reads: [sarveṣat[v]a hi(hita)-su(sukhārthaṃ) and remarks: “Hī and su at the end of the third line stand for hīta-sukhārthaṃ. This abbreviation is due to want of space”. The last but one letter of the third line is clearly da and the following sa, although a little blurred, is quite distinct. The last two aksaras stood apparently below sa(rv)/va/. of line 3, but they are quite obliterated.

\(^6\) [Cf. Lüders’ Remarks in his edition of No 14a, 94, 103, Ep. Ind. 24. 1937/38, p. 200ff. as No 2, 3, 4, resp. (= § 114, § 18, § 19 of the present work).]

\(^7\) Ep. Ind. 17. 1923/24, p. VII.

\(^8\) Mr. Dikshit states that there is nothing lost before the word Huvīśkasya.

\(^9\) The reading he is rather uncertain.

\(^10\) The first two aksaras are uncertain. The third letter is perhaps ni.
TRANSLATION

In the year 31 of Huviṣka, in the 4th (month) of winter (?), on the 20th day, the gift of Khudā (and) . . . . . the female pupils of the nun Dinnā (Dattā).

13b
Facsimile: below p. 299

§ 104

Inscription on a sculpture representing the corpulent figures of a man and a woman seated in front side by side, from Rāl-Bhādār, now in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription is engraved on the proper left side of the base of the sculpture. The other side of the base is destroyed.


TEXT

1 priyatāṃ
2 Sidha[h] 1

TRANSLATION

May the Siddha be pleased.

The words appear to be only the concluding formula of a donative inscription which was engraved on the lost side of the base. There can be little doubt that the term sidha (siddha) refers to the male person represented in the sculpture, and it is to be regretted that the mutilated state of the figure does not allow us to determine the character of the deity denoted here by sī(d)đha.

3. Koṭā Mound

Koṭā is a small village, about 3 miles to the north of Mathurā. When Cunningham 2 visited the place on his tour in 1882/83, he discovered there a number of antiquities, among them 16 railing pillars, all originating from a long mound to the north of the kund of the village. A list of the antiquities is given in ASI [Ann.] Rep. 20. 1885, p. 50—52.

Seven of the railing pillars are at present in the Mathurā Museum (J 56—62). 3 They bear no dedicatory inscriptions, but on the reverse of the pillar J 58, which is carved with two full and two half lotus ro-

---

1 The visarga is not quite certain.
settes, there are two signs above the upper half rosette which will be discussed below (§105: L.15a).

There is nothing in the finds of the Kotā mound to indicate the nature of the sanctuary to which the railing pillars belonged, and only for general reasons we may surmise that it was a Buddhist Stūpa. From the pillar J 56, which shows a male figure in the typical Indo-Scythian dress, it can be inferred that the railing was erected in the Kuśān period and a pedestal, which was found in the mound and bears an inscription (§106: L.15) in Kuśān characters, points to the same time.

15a
Facsimile: below p. 299

§ 105

Concerning the two signs on the reverse of the railing pillar J 58 from the Koṭā mound, Vogel (Cat. Mus. Math. p. 154) speaks of two figures reversed which he doubtfully read as 48 and which he took to be the serial number of the pillar. I can discover no similarity between the signs and the numerical characters, and it is not unlikely that there was some more writing which is now sadly defaced.

As we know from several inscriptions1 that the sculptors sometimes signed their works with their names or with the initials of their names, I should prefer to look at the writing as the sculptor’s signature, although, considering the bad preservation of the letters and the possibility that they have to be taken as reversed, it will be a hopeless task to decipher them. At any rate, I think it would be premature to draw from those signs any conclusions as to the number of the railing pillars.

15
Facsimile: below p. 299

§ 106

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a statue from the Koṭā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

A facsimile of the inscription was published by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 20. 1885, pl. 5, 2, and Vogel gave his reading in Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 122 (G 43).

TEXT

Jayadevapatrenā Ghoṣena///

TRANSLATION

By Ghoṣa, the son of Jayadeva . . .

---

1 [Cf. below, Index of Miscellaneous Terms, — Sculptor’s names, and Sculptor’s marks.]
4. From the Brindâban Road

§ 107

Facsimile: below p. 299

K 37

1 Inscription on the base of a male figure clad in Indo-Scythian dress. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 110 (E 25) stated that the statue was found in a bagicā on the Brindâban road about 1½ miles from Mathurā.

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the record in Ep. Ind. 24. 1937/38. 1942, p. 207f. No 6.}

TEXT

1 sava[tsa]rā 70 2 h(emantamā)s(e) pratha(me)
2 ............... rṇasya pra(timā)

5. From Ghosnā

Facsimiles: below p. 300

§ 14

Four inscriptions on bricks and brickbats from Ghosnā (about 3½ miles to the east of the City of Mathurā), now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1678; 1679; 1680; 651).

§ 108

(102c) (No 1678)

TEXT

Ānadap[ut]asa² Nāga[da]t[as]a +²

TRANSLATION

Of Nāgadata (Nāgadatta), the son of Ānada² (Ānanda).

§ 109

(102d) (No 1679)

TEXT

Nāgادate[n]a⁴ mā[atu]⁵ da[tā]

¹ [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with notes.]
² [Apparently Lüders took the dot above the second akṣara to be accidental; otherwise we would have to read: Ānāmdap[u]tasa.]
³ There is a sign after the name, which is probably no letter, but a maṅgala symbol [i.e. a svastika].
⁴ The bottom-line of the last akṣara is damaged, but the reading na is confirmed by that of § 110: L. (102e).
⁵ The ā-sign of mā is faintly visible in the impression.
§ 110

\((102e)\) (No 1680)

\([N]\ddot{a}[g]adatena m\ddot{a}t(\ddot{u})^1 dat\ddot{a}\)

**TRANSLATION**

Given by Nāgadatta (Nāgadatta) (and his) (?) mother.

The inscriptions §109: L. 102d and §110: L. 102e are made with the same die. Nāgadatta is certainly identical with the person of that name mentioned in §108: L. 102c. I admit that my explanation of mātu as equivalent to the instrumental case, which makes it necessary to supply ca after it, is not satisfactory. Perhaps the inscription recorded that the building for which the bricks were used, whatever it may have been, was given by Nāgadatta to his mother.

§ 111

\((102e2)\) (No 651)

**TEXT**

Vasagut[a]²³//

**TRANSLATION**

Vasaguta (Ṛṣagupta?) .......

The name is apparently the beginning of a longer dedicatory inscription.

6. From Saknā

14c*

§ 112

Fragmentary inscription on the base of a female figure of which only the feet remain, from the village of Saknā (about 3 miles west of Gaṇēshrā and 6 miles west of Mathurā), now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 123 (G 47).

**TEXT**

1 ........ [tha]vāśarīṣāmāṣe³ .......
2 ........ [tvā]vāna hitasūkhā⁴ .......

---

¹ The u-sign of the last akṣara is destroyed, but the reading tu is confirmed by that of §109: L. (102d).
² There was no writing before va.
³ Of the first akṣara only the right half is preserved and the reading is uncertain. There is a stroke to the left of the va, which is probably not the e-sign, but accidental. The third letter is certainly sa, not sō as read by Vogel.
⁴ Vogel: tvāna hitasūkhā [rtham], but the signs of -ā and -u are quite distinct. Restore: (sarvasa) [tvāna hitasūkhā (rtham)].
TRANSLATION

... for the welfare and happiness of (all sentient) beings...

I am unable to explain the words of the first line. One would naturally take māse as the locative of māsa and as part of the date. In that case we should expect that the word before it was either the name of the month or a numeral indicating the date of the year, but I fail to see how the words can be interpreted in either way.

7. Mōrā

14

Facsimile: below p. 301

§ 113

<1 “Mōrā Well Inscription.” The slab bearing the record is now in the Mathurā Museum (Q 1).

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the inscription in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 194—200 No 1.>

TEXT

1 + mahākṣatrapasa Rājūvulasa putrasa svāmi(sa mahākṣatrapa-
2 bhagavatāṁ Vṛṣṇīnā(ṃ) paṃcavrāṇāṅ pratimā[ḥ] āladeva-
3 ya[s]-To[śā]yāḥ ālāṃ srīmad-grhaṃ-atulam-udadhasama-
4 ārcādesāṃ ālāṃ paṃca jvalata iva paramavapuṣā .......

14a

Facsimile: below p. 300

§ 114

<1 Inscription on the pedestal of a female statue from Mōrā, now in the Mathurā Museum (E 20).

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the inscription in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 200—202 No 2.>

TEXT

1 ... (mahārāja)ṣya Kaṇ(i)[ś]ka[ṣya] (saṃvatsa)ṣ[e] (grīṣma)[m]āse
2 ...... etasya purvaye M[āṭh]uri kalavaḍ[ā] o[ḍakh]ji ..
3 ...... ye Tośāye patimā (pratis)t(āpitā)

1 [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with notes.]

§ 115  
Facsimile: below p. 302

Kṣa 3

§ 115

† Inscription on a door-jamb from Mōrā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 367).

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the record in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 208—210 No 7.

TEXT

1 (s)[v](āmisya mahākṣatrapasya Śoḍā-)
2 sa[s]ya .......... (..... di-)
3 [vas]j(e) .......... (........)
4 [p]. . . [n]a Ś[v]a (...........)  
5 saput[tre)n[na Kauśī(kiputrena)
6 Vasunā bhagav[va](to Vāsude-)
7 vasya mahāsthāna (..... śai-)
8 laṃ toranaṃ ve(dikā ca prati-)
9 śṭhāpito prito [bha](gavān Vāsu-)
10 devar[svāni[ya] (mahākṣatra-)
11 pasya Śoḍā[sa](syā .........)
12 saṃvartatyātām

§ 116  
Facsimile: below p. 302

3rd cent. B.C.

Inscription on very large bricks discovered at Mōrā, now in the Mathurā Museum. The complete legend was obtained from the different fragments.²

It was edited by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 120 + pl. 2, 1, and ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2, 1915, p. 128 + pl. 58, 16. He referred to them also in Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, p. 18. [The record was published by Lüders, Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 199 with note 2.]

TEXT

jivaputāye rājabhāryāye Brahāsvātimita(dh)i[tu³ Yaśamatāye kārīta[ṃ]

¹ [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with notes. — Based no his reading and interpretation of the record Lüders, op. cit. p. 210, thought “it not improbable that the pillar bearing the present inscription mans from the Bhāgavata temple at Mōrā”].

² [Our collection contains now only the impression of one brick (A). Putting the damaged aksaras in brackets the inscription on brick A yields the following transcript: jivaputāye rājabh[aryā]ye Brahās[v]ātimita(dh)i[tu [Yaśam]atāye kārīta[ṃ].]

³ The first letter is apparently bra, not br or bri, as read by Vogel. The last but one aksara is destroyed by the breaking of the brick, but the i-sign is partly preserved and Vogel’s reading dhi may be called certain.
TRANSLATION

Caused to be made by Yaśamatā, the king’s consort, whose son is living, the daughter of Brahāsvātimita (Bṛhatsvātimitra).

The epithet jivaputrā is found also in List No 943, 944, 1126. Brahāsvātimita has been identified by Vogel with Bahasatimita whose coins have been found at Kōsam and Rāmnagar. On account of the characters the inscription has to be assigned to the 3rd century B.C.

8. Gaṇēshrā

Several finds made in the neighbourhood of Gaṇēshrā (Gaṇēśvara), a village situated some three miles west of Mathurā City to the north of the road to Gōvardhan, have proved already long ago that the site must have been occupied by a Buddhist sanctuary in the time of the Kuśāns.

Führer obtained there the life-size statue of a standing Bodhisattva, which is now in the Lucknow Museum, and the beautiful image of a seated Bodhisattva preserved in the Mathurā Museum (A 45) was found in a well near the village. Both images belong to the Kuśān period.

In 1908 Pandit Radha Krishna had the ancient tanks at Sitōhā and Gaṇēshrā cleared. From the Gaṇēshrā tank alone he obtained no less than 62 pieces of sculpture, the oldest of which can designed to the time of the Kuśān rule.

To the same time belongs the pedestal of the portrait statue of some foreigner which bears the inscription § 119: L. 14d. It was acquired from a Koli, who is said to have obtained it from a Brahman’s house in the village, but it is hardly necessary to remark that even if that statement should be correct, there is no proof that the statue originally was set up at the site of Gaṇēshrā.

On the other hand we know that a Buddhist sanctuary at Gaṇēshrā was under favour of the foreign rulers of Mathurā. There are three distinct mounds in the vicinity of the village. When Pandit Radha Krishna examined them in the winter 1911/12, he found in one of them a stone


2 The standing image is figured in: V. A. Smith, Jain Stūpa and other Antiquities of Mathurā 1901, p. 87; Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, p. 43, pl. 35b; — the seated image: ibid., p. 42, pl. 33a; ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2. 1914, p. 69, pl. 23d; Codrington, Ancient India 1926, p. 44; Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Indian Sculpture 1929, p. 107, pl. 85 (r.); Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 57 + pl. 10; etc.


4 Cf. the reports of the excavations by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 121—123, and ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 128—130.
with an inscription in Kṣatrapa characters (§ 118: L.14d 3) which records the erection of a Stūpa by the female relative of some Kṣatrapa. A Buddhist sanctuary therefore must have existed at the site already before the Kuṣān period. It is probably much older, for the same mound produced a number of bricks with inscriptions (§120: L.14d 1) which show that a building was erected by the minister of a Hindu king of the Śuṅga period.

The mound nearest to the village also yielded numerous fragments of sandstone sculptures which appear to have belonged to a railing of very small dimensions. On one of the stones there is a fragmentary inscription in characters of the 3rd or 2nd century B.C. (§117: L.14d 2), which proves that there must have been another sanctuary on the spot, though it cannot be decided whether it was Buddhist or Hindu.

§ 117

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of sandstone evidently belonging to a small railing from the mound nearest to the village of Gaṇēshrā, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 121, and by Agrawala, JUPHS 10. 1937, p. 4 No 7a

TEXT

///bhagavaprasāda1///

TRANSLATION

...gifts to the holy one...

The characters are of the third or second century B.C.

§ 118

Fragmentary inscription on a rounded piece of red sandstone found in the second of the Gaṇēshrā mounds, now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 121f. + pl. 2, 2 and ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 128f. + pl. 58, 17.

1 Agrawala: -prasāda, but the ò-sign of dā is distinct.
TEXT

1 ///.r... sa¹ kṣaharātasa Ghaṭākasa ///
2 ///. ye thupa pa[t]i²///

TRANSLATION

... the Stūpa was erected by (some female relative) ... of (kṣat)ṛ(apa) kṣaharātā Ghaṭāka ...

Kṣaharātā seems to be not the name of a clan, as generally assumed, but a title. It is strange that thupa shows no case-ending; perhaps it is the equivalent of Sk. stūpa.

Judging from the characters, the inscription would seem to date from the time of the Saka rulers of Mathurā.

14d
Facsimile: below p. 303

§ 119

<² Inscriptio on the pedestal of a standing figure of which only the feet, apparently shod, remain; from Gāṇeṣhā, now in the Mathurā Museum (G 42).

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the record in Ep. Ind. 24, 1937/38. 1942, p. 206f. No 5.>

TEXT

1 maha[damḍa]nā[yakasya] yamaśa-

<14d 1>

Facsimiles: below p. 304

§ 120

Inscriptions on 26⁴ bricks and brickbats from the second Gāṇeṣhā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum.

They were published by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 122f. + pl. 2,3(representing Vogel's No a and b) and 2,4(No n, o and r), and again, in a more explicite form, ASI Ann. Rep. 1911/12, 2. 1915, p. 129f. (No a—v) + pl. 58, 18(No b). He referred to them also in Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, p. 18f.

¹ Restore: (kṣat)ṛ(apa)sa.
² Vogel: paṭi. Probably to be restored to pa[t]i(ṭhāpita).
³ [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with notes.]
⁴ [Lüders enumerated only 25 inscriptions omitting Vogel's No n (= 19b) which is figured in the JRAS pl. 2,4.]
III. Mathurā District: 8. Gaṇēshrā

[A] 1 (Vogel a) Rohadevasa\(^1\) Kohaḍas[\(a\)]
2 (Vogel b) Rohadevasa Kohaḍa[sa]
3 (Vogel d) .. ha[de]vasa Koha[ḍa]sa
4 (Vogel f) ........ sa Kohaḍasa
5 (Vogel h) Kohaḍasa\(^2\)
6 (Vogel j) Rohade ....\(^3\)
7 (Vogel e) Kohaḍasa Rohadevasa
8 (Vogel g) Kohaḍasa Ro[ha] ....
9 (Vogel c) [K]ohaḍasa Rohade[va] ..
10 (Vogel i) Kohaḍasa\(^4\)
11 (Vogel k) Ko[ha] ....

[B] 12 (Vogel l) Gom ....\(^5\)
13 (Vogel r) Gomi ....\(^5\)
14 (Vogel m) Gom[i]tasa amace ..
15 (omitted by Vogel) .... tasa [a]ma[ce] ..
16 (omitted by Vogel) .... ... sa\(^6\)
17 (Vogel s) [Go]m[ita] ..
18 (Vogel o) Gomitā ....
19[a omitted by Vogel] .. mitāma[c] ..
19b (Vogel n) .. mitāmacena\(^1\)
20 (Vogel q) .... ... macena
21 (Vogel u) .... .... [c]ena R.[ha] ....
22 (Vogel v) .... ...... cena Kohaḍe[na]
23 (Vogel p) .... .... [na] kāritaṃ\(^7\)
24 (Vogel t) .... .. ritāṃ\(^8\)

[[C]] 25 (omitted by Vogel) rāṇo

From this list it appears that there were two types of inscriptions, a shorter one (cf. 1—11) [A] and a larger one (cf. 12—24) [B].

**TEXT**

A Rohadevasa Kohaḍasa or: Kohaḍasa Rohadevasa

**TRANSLATION**

Of Rohadeva, the Kōhaḍa (Kauhaḍa) or: Of the Kōhaḍa Rohadeva.

**TEXT**

B Gomitasa amacena (or: Gomitāmacena) Rohadevena Kohaḍena (or: Kohaḍena Rohadevena or, possibly, only: Rohadevena) kāritaṃ

---

1 In the impression there is a small horizontal stroke above the sa.
2 At the end of the brick.\(^3\) Vogel omits de, but it is distinct.
3 There was no writing before ko.\(^4\) There was no writing before go.
4 According to Mr. Agrawala the reading Gomitasa a is probable.
5 There was no writing after kāritaṃ.\(^7\) There was no writing after ritāṃ.
TRANSLATION

Caused to be made by Rohadeva, the Kohaḍa (or: by the Kohaḍa Rohadeva or, possibly only: by Rohadeva), the minister of Gomita (Gomitra).

As is shown by the inscription on the brick No 25, there seems to have been a third version of the longer inscription [B], where rāṅo

of the king

was added to the name Gomitasa.

I am convinced that Vogel was right in identifying the rājan Gomita with the Gomita, or Gomitra, whose coins have been found at Mathurā,¹ but I cannot agree with him when he speaks of “Kohaḍa, ministre de Gomita”. The personal name of the minister was undoubtedly Rohadeva and Kohaḍa, representing Sk. Kauhaḍa, was his patronymic.

Kohaḍa as a personal name occurs in the gana Śivādayaḥ in Pāṇini 4, 1, 112. According to that rule the patronymic is Kauhaḍi, as is expressly stated in the Kāśikā on Pāṇ. 2, 4, 58.

In the Mahābhārata (Calcutta ed.) Kohala occurs as the name of a Brahmanical Ṛṣi (cf. 1, 2049; 13, 6271; 7671). Kohala, of course, is only the later spelling for Kohaḍa = Kohaḍa. In the Śāradā manuscript of the Ādiparvan, the old form Kohaḍa is preserved and has been wrongly replaced by Kahoḍa in the Critical Edition (1, 48, 9).²

But Kohaḍa or Kohala was at all times a widely spread name. It is the name of several authors; the Vedic school of the Kauhalīyas is mentioned Gobhila-Grhyasūtra 3, 4, 34, and Kauhaliputra is quoted as an authority on phonetics in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya (17,2).

9. From Naugavā

14b

§ 121

Fragmentary inscription in three lines on the pedestal of a seated Buddha image of which only the left foot together with the drapery below the legs is preserved. The first lines are engraved on the upper rim, the third line on the lower rim of the pedestal. The pedestal, which is now in the Mathurā Museum, was obtained by Pandit Radha Krishna

from the village of Naugavā, 4½ miles south-west of Mathurā City, south of the Gōvardhan road.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 60 (A 50).

TEXT

1 ...... [bhikṣ][u[s[y)a Dharmahastika ..1///
2 vihāre ..2///
3 [p][r][a][t]im[a]3 p[r]at[is]th]ap[i][t]a4///

TRANSLATION

... of the monk Dharmahastika ... ... at the vihāra an image ...
... was set up.

10. Giridharpur Mounds

Giridharpur is a village situated about 3 miles west-south-west of Mathurā City. In 1874 Growse said: "Within the borders of Giridharpur may be traced a very extensive tank, now converted into ploughed fields, with a series of mounds all round its margin. These are unquestionably Buddhist Stūpas, and will be examined. They are covered with small fragments of carved stone, indicating that here destruction was more than usually complete, and that the images were not only thrown down but deliberately broken to pieces."

Only few sculptures seem to have been recovered from the Giridharpur mounds since that time, among them being the stones bearing the inscriptions §122: L. 91d and §123: L. 77a. The inscriptions allow us to determine the age of the buildings that once occupied the site, §122: L. 91d being written in the alphabet of the pre-Kuśān period, whereas §123: L. 77a and §124: L. 92c show the characters of the early Kuśān times, but they are unfortunately so much damaged as to throw no light on the nature of those buildings. Nor can the relief with the figure of a Nāgī, standing between two warriors armed with spears, prove much in this respect, as it was not found in one of the mounds at Giridharpur, but in a bagicā near the village.

---

1 This portion of the inscription was not read by Vogel. The reading of the first word is not certain.
2 There was probably some more writing after vihāre, but it is entirely effaced. [After the word there is a dot in the middle of the line.]
3 The a-stroke of mā is attached to the bottom-line of the letter. [Cf. above p. 89, n. 7.]
4 [The second member of the third aksara is preserved only in its upper part, but the dot distinguishing tha from tha seems to be indicated.] The vowel-signs are uncertain, but sṭha and tā are more probable than sṭhā and tā.
5 Growse, Mathurā1 1874 Pt 1, p. 106.
6 The relief is now preserved in the Mathurā Museum; cf. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 116 (F 32).
11 7761 Abb. Phil. Hist. KL. 3. F., Nr. 47, Lüders'-Janert
§ 122

Fragmentary inscription on a broken lintel from the Giridharpur Tilā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1317).

**Text**

Golāśvastasya¹ Buddhayaśasya vāy.///

**Translation**

Of Golāśvasta Buddhayaśa (Buddhayaśas) . . . .

The meaning of the strange term Golāśvasta is unknown to me.

§ 123

Fragmentary inscription² on a round object from the Giridharpur Tilā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1315). The proper left side of the stone is lost. The writing and the age of the inscription have been discussed above p. 161.

**Text**

1. \(\text{varṣ}[a]\)³
2. mahārājasya 200 70 bh[ū]\(^4\)///
3. Gōtamiye balānā[s].\(^5///\)
4. tu [mā]\(^6\)

¹ Judging from the back of the impression, there seems to have been no writing before \(\text{go}\) and the short vertical stroke at the top of \(\text{sta}\) is accidental.

² [As an exceptional case in the Manuscript, the treatment of this inscription is written by typewriter with some handwritten corrections of the author who later on crossed out the transcript and the notes attached to it (see below note 3ff.). The revised version of these parts of this article is missing in the Manuscript.]

³ The word which seems to belong to the date has apparently been added afterwards.

⁴ The vowel-sign may have been \(-u\) or \(-ā\). [The reading bhū seems to be more probable as in one of the two impressions of our collection two horizontal strokes, one below the other, are to be seen attached to the right bar of the bha.]

⁵ The letter following nā may have been sya or sa, but this is not quite certain.

⁶ Perhaps tu [mā] was followed by another aksara which is now illegible. The two or three letters [written closely above the first aksaras of the fifth line] seem to have been inserted afterwards. [In the impressions the bottom-line of the second letter read as ma is not visible and the supposed ā-sign is hanging almost straight down from the right arm of the letter. — Meant as: mātu ?]
5 baladhikāsya bhū
6 bhāryaye dānaṁ sa[r]ya

It is impossible to offer a coherent translation of the inscription. Probably varṣ[a] is meant to be inserted either before or after the numerical figures. At any rate the inscription is dated in the year 270 of the Mahārāja. The era used here is undoubtedly the same as that used in the Mathurā inscription List No 78 which is dated 'in the year 299 of the mahārāja rājātīrāja'. As to the possible beginning of this era, I refer to my remarks on No 78.

Our inscription records the gift of a lady who is called Gotamī (Gautamī), and the wife of some person who is styled as baladhika, evidently an imperfect writing for balādhika. Possibly baladhika is the same military title which appears in the form of balādhikṛta in the Shāhpur inscription (CII 3, No 43 with p. 210, 2), or it may stand for the more common title balādhya[kṣa]. The name of the baladhika of our inscription is lost with exception of the first letter which probably was bhū. The words between Gotamiye and baladhikāsya must belong to the further description of the donatrix. Perhaps we may restore balānā in line 3 as balānā[s]ya dhī and combine the restored dhī with the tu in the next inserted line as (dhī)tu, although in this way the [mā] after the tu would be left unexplained. Balāna would be the true Saka equivalent of the Iranian name Vardāna which as Valāna and Ulāna occurs also in records of the Kuṣān time.

1 [The two vertical strokes rising at either end of the horizontal bar of the ka are perhaps only accidental flaws. At the lower part of the vertical bar of the akṣara in question there is a short but distinct stroke slanting down to the left.]

2 The letter was possibly bhū. [The lower part of the vertical of the bha is not quite straight, but slightly turned to the right the u-sign rising at right angles. The other vowel-sign denoting the length of the -u is written as in the bhū of the second line; cf. above p. 162, n. 4. These parts of the letter are connected by a vertical bar which seems to be accidental. Below the akṣara a sign resembling a ta seems to be written the upper part of which touches the bhū.]

3 The r-sign is uncertain.

4 The reading of the first akṣara is uncertain [as it is written in its left part not as a semicircle like in the dhī of line 5, but almost as a rectangular. It seems not impossible that the engraver intended at first to write a ba, but taking notice of his fault he finished the akṣara as dha. — To be read as: (bu*)dha?]

5 [The sa is hanging above the line, inclined to the left; cf. the sa in l. 6.] Of the next four letters only the ma is certain. [The i-sign of p[i] is only faintly visible and crossed by a flaw. The mātrkā of the [du] is to be compared with the da in dānam the lower part of which having disappeared by a long vertical cut. The sign following the [du] consists of two broad parallel strokes connected by a curved line which seems to be accidental.]

6 [The Manuscript does not contain the treatment of the inscription List No 78.]

7 The expression mahāvalādhikṛta occurs in the Majhgavām Copper-plates, CII 3, p. 106ff. No 23 + pl. 14 (line 20), and in the Khōh Copper-plates, CII 3, p. 125ff. No 28 + pl. 18 (line 31), p. 132ff. No 30 + pl. 19 B (line 13).
If the suggested restoration should be correct, it would follow that the donatrix was of Saka descent which at first sight would seem incompatible with her designation as Gotamī. But Gotamī needs not necessarily be taken as an epithet characterizing her as belonging to the Brahmanical gotra of the Gautamas. Among the Buddhists Gotamī appears to have been used also as a personal name in remembrance of the foster mother of the Buddha. As such it occurs e.g. in the Sāṅcī inscription List No 623 which records a gift of the nun Gotamī. Unfortunately this explanation also is uncertain, as the object of the gift cannot be made out, and we do not know whether the donatrix was an adherent of the Buddhist creed.

Assuming that pūcaye is a clerical error for pūjāye and that the next word begins with sapitu, the words of the last line may perhaps be translated:

for the worship of ... (in honour) of her father and mother.

\( \text{\textsection 124} \)

Facsimile: below p. 305

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a slab showing a Nāgī and a male figure with a spear in his left hand and the right raised in abhayamudrā, from the Giridharpur Tīlā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1316).

\textbf{TEXT}

///[s]ya prāvārika[s]ya ///

\textbf{TRANSLATION}

... ... of the cloakmaker ... ...

11. Pālikherā

The mound at Pālikherā, a village situated about three miles south-west of the Kaṭrā, must have been the site of a Buddhist sanctuary of considerable importance.

In the winter of 1873/74 Growse discovered here the famous ‘Bacchanalian group’, the companions of Colonel Stacy’s ‘Silenus’.\(^2\)

In 1915/16 trial excavations, undertaken by Pandit Radha Krishna, resulted in unearthing the stone-bowl with the inscription \textsection 125: L. 143d,

\(^1\) The akṣaras read as sya are uncertain.

which proves that the sanctuary was a vihāra of the Mahāsaṅghika school, and the Bodhisattva image¹ bearing the inscription §126: L. 41b.

A detached head with the monogram treated under §127: L. 143c shows that also the statue of an Indo-Scythian prince was set up at that place.

For palaeographical reasons these finds as well as the fragmentary inscription §128: L. 21c and the mason's mark §129: L. 143i must be assigned to the Kuśān period.

〈143d〉
Facsimiles: below p. 306

§ 125

Fragmentary inscription on the edge of a monumental stone-bowl from the Pālīkherā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 662).


TEXT

///(Mahā)sāmghīyānam² parīg[r]a[he] mā[t]āpitṛṇ[ā]n³ . . . . . nam⁴ hita[s](ukhāye) bh[ava][t][u] — + ⁵

TRANSLATION

(The bowl was given) for the acceptance of the (Mahā)sāmghiyas (Mahāsaṅghikas).⁶ Let it be for the welfare and happiness of the parents (of the donor), of . . . . .

The characters of the inscription belong to the Kuśān period.

〈41b〉
Facsimile: below p. 307

§ 126

Inscription on the upper and lower rims of the pedestal of a Bodhisattva statue from Pālīkherā, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N. S. 4145).

¹ In the ASI Ann. Rep. 1923/24. 1926, p. 231 it is stated that the image came from the Pālīkherā mound.
² [The fourth akṣara of the whole word may be read as ṇighi.]
³ The ā-sign of ṇā/ is probable. After this word writing filling about 16'' is obliterated.
⁴ [It seems probable to read the remnants of the letter before nam as /[vā]/; the word may be restored as (sarvasat)/[vā]/nam.]
⁵ [After the horizontal stroke there is a maṅgala symbol.]

**TEXT**

1 (mahārājasya) [d(e)vaputrasa Huv[i]śkasya sa[m] 30 9 va 3 di 5 etasya[m] purva[y](a)m) ñh[i]khuniye Puśaha[th]iniye [a](mtevāsi)-
2 ni[y](e)²
3 bh[i]khuniye Budhadevāye Bodhisatvato pratithāpito³ sahā mātāpitihī⁴ sarvasat[v]ahitasukh[a]⁵///

**Translation**

In the year 39 of mahārāja devaputra Huviṣka, in the 3rd (month) of the rainy season, on the 5th day, on this date, the Bodhisattva was set up by the nun Budhadevā (Buddhadevā), the female pupil of the nun Puśahathini (Puṣyahastinī), together with her parents for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

(143e)
Faesimile: below p. 307

§ 127

K 209

The Pālikheṭā mound is the finding place of a detached head, which is now preserved in the Mathurā Museum (No 1566).

It is figured in Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 4c—d.

---

1 The true reading may be purva[y](e).
2 Sahni reads sa after Puśaha[th]iniye and ignores the distinct ni below the ye. The aksāra, which Sahni takes to be sa, is apparently an initial a, and faint traces of the mātrkā of a ya are visible after the ni in the second line. As the photograph of the stone clearly shows that the corner of the upper rim is broken off, I have no doubt that the word is to be restored as [a]/(mtevāsi)/ni[y](e).
3 [On the plate in Ep. Ind. 19. 1927/28 the lower parts of ta and pra are distinctly visible.]
4 [The t-sign of ti is quite distinct.]
5 [There is a horizontal stroke above the first sa, therefore from the purely graphical point of view the reading samrca would be possible. On the plate in Ep. Ind. 19. 1927/28 the fourth aksāra shows a subscript va below the ta.] The end of the word may be restored as -sukh[a]/(ye) or as -sukh[a]/(rtham).
The head is covered with the conical cap which is a characteristic feature of the Indo-Scythian dress. On the right side the cap is decorated with a crescent. On the left side there is a monogram consisting of the Brāhmi letters la, va, and na, placed immediately one below the other.

The lowermost aksara may also be taken as na, if it is assumed that in interlacing the letters, the top-stroke of the na was merged into the bottom-line of the va, just as the small top-stroke of the va apparently coincides with the bottom-line of the la.

The intended reading may therefore have been Lavanā (or:) Lavana.

We find a similar monogram on the cap of a head from the village of Māṭ (cf. § 101: L. 80f). It is not quite easy to say what was the meaning of these monograms. I should suggest that they are personal names, perhaps in an abbreviated form, and that people had them embroidered on their clothing as a mark of property.

In this connection I should like to refer to two well-known scenes of the Mṛcchakatikā: Vasantasenā recognises the mantle of her lover by the name worked into it (II 20, 10) and Samsthanaka desists from covering the strangled courtesan with his cloak because it has his name on it and therefore might lead to detection (VIII 43, 23).²

(21c)

Facsimile: below p. 307

§ 128

Fragmentary inscription on the upper and lower rims of the pedestal of a Bodhisattva image from Pālikherā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 664).

TEXT

1 [ma]³ ................. [savatṣa]re 8 va[rṣa]m[āṣ]e 2 ...... [pra]⁴

Sihakasya dānaṃ B[odhi]⁵///

2 ............... p. p. ........................................ na⁶ sukhā[ye]

---

¹ Cf. ed. Parab 1900, p. 77.
² Cf. op. cit., p. 220.
³ The reading of the sign is not quite certain. After it about eight aksaras seem to have followed which are now entirely obliterated. The words mahārājasya Kaniṣkasya would exactly fill the gap before [savatṣa]re.
⁴ The aksara seems to be pra [or 8].
⁵ May we restore (divasse) [pra] and take [pra] as an abbreviation of prathame? It is hardly possible to read [sthe] instead of [pra], and the restoration *divase ṣaṣṭhe is therefore very improbable.
⁶ [The vowel-sign of the first aksara is certain in its right part which is denoted by a horizontal stroke to the right. Only faint traces of the second letter are preserved.] The word probably is to be restored as B[odhi](sateo).
⁷ The reading na is more probable than ta. Perhaps the original reading was sarvasatvānāṃ.
TRANSLATION

In the year 8 (of mahārāja Kaniśka?), in the second month of the rainy season, (on the) ...(day), the (Bodhisattva?) (was set up as) the gift of Sihaka (Simhaka) ....... for the happiness (of all sentient beings).

§ 129

On the back of an architectural piece found in the Pālikheṇā mound, now in the Mathurā Museum, there is one letter which seems to be the rest of an inscription or, more probably, a mason’s mark.

The akṣara is to be read as

ry[a]¹

§ 130

Fragmentary inscription on a broken pedestal from Pālikheṇā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1217).

Only a few letters are legible on the proper right side (a) and a single letter on the proper left side (b), which is covered with chisel marks.

TEXT

a 1 ... [r]asya
2 ... katya²
b sa///

No sense can be discerned.

§ 131

Fragmentary inscription on a broken pedestal from Pālikheṇā, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1211).

The inscription is engraved on the front side (a) and on the rim on the proper left facet of the pedestal (b), but only the latter portion is still legible.

TEXT

a .........

b ......... tv[ā]nāṃ³ hit[a]sukhaē

¹ At the top of the ligature there is a stroke to the left. It is therefore possible to read the akṣara as ry[e] or as ry[i].
² The last akṣara may also be read as tyi or rtya.
³ Restore: (sarvasa)tv[ā]nāṃ.
TRANSLATION

... for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

12. From Salempur

§ 132

Inscription on an architectural piece discovered at the Salempur well (about 3½ miles to the south-west of Mathurā City), now in the Mathurā Museum (No 735).

TEXT

Dharma

The characters are very old. Perhaps Dharma is the abbreviated name of the sculptor.

13. From the Mahōlī—Usphār Road

14e

Facsimile: below p. 308

§ 133

The stone bearing this inscription was obtained by Pandit Radha Krishna from a place on the perambulation road between the villages of Mahōlī and Usphār, about 3 and 6 miles respectively south-west of the City. It is now in the Mathurā Museum. The stone in question is the fragment of a sculpture which may have represented a Nāga. The inscription is incised on the front face, the second line being continued on the proper left face of the base.

It was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math 1910, p. 90 (C 16), and again ASI Ann. Rep. 1908/09. 1912, p. 162.

TEXT

1 [śri-]Aśv[a]dev[a]sya¹
2 Bhavanandī-pṛāvar[i]kaputrāsya²

¹ The first aksara is very imperfectly written. Vogel: ʿsr/i/. The true reading of the last but one letter is possibly vā. In that case we would have to read Aśvadevāśya.
² Vogel: Bhuvana-tripravaraka-putrasya, but in bhu the u-sign is never expressed by the elongation of the vertical line; the fourth aksara is clearly ndi not tri; the ā-sign of prā is quite distinct, and the -i of r/i, though a little blurred, is absolutely certain. The trā (not ttra as assumed by Vogel) shows the same elongation of the vertical as the bha.
TRANSLATION

Of Aśvadeva, the son of the cloakmaker Bhavanandin.

The letters of the inscription are badly and irregularly shaped, and considering the form of the bha and the ta, the inscription can hardly be earlier than 400 A. D.

14. Anyōr

Anyōr is a village at the south-eastern foot of the Girirāj or Gōvardhan hill which at present is dedicated to the worship of Kṛṣṇa. During the rule of the Kuśāns and probably even before that time it must have been the site of a Buddhist vihāra of which the two statues bearing the inscriptions §134: L.12a and §135: L.13 have survived.

12a

Facsimiles: below p. 309

§ 134

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a statuette discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna at Anyōr, where it was worshipped as the goddess Durgā by the Malkhānā Thākurs of the village. The statuette is now in the Mathurā Museum. It represents the Buddha seated, in the attitude of imparting protection (Sk. abhayamudrā), but in the inscription it is probably called a Bodhisattva.

The statuette is figured ASI Ann. Rep. 1930—34, 2. 1936, pl. 122a (cf. p. 253). With the exception of the date, the inscription, which runs on the raised rims above and beneath the bas-relief of the pedestal, is for the most part illegible. Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 63 (A 65), read only the date of the year and the month.

TEXT

1 sam 50 1 gr[i] 3 di [4]1 asya puvayā . . . m[a] . . [hāth. grasa] . .2
2 . . [sya] . . .3 Bo . . . [t].4 a . . rya5 Ma . . . [ṅghika]na6 par[i] . . [h].7

1 The figure is indistinct and not quite certain.
2 The reading of these letters is very doubtful.
3 Something like dānam may have stood in the lacuna.
4 Probably to be restored to bo(dhisa)/[t](o).
5 Perhaps to be restored to a(ca)rya, although we should expect the equivalent of ācāryānām.
6 The aksara ṅghī is pretty distinct. As there is no curve at the bottom of the following aksara it may be read only as ka, although the middle-bar of the letter is missing. The original reading was probably mahāsāṅghikana. [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 19.]
7 Restore: par[z]/(gra)[h]/(e).
III. Mathurā District: 14. Anyor

TRANSLATION

In the year 51, in the 3rd (month) of summer, on the 4th (?) day, on this date, ... the Bodhisattva (?), the (gift) of ... ..., for the acceptance of the teachers (?), the Mahāsāṅghikas.

§ 135

Inscription on the upper rim of the pedestal of a seated Buddha, discovered by Cunningham in 1882/83 outside the village of Anyor and acquired for the Mathurā Museum in 1908 by Pandit Radha Krishna. The record was published by Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 20. 1885, p. 49 + pl. 5,5, by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 48f. (A 2) with a photolithograph of the image on pl. 8, and again by Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2. 1914, p. 64f. with a reproduction of the image (pl. 23b) and the inscription (pl. 29.2). [The sculpture was figured also by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Indian Sculpture 1929, pl. 83 (l.).]

TEXT

2 vihāre sahā mātāpithi — sarvasatvānāṃ hitasukhartha[ṇ]

TRANSLATION

The gift of the Śākya lay brother Suṣa Hāruṣa, an image of the Buddha at the convent of Utthara Hāruṣa, together with his parents, for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

Suṣa Hāruṣa and Utthara Hāruṣa are apparently foreign names, though Utthara may stand for Sk. Uttara. The use of double names reminds of such names as Vag(r)a Mareg(r)a and Haṣṭṭhunā Mareg(r)a, which are probably Iranian in the Wardak Vase inscription (CII 2, 1, p. 170 No 86).

1 Cunningham and Vogel read: upāsakasya. The first two signs in Cunningham’s facsimile are perfectly imaginary. The form of the initial Ṛ as given there does not yet exist at the time of the inscription. The māṭrā kya can be easily recognized on the back of the impression, and only the śa is indistinct.
2 The anusvāra is distinctly visible on the back of the impression. The stroke before dānam appears to be intentional.
3 Vogel: Uṭtarasya, but the first aksara is clearly ā.
4 The ā-stroke of h[ā] is not quite distinct in the impression. In an old rubbing of Cunningham which unfortunately is partly spoiled by tracing the letters in pencil the sya is clearer than in the impression recently made.
5 The stroke may be accidental.
6 The anusvāra is not quite certain.
For palaeographical reasons the date of the inscription cannot be later than the beginning of the Kuśān rule.
Vogel is inclined to refer Hāruṣa to the native place of Suṣa and Uttara, but until now Hāruṣa has not turned up as a geographical name.

15. From Sonkh

\(31b\)

Facsimile: below p. 309

§ 136

Inscription on the base of a Bodhisattva statuette which is said to have been found in a mound at the village of Sonkh, Mathurā Tahsil, about 14 miles to the south-west of the City. The stone is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1602). The inscription consists of three lines engraved on the upper rim, in the middle on both sides of the central sculpture, and on the lower rim of the pedestal, respectively.

It was briefly noticed in the ASI Northern Circle, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, Ann. Rep. for 1920/21\textdegree{} (not accessible to me), and edited by D. R. Sahni, JRAS 1924, p. 400f. No 2.

TEXT

1 maharasya Kāṇi\textsuperscript{1} 20 3\textsuperscript{2} gr 1 etasya[m] purvayaṃ v[i]hārasv[ā]m[i]sya Gun[d]asya\textsuperscript{3} dhitā\textsuperscript{4} Puśyada\textsuperscript{5}
2 Bodhisatvāṃ pray[ati]\textsuperscript{6}
3 svake vih[ā]re [sarvasatvanam hi] . . . . . \textsuperscript{7}

TRANSLATION

(In the year) 23 of mahārāja Kāṇi(śka), in the 1\textsuperscript{st} (month) of summer, on this date, Puṣyada(tā), the daughter of the lord of the vihāra, Gunda, sets up a Bodhisattva in her own vihāra (for the welfare and happiness) of all sentient beings.

\textsuperscript{1} Fault of the engraver for maharajasya Kāniśkaśya sam. In the date the day also has apparently been omitted by mistake.
\textsuperscript{2} Sahni has drawn attention to the fact that there is a horizontal stroke above the three bars denoting the figure 3, and has suggested that the figure might be meant for 4. But, as he remarked himself, there is no example of such representation of the numeral 4 and, as the uppermost stroke is thinner and longer than those below it, I am convinced that it is accidental. Mr. Agrawala is of the same opinion.
\textsuperscript{3} Sahni: vihārisya Massagabhasya (?). The reading of the title and the name is absolutely certain.
\textsuperscript{4} Sahni: dhiṭi, but the ā-sign is distinct.
\textsuperscript{5} Perhaps, as suggested by Sahni, Puṣyada is a clerical mistake for Puṣyadatā.
\textsuperscript{6} The engraver has forgotten to incise the right vertical of the pa.
\textsuperscript{7} Restore: [hi](tasukāye) or [hi](tasukhārtham).
Inscription on the back of a statue of a standing Nāga discovered by Pandit Radha Krishna in 1908 near the village of Chārgāon, ten miles map-measurement almost due south of Mathurā City and about one mile south-south-west of Bhainsā. The statue is now in the Mathurā Museum.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 88f. (C 13), and again ASI Ann. Rep. 1908/09. 1912, p. 160f. + pl. 53 (image) and 56a (inscription). The statue was figured by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 41a—b (cf. p. 48), and again: Indian Serpent-lore 1926, pl. 5 (cf. p. 42 and 282), by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Indian Sculpture 1929, pl. 97, by Smith, History of fine Art in India and Ceylon² 1930, fig. 84, etc.

TEXT

1 maharajasya r[a]jāttirājasya Huvi[s]kasya¹ savatsara ca[ta]riśa² 40
2 hemattam[a]s[e]³ 2 divase 20 3 etta purvāyya
3 Senahastì⁴ [ca]⁵ Piṇḍapayaputro⁶ Bhōndake⁷ [ca]⁸
4 Viravṛddhiputro etti vayyasyā ubhayye

¹ [Vogel: Huviskasya. He apparently took the upper part of the third aksara as s- as its left vertical is bent outwards and the bottom-line not closed, comparing the ligature of the word in question with the second aksara of puṣkaranya (line 5) which is written differently.]
² In the impression the right half of the second aksara is not visible; perhaps the letter was never quite finished. Vogel read ca[tu]riśa, but such a form does never occur in any dialect and we may just as well read ca[ta]riśa or even ca[tva]riśa.
³ Probably meant for hemantamase. [At the upper right part of the ma there is a small but distinct stroke to the right which makes the reading māse instead of mase possible.]
⁴ I think that this reading proposed by Vogel is right, but it implies that here the ha of the later Eastern alphabet is used.
⁵ The impression shows nothing but two vertical strokes. Here again it looks as if the letter had not been finished. [Concerning this sign Lüders remarked later on in the Manuscript:] h? [i.e. he then took the sign as the visarga belonging to the preceding word. Senahastih, the later reading, seems to be more probable than Senahasti [ca] given in the text above.]
⁶ [The last but one aksara bears the u-sign as well as the ã-sign.]
⁷ Vogel waves between Bhōndake and Bhōndake and decides for the former. But the u-sign should be a straight stroke, while the va in the preceding word is almost exactly the same as here. The ke instead of ko seems to be due to the negligence of the engraver who forgot to draw the right bar of the o-sign.
⁸ Here the ca looks exactly like va.
5 nātā\(^1\) prattistāpenti\(^2\) puṣkaraṇiyya\(^3\)
6 svakā[yyāṁ]\(^4\) priy[y]att[i]\(^5\) bhagavā nāgo

**Translation**

In the fortieth – 40\(^{th}\) – year of mahārāja rājātirāja Huviśka, in the 2\(^{nd}\) month of winter, on the 23\(^{rd}\) day, on this date, Senahasti (Senahastin), the son of Piṇḍapayya, and Bhonḍaka, the son of Viravṛddhi (Viravṛddhi), these two comrades set up both (this) Nāga at his own tank. May the lord Nāga be pleased!

Vogel translates his reading puṣkaraṇiyya svakayyāṁ with: “at their own tank”, but svaka refers to the Nāga. The present priyyatti, instead of the more common priyātāṁ, seems to be used in analogy to jayati.

---

**Text**

1 ... [ra]jati[raja] .......... [pu]tra\(^6\) ....
2 ................. [pu]rvāyyā\(^7\) ....

---

\(^1\) Properly the second akṣara ought to be read tā, though what is meant is undoubtedly gam.
\(^2\) The tti is disfigured by one cut which seems to be accidental. In stā the subscript -ta is attached to the sa in a very odd way; perhaps what looks like -ta is really the upper part of a -tha the lower part of which was not executed. Of the e-sign only the end resembling a dot is distinct in the impression. The last sign may be taken as nti.
\(^3\) Perhaps a very small ā-sign is attached to the yya, but there is no anusvāra.
\(^4\) The intended reading is certainly svakāyyāṁ, but instead of yyāṁ we might just as well read ryyā; cf. the rva in line 2.
\(^5\) The subscript -ta looks more like -na. [Lüders transcribed the last akṣara as tti. Curiously enough he calls special attention to this letter (see in the text above) without indicating that the transiteration tta (cf. the sya of 1. 4) would be also possible and that the equivalent for priyyatāṁ, the more common reading, may have been meant by the engraver, writing priyyattā without the sign for the anusvāra at the end.]
\(^6\) Restore: [ra]jati[raja]/sya dera/[pu]tra(sya).
\(^7\) Vogel: [pu]rvāyya. The ā-strokes are pretty distinct.
III. Mathurā District: 17. Parkham

3 ................................ [k]āsas[v]avah[a]darava¹...
4 ................................ payati²...

I am unable to offer a translation. I cannot suggest anything that would satisfy myself as to the meaning of the eight syllables preserved in line 3. All that can be said is that the inscription probably recorded the setting up of some image or shrine and that it was dated in the reign of some king who by his title rājātirāja and devaputra is shown to have been one of the four Kuśān rulers. It is not unlikely that it is contemporary with the inscription § 137: L. 149b and was in some way connected with it.

17. From Parkham

150

§ 139

Facsimile: below p. 311

§ 16

On a tour during the cold season of 1882/83, Cunningham discovered a colossal standing statue of grey sandstone at Parkham, a village situated on a low mound 15 miles south of the City of Mathurā and several miles to the east of the road leading from Agra to Mathurā. The statue was worshipped at that time by the villagers under the name of Devatā. Later on it was transferred to the Mathurā Museum (C 1).

It represents a corpulent man cut in the round, including the pedestal 8’ 8” or 2,62 m high. The head is detached and both arms are broken off. The figure is clothed in a dhoti which is secured by two flat girdles, one round the waist and one round the loins. The neck is decorated with a necklace and a torque with four dependent tassels at the back. The left knee is slightly bent. The position of the arms cannot be determined with certainty, but a break on the left side of the image makes it probable that the left hand was placed on the hip. According to Cunningham the statue shows traces of having been highly polished. There is an inscription in early Brāhmi characters on the top of the pedestal (on both sides of the feet [line 1 and 3] and between them [line 2]).

A description of the statue together with a photolithograph (showing the statue as well as a facsimile of the record) and the first reading of the inscription were published by Cunningham ASI [Ann.] Rep. 20. 1885, p. 39—41 + pl. 6. Cunningham conjectured that the statue was that of “a Yaksha, or attendant demi-god, who carried a chaurī over the right shoulder,” and on account of the characters of the inscription which he took to be of the Aśoka period, he assigned the statue to the third

¹ The third aksara read sa by Vogel seems to have a subscript letter, either -va or -ta. The fifth letter is certainly not pi as read by Vogel, but ha, hā or ho.
² Vogel: [pri]jati, apparently a misprint for [pri]yati. There being no trace of the i-sign and the subscript -r being quite hypothetic, payati, to be restored to (pratiṣṭhā)payati, would seem to be preferable.
century B.C. The whole inscription, including the second line which had been overlooked by Cunningham, was read, "with every reserve", again by Konow, Ind. Ant. 38. 1909, p. 147, note 5.

In the following year Vogel gave a description of the statue accompanied by a photolithographic reproduction and his reading of the inscription in Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 83 + pl. 12. Vogel thought that it was not very likely that an image of this size should have served the purpose of a simple attendant, and, as there is no indication that it held any object over the shoulder, he felt inclined to identify it with Kubera, which would agree with the corpulence of the figure. From the characters of the inscription he inferred that the statue was to be dated in the second century B.C.

When K. P. Jayaswal had advanced the startling thesis that the two Patna statues in the Calcutta Museum were portrait statues of Śaśunāga kings, Brindavan C. Bhattacharya, in a paper in the JBORS 5.1919, p. 402—404 (Śaśunākā Statues), drew attention to the close resemblance of the Parkham image to those Patna statues, without inferring from it more than the essential identity of the three images as regards the character of the persons represented.

O. C. Gangoly went a step further. In the Modern Review, March 1919, he pointed out that the three statues were similar in every respect to a statue from Pawāyā which, by its inscription, had been proved to represent the Yakṣa Māṇibhadra, and he concluded from it that the Parkham statue as well as the two Patna statues could not be anything but Yakṣa statues. He suggested that the Parkham image represented Gardabhaka, the presiding genius of Mathurā.

B. C. Bhattacharya's paper induced K. P. Jayaswal to examine the inscription of the Parkham image, and consequently he found it to state that the statue was that of the Māgadhā King Kuṇika Ajātaśatru, set up in the 36th year of his reign, which would approximately correspond to 515 B.C. After a short preliminary note on his new reading (JBORS 5. 1919, p. 550f.), K. P. Jayaswal edited the inscription with an elaborate commentary JBORS 6. 1920, p. 173—188. The paper is accompanied by six plates showing front and side views of the statue and reproductions of impressions, plaster and paper casts, tracings by Bishun Swarup, and Cunningham's drawings of the inscription.

Whereas K. P. Jayaswal's interpretation had found the support of Haraprasad Shastri (JBORS 5. 1919, p. 563), it was strongly opposed by

1 A full description of the statue, accompanied by a photolithograph, and an edition of the inscription were published by Garde, ASI Ann. Rep. 1915/16, 2. 1918, p. 105f. + pl. 55, pl. 57, b—c.
2 G. Š. H. Ojhā expressed his full agreement with the reading and interpretation of K. P. Jayaswal in the Nāgariprakārāṇi Patrikā 1. 1920, p. 79 + plates. Griersom, JRAS 1921, p. 286, briefly noticed the just mentioned article and a discussion by Chandradhara Śarma Gulēri on the question of the so-called Patna statues. [Cf. above, p. 131, n. 1.]
Ramaprasad Chanda, University of Calcutta, Journal of the Department of Letters 4, 1921, p. 54—72, and plates 1—3 showing an excellent impression, plaster and paper moulds of the inscription. N. G. Majumdar made a valuable suggestion regarding the restoration of the first word of the inscription (ibid., p. 55, note 1) and contributed a note on the palaeography of the inscription IHQ 2, 1926, p. 444f.

The image was analysed by Sir John Marshall, Cambridge History of India, vol. 1 (1922), p. 620 + pl. 12, 26. It was figured by Bachhofer, Frühind. Plastik/Early Ind. Sculpture 1929, pl. 11, by Vogel, Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 42, by A. K. Coomaraswamy, Yakshas Pt 1 (1928), pl. 1, History of Indian and Indones. Art/Geschichte der ind. u. indones. Kunst 1927, pl. 3, 9, etc.—[Cf. also V. S. Agrawala, Cat. Brahm. Images 1951, p. 75—77.]

TEXT

1 (Mā)nibhadapuge[h]i kā(r)ī(t)ā (bha)ga[v]a(to (patimā)1

1 The first partially preserved aksara has been read ni by all except Konow who took it to be [“possibly”] the sign for om. I do not see how that would be possible. I consider the reading ni quite certain, the right part of the base-line of na being distinctly visible. The next two aksaras are bhada by common consent. It will be noticed that the line of writing is slightly ascending, and as about 2½ inches of the stone are broken off at the beginning of the inscription, it may be safely assumed that one aksara standing a little lower than ni has been lost before nibhada. I have not the slightest doubt that N. G. Majumdar’s restoration of nibhada as (Mā)nibhada is essentially correct, though I should prefer the reading (Mā)ni-bhada. — Instead of the plain pu, Jayaswal read pra apparently for no other reason but his inability to harmonize pu with his ideas about the purport of the inscription. — The following aksara was read ga by Cunningham, Konow, Vogel, sē by Jayaswal. The mātrkā is obviously ga (it is certainly not śa), but the e-sign is very probable. — The vowel-sign of the next letter was taken to be -ā by Cunningham, but it is certainly -i as recognised by Konow, Vogel and Jayaswal. The mātrkā has generally been taken as ra; Jayaswal alone read ni by assuming an archaic form of na which does not exist. But as observed by F. Gelpke [cf. above Preface, p. 12, n. 2], the letter cannot be ra, the lower end of the vertical showing a distinct bend to the right which does not occur in the ra of any period. The aksara therefore can have been only hi or pi, although the right half of the letter has disappeared.

The following letter was read kā by Konow and nā by Vogel. In the impressions before me it is distinctly kā. Of the following two aksaras only the vowel-signs have been preserved, the first being certainly -i, the second most probably -ā. The restoration kā(r)i(t)ā is obvious.

The following letter has been completely destroyed. The next three letters were read garāṇa (or garana) by Konow. The ga may be called certain, whereas the last aksara in my opinion is clearly to. The letter between ga and to is doubtful. It is hardly ra, but probably a letter of which only the vertical at the top has been preserved, while the lower portion is damaged. In my opinion the letter is to be read as [va]. — It is tempting to restore.. ga .. to as (bha)ga[va]to and to assume that the following letters which are quite illegible were patimā, but it must be borne in mind that the reading bhagavato patimā is to a large extent conjectural. — According to Jayaswal the text runs after -puge[h]i (or, as he reads, pra-Śeni) as follows: Ajā(ta)sṛtru (or tṛtru) rājo S[i]rī.
2 aṭha(h)i [bhātu]hi
3 Kuṇikatevāsinā Gomitakena katā

TRANSLATION

The image of the Holy One was caused to be made by eight brothers, members of the Māṇibhada (Māṇibhadra) congregation. It has been made by Gomitaka (Gomitraka), the pupil of Kuṇika.

I do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion of Jayaswal’s translation, as it is based on readings and interpretations which display an utter disregard of all that we know of palaeography and grammar. Anybody who compares the statue with the two Patna statues or the Gwalior statue of Māṇibhadra will be convinced that it is the image of a Yakṣa.

Provided my restoration (bha)ga[va]to is correct, the Yakṣa would be called only bhagavat in the inscription exactly as in the Masharfa inscription. But as in that inscription there can be no doubt that bhagavat refers to Māṇibhadra, since the donor calls his grandfather a Māṇibhada, i.e. a votary of Māṇibhadra, here also bhagavat can be understood only as the reverential designation of Māṇibhadra, as it is stated that the statue was caused to be made by eight brothers who call themselves Māṇibhadrapuṇgas. (Māṇibhadrapuṇga-, for Māṇibhadrapuṇga-, goes back to Sk. Māṇibhadrapūgya-, pūgya- being formed in accordance with Pāṇini 4, 3, 54 with the suffix -ya- in the sense of ‘being there’ (pūgya- ‘being in the pūga-’). From Pāṇini 6, 2, 131 (and Gana 208 and 116) it appears that pūgya- was used in particular at the end of a Tatpuruṣa-compound, which is not a Karmadhāraya, that serves as a name or designation. The Māṇibhadrapuṇga was apparently a congregation formed for the worship of Māṇibhadra. Consequently, Māṇibhadrapuṇga-

---

1 The first two akṣaras are distinctly aṭha as read by Konow and Vogel. Of the third letter only the i-sign has been preserved; it may be restored to (h)i. The sixth akṣara was read hi by Konow, pi by Vogel. The true reading is undoubtedly hi. Konow [cf. above Preface, p. 12, n. 2] thinks that hi was preceded by sam, of which I cannot discover any trace. Judging from the impressions before me the reading was almost certainly bhātuhi. There seems to have been no more writing in the line. — Jayaswal transliterated the line: ā, thū (= 10), ḍa (= 10), ā, hri (= 8) (i.e., 36).

2 The line was almost certainly correctly transliterated already by Cunningham. After the correction of ni into ni and of mā into mi by Konow, it may be called absolutely certain. There are some strokes visible before Kuṇikatevāsinā, but they are probably only accidental. — Jayaswal’s reading of the line is Kuṇika Ṣevāsināgo Māgadhānān Rājā (stop).


4 [Ep. Ind. 18. 1925/26, p. 158f.]
would name or designate a person being in (appertaining to) that congregation.

The characters of the inscription and the style of the image point to the middle of the second century B.C. as the date of its origin.

§ 140

Inscription on the torso of a figure of Kubera from the village of Parkham, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1266).

TEXT

1 āryya[sa] ...  
2 huṣami ...  
3 sya¹ niva-  
4 rttana —

TRANSLATION

... the request of the venerable (Na)huṣami(traa).

Nivarttana appears to be a misspelling for nirvarttanām or nirvarttanāt. The phrase used here has hitherto been found only in Jaina records, where frequently a gift is said to have been made at the request of some monk who invariably is styled as ārya. But it would be rash to conclude from the phrase in the present inscription that there was a Jaina sanctuary at Parkham to which the figure was dedicated. Kubera is not a special figure of Jaina mythology and the phrase and the custom implied by it may also have been in use among followers of another creed, and lastly it is not impossible that the sculpture somehow or other was brought to Parkham from the Jaina sanctuary at Mathurā.

§ 141

Fragmentary inscription on a figure of Kubera in relief from the Parkham District, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1264).

TEXT

1 ... ... traḥ² ya ... ...  
2 ... ... [dha]tham[ō] ... ...  

No sense can be discerned.

¹ The name is probably to be restored to (Na)huṣami(traa)sya.
² The akṣara may be read śraḥ.
18. From Gukharauli

(135b)*

§ 142

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a standing female statue, from Gookhroli (Gukharauli, about 17 miles to the south-east of Mathurā). The stone is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 127).

TEXT

... [syā] Senas[y]a šī¹ ...

TRANSLATION

... the pupil (?) of the ... ... Sena ...

The fragment seems to be the rest of a dedicatory Jaina inscription. A Jaina monk of the name of Sena is mentioned in List No 18 and List No 45. As the restoration of the text is not certain and as we do not know how the image came to Gookhroli, it would be unsafe, of course, to conclude that there was a Jaina sanctuary at that place.

¹ Probably to be restored as šiṣ(yo) or šiṣ(śini).
IV. MATHURĀ INSCRIPTIONS —
PLACE OF DISCOVERY UNKNOWN

1. Antiquities in the Mathurā Museum

125b

Facsimile: below p. 312

§ 143  

Fragmentary inscription on the broken pedestal of a standing figure, presumably a Bodhisattva, of which only one foot remains. The place of discovery of the pedestal, which is now in the Mathurā Museum, is unknown.

The inscription is referred to by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 61 (A 56).

**Text**

1 ///ti[n]iya\(^1\) . . ./. . .
2 ///. 3 g[r]i 1 [di]/

**Translation**

. . . . of the first wife (?) . . . . (in the year) . 3, in the 1\(\text{st}\) (month) of summer, on the . . day . . . .

§ 144  

Fragmentary inscription on a pedestal of which only the upper proper right corner is preserved. The place where the stone is found is unknown. It was edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 122 (G 39).

**Text**

1 [si]ddha[\(\text{m}\)] maharaj\(\text{ā}^2\) . . .
2 ya\(^3\) . . . .
3 paṭim\(\text{ā}\) ne\(^4\) . . .
4 va . .

**Translation**

Success! (In the year) . . . . (of) mahārāja . . . . an image . . . .

\(^1\) Restore probably: (dharmopā)ti[n]iya.
\(^2\) [Vogel: Mahārāja.]
\(^3\) After ya the left half of a letter which may have been va is visible.
\(^4\) Vogel read [te].
Inscription on the fragment of a railing pillar in the Mathurā Museum. The place of discovery is unknown.

The pillar is described by Vogel as showing on the obverse the lower portion of a female figure standing on a cushion and on the reverse two compartments. In the upper one there are two figures wearing elaborate turbans. Each holds a bunch of flowers in the right hand. In the lower panel there is a male figure in Indo-Scythian dress wearing a conical cap, a tunic, trousers, and heavy boots. He rests his left hand on the grip of his sword bound to his left side, and holds in the right hand a bunch of flowers and a garland which he seems to have taken from a flat basket or dish carried on the head of a kneeling dwarf. Both scenes are enclosed between pilasters. The inscription is incised beneath the lower panel.

It was published by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 145 (J 13).

**Text**

Sa[m]ghadeva

**Translation**

Of Samghadeva.

Vogel takes Sa[m]ghadeva as the donor’s name. I am more inclined to class the inscription with the following inscriptions, and to look at it as the sculptor’s name, which in this case is given in its full form and in the genitive case.

---

Inscription on the fragment of a railing pillar in the Mathurā Museum. The place of discovery is unknown.

According to Vogel, the fragment presents on the obverse a prostrate dwarf on which a figure is standing of which only the feet remain. On the reverse is a panel with a dwarf-like figure in a short petticoat, carrying on his head a flat dish or basket filled with fruit or flowers from which another person, whose head is broken, seems to take something. The panel is enclosed between Persepolitan pilasters. Under the panel is the inscription.

It was first edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 147 (J 21).

---

1 [The brackets indicate that the first two akṣaras of the word may be read either as saṃgha or as saṅgha.]
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TEXT

Joṭīsa¹

Vogel took the inscription as the name of the donor in the genitive case. I am convinced that, just as Rama, Dāsa, Śivara, in the inscriptions § 77: L. 125i, § 147: L. 125g, § 149: L. 125h, it is the name of the sculptor in the stem-form. Probably Joṭīsa² is the equivalent to Sk. Jyotīsa. Hemacandra, Desīnāmamālā 3, 49, quotes jodāṃ and joisāṃ in the sense of nakhhatta.

125g

Facsimile: below p. 312

§ 147

K 168

Inscription on the fragment of a railing pillar in the Mathurā Museum.³ The place discovery is unknown.

Vogel states that on one side there are the feet of a figure wearing stout boots and standing on a cushion. On the reverse in a panel enclosed between two pilasters are two men in the act of killing a tortoise with sticks. He has identified the scenes with the Kacchapajātaka, ASI Ann. Rep. 1906/07. 1909, p. 156f., fig. 1; BEFEO 9. 1909, p. 528f. (offprint p. 20f.); Sculpture de Mathurā 1930, pl. 21c. Under the panel is the inscription.

It was first edited by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 149f. (J 36).

TEXT

Dāsa⁴

This inscription also has apparently no reference to the figure or to the scene represented in the panel, but is to be regarded as the name of the sculptor.

91c

Facsimile: below p. 312

§ 148

K 114

Inscription on the fragment of a railing pillar in the Mathurā Museum (J 48). Nothing is stated about the place of discovery.

According to Vogel, on the obverse there is a standing figure completely defaced. On the reverse are two panels much obliterated. In the upper

¹ Vogel read Jodasa, but the second letter is distinctly ūi.
² Cf. the inscription § 148: L. 91c.
³ [Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math., p. 150, referred to ASI [Ann.] Rep. 17. 1884, pl. 31c where already Cunningham reproduced the fragment without referring to it in the text.]
⁴ [Vogel: Dasa. The reading given above is certain.]
panel are two figures, male and female, standing. In the lower panel are a male figure and a crouching dwarf.

Vogel remarks that these scenes seem to be similar to those on the reverse of the railing pillar J 13\(^1\), but the male figure and the dwarf re-occur also in the lower panel of the fragmentary railing pillar J 21, and that this pillar and the present pillar J 48 are the work of the same sculptor is shown by their inscriptions.

In the Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 152, Vogel refers to the inscription on pillar J 48 only by calling it "three symbols", but really it is identical with the inscription on the pillar J 21 (= §146: L. 125f).

**TEXT**

Joṭisa

In this case the inscription is incised on the tenon of the pillar, and this in my opinion definitely proves that it was not intended for recording the name of the donor, but is only the signature of the sculptor.

\[\text{125h}\]

**Facsimile: below p. 312**

§ 149

Inscription on a railing pillar in the Mathurā Museum. The place of discovery is not known.\(^2\)

Vogel states that the pillar is carved on both sides. On the obverse is a prostrate dwarf on which stood a figure of which only the feet remain. On the reverse a somewhat defaced panel contains the figure of a man, perhaps an ascetic, who holds a staff in his left hand and with his right points towards an object, probably a bird, which is shown across the trunk of a palm-tree. The scene, which is enclosed between Indo-Persepolitan pilasters, probably refers to some Jātaka. The inscription is beneath the panel and in inverted letters.

It was first read by Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math. 1910, p. 152f. (J 52).

**TEXT**

Śivara

The fact that the letters are incised upside down shows clearly that the inscription is nothing but the signature of the sculptor as was suggested already by Vogel. Probably Śivara is not the full name, but an abbreviation of Śivarakṣita.

---

1 "J 18" in Vogel, Cat. Mus. Math., p. 152, seems to be a misprint for J 13 (bearing the inscription §145: L. 125j).

2 [Cf. above p. 36f., n. 1.]
Inscription on the pedestal of a seated Bodhisattva, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 121). The place of discovery is not known. The first two lines are on the upper, the third line is on the lower rim.

The inscription was edited by Vogel, JRAS 1912, p. 119, and again ASI Ann. Rep. 1909/10, 2. 1914, p. 65, with reproductions of the image (pl. 24c) and the inscription (pl. 29, 3).

TEXT

1 [sa 10]\(^1\) 7 v[a 4\(^2\) di] .. etasa purvāyā Dharm[a]k[a]sa\(^3\) sovanik[a]sa
kūṭubiniye\(^4\)
2 upāsikā\(^5\) N[a]gapiyā\(^6\) Bodhisvatva pratīthāpeti svakāyā cet[i]-
3 yākaṭ[i]y[ā]\(^7\) acāryana Dharmagutakāna pratīgraha

TRANSLATION

In the year 17, in the 4th (month) of the rainy season, on the .. day, on this date, the housewife of the goldsmith Dharmaka, the female lay-member Nāgapiyā (Nāgapiṣṭyā) sets up a Bodhisattva in her own

\(^1\) The first two signs are badly damaged, but enough remains to make the reading sa 10 certain [which moreover is confirmed from the reverse of impression].

\(^2\) Of the numerical symbol after e[a] a vertical stroke is preserved; the symbol therefore must have been 4.

\(^3\) The reading Dharmākāsa would be possible, but the seeming ā-signs may be accidental.

\(^4\) Vogel: kūṭubiniye. [In the JRAS the third akṣaras is given as hi which apparently is only a misprint for bi.] There is a distinct horizontal stroke attached to the end of the middle bar of the ka. It touches the top-line of the kā of svakāyā in the line below, but it cannot belong to that letter as the reading svakosyā in the second line would be impossible.

\(^5\) Vogel: up[āsi]kā, but the pa has no ā-sign. [Besides the i-sign at the top of the third akṣara there are two strokes to the right which seem to be accidental.]

\(^6\) [It seems not impossible that the first akṣara is meant as nā; cf. the two instances of na in line 3.]

\(^7\) Transcribing at first in the JRAS citāyā kāṭi ye, Vogel gave in the ASI Ann. Rep. the reading: cetāyā kāṭevo (?). — The e-sign of ce is unmistakable. The vowel-sign of ta is evidently the i-sign which here is even less curved than e. g. in binī in line 1 to avoid the running into the ye of the line above. [The letter is quite distinct on pl. 24c, representing the pedestal: the vowel-sign is marked by a long horizontal stroke to the right with a curvature at the end which is not to be seen on pl. 29, 3 of the Ann. Rep. and in the impressions.] I have no doubt that the vowel-sign of ta — a nearly horizontal stroke to the left — also is the i-sign which for want of space is straightened just as the i-sign of pi in line 2. The last akṣara is certainly yā, not yo. Ceti[i]ya[kati]y[ā] is incorrectly written for cetiyakutiṣṭyā.
cāityakusṭi for the acceptance\(^1\) of the Dharmagutaka (Dharmaguptaka)\(^1\) teachers.

The construction of the sentence is faulty, the instrumental kūṭubiniye being used instead of the nominative. The term cāityakusṭi occurs once more in §157: L. 79b where a monk is said to have set up a Bodhisattva in his own cāityakusṭi. The expression seems to be a synonym of cāityaghara.

\[\text{(149g)*} \]

\[\text{§ 151} \]

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a seated statue of which only the legs and the waist are preserved. The place of discovery of the stone, which is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 1263), is not known.

\[\text{TEXT} \]

1 siddhaṃ śrī-Śiśurik[a]yā\(^2\) Jayadā[sa]ṣya kuṭumbi\(^3\) ............... m[ū]-gaki.[i]kā\(^4\) ....

2 [bhi]kṣu\(^5\) ............

\[\text{TRANSLATION} \]

Success! By the illustrious Śiśurikā, the housewife of Jayadāsa .......

I can make no suggestions as to the meaning of the rest of the inscription. Provided my reading is correct, the occurrence of the term bhikṣu in line 2 shows that the inscription recorded the gift of a Buddhist image.

\[\text{(135a)*} \]

\[\text{§ 152} \]

Fragmentary inscription on a pedestal in the Mathurā Museum (No 1611). The stone is said to come from the Kaṅkali Tīla, but this statement appears to be erroneous.

---

\(^1\) [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 18ff.]
\(^2\) There is probably no vowel-sign at the top of the ka. The ā-sign of yā is a little turned upwards, probably to avoid the crossing of the right bar of the mātrya ya.
\(^3\) Restore to kuṭumbi(ni)ya or a similar form.
\(^4\) The first akṣara may after all be mbha. The right leg of the ga is unusually elongated so that the letter looks like the numerical symbol for 7. The fourth akṣara is defaced by a deep cut, but it seems to have an ī-sign.
\(^5\) Here the writing seems to have been intentionally destroyed. The first letter is probably bhi, the second certainly kṣu. The rest is illegible.
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TEXT

1 .......... Śākyabhikṣo .......... nandi[ṣya]¹ ..
2 ............ nā .ā [ya]² ............. na .....

The only word of the text that is certain is Śākyabhikṣo(h) ‘of the Śākya monk’, which proves that the inscription recorded the gift of some Buddhist image. It is therefore almost certain that the stone does not originate from the Kaṅkāli Tilā which hitherto has yielded exclusively Jaina sculptures. Nandi may be the name, or part of the name, of the monk.

The reading of the rest of the inscription is doubtful. The ordinary phrase of post-Kuśān Buddhist inscriptions: yad atra puṇyam tad bhavatu sarvasatvānām anuttarajñānānāvāptaye can hardly be reconciled with the traces of the letters.

(143b)*

§ 153

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a Buddha image of which only the feet and the lotus between them remain, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2327). The place of discovery is unknown.

TEXT

..... sarvasatvāhitā-
sukhār[tha]³

TRANSLATION

..... for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

(21a)

Facsimiles: below p. 313

§ 154

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of an image of a seated Buddha in red sandstone of which only the lower part remains. The first line is on the upper rim, the second and third lines, which are partly obliterated, are on the lower rim. The place where the image was found is not known. It is now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2347).


¹ The ṣya is very doubtful.
² Concerning these three aksaras Lüders wrote on the margin of his manuscript:] nāhāpa.
³ Perhaps the missing य as stood in the destroyed portion of the stone.
TEXT

1 sa[m] 8 va 4 d[i] 20 3 Buddhadāsiye bhikṣunīye ....¹
2² ///. [u] .. hak[i]ye³ [vihāre]⁴ ...... (sar)[vasa]tvā[naṃ h](i)[tasu](khā)-3
   [y](e) —

TRANSLATION

In the year 8, in the 4th (month) of the rainy season, on the 23rd day, (the gift) of the nun Buddhadāsi in the ... hakiya vihāra⁴ ... for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings.

N. P. Chakravarti's conjecture that the inscription recorded the gift of a seat or pedestal cannot be upheld.

§ 155

Fragmentary inscription on a stone which seems to have formed part of a pedestal, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2686). The place of discovery is not known.

TEXT

1 ....... [s]ya [sa]gha[s]tha[vi]ra⁵
2 .... bh[ā]gineyiye⁶ nā[ma]

TRANSLATION

... of the senior of the Order ... ... by the sister's daughter ...

§ 156

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of stone in the Mathurā Museum (No 2687). The place of discovery is unknown.

¹ Agrawala reads the first akṣara after bhikṣunīye as dā which he apparently wants to restore as dānaṃ. But the reading dā is doubtful. There seems to have been an i-sign at the top of the letter.
² The last two lines were not read by Agrawala.
³ [What is left of the akṣara after .[u] may be read as ja or ṣa.]
⁴ The reading of this word cannot be called certain. [Reading [vihāre] Lüders seems to have had another and better set of impressions at his disposal, as from the two estampages of the lower rim, which are now in our collection, the remnants of the first akṣara may be read as [bhā] and the next as da.]
⁵ The anuvāra of the first akṣara may have been broken off.
⁶ The ā-sign of bh[ā] is doubtful.
TEXT

1 ... ma ......
2 ... lohitana\(^1\) ......
3 ...... [y]e ......

The inscription seems to have recorded a gift for the welfare of the blood-relatives of the donor.

\(\langle 79b\rangle\)

Facsimiles: below p. 314

§ 157

Inscription on the pedestal of an image of a seated Bodhisattva broken vertically into two pieces, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2740). The provenance of the fragment is not known.\(^2\) The first line is engraved on the upper rim, lines 2 and 3 are on the lower one.

TEXT

1 [siddhaṃ mahārājas(y)a\(^2\) Kaniṣka]ṣya\(^4\) [saṃvatsa]re 10 [6\(^6\) va 1 di] ... etasyaṃ p(ūrva)[yam]\(^6\) vihariṣya bh[i]kṣusya Nāgadattasya\(^7\) (..............)

\(^1\) Restore probably: (sa)lohitana.
\(^2\) Mr. Agrawala says: "The findplace of the pedestal No 2740 is the same as that of No 2739 described in my article in JUPHS (Dec. 1937): main street of Mathurā City, near Khanskar, about 2.5 m below the surface of the street."
\(^3\) Of the first two words the letters except [mahā] are almost entirely obliterated, but the reading is practically certain.
\(^4\) The subscript -ya shows the full tripartite form.
\(^5\) The figure of the unit may be 6, but it is not certain.
\(^6\) The ā-sign of [p(ūrva)] and the (rva) are lost owing to the break of the stone. Provided the two pieces are put together in the right distance, there is no room in the line for the following [yam or yām]. It has possibly been inserted below the line, although the traces of the letter visible there cannot easily be reconciled with the reading [yam or yām].
\(^7\) If the right distance is kept in putting the two pieces of the stone together, probably four or five aksaras would seem to have been lost after Nāgadattasya, but no writing is discernible after that word.
\(^8\) The e-sign of [y/e] is not quite certain.
\(^9\) The first aksara may be pi, the second may be na [or nam], but probably [h]ji[ta][s[y]a is to be restored to (sa)[h]ji[ta][s[y]a.
\(^10\) The i-sign of [h]ji is a little doubtful.
\(^11\) [The last aksara of the word may be read also as nam.]
Success! In the year 16 of mahārāja Kaniśka, in the 1st (month) of the rainy season, on the .. day, on this date, the Bodhisattva (was set up as) a gift of the monk Nāgadatta, a resident of the vihāra, in the Kaśṭikīya (Kāśṭhikīya) vihāra in his own caityakūṭi ... ... together with the residents of the vihāra, for the worship of all Buddhas (and) for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings, for the acceptance\(^1\) of the Mahāsaghiya (Mahāsāṅghika)\(^1\) teachers.

The Kaśṭikīya vihāra seems to be the vihāra belonging to the timber-merchants. The term 'in his own caityakūṭi' occurs again in §150: L. 24a.

\(^{143p}\)\(^*\)

§ 158

Sign on a round ball of a light purple coloured stone measuring \(3^3/4\) " in diameter and weighing \(76^{1/2}\) tolaś, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2757). The place of discovery is not known.

V. S. Agrawala read the sign as the numerical symbol for 100

\(^{91f}\)

Facsimile: below p. 314

§ 159

Fragmentary inscription on a detached piece of stone in the Mathurā Museum (No 2790). The place of discovery is not stated.

#### Text

1 ///y[ā]ye///
2 ///kiyas[a]2///
3 ///...3///

No sense can be discerned.

\(^{91h}\)

Facsimile: below p. 314

§ 160

Fragmentary inscription on a detached piece of stone, now in the Mathurā Museum (No 2791). The place of discovery is not known.

The inscription was edited by V. S. Agrawala, JUPHS 10.1937, p. 4 No 7b.

\(^1\) [Cf. Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 18f.]
\(^2\) The last aksara may also be read as s/u.
\(^3\) [Below the ya of the second line the upper part of one letter of a third line is distinctly visible.]
IV. Place of Discovery Unknown: 2. (now Lucknow Prov. Museum)  193

TEXT

1 ///. [G]. [m]. tra[sa]¹
2 ///...[ā]...²///

TRANSLATION

... of Gomitra ...

2. Antiquities in the Lucknow Provincial Museum

(149u)

Facsimile: below p. 314

§ 161

Inscription on the base of a Nāga statue probably from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (B 934).

It was edited by Vogel, ASI Ann. Rep. 1908/09. 1912, p. 163 + pl. 55a (image) and 56b (inscription).

TEXT

1 Viṣṇusyaḥ³ Gomindrapūttrasyah⁴ Ha[ku]dattap[au]ttrasyah⁵ kīṭṭraḥ⁶ —

TRANSLATION

The glorious gift (?) of Viṣṇu (Viṣṇu), the son of Gomindra (Govinda), the grandson of Hakudatta.

The inscription is in crudely executed letters of the later Gupta period. As nearly all Buddhist inscriptions in the Lucknow Provincial Museum originate from the Jamālpur mound at Mathurā, there is, as pointed out by Vogel, a slight probability that the statue represents the Nāga Dadhikarṇa who had his shrine there.

¹ Restore: [G](o)[m](i)tra[sa].
² Of the second line only the upper portions of some letters are preserved.
³ Preceded by a symbol which may be read om. Vogel: Viṣṇusyaḥ, but the vowel-sign of the first akṣara appears to be -ī. Here and in the rest of the inscription the visarga apparently is used to separate the words.
⁴ Vogel: -puttrasyah, but the ā-sign is distinct.
⁵ Vogel: Ḥastadatta-. The second akṣara can hardly be sta. It seems to be ku, the vertical stroke to the right of the letter being probably accidental.
⁶ Vogel: kīṭṭraḥ, but here again the vowel-sign of the first akṣara appears to be -ī. Perhaps, as suggested by Vogel, kīṭṭraḥ stands for kīrttiḥ.

Fragmentary inscription on a split coping stone, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (E 2). The inscription is incised across the stone, not lengthwise as one should expect in a coping stone, and therefore, in my opinion, it is probable that the stone was originally a pillar which afterwards was turned into a coping stone. The rosette carved on it is much the same as that on the coping stone J 491, which formed part of a railing from Mathurā. Nothing is known about the place of discovery of the stone.

Banerji’s attempt to identify it with a coping stone said to have been found at Rāmnagar, in the Bareilly district, has been refuted by Lüders, JRAS 1912, p. 175f. Probably the stone belongs to the Mathurā finds. The material, though somewhat different from the ordinary red sandstone, resembles that of several specimens from Mathurā, including the coping stone J 491 mentioned above.¹

The inscription was edited by R. D. Bandyopādhyāya [= R. D. Banerji²], JPAS 5. 1909, p. 271f. No 1, and again, now under the name of R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 107f. No 1 + pl. 1.

TEXT

1 na[mo² bha]gav[a]⁴///
2 [ropāgharā³]⁴///

¹ Mr. Hiranandi Sastri, to whom I owe this information, has also told me that the old register, preserved in the Museum, where the finds from Rāmnagar of the year 1892 are entered, does not mention any inscribed coping stone at all. This seems to me to be corroborative evidence for my opinion that the stone did not come from Rāmnagar.

² [Cf. below Bibliography, p. 241, n. 1.]

³ There may have been a word like siddhaṇḍ, as before the word na[mo] below the line there is a sign resembling the lower part of the ligature ddha. It is followed by a horizontal stroke somewhat higher in the line which Bandyopādhyāya apparently took as the sign for the anusvāra.] — The proper inscription begins at any rate with na[mo] and no writing is lost in the beginning of the lines 2 and 7—11 as appears from the fact that the first letters of these lines stand exactly one below the other. At the end of the lines from four to seven aksaras seem to be lost.


⁵ The reading of the four letters is only tentative. Banerji read: ........ bughara .. The first aksara may be ro, rā, ko, or kā. For the second letter the reading bu is not impossible, although it will be observed that the two vertical bars of the letter do not really touch the horizontal bars and the u-stroke also is not strictly joined to the mātrkā read by Banerji as ba. I would prefer to read pā, although this is
3 (va)r[e] pratha[me]1///
4 (di)[va]se 10 1 .[u]///
5 (...)va]mitrasya pra2///
6 (...)syas pautrenā Śāu///
7 Bhārgaviputra[e]na ..///
8 su Pāncālīye3///
9 sthiten[a] pāti4..///
10 kāyāṃ patitaḥ5///
11 itaḥ sthiteṇa///

**Translation**

Adoration of the holy ...... In the first year ...... on the 11th day ......
....., by the great-grandson of ...... va-mitra, the grandson of ......, (the
son of) Śāu ......, the son of Bhārgavi, ...... standing (in ?) ......
belonging to the Pañcālas ...... fallen in ...... from here standing ......

Although nothing can be said about the purport of the inscription,
I have treated it as an Annex to the Bhāgavata inscriptions,6 because
it is engraved in pre-Kuśān characters and composed in pure Sanskrit.
This makes it improbable at any rate that it should be a Buddhist or
Jaina inscription. The invocation at the beginning may have been
addressed to bhagavat Vāsudeva.

The inscription appears to be dated in the first year of some local
king whose name must have stood in the second line. Unfortunately
it cannot be made out in what relation the donor stood to the
Pañcālas who seem to be mentioned in line 8. Banerji wanted to re-
store the name of the great-grandfather of the donor as Dhruvamitra.
In this he may be right, but there is nothing to show that he had
any connection with that Dhruvamitra whose name is found on
Pañcāla coins.

---

1 The context seems to require varaḥ, and the reading rṣe is possible, if the
stroke to the right on the top of the letter is considered to be accidental. The me
is nearly effaced.

2 Restore: praḥ(pautreṇa).

3 Restore: Pāncālīye (ṣu) (?).

4 Banerji: hāti. I consider pāti more probable.

5 [In patitaḥ the two ta differ in writing from the other instances of this aksara
in the present inscription; cf. Banerji, op. cit., p. 108, 5 with note.]

6 [Cf. above p. 155, n. 1.]
§ 163

Fragmentary inscription on a slab of yellow sandstone from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (E 3). The place of discovery is not known.

TEXT

..... vakasya Najika ....

Najika seems to be a personal name; compare the female name Najā in the Sāñci inscriptions List No 219 and 560.

124a

Facsimile: below p. 315

§ 164

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of stone which is now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (E 8). Nothing is known about its place of discovery.

R. D. Banerji edited the inscription Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 121 No 20 + pl. 3. Lüders corrected the reading JRAS 1912, p. 160f.

TEXT

1  ////[pana]s[t[a]/
2  ///m-astaśata 100 8 gandhe² ....///
3  ///... [ast]a³ ...........///

Too little is left of the inscription to make out its real purport. The repetition of āṣṭāśata in numerical symbols leaves no doubt that it means 108, not 800. Similarly /[pana]sata, if that is the true reading, may denote 105. Perhaps the inscription contained a list of sums to be spent for the provision of some religious or charitable establishment. In that case the words of the second line might be translated:

..... one hundred and eight – 108 – for perfume ...

¹ Banerji read only tata, but the last but one aksara is certainly ṣa. The [va] is not quite certain.
² Banerji: gandhi, but the vowel-sign is -e.
³ Banerji: puṣṭ[a]. It must be admitted that the first aksara may be read as pu, but it may just as well be the sign for the initial a, as exactly the same sign, with addition of a small horizontal stroke at the end of the vertical, undoubtedly denotes initial a in § 15: L. 56 [cf. above p. 46f., n. 9].
The subscript -[t]a of the second aksara is not certain [and may be read also as subscript -pa].

Regarding the two just mentioned aksaras in addition to the traces which are left of the following one, Lüders noted on the margin of his manuscript:] puṣpāṇī...

But [if we assume the reading [aṣṭ]a as given in the text above] it is not quite impossible that the following two aksaras were again ṣata.
§ 165

Inscription on the lower part of an image, perhaps from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 41).

Text

ya[p]asa —

No sense can be discerned.

§ 166

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of red sandstone, probably from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 50).

Text

..... ḫ savihito ......

No sense can be discerned.

125c

Fragmentary inscription on a pedestal of yellow [or red] sandstone in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 55). Nothing is known about its place of discovery.

It was edited by R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 121 No 21 + pl. 3.

Text

///..... ḫ⁴ Buddhadevasya⁵ kutumbiniye Buddhaprati[m]ā

Translation

The image of Buddha (is a gift) of ......., the housewife of Buddhadeva.

1 [On the reverse of the impression there are red stains which seem to indicate that the image is made of red sandstone.]

2 [In front of the first letter a sign resembling a little angle pointing downwards is to be seen, and the last aksāra is followed by a short horizontal stroke. The reading of the second letter is not quite clear and it seems not impossible that it was meant as ma.]

3 [There are red stains on the reverse of the stampage, apparently from the stone itself.]

4 The visarga was not noticed by Banerji. Traces of the preceding aksāra are visible.

5 There is a slanting stroke to the left above the first aksāra which must be accidental.
Fragmentary inscription on a piece of a coping stone in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 475). Nothing is known about the place of discovery of the sculpture, but as it consists of red sandstone it probably came from Mathurā.

The inscription was edited by R. D. Banerji, Ep. Ind. 10. 1909/10, p. 118 No 12 + pl. 2.

TEXT
Gotiputraśa Ītarasa sova[ṇ].

TRANSLATION
(The gift of) the goldsmith Ītara (Uttara), the son of a Goti (Gaupitī).

Inscription on the fragment of a coping stone, presumably from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 513).

TEXT
......[pra]tis[ṭh]itah [sa] ......

TRANSLATION
...... set up ......

There is nothing to show that the stone came from a Jaina sanctuary. The inscription dates probably from post-Kuśān times.

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of a door-jamb of red sandstone, probably from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 534).  

1 Restore: sovaṇ(j)iṣakṣaṇa.
2 The inscription, which seems to have been engraved with little care, is much defaced and the reading conjectural. In a list of the inscriptions drawn up for the Catalogue of the Museum, Mr. Banerji read, apparently from the stone itself, huti kṣitasa. The first aksāra is probably pa, the small slanting line at the top of the right bar being caused by erosion just as in the following letters; the subscript -ra, which Banerji took to be the u-sign, is only very faintly visible. The third aksāra can hardly be kṣī. It looks like gi, but it is just possible that there was a subscript -tha. The second and the fourth aksāra are certain, and so is the visarga. The sa is doubtful.
TEXT

...... [ṛppiṇḍaṭṭa]kuṭumbinah¹ putraḥ

TRANSLATION

... the son of the householder ... ṛppiṇḍaṭṭa (?) ...

(124m)

Faciesmile: below p. 316

§ 171

Fragmentary inscription on a piece of an umbrella of red sandstone, presumably from Mathurā, now in the Lucknow Provincial Museum (J 664).

TEXT

1 ///ni[tata] .. si[dahath].²///
2 ///...[ya]khace.ik[a]syā³ v[adhū]⁴///
3 ///[rya] ... [ti]niyā [kha]///

The reading of the fragment is too doubtful to admit of a translation. The inscription seems to have recorded the gift of the umbrella by some female person who was characterized as a daughter-in-law and wife, though it must be borne in mind that the second aksara of v[adhū] is conjectural and that the traces of the letters before [ti]niyā are not much in favour of restoring dharmapatiniyā. Unfortunately I cannot even restore the name in the second line which may have been the name of the father-in-law of the donatrix. Yakhaṣeṭikasya or -cedikasya, corresponding to Sk. Yakṣaceṭakasya, would be satisfactory as far as the meaning is concerned, but the fourth aksara can hardly have been ā or ī.

3. Antiquities in the Indian Museum, Calcutta

(80b)

Faciesmile: below p. 316

§ 172

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of an image of a seated Bodhisattva from Mathurā, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N.S. 4143). The place of discovery is not stated.

¹ The reading of the first three aksaras is doubtful.
² In this line only the letters ni and si may be called certain.
³ The vertical stroke above the [ya] is not visible on the back of the stampage and therefore probably accidental. [The last but one aksara may be meant as kā.]
⁴ [The first letter may be read as v[ā].]

TEXT


TRANSLATION

In the year 4 of mahārāja deveputra Kaniśka, in the 4th (month) of winter, on the 14th day, on this date, ... by Dhanyakabhava (Dhānya- bhavā), the ... of the caravan merchant Bhavasiri (Bhavaśrī), the housewife of ... ni ... .

Owing to the deplorable state of the inscription, the reading of the date is not absolutely reliable and I fail to see the meaning of the syllables

---

1 The inscription was noticed also, as stated by D. R. Sahni, in Ann. Progr. Rep. of the Superintendent, Arch. Survey, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, Northern Circle, for the year ending 31st March 1917, p. 9. The Report is not accessible to me.
2 The word is pretty clear in the photolithograph in the Ep. Ind. Judging from the estampage, the left corner of the stone is now broken off causing the loss of ma and the left half of hə. [The top of the sa is inclined to the left; cf. the last sa in s[ā]rthavahāsa.]
3 The third letter transliterated above as [p]/(u), which is recognizable in the photolithograph, has now completely disappeared.
4 Sahni read only sa. According to the estampages, the preceding aksāra is undoubtedly śka. [The subscript -ka is indistinct.] The second letter of the name is illegible. What is left of the first aksāra can hardly have been part of hu, but it may have been the cross-bar of ka. The reading Kaniśkasa is therefore probable.
5 Sahni: sa, but the anusvāra is quite distinct.
6 The upper portion of the numerical symbol is preserved. It cannot have been 30, as stated in the ASI Ann. Rep. 1923/24, p. 231. It may have been 4 or 40. If the reading Kaniśkasa is accepted, it has, of course, to be taken as 4.
7 The figure was not read by Sahni. As a slanting up-stroke is visible, the figure appears to have been 4.
8 Sahni reads 10 9, but the remains of the second figure point to its having been 4 [or 6].
9 The word is illegible. Sahni restored asyāṇ, but there are probably three aksāras missing.
10 Sahni: purvāyāṃ. The ya certainly had no a-sign.
11 Sahni: Bhavasā... The i-sign of śi is certain, and the following aksāra is probably ri, although the i-sign is only faintly visible.
12 This is Sahni’s reading which agrees with the photolithograph. In the three estampages before me only vaye is faintly visible.
13 Sahni: [dānaṃ Bodhisat] [ya]d-attrā p[u]nya[ṃ] ta[d]-bhavatu]. In the estampages as well as in the photolithograph only the three syllables given above are legible and they are quite distinct.
which I read as ttadhanya, but Sahni’s restoration of the end of line 2 is quite impossible as the phrase yad atra punyam tad bhavatu etc. is never found in inscriptions of the Kuśān times, but occurs first in the Gupta period.

〈92b〉
(Facsimile: below p. 316)

§ 173


The inscription was edited by Ramaprasad Chanda, ASI Ann. Rep. 1922/23, p. 166f. + fig. 2. The stone is figured ibid., pl. 37b—c. As R. Chanda states, the fragment is of red sandstone.

TEXT

///ya dānam///

TRANSLATION

The gift of . . . .

The characters indicate pre-Kṣatrapa date.

〈35b〉
(Facsimile: below p. 317)

§ 174

Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a seated Buddha in grey sandstone from Mathurā, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N. S. 4154). The inscription seems to have consisted of three lines, but only the first word of the first line is legible at present.


TEXT

1 maharājarādhirāja1 . . . . . . . . . . sa[m]2
2 ma . . . .
3 . . . . §. . . .

As the inscription is in Gupta characters, it may have been dated in the reign of one of the Gupta emperors.

1 Read: -rājādhirāja.
2 [The first two lines originally consisted of about 35 aksaras as is indicated by the preserved upper parts of some letters and by the sa[m] which seems to have been the last aksara of the first line.]
§ 175


TEXT

1 siddha[ṃ] Saddhisya vadhu Matisena[ṣya]
2 dhitā¹ Nagadasasya dharmapatini
3 .........²

TRANSLATION

Success! The daughter-in-law of Saddhi (Sandhi?), the daughter of Matisena, the first wife Nagadasa (Nāgadāsa) .......

§ 176

Inscription on the coping stone of a railing cut out of a single slab of red sandstone from Mathurā, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N. S. 4247). The place of discovery does not seem to be known.

The inscription was edited by Ramaprasad Chanda, ASI Ann. Rep. 1923/24. 1926, p. 101 + pl. 35,1, and noticed, ditto, p. 232. [With exception of the last two words the record was edited also by Lüders, Acta Orientalia 18. 1940, p. 39.]

TEXT


---

¹ There is an ā-sign as well as an u-sign attached to the ta.
² [Of the third line only the upper portions of some letters are to be seen.]
³ Chanda: putreṇa. Here and in the rest of the inscription no diacritic signs have been used by him in his transcript.
⁴ [The i-sign of ki is faint but certain. At the lower part of the aksara there is a short stroke slanting to the left.]
⁵ The last aksara is probably meant for na, although the right half of the top-line of the letter is not visible and the bottom-line is blurred. [At first sight the letter looks like ne.]
⁶ There is a small stroke attached to the right of the middle-line of the na which makes the reading no certain.
⁷ It is not impossible that v[ā] was followed by a small n.
IV. Place of Discovery Unknown: 3. (now Indian Museum, Calc.)

TRANSLATION

The railing of the holy Noble-souled One has been caused to be made by the trooper¹ Bodhiyaśa (Bodhiyasas), the son of Bodhila (and) the son of a Kausikī. May the Holy-One be pleased.

There is absolutely nothing in the decoration of the railing to indicate the religious character of the building to which it belonged, but R. Chanda is probably right in inferring from the term bodhi, forming part of the name of the donor as well as of his father, that they were Buddhists and that accordingly the railing was a Buddhist monument. It is true, the designation of Buddha as bhagavat mahātman is most unusual and the concluding benedictory phrase has not yet been found with reference to him in inscriptions, but in support of R. Chanda's conjecture it may be alleged that in the Mahāvyutpatti 1,29 mahātman is enumerated among the names of Buddha.

§ 177

(138a)*

Inscription on the pedestal of an image in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N. S. 4965). The pedestal was purchased for the Museum. Nothing is known about its place of discovery.

In ASI Ann. Rep. 1924/25. 1927, p. 255 the stone is enumerated among “Sculptures of the Old Mathurā School of Art”. The inscription appears to be a modern forgery. Many signs are no letters at all, and the reading is therefore very uncertain.

TEXT

1 savatsare 5 .. va | 1 diva .. 8 .. gījāvasya dhita .. mu
2 cchi .. ṇaye eghe bodimā

I deem it not worth while to attempt an interpretation of this bungle.

§ 178

Facsimile: below p. 318

Fragmentary inscription on a broken slab from Mathurā, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (N. S. 6482).

¹ [Cf. Lüders, loc. cit.]

TEXT

1 (………………. ) .ūvulasya¹ putrasya mahāksatrapasya Ś[o]²///
2 (………………. ) ti pārvato prāśad[o]³ sabh[āh] śilāpa[tā]///
3 (………………….) . taviryo raṇe Rajūlaś-ca⁴ pi///
4 (………………….) . [s] . sy-edam⁵ arcā⁶///

Although only a small portion of the text is preserved and a coherent translation is impossible, it can be confidently asserted that the inscription in wording and arrangement of the contents closely resembled the so-called Mūrā Well Inscription (§113: L.14). There appears to have been four lines on the slab exactly as on the Mūrā slab. In both cases the donation was recorded in the first two lines in not quite correct Sanskrit. In both inscriptions the beginning is almost identical. There is the same uncertainty as in the Mūrā inscription whether the words ‘of the mahāksatrapa Ś[o]([dāsa), the son of the (mahāksatrapa Rāj]ūvula’ form part of the date or of the description of the donor. The gift consists here of a stone palace, halls, and stone slabs, and it is hardly accidental that the palace is explicitly stated to have been built of stone, just as the temple in the Mūrā inscription, which there as an object of donation, is twice called śaila, ‘made of stone’.

Like the last two lines of the Mūrā inscription, here also the last two lines are in pure Sanskrit and apparently metrical, -taviryo constituting the conclusive, raṇe Rajūlaś-ca pi and (ta)sy-edam-arcā the beginning of a Pāda in the Upajāti metre.

From the few words that remain it is impossible to make out the sense of the verses, but there can be little doubt that Rajūla mentioned in line 3 is only another form of Rājūvula, the name of the mahāksatrapa, which in the inscription on the Mathurā Lion Capital (CII 2,1, p. 30ff. No 15) also occurs as Rajula.

Whether the epithet -taviryo raṇe, ‘whose heroism ... in battle,’ refers to Rajūla or another person, probably Śoḍāsa, whether pi is to be restored as pi(tā), whether arcā is mentioned, as in the Mūrā Well Inscription, in connection with some statue that was set up, are questions that cannot be answered.

---

1 Restore: (mahāksatrapasya Rāj)ūvulasya or, possibly, (Raj)ūvulasya.
2 Restore: Ś[o](dāsasya).
3 The reading prāśāde would be possible, the right half of the o-sign being blurred, but it is improbable.
4 The ă-sign does not seem to be quite the same as in the first line, but the reading is practically certain.
5 Probably to be restored as ∼[s]-((ta)sy-edam-arcā...
6 The true reading may be ārcā.
Fragmentary inscription on the pedestal of a standing statue of which only the feet remain, now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The place where the statue was found is not known, but it originates apparently from Mathurā.

The inscription was edited by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 129 No 12 + pl. 5, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 19 + pl., by Fleet, CII 3. 1888, p. 280 No 74 + pl. 42B, by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 156 No 43.

TEXT

1 deya[dha]ṛmo-yaṁ Śākyabhikṣor-Dharmaṇḍāsasya ya-
2 d-attrā puṇyaṁ tan-mātāpitrōḥ sarvasatvānāṁ ca
3 (.....)

TRANSLATION

This is the pious gift of the Śākya monk Dharmāṣṭa. What merit there is in this (gift), (let) it (be for the attainment of supreme knowledge) by (his) parents and all sentient beings.

The writing is that of the Gupta period.

4. Pedestal of a Statue
in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay

Inscription on the pedestal of a large statue of a standing Buddha of which only the feet and part of the surrounding sculpture have been preserved. Nothing is known about the place of discovery.

It is said to have belonged to Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit and was formerly kept in the Library of Bombay University. It is now in the

1 There is no reason why the n- should be considered to have been omitted first and added afterwards as assumed by Fleet. On the other hand I am sure that the visarga has actually been inserted afterwards.
2 Fleet: ca, but there is no ḍ-sign. There may have been one more letter at the end of the line, but this is not certain. In analogy to similar inscriptions we should expect something like anuttarajñāṇāṇāvāplaye-stu in the conclusion of the sentence, and Fleet is of the opinion that these words stood in a third line which was cut away, apparently in trimming the stone for some building purpose.
Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. As the inscription closely resembles the Buddhist votive inscriptions of Mathurā, I here provisionally classed it among them.\(^1\)

It was edited by D. R. Bhandarkar, JBORS 20 (1897—1900), 1902, p. 269f.

**TEXT**

1 [mahārāja]syā Hūveskasya\(^2\) devaputrasya sa 40 5 va 3\(^3\) di 10 5 etasyā\(^4\) purvayā\(^5\) upāsikāye

2 Khvasicāye bhagavato\(^6\) Śakyumune apratimasya pratimā pratistha-pitā Ālikāyām Rośikavīhāre

3 ātmanasya ārogyadakhiṇa mātāpitina\(^7\) bhaṭārikāye Ś[am]anikamātare Śamanikāye Jīvakasya Jīvakamatu\(^8\)

4 sarvasatvānam ca hitas[ul]khārtha —

**TRANSLATION**

In the year 45 of mahārāja Hūveska devaputra, in the 3\(^{rd}\) (month) of the rainy season, on the 15\(^{th}\) day, on this date, an image of the holy incomparable Śakyamuni (Śākyamuni) was set up at Ālikā in the Rośikavihāra by the female lay-worshipper Khvasica for the gift of health to herself (and) for the welfare and happiness of her parents, of her mistress, of the mother of Śamanikā (Śrāmanikā), of Śamaṇikā (Śrāmaṇikā), of Jivaka, of the mother of Jivaka, and of all sentient beings.

5. Stone in the Patnā Museum

\(<93a>\)

Facsimile: below p. 319

§ 181

Inscription on a stone discovered at Mathurā, now in the Patnā Museum. The place of discovery does not seem to be known.

It was edited by N. G. Majumdar, IHQ 2.1926, p. 441ff. + pl.

---

\(^1\) [Cf. Lüders, List, p. 5, n. 1.]

\(^2\) Bhandarkar: Hūveskasya, but the second aṅkāra is distinctly ve.

\(^3\) There are vertical bars at both ends of the three horizontal lines denoting the figure.

\(^4\) Bhandarkar: etasya, but the a-stroke of the last aṅkāra is distinct.

\(^5\) Bhandarkar: pura(ā)yā. Here again the a-stroke of yā is distinct.

\(^6\) [At the top of the ga there is a long stroke slanting to the right which the author apparently took to be accidental. By fault of the engraver the right limb of the o-sign is written exactly like an i-sign.]

\(^7\) Bhandarkar: māt/[ā]pitanāṃ, but the anusvāra is not visible.

\(^8\) Bhandarkar: -mātu. There is no a-stroke on the ma.
IV. Place of Discovery Unknown: 5. (now Patnā Museum)

Text

///[ma]m[i]trasa putrasa r[año]1 Viṣṇum[i]trasa2 dhitu I[m]dragi-

Translation

The gift of Mitrā, a Gotamī (Gautamī), the nurse of Imdragibhadrā (Indragibhadrā), daughter of king Viṣṇumītra (Viṣṇumītra), the son of ... mamitra.

Majumdar, who takes dhārī in the sense of mother, considers Gotamī Mitrā to have been called the mother of Imdragibhadrā and daughter of King Viṣṇumītra. It is true, Sk. dhātri, generally ‘nurse’, is used in Yājñavalkya 3, 82 for a woman who is with the child6, and Hemacandra, Anekārthasamgraha 2, 444f. followed by Medinikara, assigns to dhātri the meaning janani, but in the example quoted by Mahendra, dhātri is a woman giving a child the breast.7 In Pali dhātri is always ‘nurse’, and in the same meaning the word occurs also in Aśoka’s fourth Pillar edict.

I doubt very much whether dhātri was ever used instead of mātr when mere maternal relationship was meant, and I think that also for another reason dhātri has to be taken here in the ordinary sense. It is quite unusual in the inscriptions that a female donor should record the name of her daughter, and it is extremely improbable that Mitrā, if she was the mother of Imdragibhadrā, should have done so without stating whose wife she was. In my opinion, Mitrā can only have been the nurse of Imdragibhadrā, who was the daughter of King Viṣṇumītra. She was apparently a respectable person and, as shown by her epithet Gotamī, of Brahmanical descent.

King Viṣṇumītra is probably identical with Viṣṇumīta, who is known from a coin found in Rohilkhand.8

---

1 The first akṣara may be read as r[a].
2 Majumdar: Viṣṇumītrasa. The length of the -i seems to be indicated by the curve attached to the left bar of the upper part of the ma.
3 Majumdar: Idragibhadraye. The fourth dot of the i-sign is very faint. I am convinced that the four dots which only appear as the first syllable of the word Indra (Imdra) represent everywhere in, not the initial i. The subscript -r of dra is not certain, but probable.
4 At the end of the inscription there is a symbol the meaning of which will be discussed in the following text.
5 dhātristanyanipānavardhitavavuḥ.
6 Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India 1891, p. 84 + pl. 7, 21.
The elaborately carved symbol, which appears at the end of the inscription, has been ingeniously explained by Majumdar as the word \textit{th}[a\textit{m}]b[oh] written in an ornamental fashion. But I doubt whether this interpretation can be upheld. The circle with the dot in the centre looks like the letter \textit{tha}, but the scrollwork to the right bears hardly any resemblance to the letter \textit{bha} of the time to which the inscription belongs, to say nothing of the \textit{o}-sign, which can be made out only by a considerable stretch of imagination. The rather large space which separates the symbol from \textit{dānam} is another point that speaks against the attempt to connect it with the text. As long as no monogram formed by letters has turned up in another inscription, I think it will be safer to regard the symbol as a simple auspicious mark. A mark of this kind, although far less ornamental, is engraved also at the end of the inscription on a Jaina Āyāgapaṭa (List No 107), and in a Buddhist inscription at Sāñci (List No 541) the text is surrounded by four sacred symbols.

In the absence of all information about the origin of the stone, it is impossible to decide whether the donation was made to a Buddhist or a Jaina sanctuary.
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Faesimile: below p. 318

§ 182

Inscription on a sculptured stone slab in the British Museum, London. Nothing seems to be known about the origin of the stone, but the characters, the language, and the date of the inscription leave little doubt that it comes from the region about Mathurā.\footnote{[Cf. Lüders, List, p. 5, n. 1. — Mr. D. Barrett, Dept. of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, kindly informed the editor as follows: Museum Reg. Nr.: 1887, 7—17, 53; accession year: 1887; donor: Sir Alexander Cunningham; provenance: Mathurā; Sikri sandstone; height of piece: 15—7/10 inches.]}  

The inscriptions was edited by Lüders, Ep. Ind. 9. 1907/08, p. 239—241 No 1, with two plates showing the whole stone and the inscription.

\textbf{Text}

1 siddha[m]² maharājasya deva[pu](strasya)  
2 Kāṇiśkasya savatsare [10]

\footnote{[² The \textit{anuvāra} is indistinct, because it is crossed by the line forming the base of the sculpture.]}
3 gri 2 di 9 etaye purvay[e]  
4 [u]tarāyan Na[va]mikāyan 2 hā-  
5 [rmya]n-[d]ata[m] priyatām de  
   vi grām[ena] 3

**Translation**

Success! In the year 10 of mahārāja devaputra Kāṇiśka, in the 2nd (month) of summer, on the 9th day, on this date, the temple was presented in the northern Navamikā(?). May the goddess be pleased with the village.

Hārmya, which in the same spelling is found in the Taḥtīriya Āṇaryaka 6, 6, 2, apparently denotes a small temple, and from the benediction at the end of the inscription it may be inferred that it was dedicated to a goddess by some villagers. The sculpture at the top of the stone shows a woman and a man sitting on a bench. Over the head of the man there appears something which probably is the mutilated head of a cobra, and as the stone is broken off immediately above the head of the woman, it is quite possible that she also wore the typical badge of a Nāgī. May we suppose that the female person represents the goddess mentioned in the benediction and that she was a Nāgī? That shrines were built for the worship of Nāgas is known from several Mathurā inscriptions. 4

As regards the difficult words [u]tarāyan Na[va]mikāyan, I adhere to my opinion that they cannot be part of the date. They cannot mean ‘on the following (i.e. intercalated) ninth lunar day’, since, as pointed out by Kielhorn, uttara is never used in the sense of adhika or dvitiya, nor does the suggestion of Hultzschn convince me to take uttara in the sense of ucṣyamāṇa, upari-likhita, ‘above-mentioned’. There is, moreover, no reason why the statement of the day should have been repeated after etaye purvay[e]. It appears far more probable to me that Na[va]mikā denotes the locality where the temple was erected, though I admit that it sounds rather strange as the name of a place.

---

1 The e-sign is very faint, and the correct reading may possibly be purvaya or purvayam.
2 The two convergent side-lines of va are not very distinct, just as in the letter in line 3, and there appears a vertical in the middle which makes the aksara look almost like na. But this line is far too thin to really form part of the letter and must be accidental. The reading of the word may be called certain. [At first sight the second letter looks like an initial u. — Cf. Lalitavistara 24, 136. There occurs a devakumārikā of the western quarter who is called Navamikā.]
3 I formerly read grā[masya], but what gives the last sign the appearance of sya seems to be due only to flaws in the stone. I now prefer to read grām[eva], although the e-stroke of m[e] is not quite distinct and the [va] has to be taken as a cursive form of the letter.
4 [Cf. below, Index of Miscellaneous Terms, s. v. Nāga.]

---

7. Antiquities lost

138
Facsimile: below p. 320

§ 183

Fragmentary inscription on the back of a small Buddha statue from Mathurā. The image seems to be lost now.

The inscription was published by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 25 + pl. It is edited here from Dowson's facsimile.

**Text**

1 $^{1}$ bhagavato Šakyamunisyā $^{2}$ [pra] $^{3}$ $^{4}$ $^{5}$ $^{6}$
2 t[is]$^{7}$ṭhatveti $^{8}$ masaravi .. hare $^{9}$ dasa $^{10}$ $^{11}$

A translation of the inscription is impossible. All that can be said is that it recorded the setting up of an image of the holy Śākyamuni. The script is that of the Kuśān period.

145
Facsimile: below p. 320

§ 184

Fragmentary inscription on a Buddha statue from Mathurā, which seems to be lost at present.

The inscription was published with a facsimile by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 26 + pl.

**Text**

1 (...) $^{7}$ prathitāyaśagunasy-ā[ry]asatvottamasya Dharmāśokena bhaktīya pratikṛti///

1 The facsimile shows an isolated ša or ṣra in the beginning.
2 The second aksara looks like kra, but is certainly meant for kya. The fourth letter would seem to be ni.
3 The pra is incomplete.
4 The beginning of the second line is probably to be restored as (timāṃ pra)-t[is]ṭhaveti, the first syllable of pratiṃāṃ being written at the end of the first line. The i-sign of t[is] and the upper part ofṭṣha are indistinct.
5 Dowson read: masare vihāre, but in the facsimile there is some letter [ṭa?] between vi and hare.
6 At the right end of the inscription the facsimile shows some more writing which in the original perhaps was engraved on the proper left side of the stone. It consists of three lines with two letters in each line; putre can be read in the first, prat[is] in the last line, while the letters in the middle line are illegible in the facsimile.
7 [In the facsimile the first sign at the beginning of line 1 looks like a cross surrounded by a circle. Below this sign the pra of prathitā- is written as a subscript letter.]
2 (...) re pratiṃa praṭikṣaṇātā yad-atra puṇyaṃ tad-astu mātāpitro- 
bhrāṭṛṇ[ām] ¹

No coherent translation is possible. The inscription as we have it is 
apparently only part of the original. It evidently recorded the setting 
up of an image of Buddha who is described as being ‘of renowned fame 
and virtues, the best of the noble beings’. I am sure that also the words 
‘by Dharmāśoka through devotion an image…’ are connected in some 
way with the description of the Buddha himself or of his image, although 
the context remains obscure. In the last sentence the merit of the gift 
was assigned to the parents and the brothers of the donor.

The writing is that of the Gupta period.
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Facsimile: below p. 320

§ 185

Inscription on the pedestal of a small statue from Mathurā, which 
seems to be lost now. In the Hoernle collection there is an impression 
entirely spoilt by tracing the letters in ink. ² It agrees exactly, even in 
bearing the same number, with the facsimile published by Dowson, 
when he edited the inscription JRAS 5. 1870, p. 188 No 24. The in-
scription was edited again by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 156 No 42.

TEXT

1 deyadharmo-yāṁ Śākyabhikṣoḥ Samgharaksī- 
2 tasya yad-attra puṇyaṃ ³ tat-sar[v]a[s]at[vānān] ⁴

TRANSLATION

This is the pious gift of the Śākya monk Samgharaksita. What merit 
there is in this (gift), (let) that (be) for all sentient beings ……

The writing is that of the Gupta period.

¹ This is the reading of the facsimile which must be taken for what it is worth. 
Dowson read in the first line …praṭhitam yasa gunasyāgra sarvvothamasya. The 
first word is probably to be corrected to …ḥ praṭhitayaśogunasya. In the second 
line Dowson wanted to restore re as: ‘(vi)hāre’, which is probable. Instead of 
praṭikṣaṇātā the true reading is certainly praṭiṣṭhāpita.
² [The impression is lost now.]
³ The anuvāra is visible in the impression.
⁴ This was undoubtedly the original reading which in the impression and in 
Dowson’s facsimile has been altered to something like tatsartadatta. Dowson read 
tad bhavatu… The inscription was probably continued on the lower rim of the 
pedestal.

14*
§ 186

Inscription on the pedestal of a statue from Mathurā which seems to be lost now. There is a rubbing in the Hoernle collection, but it is entirely spoilt by tracing the letters in ink.\(^1\) It agrees in every detail with Dowson’s facsimile, even in bearing the same number 18.

The inscription was published by Rajendralala Mitra, JASB 39, 1. 1870, p. 128f. No 11 + pl. 5, by Dowson, JRAS 5. 1870, p. 187 No 18 + pl., and edited again by Lüders, Ind. Ant. 33. 1904, p. 156 No 44.

It is edited here from the aforesaid reproductions.

TEXT

deyadharma-yam Śākyabhikṣor-bhadaṃmata\(^2\)-Brahmasomasya yad-ātra punyam\(^3\) tad-bhavatu sarvvasatvānām anuttarajñānāvāptaye ||

TRANSLATION

This is the pious gift of the Śākya monk, reverend Brahmasoma. What merit there is in this (gift), let that be for the attainment of highest knowledge by all sentient beings.

The writing is that of the Gupta period.

§ 187

Inscription on a railing pillar from Mathurā which seems to be lost now.

The following transcript of the author has been taken from his treatment of the inscription in CII 2, 2, 1, edited by E. Waldschmidt in collaboration with M. A. Mehendale.)

TEXT

1 ka[p]. .............
2 bhūti[sa] ........ (Vā)ts(ī)-
3 putrasa .......... sa
4 Dhanabhūtisa dāna[m] vedikā
5 toranāni ca ratanagṛha[e] sa-
6 rvabudhapujāye sahā mātāpi-
7 tihi sahā [ca] catu[hī] pariṣāhī

\(^1\) [The impression is lost now.]
\(^2\) The anusvāra is missing in Raj. Mitra’s facsimile.
\(^3\) The anusvāra is missing in Dowson’s facsimile and in the rubbing, but quite distinct in Raj. Mitra’s facsimile.
\(^4\) [Cf. above Preface p. 9 with note 3.]
INDICES
AND
BIBLIOGRAPHY
etasyā §180: L.43,1
(→ etasyāṁ)
etasyāṁ §15: L.56,1; or: -syā[m] §27: L.85,1
e[tehi] §5: L.88a,3
etta purvāyā §137: L.149b,2
etti §137: L.149b,4

→aiśvaryatayam §61: L.141,A2
(→aiś[v]arly[y]am §60: L.127,A2
(→aiśuryataya)
o[dakh]ji... §114: L.14a,2
Odiyanakasya §31: L.62

Kakāṭikānām §65: L.140,A
Kachipasa §83: L.143f

-kaṭiyā
(→cetiyākaṭiyā)
(→cetiyakṣuṭiyāṁ)
Kāṭhikāsa §25: L.98
Kanikākṣaṇa §102: L.21b,1
(→Kanikṣa⁺)
katā §139: L.150,3

-kaṭhikāsa
(→dharmanakṣaṇa)
[Ka](ni)[ska]sya (?) §172: L.80b,1
Kaniśkṣaṇa (?) §26: L.79,2; Kaniśkṣaṇa §81:L.23b,1; Kani(s)ka[sya] §114: L.14a,1; [Kaniśkṣaṇa] §157: L.79b,1; (Kaniśkṣaṇa) (?) §128: L.21c,1
(→Kaniśkṣaṇa)
(→Kānī⁺)
ka[p].... §187: L.125,1

-kaṛasya
(→kṣe)makārasya
-kaṇña-
(→Dadhikarṇa-)
-kalā- (=kāla-)
→abhya[takalagatānām]
kalam
(→devakalam)
(→devakulaṃ)
kalava[lā] §114: L.14a,2
(→kālavālōsa)
Kāṣṭha[k]a[yo]vihāre §157: L.79b,2
Kānī (=Kaniśkṣaṇa) §136: L.31b,1
Kāni(s)ka[sya] §73: L.29a,1
Kaniśkṣaṇa §182: L.23,2
Kaniśko §97: L.78b
(→Kaniśka-)
kāraṇa §120: L.14d,1,B; kārita[m] §116: L.14a
Kārīta §98: L. 80d, 3; §176: L. 92d;
kā(ṛj)i(ṛ)ā §139: L. 150, 1
kārīsyati(ṇi) §99: L. 80c, 6
kā[ṛ]ppaś[i]kasya §15: L. 56, 2
kālavālasa §18: L. 94, 2; (kā)lavālasa §19: L. 103
(→ kālavāda)
kālānumartamānasamvatsare §78: L. 148h
(→ -kalagatānāṃ, abhyatita-)
kitttaḥ (= kirttiḥ ?) §161: L. 149u, 2
[ku] §45: L. 40, 1; (ku) §62: L. 128, A. 1
(→ kubhako)
(→ kumbhako)
-kutiyam
→ cetiyakutiyam
kutu[ñ]iniyē §85: L. 149i; [k][u]ṭi[u]-bin[iye] §172: L. 80b, 2
kutumbi[n]iyā (?) §151: L. 149g, 1
kutumbiniyē §93: L. 149z, 2
kutumbiniyē §167: L. 125e; kuṭu[m]nimb[iye] §15: L. 56, 2
(→ kutu[m]nimb[iye-
kutum[ñ]inah, ...[ṛp]piṇḍaatṭa (??)]- §170: L. 1490
Kumikatevāsīnā §139: L. 150, 3
-kunda
→ Śrikuñḍe
kubhako §63: L. 125q; kubhak[o] §54: L. 125r
(→ ku)
-kulam
→ devakulam
kule §15: L. 56, 1; k[u][u][e] §14: L. 45a, 2
Kuṣāṇapuṭr[i]r[o] §98: L. 80d, 2
kutubiniyē §150: L. 24a, 1
(→ kutubiniyē)
(→ kutumba
Koṭeyaganā §23: L. 89c, 1
-koṭhako
→ dārakoṭhako
Koliye §15: L. 56, 1; K[o][i]lye §14: L. 45a, 1
Koṣikīye §18: L. 94, 3
(→ Kauṣikiputreṇa)
Kohāṣaṣa §120: L. 14d 1, A
Kohāde[n]a §120: L. 14d 1, B
Kauṣikiputr[e]ya §176: L. 92d
Kauṣi[kiputreṇa] §115: L. 82a, 5
(→ Koṣikīye)
Kśapḍamihir(a)-putrasya (?) §30: L. 60, 8/9
kṣatrapa[sa] or: -[sy]a §2: L. 125e, 1;
(kṣat)r[apa]sa §118: L. 14d 3, 1
(→ mahākṣatrapa-)
kṣaharītasas §118: L. 14d 3, 1
kṣ[a]raṇika §79: L. 97c, 3
(kṣe)mak[a]ra[s]ya (?) §99: L. 80c, 1
Khudaye §103: L. 13a
Khvasīcāye §180: L. 43, 2
ganjavareṇa §64: L. 82, 1
-gana
Koṭeyaganā
gana (= gana) §14: L. 45a, 1
gan[i]syaya or: ga[n][i]syya §15: L. 56, 2
gane §15: L. 56, 1
-gatapara
→ Śr(ī)gatapara
-gatānām
→ abhyatika kalagatānāṃ
gandhe §164: L. 124a, 2
-gunasya
→ prathityaṣaṅgaṇasya
-guta
→ Vasaguta//
-gutakāṇa
→ Dharmagutakāṇa
Gun[d]asya §136: 31b, 1
gr §24: L. 38, 1; §31: L. 62; §32: L. 62a, 1; §33: L. 62b, A; §34: L. 63; §74: L. 31a, 1; §136: L. 31b, 1
gri §102: L. 21b, 1
gṛṣmāṃśe §94: L. 149a, 3
(→ gri)
(→ (gṛṣma)m(āṣe))
-grham- §113: L. 14, 3
-grhe
→ ratanaghe
→ saīlā-devaḥ (he)
Goti/// §73: L. 29a, 2
Golāśvastasya §122: L. 91d
Gotamiye §123: L. 77a, 3; Gotam[i]ye or: Gotam[i]ye §181: L. 93a
Gotiputrasa §18: L. 94, 1; §168: L. 92a
-gotrena
→ Bhāradvāja-sagotrena
-gotrena
→ Śegrava-sagotrena
Gomitakena §139: L. 150, 3
Gomitasa §120: L. 14d 1, B
Gomitāmacena §120: L.14d 1,B
[G][o][m][a][n][a][s][a] §160: L.91h,1
Gomindrapūtrāsyaḥ §161: L.149u,1
[Gra]...// §103: L.13a
grā[m]ena] §182: L.23,5
grī §182: L.23,3; gr[i] §134: L.12a,1; gr[j]i §143: L.125b,2
(grī[ṃ/ma][ā]e) (?) §114: L.14a,1
〈→ gr〉
〈→ grī〉
〈→ grīmāmāse〉

Ghatākasa §118: L.14d 3,1
Ghoṣako §26: L.79,1
Ghoṣena §106: L.15
〈→ Dhāmāghoṣāye〉
〈→ Budhāghoṣāsya〉
〈→ Bhadrāghoṣa〉

ca §21: L.111,2; §46: L.126,1; §52: L.125m; §54: L.125r; §64: L.82,3; §67: L.146,2; §90: L.97e,2; §98: L.80d,4; §99: L.80c,3; 6; §102: L.21b,2; §178: L.85c,3; §179: L.148,2; §180: L.43,4; §187: L.125,5; c[a] §99: L.80c,3; [c]a §137: L.149b,3; [ca] §53: L.125n; [ca] (?) §137: L.149b,3
cakkra... (= ca(m)kkrā(ma)?) §99: L.80c,4
ca[t]riṣa §137: L.149b,1
c[a]tudīṣe or: c[e]tu- §35: L.64,B1
〈→ caturdīṣe〉
catur[th]e §94: L.149a,3
caturd[ī]se §33: L.62b,A
tudīṣe〈→ → caturdīṣe〉
tudīṣe〈→ caturdīṣe〉
[c]aturv[ṃ/ma]e or: -viṣe §94: L.149a,2/3
caturv[ṃ]sya §33: L.62b,A
ca[tu]hi §187: L.125,7
C[a]ndak[a] or: C[ā]ndak[ā] §27: L.85,4
caturdīṣe §39: L.132,B 1; catur[rd][i][śe]
§38: L.139,1/2; ca[t]urdīṣe §31: L.62
caturdīṣe[e] §40: L.133,B 2
caturdīṣe〈→ caturdīṣe〉
Cikkakasa §26: L.79,1
Cut[a]kaviḥare §79: L.97e,1
-ce i kāsya
tahhake i kāsya
c[e][i]ya[k]utiyaṃ §157: L.79b,2
c[e][i]ya[k]atiya[ṃ] §160: L.24a,2/3
c[e]tudīṣe or: c[a]tu- §35: L.64,B 1
-<chatram
→ (ya)ṣṭicchatram
-<chandogena
→ Māṇacchandogena

Jayadā[sa]ya §151: L.149g,1
Jayadevaputraṇa §106: L.15
→Jayabhaṭṭāyār- §8: L.78c,1
→Jayasenasya, bhadata- §20: L.99,1
Jāḍasa §75: L.91e
-<jāta
→ Sthāvarajāta
Jivakasya §31: L.62
jivaputaye §116: L.14aa
Jivaśiri §65: L.140,B
Jivakamatu §180: L.43,3
Jivakasya §180: L.43,3
Jotisa §146: L.125f; §148: L.91e
-<jñānāvāpyaye
tanuttarajñānāvāpyaye
tanuttarajñānāvāpyaye
jvalata(h) §113: L.14,4

[ṭe] (mason’s mark?) §11: L.91a

Ta[k]a[da]masya, [Vema] or:
Ta[k]a[sa]- or: Ta[k]ṣumasya, [Vema]
§98: L.80d,2
(ta)[lā]gaṇa- §99: L.80c,3
[ta]tas- §99: L.80c,3
<ta> §185: L.147,2
tad- §8: L.78c,1; §67: L.146,1; §184: L.145,2; §186: L.149
tan- §179: L.148,2
tapi (= tehi?) §73: L.29a,3
Talak[i]fe or: -[y]a[m] §30: L.60,6
«ta(s)y-edam» §178: L.85c,4
teṣam §27: L.85,5
<tehi?〉
→ tapi

toranaṃ §115: L.82a,8
toranāni §187: L.125,5
Toṣaya §114: L.14a,3
To[sa]lāyāh §113: L.14,3
-<trāta-
→ Šavatrāta-potriya (= Śiva-)
tri[ṃ]se or: triṣe §94: L.149a,4
tri[se] §30: L.60,5
«<pacatrisaṇya>
t[re]piti[ka]ya §24: L.38,1
tre(piti)[kā]ye §24: L.38,1

thupa §118: L.14d 3,2
dakṣī §6: L. 143k
→ arogadakṣīnaye
-dakṣīnaye
→ arogadakṣīnaye
-dakṣina
→ arogadakṣina
→ (dakṣina)
→ (mahā)a-dakṣīnaye
-daññanāyakasya
→ mahadaññanāyakasya
→ (daññanāyakasya, mahā)
-daññanāyakasya
→ mahadaññanāyakasya
→ (daññanāyakasya, mahā)
-daññanāyakasya
→ mahadaññanāyakasya
dāna §54: L. 125r; dāna[a] or: dān[a]
§90: L. 97e, 1; dāna[a] §157: L. 79b, 2
dānā §14: L. 45a, 3; dān[a] or: dān[a]
§90: L. 97e, 1; dān[a] or:
dān[o] §20: L. 99, 2
→ dāna-
→ dāna-
d[ā]nām or: d[i]nām §35: L. 64, B 1
-dānasya
→ Bhaṭṭidānasya
[D][ā][n][i]ni...[i] ye §23: L. 89c, 2,
dārakehi §27: L. 85, 6
d[ā][r]koṭhako §98: L. 80d, 4
Dāsā §147: L. 125g
Dāsasya §85: L. 149i
→ -Rūḍhāsasya
→ Jayādāsasya
→ Dharmanāsasya
→ Buddhādāsasya
→ Saguṇādāsasya
→ -Dāsasya
-dāsiye
→ Amohāsiye
→ Bama(dā)[si]ye (?)
→ Buddhāsiye
di §15: L. 56, 1; §24: L. 38, 1; §31: L. 62;
§33: L. 62b, A; §39: L. 132, B; §74: L. 31a, 1; §102: L. 21b, 1; §126: L. 41b, 1; §134: L. 12a, 1; §172: L. 80b, 1;
§180: L. 43, 1; §182: L. 123, 3; d[i] §12: L. 52a; §14: L. 45a, 1
→ divase
deva
→ devasvay
→ uṣādevasvay
→ Jayadeva
→ Dharmadevasvay
→ Buddhadeva
→ Rohadeva
→ Vśudeva
→ Śaṅghadeva
→ Śaṅghadevasvay
devakal[am] §89: L.80c,3
devakula[m] §98: L.80d,3; (de)[va]-
kulam §99: L.80c,2
-devakulikasya
→ Dādhikarṇyadevakulikasvay
-devagṛ(he)
→ sādadevagṛ(he)
devadharm[m]apa[ṛ]j[i]yāgena §60: L.
L.127, A2
(→ deyadharma-)
d[e]va[p](utraṣa) §172: L.80b,1; [d][o]-
vapurasu §126: L.41b,1
devaputrasya §30: L.60,2; §94: L.149a,
1/2; §180: L.43,1; devaputraj[asya]
§24: L.38,1; deva[pu]trasya §182:
L.23,1; [d]evaputrasya §15: L.56,1;
(d)[o]vaputrasa §16: L.80; (deva)-
[pu]tra(ṣya) §138: L.149c,1
→ mahārajajītāyajadevaputrasya
→ mahārajajadevaputrasya
→ mahārajajāyadevaputra(ṣa)
devaputro §97: L.78b; §98: L.80d,1
devaputrasya §31: L.62
(→ -da[v]aputraḥḥare, mahāraja-)
(→ davaputrasa)
Devarakṣi[ti]ṣya or: -[t][āye] §76:
L.89a,2
[de]va[la]ye (?) §73: L.29a,2
devasya §81: L.23b,2
dev[ā]ddharmaparitaḥ[k]ena or:
-ddharmma- §62: L.128, A2
(→ deyadharma-)
-devāye
→ Budhadevāye
devi §182: L.23,5
Devilasya §34: L.63; §93: L.149z,3
dev[ō] §22: L.149k,4
(→ devasya)
[d]evvadharmanap[ra]t[avā)[n]m §61:
L.141, A2
(→ deyadharma-)
-dēkāṁ
→ āḍāsātāṁ
Droṇalena §94: L.149a,4/5
dvā[da]ṣa[ṛ]ṭtreṇa §94: L.149a,6
Dhā[n]ivā[ā]lasya or: Dhuṅi- §14: L.45a, 2
Dhā[n]iṣirīya or: Dhuṅi- §14: L.45a, 2
-dhānya . . . . . tta- §172: L.80b, 2
Dhā[ṇya]bhavaye §172: L.80b, 2
Dhanabhūtīsa §187: L.125, 4
Dhana[m]i[ra][sa] §17: L.107b, 1
Dhanavat[i]ye §24: L.38, 2
dhanasya §21: L.111, 3
Dharda §132: L.1431
dharmakathiyasa §35: L.64, B1
§150: L.24a, 1
Dharmakaṇa §80: L.97b, 1
Dharmagutakāna §150: L.24a, 3
-Dharmadāsasya §179: L.148, 1
Dharm[ā]v[a][s][y]a §44: L.1251
dharmapatini §175: L.143m, 2
dharmapa)[ti][ni]ya (t) §143: L.125b, 1;
dharmapa)[ti][ni]ya (t) §171: L.124m, 3
-chartpa]ya
-dharmaparṇyakena or: -rma-
-devadādharmaparṇyakena
-dharmaparṇyakena, -nam
-devadādharmaparṇyakena
-devadādharmapa-(r)(tyog)enaṃ
Dharmap[r][i]yas[ya] §47: L.137, b2
-dha[r]ṃasthitasya
-satyadha[r]ṃasthitasya-
Dharmahastika .. §121: L.14b, 1
§150: L.24a, 1
dharmāvala[m][bānāṃ] §79: L.97c, 2
Dharmāsokena §184: L.145, 1
-dharmo-
-devadādharmo-yaṃ
Dharmadatasaya §35: L.64, A
Dharmadattasya §35: L.64, B 1
dharm(a)[mapa]tnya, /|\-d- §23: L.89c, 2
_chartpatini-
-dharmaparṇyakena
-devadādharmaparṇyakena
-devadādharmaparṇyakena
-dharmo-
-danadharmmo
-dharmaparṇyakena
-devadādharmaparṇyakena or: -rman-
dhā[n]i[ye] §181: L.93a
Dhā[m]gaḥoṣāye §20: L.99, 2
-dhārā . . . .
-uḍadhasamadhāra . . .
Dhā[m]mμa[m]var[m]ma §65: L.140, C
dhitā §177: L.138a, 1
dhitā §136: L.31b, 1; dhi(tā) (t) §74: L.31a, 2; dhitā or:
dhitu §175: L.143m, 2; dhitu §181: L.93a; dhit[u] §83: L.149z, 2; dh[ti]u
§17: L.107b, 1
→ Brahasvatimita(dh)itu
(→ itu)
Dhūniv[ā]lasya or: Dhā[n]ī- §14: L.45a, 2
Dhūnī[ś]irīya or: Dhā[n]ī- §14: L.45a, 2
na-
→ nāṇatra
Nagadasasya §175: L.143m, 2
[Nā]g[a]nandisyasa §93: L.149z, 1
N[a]g[a]p[a]ya or: N[a]ga- §150: L.24a, 2
(→ nāga-)
Nagarakīyasya §78: L.149h
Najika . . . §163: L.143o
nanayat= (= anumānayat?) §99: L.80c, 1
-nandasya
→ Bhavanandasya
-nandi-
→ Bhavanandī-prāvarikaputrāsya
Nandibalapramukheśì §27: L.85, 5/6
-nandi[sa], . . . §152: L.135a, 1
→ Naganandisyasa
→ Buddhaḥanamdī(ṣ)ya(a)
Namāye §2: L.125c, 1
-namo §19: L.103; na[mo] §162: L.89b, 1; [na]mo §18: L.94, 1
Na[va][m]kāyaṃ §182: L.23, 4
(Na)huṣami[tra]sy(a) (?) §140: L.150a
Nāgadat[as]a §108: L.102c
Nāgadate[n]a §109: L.102d; [N]āg[a]datena
§110: L.102e
Nāgadattasya §157: L.79b, 1
N[a]g[a]p[a]ya or: N[a]ga- §150: L.24a, 2
Fixed: (nāgaṃ written) nātā §137: L.149b, 5
-nāgaṃ... (→ Naga-)
-nāgariya
(→ U)cenāgariya
nāgasya §102: L.21b, 2
[nā]g[en]dr[ā]sya §27: L.85, 2
nāgo §137: L.149b, 6
nāṇatra §65: L.140, A
nātā (= nāgaṃ) §137: L.149b, 5
-nāpitasya
→ rājanāpitasya
nā[ma] §155: L.135c, 2
n[ma][n][i] (t) §65: L.140, A
-nāyaka-
→ mahadamā-, -dāṇḍanāyakasya
→ (mahāda)ṇāyanāyaka-
Nāyasa §101: L.80f
nā[h]a[pa] (?) §152: L.135a
nīyataka §65: L.140, A
niyavaḍ[a]ksya or: -vaḍ[u]- §102: L.21b,3


nirvarttanā §13: L.149j, A 2

nirvarttanā §140: L.150a,4


paccatīrāsa ya §45: L.40,1

→ paṇca, —

pacanaḥ §65: L.140,A

Pacanāgariya (= Uce-) §14: L.45a,2

paṇca §113: L.14,4

paścavirāṇāṃ §113: L.14,2

→ paccatīrāsa

→ paṇaśatā//]

→ paṭṭā//

→ sīlāpaṭṭā//

→ -paṭṭo, sīlā-}

paṭṭimā §119: L.14d,2; §144: L.81a,3

→ pratimā-}

→ -paṭṭo

→ sīlāpaṭṭo

→ -paṭṭa//, sīlā-}

[p[a]ṇaśatā//] §164: L.124a,1

→ paṇca, —

paṭṭihāpiṭo §1: L.125a,1; [pa](tiḥhā-piṭo?) §17: L.107b,2

→ paṭṭihāpiṭa-}

paṭitaḥ §162: L.89b,10

→ bhagnapatitaviśeṣaṃ

→ paṭṭa
dharmapatitaviśeṣaṃ

→ paṭṭina

dharmapatitaviśeṣaṃ

→ ma]na/pāka/patina (?)

→ paṭṭi
dharmapatitaviśeṣaṃ

→ paṭṭinīyaḥ

→ (dharmapāṭ)īniyā

→ paṭṭya, -dharmma-

→ paṭṭimā (?)

→ paṭṭimā (?)

→ paṭṭimā (?)

→ paṭṭimā (?)

→ paṭṭihāpiṭa-}

→ -paṭṭnya, -dharmma-

→ paṭṭinya (paṭṭihāpiṭa) §114: L.14a,3

→ paṭṭihāpiṭa-}

→ paṭṭinya (paṭṭihāpiṭa)
-pi[t]tra, mātā- §78: L. 149h
-pittro, mātā- §67: L. 146,1/2
-pittroḥ, mātā- §179: L. 148,2
pitramātrabha §4: L. 143c,3
-pit[r]in[a], māt[a]- §90: L. 97e,1/2
-pitro-, mātā- §184: L. 145,2
-piyā
  → Nāgapiyā
  (→ -priyāye, Nusā-)
pukṣiriṇi §102: L. 21b,2
  (→ puṣkarani, ...) -pugehi
  → (Mā)nibhadapugehi
pujāye §90: L. 97e,2; pujāy[e] §44: L. 125
  → sarvabudhapujāye
  (→ -pucaye, ...) -pujā-
puṇyaṁ §67: L. 146,1; §78: L. 149h;
  §179: L. 148,2; §184: L. 145,2; §185: L. 147,2; §186: L. 149; puṇya[ṛṇ] §8: L. 78c,1
-puṣasa
  → Anadapuṣasa or: Ananda-
-puṭāye
  → jivapuṭāye
-puṭra-
  → Mittravarmanputtra
  → Rudrilaputrena
puṭraḥ §170: L. 149o
-pu(trakasya)
  → sapu(trakasya)
putrasa §113: L. 14,1; §181: L. 93a
  → Gotiputrasa
  → devaputrasa
  (→ [Vājas]īs)i)putrasa
putraṣya §178: L. 85c,1;
-(pu)[t]ra[sa][y][a], ...- §102: L. 21b,3
  → davaṇṭrasya
  → devaputrasa
  (→ devapūṭrasya)
  → Vakamihiraṇputrasya
-puṭrāya
  → Bhavanandipravarikapuṭrāya
putreṇa §61: L. 141,1; §176: L. 92d;
-pu[t]eṇ[a], ...sa- §115: L. 82a,4/5
  → Kauśikṇputreṇa
  → Jayadevaputreṇa
  → Bhārgaviputreṇa
  (→ -putreṇa, Rudrila-
potreṇa §62: L. 128, A1
putreṇi §27: L. 85,5
-puro
  → Kuṣaṇapuro
  → devaputro
  → Piṇḍapayyaputro
  → Virārdhiputro
  (→ -puṭāsa, Ṛndrasama-)
  (→ -puṭrasyaḥ, Gomindra-)
  (→ -puṭrasya, deva-)
[p]udhdhapijārt[th]a[m]
  → sarva[p]udhdhapijārt[th]a[m]
purvayan[ṃ] §136: L. 31b,1; purva[y](a)m
  or: [y](e) §126: L. 41b,1
purvayā §180: L. 43,1; [p]ure[va]yā §29: L. 52,1
purvaye §114: L. 14a,2; purvay[e]
  §182: L. 23,3; purva[y](e) or: [-y](a)m
  §126: L. 41b,1
[p]uṛv[a]yan §172: L. 80b,1
purvāyā §150: L. 24a,1
purvāyā §137: L. 149b,2; [p]uṛvāyā
  §138: L. 149c,2
purvavayaṃ §30: L. 60,5; [p]urvvayaṃ
  §32: L. 62a,1
purv[va]yan §102: L. 21b,2
  purvāya[e] §35: L. 64,A
  purvāya §134: L. 12a,1
  (→ pūrvva-)
Puṣaha(th)jīnye §126: L. 41b,1
Puṣyada(ta*) (?) §136: L. 31b,1
puṣkarani §64: L. 82,2; [p]uṣka[raṇi]
  §64: L. 82,1/2
puṣkaraniṇyā §137: L. 149b,5
  → yamaṇḍapuṣkaraniṇāṃ
puṣkariṇi §98: L. 80d,4
  (→ pukṣirīṇi)
-pūcaye
  → sarva[bu*][dha]pūcaye (?)
pūjāya §89: L. 97a,1
-pūjāye
  → sarvabudhapijāye
pūjārthāṃ §81: L. 23b,2
  → pūjārt[th]a[m]
  → sarva[p]udhdhapijārt[th]a[m]
  (→ pujā-)
-pūṭāsa
  → ṚṇDasamapūṭāsa
-pūṭrasyaḥ
  → Gomindrapūṭrasyaḥ
-pūṭrasya
  → devapūṭrasya
  (→ -puta-; putra-; putra-)
pūṛvavaya[m] §27: L. 85,1; pūrvavay[am]
  or:
pūrvavaye §41: L. 89,2
पुः(र्व)व्यायम् §74: L. 31a, 1
पुः(र्व)व्यायाम् §15: L. 56, 1; §94: L. 149a, 4
(→ पुर्वा)
(→ पुरव्या)
पोठयासक[ aux] (sa) §18: L. 94, 1
-पोत्रिया
→ शवातीतपोत्रिया (= शिवा-)
-पाटुसर्वायह
→ हकुडत्कापाटुसर्वायह
pautreṇa §162: L. 89b, 6
(→ pra(pautreṇa)
Pauṣamāsadivase §81: L. 23b, 1
[pra] [?] §128: L. 21c, 1
(→ pra[pratame]
-प्राकर्षीि
→ सामान्धप्रकर्षीि
-प्रतिया-pāṇām
→ सामान्धप्राकर्षीिपाण्य
→ सामान्धप्रकर्षीिपाण्य
pratathāpita[ā] §22: L. 149k, 2
prat[as][th]apitā §14: L. 45a, 3/4
(→ pratishthāpita-
pratikṛti// §184: L. 145, 1
pratikṣāpita §184: L. 145, 2
(→ pratishthāpita-
pratigrhahe §150: L. 24a, 3; [pra]ti-grahe §157: L. 79b, 3
pra[t][i][g][ra][ha]ho §102: L. 21b, 2/3
(→ parigrha
(→ parigrhe
pra[t][i][t]hāpito) §18: L. 94, 3
pratīthāpeti §150: L. 24a, 2
pratīthāpito §126: L. 41b, 3; p[ra]t[itä-thā][p][i][to] §24: L. 32, 2; p[ra]t[itäthā][p]-pito §73: L. 29a, 2
(→ pratishthāpita-
pratimām §81: L. 23b, 2
-प्रतिमासिया
→ apratimāsya
pratimā §4: L. 143c, 1; §9: L. 149v, 1;
3: §29: L. 52, 2; §180: L. 43, 2; §184: L. 145, 2; prat[imā] §22: L. 149k, 1/2;
pra(timā) §107: L. 41a, 2; [p][r][a]timā[ā]
§121: L. 14b, 3
→ Budhāpratimā
→ Budhāpratimā
[pra][timām] [?] §183: L. 138, 1/2
pratimā[h] §113: L. 14, 2
(→ paṭimā
(→ paṭimā
(→ proḍimā
(→ "bodhīmā" [?])
prat[i][ṣṭ[a][p][a][y[ati]] §136: L. 31b, 2
pratiṣṭāpita §29: L. 52, 2
pra[t]iṣṭāpita[ṃ] §74: L. 31a, 1
pratiṣṭāpito §27: L. 85, 3
(pra)tiṣṭā[ḥ]aveti §183: L. 138, 2
pratiṣṭā[ḥ]apayati §81: L. 23b, 2/3; (prati-
ṣṭā[ḥ])apayati [?] §138: L. 149c, 4
pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita[ḥ]a §94: L. 149a, 7
pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita[ḥ]a §4: L. 143c, 1; pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita-
[ā] §23: L. 89c, 2
(prati[ṣṭā[ḥ]pita] §115: L. 82a, 8/9; (prati-
ṣṭā[ḥ])pita[?]to [?] §79: L. 97c, 1
(→ pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita-
(→ (patis)[i]pita) [?]]
(→ pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita"
(→ pratis[th]apayati, -ṣṭapita-
(→ pratis[th]apayati
(→ pratis[th]aveti
(→ pratiṣṭā[ḥ]pita-
pratisthāpita §180: L. 43, 2
pratis[th]āpito §72: L. 88
pratisthāpayati [?] §121: L. 14b, 3
pratistāpenti §137: L. 149b, 5
-प्रायसाता
→ agraprāyasa
tāye
[pra]th[a] §76: L. 89a, 1
prathame §30: L. 60, 4; pratha[me] §162:
L. 89b, 3; pratha(me) §107: L. 41a, 1
(→ [pra] [?]?
prathitāyasya[a]ṣyasya[ya] [?] §184: L. 145, 1
pra(pautreṇa) §162: L. 89b, 5
-प्रामुख्यानम्
→ Bhadilapramukha
→ Bhadilapramukham
→ Bhadrilapramukham
-प्रामुख्यीि
→ Nandilapramukhehi
prarigrhe §2: L. 125c, 6
(→ parigrha
(→ parigrhe
(→ prarigrhe
pravarika[ह]][स]i[ठ][is]y[ya] [?] §81: L. 23b, 1
(→ prāvarika-
-प्रासः
→ bhagavaprāsa
dā
-प्रासः
→ sarvādulyakaprahaṇārthāṃ
-प्रावरिकपृत्राया
→ Bhavanandipa[व]r[क]aputrāya
Pravārīkavīhāre [e] §74: L. 31a, 1
prāvārika[ṣ](ya) § 124: L. 92c; prāvāri-
(kasya?) § 7: L. 149f
→ pravārika-Hāsth(is)y(a)
prāśād(o) § 178: L. 85c, 2
→ pāśāda)
prāhāṅk[i][a][m]; pr[ā]hānika[ṃ]nāṃ § 46:
L. 126,1; 2
priy(a) (= priyātāṁ?) § 22: L. 149k, 4
priyātāṁ § 104: L. 13b, 1; § 182: L. 23,5;
priyātā[m] § 176: L. 92d
- priyasya
→ Dharmapriyasya
-priyāye
→ Nusāpriyāye
→ r-piyā, Nāgā-
priya[y]att[i] or: -ttā § 137: L. 149b, 6
prīto § 115: L. 82a, 9
priyātāṁ § 15: L. 56, 2
priyant[a][m] § 94: L. 149a, 7
prodimā § 14: L. 45a, 3
→ pratiṃmā-

-pharasya
→ Haranārdadhapharasya
→ Horaruddapharasya
Phala[pha][// or: [-ba][// § 56: L. 135
[Phala]aphalasa[ya § 57: L. 125x
[Phal][gu][ya]sa[ya] § 76: L. 89a, 2

b[ā]kasa[ti]manita § 98: L. 80d, 3
[bā]ma[dā][s]i[ye (?): [Ba]ma[ye § 14:
L. 45a, 1/2
→ Brahma-
baladhākṣya § 123: L. 77a, 5
-bala-
→ Nandibala-pramukhehi
-balav[r]d[dy](th) artha
→ ayubalav[r]d[dy]j artha
Balasya § 24: L. 38, 1
balān[a][sa][ya) (= Balān[a][ya) ?)
§ 123: L. 77a, 3
→ Valānasya
→ Valānasya
Buddha[sa]savy[ly](a) § 66: L. 125d
Buddha[sa]sava § 65: L. 140,B
Buddha[sa]sava § 45: L. 40, 1
Buddha[sa]siiye § 154: L. 21a, 1
[Bu][d][d][d][da][va] § 65: L. 140,C
Buddhadevasya § 167: L. 125c
Buddhahanāṃd[ni][i][a][ya] (a) § 41: L. 89, 2
Buddhaprat[i][mā] § 167: L. 125c; B[udh][a]-
dha[prat][i][mā] § 74: L. 31a, 1
→ Buddhapttrimā
Buddha[mi]trā[e] § 24: L. 38, 1

Buddhamitra(y)a § 58: L. 125o
Buddhaya[sa]sava § 122: L. 91d
B[udh][a][rakṣita][rakṣita][s][y][a] or: Buddh[a]-
§ 39: L. 132,A
Buddharakṣita[sa] § 46: L. 126,1; . Bu-
Buddharakṣita[sa] § 40: L. 133, B1
→ Buddharakṣita[
Buddhasya
→ saṃyasaṃbuddhasya
Buddhānān[a][s]a[ya] § 47: L. 137, b1
Buddha[sa]rakṣita[sa]sita[sa] or: Buddh[a]-
§ 39: L. 132, A
→ -[p]udḥapājārt[th]a[m], sarva-
→ Buddh-
→ -buddhān, sama-
Buddh[ā]śreṣṭhasya § 33: L. 62b,B
Buddh[ā]śreṣṭhasya § 33: L. 62b,A
Budhaghoṣasya § 56: L. 135
Budhadevāye § 126: L. 41b, 3
Budhaprat[i]mā § 135: L. 13, 1
→ Buddhapratimā-
→ Buddhasya
→ saṃyasaṃbuddhasya
Budhakṣita[sa]sita[sa] § 1: L. 125a,1
→ Buddharakṣita[
Budhav[ā]lasa § 90: L. 97e, 1
B[udh][a][kṣita[sa]sita[sa] § 14: L. 45a, 3
→ Buddhakṣita[
Buddhasya
→ saṃyasaṃbuddhasya
"bodimā" (?) § 177: L. 138a, 2
→ pratiṃmā-
B[o]disāto or: B[o]dhisatt(v)o §72: L.88
Bodhisatt[v]o § 157: L. 79b, 2
B[udh][a][s][y]o or: B[o]disāto §72: L.88
→ Bo[hila]sa § 176: L. 92d
Bodhisacc[a] § 1: L. 125a,1
→ Bo[dh][isa]la[sa] § 134: L. 12a, 2
B[udh][a][hisa]la[sa] § 2: L. 125c, 2
Bodhisattva[sa] § 136: L. 31b, 2
Bodhisattva[sa] § 150: L. 24a, 2
→ Brahmāsasita[sa] § 186: L. 149
→ Bana-
brāhmaṇena §64: L. 82,1; brāhm[a]ṇena
§94: L. 149a, 5
brā[h]maṇebhyaḥ §99: L. 80c, 6

bhaktyā §184: L. 145,1
[bhagavata]ṭah §29: L. 52, 1
bhagavatāṁ §113: L. 14, 2
[bha]gav[a](te) §162: L. 89b, 1
bhagavato §4: L. 143c, 1; §176: L. 92d; §180: L. 43, 2; §183: L. 138, 1; bhagavat[o] §27: L. 85, 2; §102: L. 21b, 2; bhagavato §12: L. 52a; bhagav[a]-to §115: L. 82a, 6; (bha)gava[to] (?) §139: L. 150, 1
bhagavaprasādā §117: L. 14d2
bhagavā §137: L. 149b, 6; bhagavā[ś] or:
bhagavā[ṃ] §176: L. 92d; "bhagavā" §15: L. 66, 2; [bha](gavān) (?) §115: L. 82a, 9
bhagavāto §81: L. 23b, 2
[bha]gnapatitavāsirna[m] §99: L. 80c, 3
bhāṭārikāye §180: L. 43, 3
-bhāṭātyār-
→ "Jayaṭāṭātyār"
Bhāṭāṭidāmasya §13: L. 149j, 1
bhadata-Jayasenaśya §20: L. 99, 1
bhadama[ṇ]a or:
bhadama[ṇ]a[ṇa] §59: L. 129; "bhadamṇta-
§186: L. 149
-bhada-
→ (Mā)ṇibhadapuṇe
[ba]ṇḍilapramukhana §51: L. 131
Bhadilapramukhānam §50: L. 125w, 1
Bhadraghoṇas[p]ak[m]ānām §47: L. 125s; Bhadraghoṇas[ṇ]ak[m]ānam §49: L. 125u; [bha][ṇḍilapramukhā]
§48: L. 125b
Bhadraghoṇas[y]a §53: L. 125n; Bhadra-gohosasya §52: L. 125m
Bhadrasya §52: L. 125m; Bhadras[y]a
§53: L. 125n
-bhadātyā-
→ Indragoṇibhadātyā
bhāṭāyāye §19: L. 103
-bhāṭāyāy-
→ rājabhāṭāyāy
-bhāṭāyakasya
→ sabhāṭāyakasya
bhāṭāyāya §81: L. 23b, 2
→ bhāṭāyāy
bhavat[āṁ] §46: L. 126, 2
bhavatu §27: L. 85, 7; 8; §31: L. 62;
§44: L. 125l; -bhavatu §8: L. 78c, 1;
§67: L. 146, 1; §186: L. 149; bhavat[u]
§35: L. 64, B2; bhava[t]u §41: L. 89, 4;
bhav[ā]ṭ[u] §60: L. 127, A2; §62:
L. 128, A2; bh[ava][ṭ][u] §125: L. 143d;
[bha][v]at[u] §44: L. 125l
→ bhāṭ[vatu]
Bhavana[n]daśya §93: L. 149z, 2
Bhavandiprāvaṇa[i]kapurāṇa §133:
L. 14e, 2
-bhavaye
→ Dhanyabhavaye
Bhavasir[ṣa] §172: L. 80b, 1/2
bhavvatu or: bhāvvatu §61: L. 141, A2
→ bhavatu
bhāṣa[ṇa][k]āṣya §33: L. 62b, A
bhāṣana[k]aṣya §33: L. 62b, B
bhāgineyīye §24: L. 38, 2; bh[ā]gineyīye
§155: L. 135c, 2
bhāgīn[ye] §84: L. 143g, 2
[bhāt]uhi §139: L. 150, 2
→ bhṛtr-
Bhadravadādive §78: L. 149h
Bhāradvajāgottrena §94: L. 149a, 5
Bhārgavīpurṣ[e]na §162: L. 89b, 7
bhārṣe §123: L. 77a, 6
→ bhārṣe
→ bhārye, rāja-
→ bhārya
bhārvatu or: bhavvatu §61: L. 141, A2
→ bhavatu
[bhi]ks[a//] §151: L. 149g, 2
[bhi]ks[u][nā] or: [-nā] §29: L. 52, 1
bhikṣuṇīye §154: L. 21a, 1; bh[i][k][ṣu]-niy[e] or: -niy[e] §103: L. 13a
[bhi]ksuṇiye §24: L. 38, 1
bhikṣuno §52: L. 125m
-bhikṣunyār-
→ Śākyabhikṣunyār
[bhi]ksunam §46: L. 126, 1
[bhi]ksu[nā] or: [-nā] §29: L. 52, 1
bh[i][k][ṣu][nā]ey[e] or: -niy[e] §103: L. 13a
bhikṣusya §33: L. 62b, A; §39: L. 132,
B1; §41: L. 89, 2; §56: L. 135; bhikṣu-
s[y]a §35: L. 64, A; bhikṣu[s]ya §54: L.
125r; bh[i]ksusya §35: L. 64, B1; §157:
L. 79b, 1; bh[i]ksusya or: bh[i]-
 §31: L. 62; bhikṣus[y]a §44: L. 125l;
bhikṣus[y]a §36: L. 125y; [bhikṣu]s[y]a
§121: L. 14b, 1
[bhi]ksu[s]y[a] §32: L. 62a, 1
-bhikṣo
→ Śākyabhikṣo
bhikṣo[ḥ] (?) §40: L. 133, A, n.2; bhik-
ṣo[ḥ] §53: L. 125n; §55: L. 125k, 1
→ Śākyabhikṣo
bhikṣor
→ Śākyabhikṣor
bb[i]khuṇīye §126: L. 41b,1; 3
bhikṣunīye §24: L. 38,2
bhikhusa §90: L. 97e,1
bhikṣ[ī]ya or: -ks[ū]- §40: L. 133, B1
bhikṣusya §24: L. 38,1; §38: L. 139,1;
§45: L. 40,1; bhikṣ[ī]ya or: -ks[i]-
§40: L. 133, B1; bh[ī]kṣusya or: bh[ī]-
§31: L. 62
Bh[ū]mo nāgasya §102: L. 21b,2
bh[ū]/ or:
bh[ū]/// §123: L. 77a,2
Bh[ū]/// §123: L. 77a,5
-bhūt[sa], ... §187: L. 125,2
→ Dhanabhūtīsa
-bhogatāya
→ mahābhogatāya
Bhoṇḍake §137: L. 149b,3
bhṛṛtṛ[k][a] or: -k[a]- §27: L. 85,4
-bhṛṛtṛ[k][ām] §184: L. 145,2
(→ bhātuhī)
-maṇḍavikā
→ Vardhamāṇamaṇḍavikā
-matasya
→ svamatasya
Matāsena[asya] §175: L. 143m,1
-matu
→ Jīvakamatu
(→ mātū)
-m[a]trasya or: -m[i]-, B., ... §44:
L. 1251
-madu...
→ sopitumadu...
(→ mātū)
[Ma]dh[ū]ravanake §24: L. 38,2
(ma)[na][pāka][patina (?) §99: L. 80c,5
ma[no]/// §21: L. 111,2
-māse
→ hematamaśe or: -māse
(→ -māsa-)
mazaravi... hare (?) §183: L. 138,2
-māse
→ hematamaśe or: -māse
(→ -māsa-)
Maṣṭana/// §100: L. 80e
ma[h]./// §99: L. 80c,3
mahākṣatrapasa §113: L. 14,1
(→ kṣatrapa-)
(→ mahākṣatrapa-)
mahahata §21: L. 111,3
mahā[daṃḍa][nā][yakasya] §119: L. 14d,1
mahadāṇḍanāyakasya §30: L. 60,6/7
(→ mahādāṇḍa-)
mahar[aj]asya or: -r[a]jasya §102: L. 21b,
1; maharajasya §137: L. 149b,1;
mahara[ja]syasya
(→ mahārasya
mah[ā][r][a][j][ā] §96: L. 85b
maharajā ... §144: L. 81a,1
maharasya (= maharajasya) §136: L. 31b,1
maharajārādhirāja =
maharajārajārādhirāja §174: L. 35b,1
maharajasya §182: L. 23,1; mahar[ā]-
jasya or: -r[a]jasya §102: L. 21b,1;
maharajasya §73: L. 29a,1
(→ mahārāja-)
Mahā[sa]bhhas[y]a §22: L. 149k,1
(→ Rṣabha-
mahākṣatrapasya §64: L. 82,1; §178:
L. 85c,1; (mahākṣatrapasya §115:
L. 82a,10/11
-[ma][hāk][s][a][trape][n][a] (?) §99: L. 80c,5
(→ kṣatrapa-)
(→ mahākṣatrapa-)
Mahātm[an[o] §176: L. 92d
[mahādāṇḍa (?) §30: L. 60,10
(mahādā)[ṇ][ā][ya][ma][hāk][s][a][trape][n][n][a] (?) §99: L. 80c,5
(→ mahadāṇḍanāyakasya)
(→ mahadāṇḍanāyakasya)
→ mahābhogatāya
§15: L. 56,2
mahārajajātirājadevapatrasya §99:
L. 80c,2
(→ mahā(j)rajajātirājadevaputra(traya-
jasya))
mahārajasya §24: L. 38,1; mahar[a]-
jasya §29: L. 52,1
maharajasya §30: L. 60,1
maharajajad[a][v]aputra(traya)ihāre
§29: L. 52,3
maharajadevapatrasya §81: L. 23b,1
m[a][h][a][r][a][j][ā][j]ātirājadevaputra(trasya)
§99: L. 80c,4
(→ mahārajajātirājadevapatrasya)
mahārajasya §14: L. 45a,1; §31: L. 62;
§94: L. 149a,1; §123: L. 77a,2; ma[a-
har[a][ja][s][a][Ya][a] §15: L. 56,1; [mahā-
rāja]syas §180: L. 43,1; [mahārāja-
s[y]a] §157: L. 79b,1; (mahārā)-
jasya (?) §26: L. 79,2; (mahārā-
jasya (?) §114: L. 14a,1; (mahārāj-
jasya (?) §126: L. 41b,1
maharaj śa §97: L. 78b
mah[a][r][a][j][ā][s][a] §172: L. 80b,1
mahārāja §98: L. 80d, 1
→ mahārāja

(Mahāvīra-
→ Mahāvīrasa)
Mahā[saghi]yan[ā]m or:
Mahāsaghiyanām §86: L. 97d
Ma[hās][ṅhika]na §134: L. 12a, 2
(Ma)[h][ās[ṅhikan][ā] §79: L. 97c, 2
(Mahā)saṅghiyānām or: -sāṅghī- §125: L. 143d
mahāsthāna ... §115: L. 82a, 7
[Ma]h[āpjapājḥ] [ā]sak[ā]n[ā]m (?) §89: L. 97a, 1
Mānacchandogena §94: L. 149a, 5/6
[māt]ap[i]j[i]na or: -ṇḍa §44: L. 125l
mātare §1: L. 125a, 1
→ Šamanikamātare
mātāpitina §180: L. 43, 3
mātāpitīhi §1: L. 125a, 2; §24: L. 38, 2;
§80: L. 97b, 1; §135: L. 13, 2
mātāpitīhi §187: L. 125, 6/7
mātāpitīhi §126: L. 41b, 3
mā[t]āpitṛ[ā]m §125: L. 143d
mātāpitṛṇām §27: L. 85, 6; mātāpit[j]rṇām (?) §29: L. 52, 2
mātāp[ī]tra §78: L. 149h
mātāpīttra §67: L. 146, 1/2
mātāpīttrṭra §179: L. 148, 2
mā[t]āp[j]t[jin][ā] §90: L. 97c, 1/2
mātāpitrora §184: L. 145, 2
(→ -matu, Jivaka-)
(→ -madu, savipitu-)
→ mātrābha
→ pitramātrābha,
Māthurakas(a) §19: L. 103
Māthurasya §102: L. 21b, 3
Māthura[ṇ]am §27: L. 85, 3
Mā[th]jer kalavada[ṇ] §114: L. 14a, 2
(Mā)ni[n]hadapuge[ḥ]i §139: L. 150, 1
-māse
→ hemamāsa or: -maṣe
-māṣa-
→ Pausamāṣa-divase
-māṣa
→ hemamāṣa
-māṣa
→ [māṣa], ... §76: L. 89a, 1
-māṣa, [tha]vaṣarīṣā- (?) §112: L. 14c, 1
→ grēmaṇāsa
→ (griṣma)[m]āṣe (?)
→ varṣāmāse
→ hemamāse
→ hemamāṣa
(→ -maṣe, hemata-)
(→ -mase, hematta-)
Māhāvīrasa §19: L. 103
→ Gomītāmacena
→ Brahāvātmita-(dh)itu
→ m(i)ta[kasya
→ Vṛ. dhu m(i)ta[kasya
→ mitakena
→ Gomītakena
→ mitasa
→ Gomītasa
Mitravarmmaputtra §78: L. 149h
Mitraśarma §26: L. 79, 1
-m[i]trasa, [[[ma]- §181: L. 93a
→ G(o)m(i)trasa
→ Dhanam[i]tra[sa]
→ -mitrasa, ... [va]- §162: L. 89b, 5
-m[i]trasa or: -ma[sa], B. ... §44: L. 125l
→ (Na)huṣami[tra]ṣya
→ Sāṃ[gh]am[i]tra[ṣya
(→ -mitra,-...)
Mitrāya §181: L. 93a
→ Buddhmitrāya
→ Śimitrāya
mi rā .[i] .[h]ā .e ... §72: L. 88
-mihira-
→ Kṣaṇ[d]amihira-ra-putrasya?)
→ Vakamihira-putrasya
→ Vakamihirsya
→ Vakamihirsya or: Veka- (?)
(→ -mihirāsa, -...)
-mitra-
→ Śaṅgamitrā-sadevaḥāra
→ mitrasa
→ Viṣṇumitra
→ mitrasa(y)a
→ Buddhmitrasya(y)a
(→ -mīta,-...)
(→ Mitravarmmaputra)
(→ -mitra,-...)
→ mihirāsa
→ Vakamihirsya
→ VVagamihirsya
(→ -mihira,-...)
→ munisya
→ Śaṅkapunisya or: Śakra-
munisya
→ Śaṅkapunisya
→ μune
→ Śaṅkapune
-mu(neh) → Šākyamu(neh) (-)mokṣi . . . . . . §10: L.1491

rājayasya
→ Sarva-Ścāndavirūṭisṛṣṭarājayasya
rāna §120: L.14d 1,C; r[āna] or: r[āna] §181: L.93a
rādya §91: L.124r
rāttrena
→ deśadakārattrena
Rudrilapattraṇa §94: L.149a,4
Rośikavāhare §180: L.43,2
Rohadevasa §120: L.14d 1,A
R(o)[ha](devena) §120: L.14d 1,B

Lavaṇa or:
Lavana §127: L.143a
-lohitana
→ (sa)lohitana

va §35: L.64,A; §37: L.65; §126: L.41b,1; §154: L.21a,1; §177: L.138a,1; §180: L.43,1; v[a] §12: L.52a; §150: L.24a,1; or: v[ā] §14: L.45a,1; [va] §27: L.85,1; §157: L.79b,1
(→ varsāṃśa)
Vakamihiraputrasya §60: L.127,B; §61: L.141,B; §62: L.128,B
V[akamih][r][a][s][v][a][a] §60: L.127,A1
v[a]gamihirāsya, V- §61: L.141,A1
V[a][dakṣa][ma][s][ya][a] or: Vu- §39: L.132,A1
V[a][dakṣa][s][y][a] or: Va[md][a]-, Va[d][a]-, Va[md][a]- §39: L.132,B1
Vanda[ks]asya §40: L.133,B1
Va[md][akṣa][s][y][a] or: Va[d][a]-, Va[md][a]-, Va[d][a]- §39: L.132,B1
Va[md][akṣa][s]asya §40: L.133,A
Va[md][akṣa][s][y][a] or: Va[md][a]-, Va[d][a]- §39: L.132,B1
vadhū §175: L.143m,1
[vadhū]ye §17: L.107b,2
v[adhū]/or: v[ā]- §171: L.124m,2
vadhū[ye] §84: L.143g,1; vadhū[ye] §76: L.89a,2
(→ vadhūye)
-vane
→ upavane
V[amd][akṣa][s]asya or: Va[d][a]-, Va[md][a]-, Va[d][a]- §39: L.132,B1

-varmanā
→ Buddhavarmanā
-varmasya
→ Buddhavarmasya
-varmma
→ Dharmavarma
→ Mittravarma-puttra
-varmnasya
→ Saṅghavarmanasya
vars[a] §123: L.77a,1
varsam[ā]se §30: L.60,3/4; va[ṛṣa]-māsa §128: L.21c,1
vars[a][m]a (= -māse) §23: L.89c,1
[va]rṣāṃśa §72: L.88
(→ va)
(→ vā)
(v[a]ṛṣ[e]) §162: L.89b,3
v[a]lasya or: -v[ā]-
→ Dh[a]raṁśā[ḷ]asya or: Dhuṁśā
Valānas[y]a §30: L.60,7/8
(→ Ulāṇasya)
(→ Balāṇas(y)a)
-vāśikasya
→ Vojyavāśikasya
Vasagut[a]/// §111: L.102e 2
Vasunā §115: L.82a,6
-vast[avaya]sya, ... §45: L.40,2
-vahāsa
→ sārthavahāsa
v[ā] or: v[a] §12: L.52a; §14: L.45a,1
(→ varsāṃśa)
Vākuḍātavr[ā]sikasā[ā] §55: L.125k,1
vacakāsya- §15: L.56,1
(Va)tas(iputrasa) §187: L.125,2/3
(vā*)diyānām
→ Śavasthī(va*)diyānām
vadhūye §14: L.45a,3
v[ādhū]/// or: v[a-] §171: L.124m,2
→ vadhū-
vāy.-/// §122: L.91d
-vālasa (= -pālasa)
→ Budhavālasa
v[ā]lasya or: -v[a]-
→ Dh[a]raṁśā[ḷ]asya or: Dhuṁśā-
vāśin-
→ antevāsin-,
→ Vāśikasya, sāher-v- §94: L.149a,2
(Vā)[s]iṣṭikasaya §28: L.33
(Vāsu)devaḥ §115: L.82a,9/10
Vāsuv(au)svasya?) §30: L.60,2; (Vāsudevasya?) §115: L.82a,6/7
vāstusmi §65: L.140,A
-vināśe
→ caturvināśe or: -viśe
viṇā
to sarṭa
vi[ijā]yamānānaṃ §27: L.85,4/5
vi[d]yaṣya
to caturve[di]yaṣya
Viravṛddhiprotro §137: L.149b,4
vira-
to Māhāvīrasa
→ Sarva-Scandavirātīrṣṭarājyaṣya
→ viṇāṃ, paṃca→
viśirṇaṃ
to bhagnapatitaviśirṇaṃ
viṣe
→ caturvīṣe or: -viṇā
dv[i]śarāṣṭakaṣya §61: L.141, A1
[v[ji][va]ṣa[k]aṣya §119: L.14d,2
viśv[a]si[k]kaṣya §63: L.125q; viśv[a]-ṣik[a]ṣya or: viśv[a]ṣik[a]ṣya §60: L.127, A1
→ vaiśvasi[k]kaṣya
Viṣṇum[tr]asa §181: L.93a
→ Viṣṇuyāḥ
visa .. [a[k]e] .. §2: L.125c,2
vihariṣya §157: L.79b,1
vihariḥ [i] §157: L.79b,2
vihariṣya
→ sadhyavihariṣya or: sadhyyi-
→ Saṅghamitra-sadevihaṁśa
→ vi ha .. hare (t)
→ masaravi .. hare (t)
vi[j]hārasvānm[im]iṣya §136: L.31b,1
vihārīṣa
→ Saṅghamitra-sadevihaṁśa
→ sadhyavihariṣya or: sadhyyi-
vihāre §1: L.125a,2; §65: L.140,A;
§86: L.97d; §121: L.14b,2; §135: L.13,2; vihāre §136: L.31b,3; [v[i]hāre §157: L.79b,2; [vihāre (t)]
§154: L.21a,2; (vihāre (t)) §184: L.145,2
→ Cutakavihaṁśa
→ Pravārikavihaṁśa
→ mahārājaḍa/(v)a/(putra)vihaṁśa
→ Yaśāvihaṁśa
→ Rośkavihaṁśa
→ Śīrivīhaṁśa
→ Suvanakāravi(hā)re
→ vihaṁśa
→ vihito
→ savihito
→ paṃcavitavṛyaṁ
→ viha→
vīryo, //.. ta- §178: L.85c,3
Viṣṇusyaḥ §161: L.149u,1
→ Viṣṇum[tr]asa
v[i]hāre §31: L.62
→ vihaṁśa
Vudakṣa[raṇ]ṣ[y][ā] or: V[a]- §39: L.132,A
Vṛddhāya §54: L.125r
→ Vṛddhahastī[ṣ[y]][a] §15: L.56,1
→ vihaṁśa
→ Viṣṇum[tr]asa
→ dhy[ar]tha
→ āyubalav(r)aj[ar]tha
Vṛddhisya §84: L.143g,2
Vṛṣṭiṇaṃ §113: L.14,2
vedikā §176: L.92d; §187: L.125,4; ve-
dikā §115: L.82a,8
[Vema] Ta[ka]d[a]ṃvasya or: Ta[ka]jam,
→ kṣu- §98: L.80d,2
Veraḥ[na]ṣya (?) or: Kha- §15: L.56,2
Vairāśakhi(ya) §23: L.89c,1
→ V[a]rij[ya]nāṃ §15: L.56,1
v[a]jāvastakṣya §62: L.128, A1
→ viśvaśi[k]kaṣya
→ viśvasa[k]kṣya
→ viśvasi[k]kaṣya
V[ō]jaya[vaśi]kaṣya §44: L.125l
vyavahārīhi §65: L.140,A
vyāstā/// §79: L.97c,1
[V]r.[d]h[um][i]t[a]kaṣya §15: L.56,2
V[a]jagṛmhihrāṣya §61: L.141, A1
→ Vakmihirā-
Śakyamunīṣya or: Śakra- §183: L.138,1
Śakyamune §180: L.43,2
Śakramunīṣya or: Śakya- §183: L.138,1
→ Śakya-
→ Śakhi (ya)
→ Vairāśakhi(ya)
→ śākha
→ sata
→ aṣṭākata
→ [pāṇa]sata///
Śāmanikāya §180: L.43,3
Śāmanikāya §180: L.43,3
→ sarma
→ Mitraśarmo
→ sāma-, Īndra-
Śavātrītapotṛ[i]ya (=Śiva-)§14: L.45a,3
Śāu . . . §99: L.80c,5
Śākyabhikṣṣūyāra- §8: L.78c,1
Śākyabhikṣo §67: L.146,1; §152: L.135a,1
Śākyabhikṣo §185: L.147,1
Śākyabhikṣor §179: L.148,1; §186: L.149
Śā[ka]yamunīṣya §4: L.143c,1
[sa]gha[s]tha[vira(sya)] §155: L.135 e, 1
(→ saṅghasthavirasyā)
-saṅghīyānaṁ, -yanā
→ Mahāsaṅghīyānaṁ, -yanā
(→ saṅghīkāṇā, Mahā-)
(→ saṅghīyānaṁ, (Mahā)-)
saṅhe or: saṅheṁ §31: L.62
(→ saṅhe)
Saṅgārakasya §9: L.149 v, 2
[Saṅha] ... [sya] §47: L.137, b1
Saṅ[gha]d[a][śa][śa]syā §47: L.137, b1
(→ Saṅhadāsasya)
Saṅ[ghadevasa or]: Sa[m]- §145: L.125 j
Si[n]ghadevas[ya] §47: L.137, b1
Saṅghadevasīya §55: L.125 k, 1
s[sa]ṅhapraṇātānaṁ §50: L.125 w, 1
saṅhapraṇātānaṁ [a|m] §48: L.125 t; saṅhapraṇātān[a|m][ān] §47: L.125 s
(→ saṅhapraṇātānaṁ)
Saṅ[gham]it[ra][sa][syā] §47: L.137, b2
Saṅghamitra-sadeviḥ[ā]rīsa §45: L.40, 1
Saṅghavarm[m][a][syā] §54: L.125 r
saṅghasthavirasyāya §59: L.129
(→ saṅghasthavirasyā)
saṅhe §38: L.139, 1; s[a]ṅhe §39: L.132, B 1
(→ saṅhe or: saṅheṁ)
(→ saṁhe)
saṁkkālayitavayāḥ §65: L.140, A
Sa[m]ghadevasa or: Sa[n]gha- §145: L.125)
(→ Saṅghadevasiḍ)
saṅhapraṇātānaṁ §51: L.131
(→ saṅhapraṇātānaṁ)
(→ saṅhapraṇākṣtehi)
(→ saṅhapraṇātānaṁ)
Saṁgharaksitaṣaya §185: L.147, 1/2
(→ Saṁgharaksita)
Saṁghila §81: L.23 b, 2
saṁghapraṇākṣtehi §65: L.140, A
saṁghapraṇātānaṁ §49: L.125 u
(→ saṁghapraṇātānaṁ)
Saṁgha[r][a][ks][i][t[a] §65: L.140, B
(→ Saṁgharaksitasya)
saṁhe §33: L.62 b, A; §35: L.64, B 1;
saṁ[gh]j[o][o] §40: L.133, B 1
(→ saṅhe)
-saco
→ Bodhisaco
(→ saṅva, ...)
-satatādas(u)khaye
→ sa(v)vasatādas(u)khaye
-satāna
→ saṁvrasatāna
(→ sarvasatvāhitasukhārtha)
(→ sa(re)vatāthida(ukhaye?))
(→ sarvasatvāhitasūkha)
(sar[r][vastvā]a[na] §35: L.64, B2
sarvasatvānām §179: L.148,2; (sar[v]a-[s]at[tvānām] §185: L.147,2
(→ sarvasatvānam)
(→ sarvasatvāna, -naṃ, -nām)
(→ savasatānam, -satvānām, -savānd)
(→ sārvasatāna)
sarvasatvāhitasukhārtha[tha] §153: L.143b
(→ sarvasatvāhitasukha-)
(§*Sarvāstīvādin, gen. pl.:
→ Śāvasthi(vā)*dīyānām)
sa(re)v[a]sata[ha]s(a)ukhaye? §102:
L.21b,3/4
(→ sarvasatvāhitasukha-)
sar[v]asat[va]na[ma]- §8: L.78c,1/2
(→ sarvasatvānām)
sarvasatvāhitasukhikā §31: L.62
(→ sarvasatvāhitasukha-)
sarvvasa[tvā]na §41: L.89,4
sarvasatvānām §27: L.85,7
sarvasatvānām §186: L.149
(→ sarvasatvānām)
sarvasatvānāntarajñānaṇavāptaye §67: L.146,2
sarvāvadkuṇkhaprahaṇārthaṃ §81: L.23b,3
(→ sarvāvad (u)khopāsaṃaya)
sarvvas[ā]ṃ §46: L.126,2
(sa)lohitana §156: L.135d,2
sav[a]carā §14: L.45a,1
savachare §73: L.29a,1
savat.a[re] or: savatca[re] §35: L.64, B1/2 (cf. p. 72.n.3)
savatsara §137: L.149b,1
sa[v]asarā §107: L.41a,1
savatsare §29: L.52,2; §30: L.60,3;
§182: L.23,2; "savatsare" §177: L.138a,1; [savatsa]re §128: L.21c,1
(→ savatsare)
savabūḍhanām §89: L.97a,1
(→ sarv[p]uddha-)
(→ sarvabudha-)
savasatānām §2: L.125c,3
savatvānām[ē] §1: L.125a,3
savasa[v][ā]na[ē] §90: L.97c,2
(→ sarvasatvānām)
-savānd
(→ savasavānd)
savihito §166: L.149q
saha §62: L. 128, A 1; §73: L. 29a, 3
sahā §24: L. 38, 2; §61: L. 141, A 1; §80: L. 97b, 2; §126: L. 41b, 3; §135: L. 13, 2; §187: L. 125, 6; 7; s[ā]hā §80: L. 97b, 1; 2; s[ā]hā §60: L. 127, A 1

(- sahā)

(sa)[h][ta][y]a §157: L. 79b, 2
-Śāgarābhīyāṃ, Sāmu[d]r[a]- §9: L. 149v, 1/2

(- Sagarasya)

-sānghikaṅa

→ Mahāsāṅghikaṅa
-sāṅghīyāṇam or: -sāṁghī-

→ (Mahā) sāṅghīyāṇam, -sāṅghīyāṇam

(- sāṅghīyāṇam, Mahā-)

-sātō

→ Bodīḍa or:

-sāt(v)jo

→ Bod(dh)at(v)jo

(- satva-, ...-

S[ā]mu[d]r[a]- or: Samu[d]r[a]- §9: L. 149v, 1
s[ā]rthavaḥāsa §172: L. 80b, 1
sārvva[a]satāna §3: L. 89e, 2

(- sarvasatvarṇāṇa)

(*Sāvattiveśāṇaṃ

→ Sāvasthi(vā*)diyāṇaṃ

sahā §1: L. 125a, 2; [sā]hā §19: L. 103

(- sahā)

[siddha (?) §93: L. 149z, 1
siddham §27: L. 85, 1; §74: L. 31a, 1;

§151: L. 149g, 1; siddha[m] §157: L. 143m, 1; §182: L. 23, 1; [s]iddham §144: L. 81a, 1; [siddham] §157: L. 79b, 1; [cf. §54: L. 125r, n. 1]
siddham §8: L. 149v, 1; §52: L. 125m;

§55: L. 125k, 2; §94: L. 149a, 1; s[i]-ddham or: s[i]- §15: L. 56, 1; [siddham] §50: L. 125w, 1
Sīdh[a]h §104: L. 13b, 2
Sīhakasya §128: L. 21c, 1

-/s/[ihasya?]

→ Śāk[y](a)s[i]/ihasya?

s[i]ddham or: s[i]ddham §15: L. 56, 1
-sukhaye

→ sarvasatvahitasukha(ye?)

→ sa(re)vasatahidas(ukhaye?)

→ hitasukhaye

-sukhartham

→ hitasukhartham

-sukhā
e

→ hitasukhā
e

sukhā[ye] §128: L. 21c, 2

→ hitasukhā
e

-sukhrtha

→ sarvasatvahitasukhrtha

→ hitasukhrtha

-sukhrtham

→ hitasukhrtham

(- sukha-)

Sukhi[a] §65: L. 140, C
Suv[a]p[a]al[kā]ra[yi](hā)r[e] §89: L. 97a, 1

(- sovanikasa)

[Sv]yānasya (1) or: [A]yā- §63: L. 125q
Sūnasya §135: L. 13, 1
-sūkha

→ sarvasatvahitasūkha

→ sūkha(rtham?)

→ hitasūkha(rtham?)

(- sukha-)

Senas[y]a §142: L. 135b

→ -Jayasenasya

→ Matisenasya

Senahasti [ca] or: -hasti §137: L. 149b, 3
-somasya

→ -Brahmasomasya

sovanik[a]sa §150: L. 24a, 1; sova[n](i-kasa?) §168: L. 92a

(- Svarakāravi(hā)re)

stambho §64: L. 82, 2
stāne §27: L. 85, 2/3

(- sthāna, mahā-)

-sthavirasya

→ saṅgha-, saṅghasthavirasya

→ sthāna/// mahā-

-sthāna///

→ mahāsthāna///

(- stāne)

sthānikyiye §15: L. 56, 1
Sthāvarajāta §65: L. 140, B
-sthitasya

→ satyadha(r)masthitasya

-sthitena [a]; sthitena §162: L. 89b, 9; 11
sya (≡ syā?) §78: L. 149h
svakā[yam] §157: L. 79b, 2
svakā[yā] §150: L. 24a, 2
svakā[yyām] or:

svakā[ryām] §137: L. 149b, 6

(- sake)

-sevatvā

→ Bodhisvatva

(- satva, ...-

svamanasya §81: L. 23b, 2
-svāti-

→ Brahāvati(mita-(dh)itu

svāmi(sa) §113: L. 14, 1
svāmisya §64: L. 82, 1; svāmi[sa] §115: L. 82a, 10; [s][v][ām]isya §115: L. 82a, 1

→ vihārasvāmisya
Hitasūkha

→ sarvvasatvahitasūkha

Hitasūkha (rthaṃ?) §112: L. 14c, 2

→ hidas (ukhaye?)

→ sa (rv) vasatāhidas (ukhaye?)

→ hitasya

→ (sa) hitasya

Huv[maspal(o)[na] §98: L. 80d, 3

Huvākaśya §15: L. 56, 1

Huvikāśya §16: L. 80; §99: L. 80c, 4;

Huvī[sv]kāśya (?) or: Huvī[sv]kāśya §137: L. 149b, 1

Huveṭksaśya §14: L. 45a, 1

Huveśkaśya §29: L. 52, 1; Huv[e]śkaśya §24: L. 38, 1

Huvī[sv]kāśya §31: L. 62

Huveśkaśya §180: L. 43, 1

[h(e)] §172: L. 80b, 1; [he] §103: L. 13a

hematt[ā]se §73: L. 29a, 1

hematt[a][se] or: -m[ā]se §137: L. 149b, 2

hemanta §28: L. 33

hemantamāsa §29: L. 52, 1

hemantamāsa §15: L. 56, 1; h(e)mantamāsa (?) §107: L. 41a, 1; (hema)-[nta][mā][s]a] §5: L. 88a, 1

Haramurd[gan][a] [sa] §60: L. 127, A 1

Haramurddapharasya §61: L. 141, B;
Horamu[r]d[d]apharasya §60: L. 127, B

Horamu[r]dvagen[a] §61: L. 141, A 1


→ Haramurd[ddapharasya]
INDEX OF MISCELLANEOUS TERMS. ¹

For the signs: °, ( ), [ ], *, §, ⟨ ⟩, L., see above p. 9 ff.

Abhisāra ........................................ p. 39
ābhyantrō gaṇaḥ .................................... p. 56
abhyaṭītakālagata ................................ p. 81
antevāsin, -vāsinī ................................. p. 50 ff.
-ātisṛṣṭaṛāja ....................................... p. 142 ff.
aupasthāyikanirmūḍa .............................. p. 56
Aurangzeb ........................................... p. 29
Bahasatimita
   → Brhatsthāmitra
Bakkula
   → Vakkula, etc.
baladhika .......................................... p. 163
bhadanta .......................................... p. 50
bhāṣaṇaka .......................................... p. 70
Brhatsthāmitra ..................................... p. 156
Buddhist schools
   Kakāṭika .......................................... p. 102
   Mahopadeśaka (?) .............................. p. 123
   Caṇḍavira (Śaṇḍavira) ....................... p. 143
   Čāṣṭana .......................................... p. 147
   caturvidya ....................................... p. 70
   Curzon Museum ................................ p. 9
Dadhikarna
   → Index of the words found in inscriptions, s.v.
Designations of Buddha
   Devātideva ...................................... p. 119
   Mahādeva ....................................... p. 119
   (?) Mahātman ................................ p. 203
   Pitāmaha ........................................ p. 118
   svamato devaḥ ................................... p. 119
devakula .......................................... p. 144 ff.
Devātideva
   → Designations of Buddha
dhātṛi ................................................ p. 207
gañjavara .......................................... p. 100
Gotami ............................................... p. 164
Gupta alphabet ('eastern variety') .......... p. 117 ff.
hārmya ............................................... p. 209
Hoernle collection ................................ p. 7
Hora-murmaṇḍa-ga, -phara (with v. l.) .... p. 95 ff.
Hūan-tsang ........................................ p. 60; 77
இஎ (initial) ........................................ p. 207, n. 3
jīvaputrā .......................................... p. 156
Kacāṭika
   → Buddhist schools
kālavāda .......................................... p. 11, n. 5
Keśavadeva temple ............................... p. 29
kṣaharāta .......................................... p. 158
L. (abbreviation) ................................ p. 11
List of inscriptions in the eastern script .... p. 118, n. 1
mahādānapati ..................................... p. 96
Mahādeva
   → Designations of Buddha
Mahātman
   → Designations of Buddha
Mahopadeśaka (?) ............................... p. 123
   → Buddhist schools
Māṅgala symbols in inscriptions .......... p. 75; 76 ff.; 80; 152, n. 3; 154; 165, 5; 193, 3; 208
mao-lun .......................................... p. 96
Metrical inscriptions ............................ § 21: L. 111;
   § 113: L. 14; § 178: L. 85 e
Monkey Stūpa .................................... p. 60
Monograms (property marks on clothing) .. p. 167
muruṇḍa (muruṇḍa with v. l.), muroḍa ........ p. 96 ff.
Nāga cult, etc. .................................... p. 37;
   38; 63; 148; 193; 209
   → Dadhikarna
ndo  in the Saka language .................... p. 97 ff.; 100
pañcavrāh ......................................... p. 12, n. 3
phara ............................................... p. 97
Pitāmaha
   → Designations of Buddha
prādhānika ........................................ p. 83
S. = Sarṇvat
Śaṅgrava (gotra) ................................ p. 100
saṅghapraṇṭa ..................................... p. 84
Sarva .............................................. p. 143
satyadharmashitha .............................. p. 141 ff.

¹ "The words are given under their Sanskrit form if this really occurs or can be easily formed" (Lüders, List, p. 213, n. 1).
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Sai-wang .................. p. 96
Sculptor's marks .......... §70: L. 91b; §105: L. 15a
Sculptor's names .......... §77: L. 125i; §132: L. 143l; §145: L. 125j; §146: L. 125f; §147: L. 125g; §148: L. 91c; §149: L. 125h
Siggava .................... p. 100
śisya, śisinī ................. p. 50
seryathā = p. seyyathā .... p. 83
Śodāsa ..................... p. 100
svamato devah
→ Designations of Buddha
Upagupta-monastery ....... p. 60
Vaḍakṣa, Vaṇḍakṣa .......... p. 77
-Vaga-mihira, v.; Vaka-mihira p. 95
Vakkula, Vatkula; Vakkali;
Vākuḍa ..................... p. 89
Vālukṣa ..................... p. 77
viśvāsika, vai .............. p. 98
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From Cunningham, ASI [Ann.] Rep. 3, 1873, pl. 1.
FACSIMILES
§ 5: (L. 88a) (line 1, from /nta/ to /di/: 8 cm).  
§ 8: (L. 78c) (line 1, aksara 1—32, i.e. from de to sa: 39.5 cm).  
§ 11: L. 91a (3 cm).  
§ 27: L. 85 (line 2, from bha to stā: 29.5 cm). — Below: the first two lines of an old rubbing of the Hoernle collection (cf. above p. 62, 1).
§ 80: L. 60. Cunningham's rubbing (line 5, from *tri* to *yam*: 24 cm).
[ Cf. also the following page. ]
§ 32 : L. 62a. Two different impressions of the inscription (↔ 55 cm). • [§ 33: cf. the following page.] • § 34 :
L. 63 (from ḏá to 20: 50 cm).
§ 37

§ 38

§ 87: L. 05 (from da to 10 l: 35.5 cm).

§ 88: L. 139 (line 1, from da to to: 41.5 cm).
- A: torus inscription.
§ 40: L. 123 (= L. 134). B: base inscription (from do to scep: 43 cm); — A: torus inscription.
§ 44: L. 1251 (baqara 1-11, i.e. from d/3 to eye: 26 cm).
§ 50: L. 125w (line 1, left part, from dā to nam: 17.5 cm).

§ 51: L. 131 (= L. 125v) (from dā/ to kha: 25 cm).

§ 52: L. 125m (from si to ca: 46 cm).
§ 57: L. 125x (e.g., 1 to 2 cm).
§ 58: L. 1250 (from dd to 28 cm).
§ 59: L. 1259 (L. 1301) (from dd to dam: 21.5 cm).
§ 60: L. 127. Two different rubbings of A, the base inscription (line 1, from da to ñ: 53 cm); — B: torus inscription.
§ 61: L. 141. A: base inscription (line 1, from \([d/a] to [re]: 48 \text{ cm}\)); — B: torus inscription. — To the right of B: the last six akṣaras of A, line 1, from another impression.

§ 62: L. 128. A: base inscription (line 1, from \([d/a] to [re]: 45 \text{ cm}\)); — B: torus inscription. — To the right of B: the last seven akṣaras of A, line 1, from another impression.
§ 65 : L. 140. Line A: the rubbing of the Hoernle collection (akṣara 2—17, i.e. from pa to nam: 57 cm). [Cf. the following page.]
§ 65: L. 140 (continued). Line B, akṣara 1—20 (i.e. from sthā to āgha = 64 cm): the rubbing of the Hoernle collection (before sthā, i.e. at the beginning of the line; the i-sign of the last akṣara of line A; cf. above p. 101,5); — akṣara 19/20 (smaṅgha)—23 (i/a/): a modern impression. — Line C: a modern impression.
§ 75: (L. 91c) (from ṛa to sa: 40 cm).  § 76: L. 89a (impression of the first two lines: ↔ 44.5 cm).  § 77: L. 125i (from ra to ma: 3.5 cm).
§ 79: (L. 97c) (line 1, from p/i to stā: 20 cm).  § 80: (L. 97b) (line 1, aḵšara 1—22, i.e. from bo to na: 37 cm).

- § 83: (L. 143f). Pencil tracing (from ka to sa: 9.5 cm).
- § 84: (L. 143g) (line 1, from da to dhū: 6 cm).
- § 86: (L. 97d) (from ḏ to /ja/: 37 cm).
(L. 85a) (aksara 1—4: 8 cm).
§ 96: (L. 85b) (from ma to j/a): 4.7 cm; — to the right: another impression (inscription only). § 97: (L. 78b) (from ma to sko: 62 cm). [Cf. above p. 133,2.] § 98: (L. 80d) (line 1, from ma to tro: 21.5 cm).
§ 99: (L. 80c). Two different impressions of the inscription (line 1, from not to jye: 41 cm).
§ 118: (L. 14d/b) (from x to as [chord]: 19 cm).

§ 119: L. 14d (line 1, aksura 1-11, i.e. from ma to pe:
26.5 cm).
§ 229: (L. 14 d.), (A) 1 = Vogel's No. a (from ro to σ(a); 23 cm), 2 = Vogel's No. b, 3 = Vogel's No. d, 9 = Vogel's No. o, 18 = Vogel's No. m, 18 = Vogel's No. n (13, 14, 15).

§ 228:...
§ 121: L. 14b (impression of line 1: ↔ 15,5 cm). • [§ 122: cf. the following page.] • § 123: (L. 77a) (line 2, from ma to bh[a]: 20,5 cm).
• § 124: (L. 92c) (from prd to ka: 4,5 cm).
§ 122: (L. 91 d) (from go to va: 37 cm).  

§ 125: (L. 143 d). Above: the beginning of the inscription (aksara 1—13, i.e. from śāṃ to ṣadāṃ: 19 cm), and: → the whole inscription (another impression), from śāṃ to the man-gala symbol.
§ 180: (L. 143h). a: inscription on the proper right side of the pedestal (line 2, from . . to tyd: 5 cm); — b: from the proper left side. • § 181: (L. 143n). a: inscription on the front side of the pedestal; — b: from the proper left side (from tv[?a] to e: 7.5 cm). • § 188: L. 14e (line 2, from bha to sya: 24 cm).
§ 134: L. 12a. Two different impressions of line 1 (from sum to /aq/; 19 cm); one impression of line 2. • § 135: L. 13 (line 1, akṣara 1–28, i.e., from 1/16 to 1/20; 61 cm). • § 136: L. 31b (line 1, from ma to do; 30 cm).
§ 157: (L. 79)b. Two different impressions of line 1 (from *si* to *t/a*: 33.5 cm); one impression of line 2/3.  
§ 159: (L. 91f) (line 2, from *ki* to *s/a*: 5.5 cm).  
§ 160: (L. 91h) (line 1, from *g* to *s/a*: 7.5 cm).  
§ 167: L. 125e (from the visarga to /m\’a/: 18 cm).
§ 168: L. 92a (from go to va: 36 cm).
§ 171: L. 124m
(line 2, from /ya/ to v/a/: 14 cm).
§ 172: (L. 80b) (line 1, from r/\’a/ to bha: 62 cm).
§ 173: (L. 92b) (from ya to nam: 7 cm).
§ 178: (L. 85c) (line 1, from vu to δ[θ]: 33,5 cm).  

§ 179—§ 181: cf. the following page.  
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