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SCRIPSIT
More than ten years ago arrangements were concluded for the preparation of a volume of Kharoshṭhī and Brāhmaṇ inscriptions, to be edited jointly by Professors Lüders and Rapson and to be issued as vol. ii of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.

In 1922 Professor Rapson intimated that his other engagements precluded him from undertaking the work, and, at the suggestion of the Government of India, the Secretary of State for India in Council decided to offer the vacant post to me, and this was done in a letter of the 17th November 1922.

Having already devoted much time to the study of Kharoshṭhī and Kharoshṭhī inscriptions I gladly accepted the offer, though I much regretted that Professor Rapson, with his unrivalled knowledge of Kharoshṭhī, had not been able to undertake the task.

During the six years which have passed since then I have given most of my time to the work.

Through the courtesy of the Indian Government I was able to visit the chief Indian Museums and examine the originals of most Kharoshṭhī inscriptions in the first months of 1925, and through the kind services of Sir John Marshall I have been provided with estampages and photographs of all the inscriptions preserved in India. The authorities of the British Museum and the Royal Asiatic Society have sent me photographs of the inscriptions in their possession, and the India Office has been good enough to prepare for my use an excellent plaster-of-Paris cast of the Mathura Lion Capital. Finally, the French authorities have, at the request of the Foreign Office, graciously placed at my disposal reproductions of the Kharoshṭhī records preserved in the French capital. For all the assistance given me in this way I beg to offer my sincere thanks.

My friends Professors Karlāgren, Lüders, and Thomas have laid me under heavy obligation in connexion with my work. Professor Karlāgren has gone through the proofs of the introduction and saved me from several mistakes. Professor Thomas has kindly read the proofs of the whole volume, and both he and Professor Lüders have on several occasions discussed many difficult points with me and helped me in many ways. I have tried to acknowledge the assistance I have received in
this way, but I am afraid that I have done so unsatisfactorily, and in this place I should like to give expression to the cordial gratitude which I feel towards them.

Finally, I wish to add that it is largely due to the Oxford University Press if the outer appearance of the book will be found satisfactory. To people who have often had to fight some printing-office in order to produce fairly acceptable work it is a rare experience to co-operate with the Clarendon Press and to feel that there is no fight, but only a competition in order to make the results as excellent as it is possible at the present day.

STEN KONOW.
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HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

Kharoshthi cannot, like Brāhmī, be characterized as the national alphabet of India. It has, it is true, been developed on Indian soil and for noting down the sounds of an Indian language, but its use was restricted to a comparatively limited territory, and even there we have occasional indications of Brāhmī having been employed, e.g. in ancient seal legends from Taxila.

Bühler has shown that the Kharoshṭhī characters are derived from Aramaic, which Origin of was in common use for official purposes all over the Achaemenian empire during the period when it comprised north-western India. Some features, such as the vowel system and the compound consonants, point to the conclusion that the alphabet was elaborated with the help of Brāhmī, which must accordingly have been in existence for some time previously.

From the purely Indian point of view there was not, therefore, any necessity for framing a new script. And Bühler is evidently right in assuming that Kharoshṭhī is 'the result of the intercourse between the offices of the Satraps and of the native authorities, the Indian chiefs and the heads of towns and villages, whom, as the accounts of the state of the Panjāb at the time of Alexander's invasion show, the Persians left in possession in consideration of the payment of their tribute. The Hindus probably used at first the pure Aramaic characters, just as in much later times they adopted the Arabic writing for a number of their dialects, and they introduced in the course of time the modifications observable in the Kharoshṭhī alphabet'.

This development may have taken some time. It was an accomplished fact in the middle of the third century B.C., when the alphabet was used in the Māñsehrā and Shāh-bāzgārī versions of Aśoka’s edicts, though Aramaic was then still in use, as shown by the Aramaic inscription found at Taxila, in which Professor Andreas has recognized Aśoka's usual designation Priyadarśin. The alphabet then remained in use for more than half a millennium, the last known Kharoshṭhī inscriptions dating from the fourth or fifth century A.D.

Bühler has pointed out that Kharoshṭhī is evidently a clerk's and not a Pandit's Kharoshṭhī alphabet. Outside of India we find it used also in books, in the Duttreuil de Rhins manuscript containing a version of the Dhammapada in a north-western Prākrit, which has been found near Khotan. It is possible that the same may sometimes have been the case in India, and it is even possible that the Duttreuil de Rhins manuscript was written in India. The only old manuscript actually found in India within the territory and the period covered by Kharoshṭhī inscriptions is, however, written in Brāhmī.

The area within which we can prove Kharoshṭhī to have been regularly used Kharoshṭhī belongs to the north-west. The easternmost limit is, in the Panjāb, at Māñikiāla. There are two inscriptions from Kangra, where Kharoshṭhī is used in addition to Brāhmī, and there is another record from Kānlā, which shows that the alphabet was known further to the east, and foreign conquerors from the north-west used it in a well-

2 Ed. Senart, JA, ix, xii, 1898, pp. 193 ff.
3 Cf. Bühler, Indische Palaeographie, § 7.
known inscription in Mathurā on the Jamnā, where Brāhmī was the common alphabet, also in inscriptions and on coins. We even possess a Kharoshṭhī record from Patna. But the plaque on which it is written has evidently been left there by a person who came from the north-west. We do not know exactly how far the use of Kharoshṭhī extended towards the west. Coins with Kharoshṭhī legends have been found in Seisītān and Kandahār, but the westernmost Kharoshṭhī inscriptions which have been found are from Khowat in Afghanistan and, side by side with Brāhmī records, from the Thal valley in Baluchistān. And even here we have every reason for assuming that the alphabet was brought and used by immigrants from the east. For it is little suited for the requirements of Iranian languages, and we have nothing to show that the dialect in which most Kharoshṭhī records are written was ever spoken as a vernacular much further east than Jalālābād.

The northernmost Kharoshṭhī records come from Tirath in Swāt and Khalatse in Ladakh, and in the south we have some fragments from Mohenjo Daro in the Lārkāna district and Kharoshṭhī legends on the coins of some of the oldest of the Western Kshatrapas. But such stray instances do not prove anything more for the proper Kharoshṭhī area than the Kharoshṭhī word tīpikaraṇa in the Siddāpur edicts of Asoka. The Kharoshṭhī area proper may be defined as extending from about 69° to 73° 30’ E. and from the Hindu Kush to about 33° N., and there can be little doubt that its place of origin was Gandhāra, perhaps more especially Taxila.

Professor Sylvain Lévi has given a different account of the origin of Kharoshṭhī.¹ From a notice in Chinese Buddhist literature, according to which the correct form of the name Shu-le, i.e. Kashgar, is K'iu-tu-shu-ta(m)-lē, which, according to M. Lévi, corresponds to Sanskrit Kharoshṭhra, he draws the conclusion that the correct name of the alphabet was Kharoshṭhī, and that this name means ‘the script of Kharoshṭhra’, i.e. Kashgar.

Messrs. O. Franke and R. Pischel protested against this explanation,² and M. Lévi³ modified his theory and maintained that Kharoshṭhī was the script of Kharoshṭhra, and this again an old Indian designation of the country between India and China. Franke objected ⁴ that we have no such Sanskrit word as Kharoshṭhra, that the Chinese K'iu-tu-shu-ta(m)-lē can hardly be a rendering of such a form, and that the Indian name of the alphabet is given as Kharoshti, Kharosthi in Indian sources.

So far as I can see, M. Lévi’s theory is hardly reconcilable with what we know about the history of the alphabet.

It is true that numerous Kharoshṭhī documents have been found in Chinese Turkestan, notably in the eastern oases to the south of the desert, and that the only known Kharoshṭhī manuscript comes from the Khotan country. The alphabet is, however, everywhere used for writing an Indian language, and we should a priori be inclined to think that it was brought to Turkestan by Indian immigrants. Moreover, the manuscript and the documents belong to a comparatively late date, none of them being apparently older than the second century A.D.

In India, on the other hand, the use of Kharoshṭhī can be traced back to the third century B.C. Moreover, Bühler seems to me to have proved definitely that it has been evolved from Aramaic to suit the exigencies of an Indian language, and we know that Aramaic was used in the Achaemenian offices and also that it was used in north-western India. At the time when Kharoshṭhī came into existence there does not seem to have

¹ BEFEO, ii, 1902, pp. 245 ff.
² BEFEO, iv, 1904, pp. 543 ff.
³ SBBAW, 1903, pp. 184 ff., 735 ff.
⁴ SBBAW, 1905, pp. 238 ff.
been any Indian settlement in Turkestan, which was then peopled by various nomadic tribes, who do not seem to have been in possession of any developed civilization.

It therefore seems to me that we must accept Bühler's view about the origin of the Kharoshthi. I also think that he was right in assuming that the name was in India considered to mean 'the script invented by Kharoshtha', though it is quite possible that it is due to a popular etymology of an Aramaic word meaning 'writing', which sounded like kharottha and was Sanskritized as kharoshtha, ass.-lip.¹

I am not, however, in this place concerned with the origin and the older history of Kharoshthi. The inscriptions published in this volume do not belong to the period when the script first began to be used, and none of them can be brought into connexion with the Achaemenians or with the Mauryans, who succeeded them as rulers over north-western India.

Most of them belong to the period when new conquerors had made themselves masters of the country, after the downfall of the Mauryan empire, and the oldest of them can be directly connected with these foreign invaders.

Three such peoples are often mentioned together in Indian sources: the Yavanas, the Sakas, and the Pahlavas, and they are all represented in Kharoshthi inscriptions.

The Yavanas or Yonas, i.e. the Greeks, had already made their appearance on the Indian soil before the Mauryan dynasty came into being. It was, however, only at a somewhat later date that they began to penetrate the north-western provinces in earnest. In the first half of the second century b.c. Greek rulers crossed the Hindukush and made themselves masters of the Kâbul country and north-western India: the houses of Euthydemus and Eucratides. And Greek princes held their own in these districts down to the first century b.c.

Demetrius, who seems to have made himself master of parts of India about 175 b.c., began to use Kharoshthi in his coin legends, and this practice was continued down to the last Greek ruler in the Kâbul valley, Hermæus, in the first century A.D.

Most of these rulers are only known from their coins, and our information about them is rather scanty. We can, however, see that their conquest led to the result that Greek notions came to exercise a certain influence in the Indian borderland, notably in the framing of the calendar and in the development of Buddhist art.

None of the Greek rulers known from coins or other sources is mentioned in Kharoshthi inscriptions, and there are only faint traces of the Greeks in them. A meridarkha Thetidora, i.e. μεριδάρχης Théodorus, is mentioned in an inscription which has been found in Swat, but on a portable object, so that we do not know exactly its place of origin. Another inscription, which has been dug out at Taxila, also contains the same title, but the name of the meridarkh has been lost. Finally the name Thetudama occurs on a seal stone found in Bajaur.

These records do not teach us anything new. The two meridarkhs are mentioned as establishing Buddhist relics and sanctuaries, but we knew beforehand that the Greeks in India often assimilated themselves to the religion and civilization of their subjects.

The successors of the Greeks, the Sakas and Pahlavas, play a much more prominent role in Kharoshthi inscriptions. Some of their chief rulers and leaders are mentioned by name, and their history forms the basis of the chronological questions connected with these records. The inscriptions themselves are one of the principal sources for our knowledge of an important period of Indian history. But they cannot be used as such

¹ Cf. Ludwig, Gurupājakṣākṣumati, pp. 68 ff.
without a certain familiarity with the chief features of the history of the Śakas and Pahlavas.

The Śakas. The Śakas are frequently mentioned in Indian literature, especially in the epics, but very little information can be gathered from such sources, if we abstract from some Jaina accounts which will be utilized below. They are spoken of as belonging to the barbarous peoples who will rule in the Kaliyuga, or as degraded Kshatriyas. They are mentioned together with other north-western peoples, such as Kámbojas and Yavanas, but also in other connexions. We hear about their being uprooted by Vikramaditya, the reputed founder of the Vikrama era, and another well-known Indian reckoning is designated as the Śaka era. The Purāṇas speak about eighteen (or sixteen) Śaka rulers following after the Gardabhillas and remaining in power for 380 years, &c.

The last-mentioned Notice evidently refers us to the Western Kshatrapas of Surāshṭra and Malava, who are not represented in Kharoshthi inscriptions, though they were evidently of the same stock as the Śakas of the north-west. The others are rather vague and leave the impression that the term Śaka was used in a lax way.

It has always been recognized that the word Śaka is the same name which is handed down in Iranian and classical sources as āsaka, and most scholars agree in identifying it with the Sā, old pronunciation Sāh, of Chinese annals. There is also a general consensus of opinion to the effect that the Śakas were foreigners and Iranians. The genuine form of the name is accordingly Saka, with a dental s, and the Indian Śaka looks like a popular etymology, connecting the name with the base sāh, to be strong, powerful, able.

These identifications make it possible to utilize classical, Iranian, and Chinese sources for the reconstruction of the history of the Śakas.

The earliest Greek author who wrote about the Sakai seems to have been Hecataeus from Miletus (about 500 B.C.), whose writings have not, however, been preserved. Then comes Herodotus (about 490-420 B.C.), who mentions them in several places.

From him we learn that the Persians used the designation Saka in a loose way, to denote all Scythian peoples, e.g. the Amyrgians, who, according to Hellanicus (about 450), lived in some plain, perhaps the plains east of the Caspian or north of the Jaxartes, though Professor Thomas is inclined to think of the Gedrosian desert or part of the Persian desert.

Also Pliny and other classical authors are in agreement with this statement of Herodotus.

The stray references found in classical literature give us some idea of the locality where classical authors placed the Sakai. Herodotus mentions them together with the Sāctrians (l. 153; vii. 64; ix. 113), and with India (vii. 9), and (iii. 93) as forming the eleventh nomos of the Persian empire together with the Kaspior. Arrian (Anabasis, iii. 8, 3; vii. 10, 5) speaks of them in connexion with Bactrians and Sogdians; Curtius Rufus (v. 9, 5; vi. 3, 9; vii. 4, 6) with Indians; Strabo (xii. 8, 2) and Pliny (l.c.) locate them beyond the Jaxartes, and the former states (xii. 6, 2) that the ancient historiographers of the Hellenes called the tribes beyond the Caspian Sea partly Sakai, partly Massagetai, without having accurate knowledge about them, and, in another place

---

1 Karljen, no. 773.
2 Cf. vii. 64: τοῦτον δὲ έλεως Σακας 'Αμύργιος Σακας έκάλεσα ε’ γὰρ Περσος πάντας τοδε Σακος καλεσαν Σακας.
3 'Αμύργιος πεδιον Σακας.
4 JRAS, 1906, p. 199.
5 Naturalia historia, vi. 50: 'ultra (sc. faxartem) sunt Scythorum populii. Persas illos Sagas in
[uni]versum appellaveru a proxima gente.'
(xi. 8, 2), that, beginning from the Caspian Sea, most of the Scythians were called Daai, farther to the east, however, preferably Massagetai and Sakai. He also (xi. 8, 2) gives the information that they were mostly nomads, and had spread over a large territory: they had occupied Bactria and the best district of Armenia, which was thence called Sakasene, and they had even advanced to the Cappadocians, where, however, the Persian strategoi had annihilated them.1

According to Megasthenes,8 the Hemodon mountain separates India in the north from that part of Scythia which is inhabited by those Scythians who are called Sakai. Ptolemy (vi. 13) locates the country of the Sakai between 35° and 49° N. and between 125° and 143° E. Its frontiers are, according to him: to the north and north-east, Scythia on this side of Imaon oros; to the east, Scythia on the other side of that mountain; to the south, Imaon oros; and to the west, Sogdiana, the upper Iaxartes being here partly the borderline. According to his map, the way from Bactria to the Sakai passes through the country of the Sogdians between the Oxus and the Iaxartes, and we are furnished with the names of several Saka tribes: Karatai, Komarai, Komedai, Massagetai, Grynaioi, Skythai, Toornai, and Byltai.

Ktesias9 mentions Roxanake as their royal city, and that name is still preserved in the present Roshan.

It is evident that the old home of the Sakai was considered to be in the Pamir country, to the north of the Hindukush and east of Bactria and Sogdiana, and that Saka tribes were further considered to exist to the east of the Caspian Sea and beyond the Jaxartes.10

Later on Sakas are also mentioned in the present Seistan, the oldest source being here Isidor of Charax, who lived under the emperor Augustus.6 It is possible that these Sakas are referred to by Orosius under the name of Sacaranae, in the description of ‘Caucasus’, where he speaks of Mount Oscobares, situated between the Dahae, the Sacaranae, and the Parthynae.8 If his source were Agrippa, who died in the year 12 B.C., this statement would take us a little further back, and it is perhaps probable that the Sakas came to Seistan about the end of the second century B.C., as we shall see later on.

Another source from which knowledge about the Sakas can be derived are the Persian inscriptions of Darius.7

In the Behistun inscription l. 6, Darius mentions the countries which he inherited, and Saka here comes between Bactria, Sogdiana, and Gandhāra on one side, and Thata-gush, Arachosia, and the Makas on the other. In ii. 2 Saka is mentioned last among the provinces which revolted while Darius was in Babylon, after Parthia, Margiana, and the

---

1 xi. 8, 4: καὶ γάρ τὸν Βακτριανὸν κατέχουν καὶ τῆς Ἄρμενως κατεκτήσαντο τὴν ἄρτωτην γῆν, ἕκαθιν καὶ ἐπάνω ἐκεῖνο εκτίτικος τῆς Ἰαχαράτους καὶ μέχρι τῶν πρὸς Εδέσιν ὀικῶν Πομίκων τῶν καθοῦ προσδίδοντο. Ἐπιθύμομεν 8 αὐτὰς πανηγυρίζοντας ἀνά τῶν ἀμφίφων οὐ τότε ταῖστε τῶν Περσῶν στρατηγοὺς μετὰ ἄρθρων ἀστικὰς ἡμικοινοιοι.

2 Cf. Diodorus Siculus, ii. 35, 1: τὴν δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἄρτοτας τοῦ Ἡμικοινοὶ διείλευε τῇ Σκηνίδας ἡ κατοικίδιο τῶν Σκηνῶν ἡ προσευρανοῦμεν Σκινάν.

3 Nicolau Damascenius, Β: ‘Ραγδανικὴ ἡ πόλις ἐν ἐν Σκινάν τοῦ βασιλέως ἦν.


5 Cf. Stathom Parthikoi, 18: ἱερόν Σκοροφεινὴν Σκοροφεινὸν Σκοβῶν ἢ καὶ Παραγκανή; cf. Ptolemy, iv. 19, 3, where the last name is given as Παραγκανή.

6 l. 2, 16: ‘inter Dahas, Sacaranae et Parthynae montes Oscobares ubi Ganges fluminis oritur et isaur in su.‘

7 I quote from H. C. Tolman, Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenid Inscriptions, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1908.
without a certain familiarity with the chief features of the history of the Šakas and Pahlavas.

The Šakas are frequently mentioned in Indian literature, especially in the epics, but very little information can be gathered from such sources, if we abstract from some Jaina accounts which will be utilized below. They are spoken of as belonging to the barbarous peoples who will rule in the Kaliyuga, or as degraded Kshatriyas. They are mentioned together with other north-western peoples, such as Kámbojas and Yavanas, but also in other connexions. We hear about their being uprooted by Vikramáditya, the reputed founder of the Vikrama era, and another well-known Indian reckoning is designated as the Šaka era. The Puránas speak about eighteen (or sixteen) Šaka rulers following after the Gardabhillas and remaining in power for 380 years, &c.

The last-mentioned notice evidently refers us to the Western Kshatrapas of Suráshtra and Málava, who are not represented in Kharoshthi inscriptions, though they were evidently of the same stock as the Šakas of the north-west. The others are rather vague and leave the impression that the term Šaka was used in a lax way.

It has always been recognized that the word Šaka is the same name which is handed down in Iranian and classical sources as saka, and most scholars agree in identifying it with the Sui, old pronunciation Sök, of Chinese annals. There is also a general consensus of opinion to the effect that the Šakas were foreigners and Iranians. The genuine form of the name is accordingly Saka, with a dental s, and the Indian Šaka looks like a popular etymology, connecting the name with the base šak, to be strong, powerful, able.

These identifications make it possible to utilize classical, Iranian, and Chinese sources for the reconstruction of the history of the Šakas.

The earliest Greek author who wrote about the Sakai seems to have been Hecataeus from Miletus (about 500 B.C.), whose writings have not, however, been preserved. Then comes Herodotus (about 490-420 B.C.), who mentions them in several places.

From him we learn that the Persians used the designation Saka in a loose way, to denote all Iranian peoples, e.g. the Amyrgians, who, according to Hellanicus (about 450), lived in some plain, perhaps the plains east of the Caspian or north of the Jaxartes, though Professor Thomas is inclined to think of the Gedrosian desert or part of the Persian desert.

Also Pliny and other classical authors are in agreement with this statement of Herodotus.

The stray references found in classical literature give us some idea of the locality where classical authors placed the Sakai. Herodotus mentions them together with the Bactrians (i. 152; vii. 64; ix. 113), and with India (vii. 9), and (iii. 93) as forming the fifteenth nomos of the Persian empire together with the Kaspiori. Arrian (Anabasis, iii. 8, 3; vii. 10, 5) speaks of them in connexion with Bactrians and Sogdians; Curtius Rufus (v. 9, 5; vi. 3, 9; vii. 4, 6) with Indians; Strabo (xi. 8, 2) and Pliny (l.c.) locate them beyond the Jaxartes, and the former states (xi. 6, 2) that the ancient historiographers of the Hellenes called the tribes beyond the Caspian Sea partly Sakai, partly Massagetai, without having accurate knowledge about them, and, in another place

---

1 Karlgren, no. 773.
2 Cf. vii. 64; τὸν Θεόν Σωκατῆρα ᾿Αμύργων Σάκας ἱκάλεσαν' οἱ γὰρ Πέρσαι πάντας τοὺς Σκοτας καλοῦσιν Σάκας.
3 ᾿Αμύργων πεθαίνον Σάκων.
4 JRAS, 1906, p. 199.
5 Naturalis historia, vi. 50: 'ultra (sc. Jaxartem) sunt Scytharum populi. Persas illos Sagas in [null]versum appellaver e a proxima gente.'
THE SAKAS

(xii, 8, 2), that, beginning from the Caspian Sea, most of the Scythians were called Daai, farther to the east, however, preferably Massagetai and Sakai. He also (xii, 8, 2) gives the information that they were mostly nomads, and had spread over a large territory: they had occupied Bactria and the best district of Armenia, which was thence called Sakasene, and they had even advanced to the Cappadocians, where, however, the Persian strategoi had annihilated them.1

According to Megasthenes,2 the Hemoden mountain separates India in the north from that part of Scythia which is inhabited by those Scythians who are called Sakai. Ptolemy (vi. 13) locates the country of the Sakai between 35° and 49° N. and between 125° and 143° E. Its frontiers are, according to him: to the north and north-east, Scythia on this side of Imaon oros; to the east, Scythia on the other side of that mountain; to the south, Imaon oros; and to the west, Sogdiana, the upper Jaxartes being here partly the borderline. According to his map, the way from Bactria to the Sakai passes through the country of the Sogdians between the Oxus and the Jaxartes, and we are furnished with the names of several Saka tribes: Karatai, Komoroi, Komedai, Massagetai, Grynaioi, Skythai, Toornai, and Byltai.

Ktesias3 mentions Roxanake as their royal city, and that name is still preserved in the present Roshan.

It is evident that the old home of the Sakai was considered to be in the Pamir country, to the north of the Hindukush and east of Bactria and Sogdiana, and that Saka tribes were further considered to exist to the east of the Caspian Sea and beyond the Jaxartes.4

Later on Sakas are also mentioned in the present Seistān, the oldest source being here Isidor of Charax, who lived under the emperor Augustus.5 It is possible that these Sakas are referred to by Orosius under the name of Sacaraucae, in the description of "Caucasus", where he speaks of Mount Oscobares, situated between the Dahae, the Sacaraucae, and the Parthenaeae. If his source were Agrippa, who died in the year 12 B.C., this statement would take us a little further back, and it is perhaps probable that the Sakas came to Seistān about the end of the second century B.C., as we shall see later on.

Another source from which knowledge about the Sakas can be derived are the Persian inscriptions of Darius.7

In the Behistun inscription i. 6, Darius mentions the countries which he inherited, and Saka here comes between Bactria, Sogdiana, and Gandhāra on one side, and Thata-gush, Arachosia, and the Makas on the other. In ii. 2 Saka is mentioned last among the provinces which revolted while Darius was in Babylon, after Parthia, Margiana, and the

---

1 xi, 8, 4: καὶ γὰρ τὴν Βακτριανὰν κατέχουν καὶ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν κατεκτήσαντο τὴν ἐρήμην γῆν, ἦν καὶ εἰσάγονεν εἰς τὴν Σακαγηνήν καὶ μεῖχες Καππαδόκαν καὶ ἄλλα τῶν πρὸς Ἐδέσσαν ὅπως Ποισικοὺς τῆν καλύπτον προσῆλθο. Ἐπιθέμενοι δὲ αὐτοῖς πανηγυρίζοντες ἀπὸ τῶν λαφρῶν αἱ τὰς ταύτης τῶν Περσῶν στρατηγοὺς νίκησων ἀρδεύει αὐτοὺς ἑράνισαν.

2 Cf. Diodorus Siculus, ii. 35, 1: τὴν δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἄρετους τὸ Ἡμιδών ὄρος εἰς ἑαυτῷ τὴν Σκυθίας ἦν κατικοῦσι τῶν Σκύθων οἱ προσαγωγευμένοι Σάκαι.

3 Nicolaus Damascus, 6: Ὑπανθικὴ ὡς πόλις ἐστὶν Σάκαι τὸ διάφερον ἤν.


5 Cf. Statthom Parchiloi, 18: ἐντείθη τὰ Ἁλουλοτὰ Σακαταντήν Σάκων Σκύθων ἢ καὶ Παραστακηνή; cf. Ptolemy, iv. 19, 3, where the last name is given as Τατακηνή.

6 i. 2, 16: "inter Dahae, Sacaraucae et Parthenaeae omnes Oscobares ubi Ganges fluentes ortum et insae nascitur".

7 I quote from H. C. Tolman, Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achamenidan Inscriptions, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1908.
Thatagush. In the Persepolis inscription e 2 the Sakas are mentioned among the eastern countries, after Arachosia, India, and Gandhāra, and before the Makas. In the Nakhsh-i-Rustam inscription a 3 we have another enumeration: Media, Susiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Khorsamia, Zranka, Arachosia, the Thatagush, Gandhāra, India, Sakā Haumavarka, Sakā Tigrakh∧ya, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Cappadocia, Sparda, Ionía, Sakā tyaiy taradraya (or paradraya), Skudra, the Takbarā Ionians, Puntians, Kushians, Maxyes, and Karkians.

From these enumerations we can hardly draw any other inference than that there were several Sakā tribes, and that they all belonged to the eastern parts of the empire. The Nakhsh-i-Rustam inscription, which mentions Zranka, i.e. Drangiana, without any reference to Sakas, might be taken as an indication that they were not, in those days, settled in Seistan. But such an inference is not necessary.

A more precise localization can be derived from the gold tablet of Darius, where his empire is defined: 'from the Sakas beyond Sogdiana (hva Sakābīk tyaiy para Sogdām) to Ethiopia (a Krēkē); from India (hva Hidaw) to Sardis (a Spardē). Here we have a clear indication that Sakas were settled to the east of Sogdiana, i.e. where classical authors locate the old Sakā country.

It will be seen that the Nakhsh-i-Rustam inscription mentions some individual Sakā tribes: the Tigrakh∧ya, the Haumavarka, and those 'beyond the sea' (taradraya or paradraya).

The Sakā Haumavarka have been identified with the Amyrgioi, who have been mentioned above and who cannot be located with certainty.

The Sakā Tigrakh∧ya are evidently referred to in the Behistun inscription v. 4, where we read: 'with my army I went to the Sakā country, towards the Sakā country (hva kārē Sakām adām ashiyawam abiy Sakawm). ' Then follows a mutilated passage, ... m tigrām b. r. t. y., where some scholars have found a reference to the Tigris, while others, apparently with more justification, supply khandām tigrām barāniy, 'who wear a pointed cap', and see a reference to the Sakā Tigrakh∧ya. After a new lacuna follows a mutilated passage: 'towards that sea ( ... iya abiy draya asa), ... I crossed in rafts ( ... ) the Sakas I smote ( ... ak ... ā pisa viyataraya ... Sakā asvājāwam).

If the restoration khandām tigrām barāniy is right, we learn that the Sakā Tigrakh∧ya lived beyond a sea, and this may help us to locate them.

The designation Tigrakh∧ya, 'of pointed caps', has been explained by what Herodotus says about the Amyrgioi, that they used pointed headgear. It has usually been assumed that Herodotus has confounded the Amyrgioi with the 'wearers of pointed caps'. It seems, however, that such headgear was common with all those tribes, though only one of them is named in these inscriptions after this apparel. Also Herodotus knows a similar name, viz. Orthokorybantioi, which looks like a translation of Tigrakh∧ya, and states that they formed the tenth nomos of the empire of Darius, together with the Parikanioi, i.e. the inhabitants of modern Ferghāna. Professor A. Herrmann is therefore probably right in assuming that the Orthokorybantioi, i.e. some Sakā Tigrakh∧ya,

3 Cf. vii. 64: Συνάν δέ εις Σεβαίην περί μνέ τῆς κεφαλῆς κυρβαλλάς ἵνα δύο ἀπτεργάδες ὀρθάς εἰχον πεττυμος.
lived to the east of the Caspian Sea, and that the mutilated passage in the Behistun inscription refers to an expedition against them: Darius proceeded towards the Saka country, towards the Caspian Sea, and then crossed not the sea, but the mouth of the Oxus. This explanation seems to me to be preferable to that of Professor Thomas,¹ which has been accepted by Professor Rapson,² according to which the sea (draya) was the Hamun lake, and the Sakas those of Seistân. We have not, so far as I can see, sufficient reason for assuming that Sakas had settled in Seistân in the days of Darius.

If we compare the statements of Herodotus with the inscriptions, we thus become inclined to assume that the Orthokyphantioi were the Sakas beyond the sea, who, according to the Behistun inscription wore pointed caps and could therefore be named after this headgear, but that there may also have been another Saka tribe, in the neighbourhood of the Amyrgians, to whom the designation Tigrakhauda was more especially applied by the Persians.

The indications in the Persian inscriptions thus lead us to the same localization as the classical sources: to the east of Sogdiana, and to the east of the Caspian Sea and the country on the Jaxartes.

Also the Chinese annals contain some information about the Sakas and their old Chinese home. As mentioned above, the Sakas are there called Sai or, in the pronunciation of the T'ang period, Sok. In the oldest sources they are frequently spoken of as the Sakas. Sai-wang, a designation which will be dealt with later on.

We hear that the Sai-wang were, some time before 160 B.C., driven out from their old home by another tribe, the Yue-chi, with which we shall have to occupy ourselves later on.³ The Yue-chi were, in their turn, driven out by the Wu-sun, whose settlements have been defined by Professor Franke as extending from Urumchi to the west of Issik-kul, from the Dzungarian desert and down towards the Tarim.

Here accordingly Saka tribes must have been settled in the beginning of the second century B.C., near the Issik-kul.

We further read in the Ts'ien Han-shu the Annals of the Earliest Han Dynasty:⁵ 'the Sai race split up and formed a series of states. From Shu-le (Kashgar) on towards the north-west, what belongs to the states of Hiu-sun and Yuan-tu are all originally tribes of the old Sai.'

According to Professor Franke Hiu-sun and Yuan-tu should be located to the north-west of Kashgar, below the south-western spurs of the Tien-shan and on the southern affluents of the Narin, Hiu-sun more towards Ferghana, Yuan-tu to the east of Hiu-sun and extending towards the country of Wu-sun. Professor A. Herrmann (f. c.) locates Yuan-tu about the Russian fort Ikreshlan and Hiu-sun in the Alai valley.

We thus arrive at about the same localization as from the classical and Iranian sources, and learn that the old Saka territory extended as far east as the Issik-kul.

The Ts'ien Han-shu speak of the Sakas as having had a large distribution and of their having founded many states, and we have seen that also Strabo has some remarks of the same effect. From Chinese sources we learn that the Sakas were seriously affected by the great movement which began in Central Asia in the second century B.C.

We read in the Ts'ien Han-shu:⁶ 'the Yue-chi had been conquered by the Hsiung-nu and had, in the west, attacked the Sai-wang. The Sai-wang had fled southwards

¹ JRAS, 1906, pp. 181 ff.
² Cf. e.g. Franke, Beiträge, pp. 46 ff.
³ Chap. 56 a, fol. 10 v⁴; Franke, Beiträge, pp. 47 ff.
⁴ Chap. 61, fol. 4 v⁴; cf. Franke, Beiträge, pp. 46 ff.
⁵ The Cambridge History of India, i, p. 564.
⁶ Ibidem, pp. 15 ff.
and settled in a distant country. We shall see later on, in connexion with the Yüe-chi, that their defeat at the hands of the Hsiung-nu had been effected in 176 B.C., and that they were themselves driven out of the old Saka country about 166 B.C. The Saka exodus alluded to in the Tsien Han-shu must accordingly fall between these two dates.

The designation Sai-wang has given rise to much discussion. It consists of two words, sai, old sek, which has been identified with saka, and wang, a well-known Chinese word, which means 'king, prince, sovereign'. Sai-wang accordingly seems to mean 'Saka-king', or 'Saka-kings', and this is a priori not a likely designation of an individual tribe.

Professor Franke therefore proposed to explain wang in this name not as the usual Chinese word meaning 'king', but as part of the name itself. Professor Herrmann wanted to correct Sai-wang to Sai-yü, older pronunciation Sak-yöch, and to explain this as corresponding to an Iranian Sakā rawata, which does not, it is true, exist, but which he found again in the designations Sakaranālī, Sarnecār, of classical authors, with which we shall have to deal below.

We have not, however, any right to correct the Chinese text, and Professor Franke's explanation only creates a new difficulty, because we have no information about any tribe being called Sakawang or some similar name. Moreover, the designation 'Saka-king' for some tribe or dynasty is known from other sources.

In the Allahabad posthumous stone pillar inscription of Samudragupta we read in l. 23 of certain successes achieved by the Gupta emperor in connexion with Dācaputrā, shahī-shāhānushahī-Saka-murugda-Saimbalakādībhī dha, where Saka-murugda is evidently a designation of a similar kind as Dācaputrā and Shahānushahī. Now murugda is almost certainly a Saka word meaning 'master', 'lord'. It seems to occur in the form muro ā, i.e. muroda, as a title of King Kasishka in the Zoda inscription; it is found in the compound hōra-murudaga in certain Brahmi inscriptions from Mathurā, and Professor Lüders has further compared the word horamūrdo of the Mānikiyā inscription, explaining hōra as the well-known Saka word for 'gift, donation', and horamūruda as corresponding to Sanskrit davapati, so that murudaga must mean 'master, lord'. Professor Lévi has further shown that muro da is well known from Indian literature and occurs, in the form mro Lucifer, as a title of Indian rulers in Chinese sources. I have therefore identified Sakamurugda with the Chinese Sai-wang, Saka-king, where wang is simply a Chinese translation of the Saka word murugda, just as this same word was translated into Indian as muroda in the titulature of the Indian Saka dynasty known as that of the Western Kshatrapas.

There was accordingly a Saka tribe known as the Saka-murundas, evidently because their chiefs were styled murundā, while other Saka tribes used other titles, a state of affairs which is well attested. In the Saka texts from the Khotan country we find royal titles such as reh and shahāu; in the Jain text Kalahāryakathānaka the chiefs are sāhīs and their overlord sāhānu sāhī, a title which recurs in the sāhānu sāhī of the Allahabad prasasti; and the Kushāna dynasty of Kanishka uses in cenn legends the title shahānu shah, i.e. shahānu shahāu.

A designation such as Saka-murundā, Sai-wang is therefore quite natural.

1 L.c., sub voce Sacaraucæae.
2 Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum iii, pp. 1-ff.
4 SBAW, 1913, pp. 420 ff.
6 SBAW, 1913, pp. 710 ff.
The Sakas

We have already seen that Strabo mentions a Saka conquest of Bactria, where the Greek kings were ousted by Scythian nomads, and some of these nomadic tribes are enumerated by him, notably, the Asii, Pasaioi, Tochari, and Sakarauloi.

Sakas thus were instrumental in overthrowing the Greek empire in Bactria, and some of these Sakas seem to be called Sakarauloi.

This name occurs in various forms. One of the manuscripts of Strabo has Sakarauloi. Sarakauloi; Lucianus (Macrob. 15) speaks of Sakaurakoi (Σακαυρακοῖ Σαθύλας); Ptolemy (vi. 14, 14) of Sagaramaikai (Σαγαραμάκαι); Orosius (i. 2, 16) of Saccaraucae, and Trogus Pompeius (Prolog. xiii.) of Saracace, i.e. evidently Saracace.

I have already mentioned that Professor Herrmann identifies the Sakarauloi or Sakarakauki with the Kaiwang, and it seems to me that he must be right, though I cannot accept his correction of the Chinese word. It is tempting to see in rauki, raukoi, urakoi, or how the correct form may be, a word formed from the same base as Khotani Saka rau king, rauki, rauki, and consider Sakarauloi, Sakarakouki as a rendering of Sakarauruqai into a different dialect, just as we find different forms of the old x̠hayatīya such as x̠hik, x̠huk, x̠hơn in different Iranian languages.

We do not know whence the Sakarauloi came on their march towards Bactria. Some of Strabo's account is not quite clear. If the Kal after Xakaraulou has come in by mistake, as is often held to be the case, they seem to have come from the old Saka country to the east of Sogdiana and the Jaxartes, and we should become inclined to connect their inroad with the events narrated in the Tsien Han-shu. On the whole it seems to me that such was probably the case, though it is hardly possible to prove that Professor Thomas was wrong in thinking that the Saracace or Saracaceae started from the country north of Parthia and between the Caspian and the Aral Sea.

Some remarks about these events are contained in the extracts of Trogus. In the 4th book he had dealt with the establishment of an empire in Bactria by Diodotus, which event took place about the middle of the third century B.C. In that connexion he gave an account of how Scythian tribes, the Saracace and the Asan, took possession of Bactria and Sogdiana. Trogus' text has usually been constructed to mean that the Scythian invasion took place during the reign of Diodotus. There is, however, no indication to show that the Greek power in Bactria was weakened in his days. He and his successors remained firm in the possession of the country down to the time of Eucrates and Demetrius in the second century a.D. But then evil times set in, and we learn from Justin that the Bactrians lost both their empire and their freedom, being

---

1 xii. 8: 4: καὶ ἦς ὁ βατριακῇς κατάχοι.
2 Cf. xii. 8: 2: μενεται δὲ γνόριμος γεγονὸς τῶν νομάδων οἰ τοὺς Ἐλληνας ἀφελόμενοι τὴν Βατριακὴν Ἀσίαν καὶ Πασίονι καὶ Παχεροι καὶ Σακάρανος καὶ ἐφημῖνας ἀπὸ τῆς περισσός τοῦ Ἰταρίου τῆς κατὰ Σακάρανος καὶ Σογδιανοῖς ὑπὸ κατέχουσιν Ἱμᾶν καὶ τῶν Ἰδίων οἱ μὲν προσγερόστησαν Ἀσπαροί οἱ δὲ Εὐνοῦχοι ηλιστηγεταὶ τῆς Ἰταρίος παράκατοι καὶ ἐκ τούτων αὐτῶν, ὅπως ὁ χαρά Albania, pro φυλούσι διερρέουσι καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἀντιπεριστάσεως τῆς Ἰρά.
3 Charpentier, ZDPV, 71, pp. 368 f., follows up a suggestion of Professor Jacobsthal that there may be some connexion between Sakarauloi, etc., and Sagahila, the country of the Sakas on the Indus, according to the Kālchikal yāyaktānāka. He thinks that the second part of the word may be contained in Ku-lang-na, mentioned as a kingdom by Huán-tsang and corresponding to the modern Kāra in the upper part of the valley of the Kokcha. Both the Greek and the Indian traditions may have been wrong in seeing the word Saka in the name, which may ultimately be connected with the modern Sailkho.
5 in Bactriani amnis rabus ut a Diodoto regis constitutionem est. Deinde quo refugianse Scythiae gentes Saracae et Asinius Bactram occupaverunt et Sogdianos.
harassed by the Sogdians, the Arachotis, the Drangae, and the Arei, and finally oppressed by the Parthians.¹

I therefore think that we must either assume that some words have been lost or else interpret Trogus in a different way, taking the quo of quo repugnante to be the interrogative and not the relative pronoun. He had narrated how Diodotus established his empire in Bactria and incidentally added some remarks about a later ruler, during whose reign the Saraucae and Asiani entered upon the stage and involved him in war.

Marquart ² explains Trogus’ statement to mean that the Saraucae occupied Bactria and the Asiani Sogdiana, and though it is not necessary to interpret the text in this way, he is probably right, since we know from Strabo that Saka tribes occupied Bactria. I further accept the identification of the Saraucae with the Sakarauloi.

In the Prologus of the 42nd book of Trogus there is a further notice about the Saraucae: ‘added are the Scythian matters: the Asiani (becoming) kings of the Tocharians and the annihilation of the Saraucaes’.³ It seems necessary to infer that the Saraucae had been living in the Tocharian country, and that, at a later date, they were ousted by the Asiani, who had in the meantime become the rulers of the Tocharians.

Now we shall see later on that the Asiani are probably identical with the Yüe-chi of the Chinese annals, and that the Tocharians were settled in and to the east of Bactria, when the Yüe-chi became their masters. We therefore seem to have good reason for combining the classical and the Chinese accounts in order to reconstruct the course of events.

I have already drawn attention to the Chinese accounts about the encounter between the Yüe-chi and the Sai-wang, and I shall have to return to them later on in connexion with the Yüe-chi. We have seen that the latter had been conquered by the Hsiung-nu in 176 B.C. and had subsequently entered the country of the Sai-wang in the neighbourhood of Issik-kul, the Sai-wang having gone southwards and settled in a distant country. We shall see below that the Chinese had something more to say about this distant country, but it may be surmised that the Sai-wang exodus was the beginning of the Scythian pressure on the Greek empire in Bactria, and it is a curious fact that it seems to coincide with the Indian conquests of Demetrius, which may, or may not, be due to a desire for strengthening his position in another direction.

About 160 B.C. the Yüe-chi were then driven out of the old Sai-wang country by the Wu-shun, assisted by the Hsiung-nu.⁴ This then seems to have been the time referred to by Trogus, when the Asiani, i.e. the Yüe-chi, took Sogdiana and the Saraucae Bactria.

After Chang K’ien had returned from his visit to the Western Countries in 126 B.C., he submitted a report of the state of things as he had found it. The Yüe-chi were then masters of the Ta-hia, i.e. the Tocharians, but their capital was still to the north of the Oxus.

At this time, therefore, the position of the Saraucae must have become a different one, but we cannot draw the inference that they had been entirely annihilated.

In the Hou Han-shu, the annals of the Later Han, the situation is, as we shall see, quite different. The Yüe-chi have transferred their capital to the south of the Oxus, and there is evidently no room for the Saraucae. The Hou Han-shu deals with the

¹ Cf. xii. 6: ‘Bactriam antem per varia bella iactati non regnum tantum verum etiam libertatem amiserunt, sigidentem Sogdianorum et Arachotis et Drangarum et Areorum bellis fatigati ad postremum ab invulsoiioribus Parthis velut excangues oppressi sunt.’
² Eränähr, p. 204
³ Additio his rei Scythicae, Reges Thracorum Asiani interiusque Saraucaorum.
⁴ Cf. Franke, Beiträge, p. 15.
events of the period A.D. 25–220, but we have no means for inferring when the new state of things in Bactria was established.

We may only surmise that the Yüe-chi began to exercise pressure on the Saurucae shortly after 160 B.C., and they had succeeded in materially weakening their position when Chang Ki'en visited the country about 130 B.C. It is probable, but cannot be proved, that these events gave rise to a new movement of the Sakas in Bactria, and it is possible that their eyes were now turned towards Scisîn, where we find them about the times of Christ, as we have already seen.

The Chinese annals, however, also give information about further Saka wanderings. Sakas in The Ts'ien Han-shu, chap. 96 b, fol. 10 v", runs: 'the Great Yüe-chi went towards the west and made themselves masters of Ta-hia, but the Sai-wang went southwards and made themselves masters of Ki-pin'. We also hear something about the route they followed: 'the Sai-wang went towards the south and passed the hien-tu (the hanging passage)'.

The hien-tu is also mentioned in other places. In the Wei-liao, the history of the Wei Dynasty (A.D. 220–264), we read that the southern route from China westwards went via Ts'ung-lung (the Pamirs) and hien-tu to the country of the Ta Yüe-chi, whose empire at that time extended over a large part of India. According to Chavannes, this is the Bolor route through the Yasin valley, by which travellers went from Wakhân to the Indus and further to Kashmir and Udyama. It is practically the same route which the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien followed.

In his Serindia Sir Aurel Stein shows how the pilgrim went from Kie-ch'a (Kâshgar) over the Pamirs to the country of To'li, the modern Darel on the right bank of the Indus, opposite Chilas. Thence he followed the Indus towards the west. 'The way was difficult and rugged (running along) a bank exceedingly precipitous, which rose up there, a hill-like wall of rock, 10,000 cubits from the base. When one approached the edge of it, his eyes became unsteady, and he, if he wished to go forward in the same direction, was there no place on which he could place his foot, and beneath were the waters of the river called Indus. In former times men had chiselled paths along the rocks, and distributed ladders on the face of them to the number altogether of 700, at the bottom of which was a suspension bridge of ropes, by which the river was crossed, its banks being there eighty paces apart.'

This was the hanging passage, and, according to Sir Aurel, the map shows 'that even at the present day the main track along the Indus crosses below Darel to the left bank and does not regain the right bank until Mirbat, some eight miles above the side valley of Kanda belonging to the Swât'.

After having passed the hien-tu, the Sai-wang, as we have seen, made themselves Ki-pin masters. According to Chavannes Ki-pin means Kashmir from the period of the Han and down to that of the northern Wei, and was only in the T'ang period identified with the country about the northern affluents of the Kabul river, the present Kafiristan. It seems to me, however, that Professor Franke must be right when he says that the Chinese do not seem to have had any clear idea about the position and limits of the country. We read in the Ts'ien Han-shu: 'The capital of the kingdom of Ki-pin

---

1 Ts'ien Han-shu, chap. 96 b, fol. 1 v°.
2 Young Tao, II, vi, p. 549.
3 pp. 5 ff.
4 L.c., p. 538.
5 L.c., pp. 59 ff.
6 Chap. 96 a, fol. 10 v°; cf. A. Wylie, Journal of the Anthropological Institute, x, 1881, pp. 33 ff.; Franke, l.c., pp. 63 ff.
is the city of Sün-sien, distant from Ch’ang-an 12,200 li. The country is not under
the control of the Governor-General. The numbers of families, persons, and picked
troops are very large, as it is a great country. The seat of the Governor-General lies
north-east, at a distance of 6,840 li. The kingdom of Wu-ch’a 4 lies 2,250 li to the east.
The kingdom of Nan-tou 5 is nine days’ journey to the north-east. The country joins
the Ta Yue-chi on the north-west, Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia) on the south-west; ... The
land of Ki-pin is flat, and the climate mild and agreeable. The country produces
medicago sativa, various herbs, strange trees, sandal wood, sophora japonica, rottrlera
japonica, bamboo, and the varnish tree. They cultivate the five grains (i.e. hemp,
millet, rice, wheat, and pulse), grapes, and various fruits. They manure their gardens
and fields. In the low and damp ground they grow rice. In winter they eat raw
vegetables. The people are ingenious in carving, ornamenting, engraving, and inlaying;
in building palaces and mansions, weaving mats, ornamental perforation, and embro-
irdery; and excel at cooking. They have gold, silver, copper, and tin, of which they
make vessels, and expose them for sale. They have a gold and a silver currency. On
the obverse of their money is a man on horseback, and on the reverse a man’s face. The
country produces the Indian ox, the buffalo, the elephant, great dogs, large apes, and
the pea-fowl; also pearls of different kinds, coral, amber, rock crystal, vitreous ware,
camels, and domestic animals the same as other nations.

(China’s) communications with Ki-pin began in the days of Wu-ti (140–85 B.C.). As
it was distant and far away, Chinese troops could not come there. The king of the
country, Wu-t’ou-lao, 6 on several occasions put the Chinese envoys to death. When
Wu-t’ou-lao died, his son succeeded him on the throne. He sent envoys to bring tribute.
The captain at the barrier, Wên-chung, was sent to escort them home. The king again
wished to do violence to Wên-chung. But Wên-chung became aware of this and,
together with the son of the king of Yung-k’u, 7 Yin-mo-fu, 8 he attacked Ki-pin and
killed the king, whereafter Yin-mo-fu was installed as king of Ki-pin and received the
seal and ribbon (of investiture).

Afterwards the sub-general, Chao-tè, went as envoy to Ki-pin. He got on bad
terms with Yin-mo-fu. Yin-mo-fu put him in chains and killed his attendants, more than
seventy persons in all. He then sent envoys, who were to submit a written apology.
The emperor, Yüan-ti (48–33 B.C.), did not, however, take any notice of the distant
countries. The envoys were therefore sent back to hien-tu; the relations were severed
and no further communications were kept up.

In the time of the emperor, Ch’èng-ti (12–7 B.C.), envoys were again sent with
presents and an apology. There was an intention to dispatch envoys to escort them
back. But Tu-k’in addressed the Generalissimo, Wang-fèng, to the following effect:

Then follows a long speech, in which Tu-k’in warns against entering into further
communications. ’Those who bring offerings,’ he says, ’are not dignitaries of the king’s
surroundings, but traders, low-caste people, who want to sell and to buy, and the offerings
are a mere pretence.’

According to the Hou Han-shu, Ki-pin is reached from Tashkurgan via the hanging

---

1 Old pronunciation zyhu-siän, Karlgren, nos. 1142 and 799.
2 To the east of hien-tu; cf. Frankel, p. 58.
3 South of Yüan-ti and east of the Ta Yue-chi; cf. Frankel, p. 59.
4 Old pronunciation m’ou-t’ou-lau, Karlgren, nos. 1288, 105, 516.
5 Old pronunciation kwong-k’i-jau, Karlgren, nos. 910, 493.
6 Old pronunciation j’ü-mu-leh’iu, Karlgren, nos. 274, 636, 757.
THE SAKAS AND KI-PIN

passage, and lies on the way to Wu-i-shan-li. The Wei-shu gives as its capital Shên-kien, south-west of Po-lu, states that the country is situated in the midst of four mountains, is 800 li from west to east and 300 from north to south, and then goes on to describe the country much in the same way as the Ts'ien Han-shu.

It will be seen that the Chinese notices are not quite clear. If we limit ourself to the Ts'ien Han-shu, which narrates the events connected with the wanderings of the Sakas in greatest detail, we shall, however, find that Ki-pin was to the south-east of the then country of the Yüe-chi, i.e. evidently south of the Hindukush; to the north-east of Arachosia and to the west of the Indus.

We cannot, therefore, well identify it with Kashmir, but it may have comprised the Swât valley, and it certainly extended westwards towards Arachosia. Whether it comprised Kao-fu (Kâbul) or not, we cannot say. The Hou Han-shu, chap. 118, fol. 11 v6, states that that country never long belonged to any big state. Of the empires of T'ien-chu (India), Ki-pin, and An-sî (Parthia), whichever was powerful, conquered it, and lost it again, when it became weak.

In favour of such a localization of Ki-pin, the country occupied by the Sai-wang, to the west of the Indus and below the Hindukush also speaks a notice in Hûan-tsang's description of Shang-mi, the present Mâstî, according to which the king of that country was of the Sâkya race, for Sâkya is, in this connexion, evidently a misunderstanding instead of Saka. We may also compare the statement in Hemâendra's Abhidhâna-chintâmanî, v. 960, Lampâkas tu murandâh synh, the Lâmpâkas would be murandâs, which seems to show that the country of Lâmpâka, the present Lâghmân, had at a comparatively late date preserved the memory of the rule of the murandâs, i.e. evidently the Saka murundâs, the Sai-wang.

Who the rulers mentioned in the passage of the Ts'ien Han-shu translated above were, and whether they, had anything to do with the Sai-wang conquest, we cannot say. Professor A. Herrmann thinks that Yin-mo-fu is a rendering of the same designation which Herodotus gives in the form Amyrgios, and that he was the Sai-wang who conquered Ki-pin, and also that he is identical with the Indian Saka ruler, Maues, Moga. But it is hardly possible to see an old amurgha (Amyrgios) in the name Yin-mo-fu, and Moga does not, as we shall see, seem to be the first Saka conqueror of India. Moreover, the account of the Ts'ien Han-shu connects Yin-mo-fu with the emperor Yuan-ti (48-33 B.C.), while the Sai-wang conquest of Ki-pin apparently belongs to an earlier period. It therefore seems more probable that Yin-mo-fu was not a Saka, but belonged to another people and was instrumental in making an end to the Saka dominion in Ki-pin.

We have thus seen that Sakas had, at a comparatively early date, occupied Bactria, where they seem to have been ousted by the Yüe-chi. We have found them in Seistân about the times of Christ, when the country had already received its name from them, so that we may reasonably assume that they had been settled there for some time. It is therefore, as suggested above, probable that they settled in Seistân as a consequence of the pressure which the Yüe-chi began to exercise shortly after 160 B.C. Finally we hear about a Saka dominion in Ki-pin.

In the first century B.C. we now find Sakas, or as the Indians call them Śakas, Sakas in established in Sind and in the Panjâb, and the history of these Indian Sakas is of the utmost interest for our appreciation of the Kharoshthi inscriptions. Several of them

1 Chap. 102, fol. 9 r°; cf. Specht, JA. VIII, ii, 1883, p. 333.
2 Cf. Stein, Serindia, p. 44.
3 i.c. sub voce Sakal.
bear direct witness to the rule of Saka kings and chiefs, and they are themselves among the sources for our knowledge of the history of India in the Saka period.

This history is little known. We cannot say for certain when the Sakas first made their appearance in India or whence they came. There are no indications to show that they made important independent contributions to Indian civilization. But we get the impression that their rule gave rise to a certain fermentation, which became of importance. The influx of Greek notions and Greek art continued, and even if Indian civilization continues to bear an Indian stamp, there can hardly be much doubt that the crossing and intercrossing of ideas and ideals acted as a powerful ferment. It is scarcely a mere accident that Indian literature and civilization had a rich development during and after the Scythian period, and every student knows how important it was in the history of Indian Buddhism. The Sakas introduced new royal titles in India, and it seems probable that the political ideas underlying them were likewise partly assimilated. In civilization, however, the Sakas seem to have received more than they gave. On the other hand, they became the great intermediators through whom Indian civilization and Indian ideals spread to Central Asia and the far east.

It is an important period, and we should like to know more about it. Our sources are, however, rather limited. In addition to the Kharoshhti and some Brahmi inscriptions we have a series of coins and some references in literature. What is written in Sanskrit does not help us much, but some information can be gleaned from classical authors, from Jaina tradition, and from what we know about the general history of the period.

The Scythian period is a long one, extending from the first century B.C. down to the time of the imperial Guptas and even longer. More than one foreign people entered on the stage, and it is not always easy to keep them separated from each other. In the present place we shall, however, limit ourselves to the beginning of Scythian rule in India.

Classical authors speak of the Indo-Scythians and their country Indo-Scythia. According to Ptolemy (vii, p. 55, 62) it extended on both sides of the Indus, from the Kabul river to the Arabian Sea. The delta was called Patalene, the country to the north and north-east Abiria, and the south-eastern province Syrastrene, i.e., Surashtra, the modern Kathiawar. Also Dionysius Periegeta speaks about the 'Southern Scyths' as settled on the Indus, and his commentator, Eustathius, states that the Indo-Scythians are meant. In the Periplus Scythia, i.e., Indo-Scythia, is spoken of as being under Parthian rule. At the time of that work, i.e., in the second half of the first century A.D., Indo-Scythia accordingly seems to have come under the rule of the Parthians.

The inference which we can draw from these sources is, accordingly, to the effect that the stronghold of the Scythians, i.e., in this connexion the Sakas, was in the Indus country, and that the Saka conquest had been effected long before the second half of the first century A.D.

A similar result must be derived from the traditional accounts preserved by the Jainas. The most important one is contained in a work of unknown date, the Kalakacharyakathana.2

We there read about the Jaina teacher, Kalaka, whose sister was abducted by

---

1 v. 1558: "Indan πάντα πολεμίων νότη μυθέα ετενίσωσι.
2 Ed. by H. Jacobi, ZDMG, 54, 1880, pp. 247 ff.
Gardabhilla, king of Ujjayini. He then proceeded to the kūla called Sagakūla,¹ the kūla of the Sakas. There the feudatories (sāmanta) were called sāhi and their overlord (sāmanīkhtyat) sākānu sāhi, i.e. King of Kings. Kālaka stayed with one of the sāhis, and as this chief together with ninety-five other sāhis fell into disgrace with the 'King of Kings', Kālaka induced them to accompany him to Hindukūṣa (Hindugadēsa). They crossed the Indus (uttarāniṃa Śindhun), embarked in ships (samārpiṇiṇa jānavatūsa), proceeded to Kāthiāwār (sāmaṇgaṇa Suraśāvatūsa) and divided that country among themselves. When the autumn came, the āchārya led them on to Ujjayini, where Gardabhilla was made a prisoner. A sāhi was established as overking (vayakēriṇya), and in this way this dynasty of the Saka kings came into being (evaṃ Sagarakṣaṇa eva vamsa samuppanno).

After some time (kalantareṇa keṇu) Vikramāditya, king of Mālava, ousted this Saka dynasty (uppādātā Sagāṇa tan vaṁsaṁ) and established his own era (payudāvio nīya samvavāvaharac). But also his dynasty was uprooted (tasā va vaṁsaṁ uppādāna), by another Saka king (Sagarkṣaṇa), who established his era of his own when 135 years of the Vikrama era had elapsed (payudāvā viṣṇa Vaiṣṇavā vāsānaṁ purvavāvaharac haṁva jevaṁ samvavāvaharac nīya). It is then added that this incident has been narrated (eyam pāsangryaṁ samākhāyaṁ) in order to give information about the (origin of the) Sāka era (Sagarakṣaṇa-vatsitān). I cannot see the slightest reason for discrediting this account, as is usually done, because most scholars are a priori disinclined to believe in Indian tradition and sometimes prefer the most marvellous accounts of foreign authors to Indian lore. Almost every detail can be verified from other sources. A Saka empire in the Indus country is, as we have seen, known from classical sources. Ptolemy speaks of the extension of Saka power to Kāthiāwār, and the use of the imperial title 'King of Kings' among the Sakas is, as we shall see later on, attested by coins. And the Purāṇas² speak of Saka kings as the successors of the Gardabhilla dynasty.

I have therefore no hesitation in drawing the inference that a Saka empire, with emperors using the title 'King of Kings' (sākānu sāhi), existed in the Indus country some time before the establishment of the Vikrama era. Its centre of gravity seems to have been on the western shore of the Indus, and it is of interest that the recent excavations at Mohenjo Daro in the Lārkānā district have brought to light traces of the successors of the Sakas, the Kushiānas. We are further told that these ancient Sakas made themselves masters of Kāthiāwār and, for some time, of Ujjayini; that their overthrow in the latter place by Vikramāditya was the occasion for the establishment of the Vikrama era; and that 135 years later another Saka established the well-known Saka era. We are not told that the sāhi who ousted Gardabhilla introduced an era of his own, and we are left to guess whether his dynasty brought an era from Sagakūla, which era must then have been established some time before the expedition to Ujjayini and probably by the first sākānu sāhi, or stuck to the old reckoning of Mālava. The former alternative seems to be the most probable one, since Vikramāditya thought it advisable to introduce an era of his own. We have no certain traces of Indian secular eras before Vikramāditya.

¹ We do not know whether kūla is the well-known kūla, bank, shore, or a misunderstood foreign word.
successes in war, that finally they established themselves as masters of all within the Euphrates. They further appropriated a portion of Bactria, by bringing force to bear upon the Scythians and even before that upon those about Eucratides'.

It has been supposed that Mithradates I extended the Parthian empire beyond the Indus into the Panjáb, and that this event was commemorated through the introduction of the imperial title 'King of Kings' in India. For the historian Orosius states that he conquered all the peoples between the Hydaspes and the Indus. Professor Rapson is, however, probably right in thinking that to an author writing from the standpoint of Parthia the expression 'between the Hydaspes and the Indus' must surely connote an extension from west to east—from a Persian river to the great Indus which has so often in history been the boundary between Iran and India. Hydaspes is a Persian name, and the river mentioned in this passage is no doubt the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil (Georgics, iv. 211). The theory of a conquest of N.-W. India by Mithradates I would therefore seem to be founded on a misunderstanding of the historian's statement.

Mithradates' successors were less powerful. Phraates II (138–128 B.C.) had to call in Scythian auxiliaries in his wars against Syria, and, when he tried to withhold their wages, they turned against him, and he was killed in battle. The next king, Artabanus I (128–123 B.C.), was no more successful. The Scythians are stated to have returned to their own country after having devastated Parthia, but Artabanus was afterwards killed in battle against the Tochari.

It may be surmised, though it cannot be proved, that it was during the reign of these two kings that Sakas settled in Seistan, and this surmise finds some support in the fact that the Arachot, Drangae, and Arei are mentioned in the passage from Justin quoted above as instrumental in weakening the Greek dominion.

The fortunes of Parthia were, however, reasserted by Artabanus' son and successor, Mithradates II, the Great (123–88 B.C.). He seems to have been the first Parthian ruler to assume the imperial title 'King of Kings', and 'it was in his reign that the struggle between the kings of Parthia and their Scythian subjects in eastern Iran was brought to a close and the suzerainty of Parthia over the ruling powers of Seistan and Kandahar confirmed'.

In eastern Iran the "King of Kings" and the prince of his family who was associated with him in the government issued coins bearing the names of both—the former in Greek on the obverse, and the latter in Kharoshthi on the reverse. Greek was the ordinary language of coins throughout the Parthian empire; it was not characteristic of any particular province. Kharoshthi, on the other hand, was, in eastern Iran, restricted to Arachosia (Kandahar). We may reasonably infer therefore from the coin-legends that the viceroy governed this province in the upper valley of the Helmand and its tributaries. The other province, Drangiana (Seistan), was most probably under the direct rule of the suzerain.

The paramount position acquired by Mithradates II did not outlast his reign. Professor Rapson draws attention to the fact that the title 'King of Kings' was not used in Parthia 'during the interval from 88 to 57 B.C. which separates the reigns of Mithradates II and III; and in the meantime it was assumed not only by the Sakas king Mauzes in the East, but also, in the years 77–73, by Tigranes, king of Armenia, the great rival of Parthia in the West.'

---

1 L.c., p. 568.  
2 Justin, XLI, 1, 2 ff.  
3 p. xxii.  
This line of argument seems to be unobjectionable. Mauzes cannot be placed earlier than 88 B.C. For there is no reason for assuming that he, or his predecessors, revived an ancient title which Iranian tradition had long connected with supreme imperial power. There is every probability that the imperial title was assumed in imitation of rulers with whom the Sakas had been connected, and then there can hardly be the question of anybody else than Mithradates II.

We must therefore accept the explanation given by Professor Rapson that the invasion of India must be ascribed not to the Parthian emperors, but to their former feudatories in eastern Iran; not to the reign of Mithradates I, but to a period after the reign of Mithradates II, when the power of Parthia had declined and kingdoms once subordinate had become independent.

It also seems to me that we must necessarily follow Professor Rapson in assuming that the Saka invasion did not start from the Kabul valley. In the first place, if the Sakas came through the Kabul valley, all traces of their invasion must be supposed to have disappeared from that region; for, among the many thousands of coins which were collected on its sites at the time when the country was still open to archaeological investigation, the coins of the earliest Saka kings are conspicuous by their absence; and, secondly, it is certain that the Kabul valley remained in the possession of the Yavana princes of the house of Eucratides after the Yavana dominions in N.-W. India on the eastern side of the Khyber Pass, that is to say, in Peshāwar and Rawalpindi, had been conquered by the Sakas. Ingress from Bactria was therefore barred at this period.

The alternative suggestion that the Sakas may have come into India from their northern home in the country of the Jaxartes through Kashmir involves a physical impossibility. The geographical difficulties of this region are such that an invasion from this direction of tribal hordes or armies sufficiently powerful to overwhelm the Yavana kingdoms and to conquer the whole of the N.-W. Frontier Province and the Punjab is inconceivable.

Any direct invasion from the north seems, in fact, to be out of the question. It is therefore far more probable, nay almost certain, that the Sakas reached India indirectly, and that, like the Pahlavas, they came through Ariana (W. and S. Afghanistan and Baluchistan) by the high road, associated in modern times with the Bolān Pass, which led from the Parthian provinces of Drangiana (Seistan) and Arachosia (Kandahār) over the Brāhūli mountains into the country of the lower Indus (Sind).

It will be seen that this theory is in thorough accord with the Jaina tradition about a Saka empire on the Indus in the first half of the first century B.C., and we may now state that this empire had been established some time between 88 and 60 B.C.

In this connexion it is also of interest to note that the name Sakastana, which is at the base of the modern Seistan, is used by the Indian Sakas in the Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions which will be mentioned below. For we there find, towards the end, the words: sasasa sak(r)ṣatanasa puye, in honour of the whole Saka country, i.e. the Indian Sakas brought to India the name which they had formerly applied to their home in Seistan.

In such circumstances it is not necessary to assume that Mauzes, whose coins have only been found in the Panjāb, was the first Saka conqueror in India. It is more probable that he had predecessors in the Indus country, and, if we can trust the Kāka-kāhāryakathānaka, these predecessors used the imperial title 'King of Kings'. In other words, Mauzes was not the first to introduce the title in India, and his coin-legends may
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

It seems to me that the various indications which can be gathered from Parthian history and from Indian tradition can only be reconciled by assuming that a Saka empire was established in the Indus country some time after the demise of Mithridates II in 88 B.C., that this empire was extended to Kāshīwār and Mālava about 60 B.C., and that it was subsequently materially weakened by Vikramaśilā. It is natural to infer that its centre of gravity then became the Panjāb, and that Maues' date is subsequent to the introduction of the Vikrama era.

But then it becomes probable that the era used in the copper-plate inscription of the year 78, which mentions the mahārāya Moga, was instituted in commemoration of the foundation of a Saka empire after the demise of Mithridates II, so that the year 78 could not fall earlier than about 10 B.C., and it is, in this connexion, of interest that Sir John Marshall has, from archaeological reasons, approximately dated the record in 17 B.C.\(^1\)

The copper-plate of the year 78 is not the only inscription dated in this era, and not the oldest one. At Maira in the Salt Range, about 100 miles to the south of Taxila, a Kharoshṭhī inscription has been found in an ancient well, which is, it is true, too defaced to be utilized with confidence, but which seems to agree with the Taxila plate in palaeography. It seems to be dated in the year 58, and it is possible that it contains the word Moasa, i.e. the name of the same ruler who is mentioned in the Taxila plate.

Then there is an inscription from Fatehjang, ten miles south of Taxila, which is dated in the year 68, but which does not contain any royal name, and, further, we have three old inscriptions from the Hazāra district. One of them, which has been found at Mānsehrā, is certainly dated in the year 68, while the others, which are still in situ at Shahdaur in the Agor valley, cannot be dated with certainty. One of them perhaps belongs to the year 60 and mentions a rājan Damijada, whose name is followed by a word which seems to begin with saka, i.e. he or the era used by him seems to be referred to the Sakas. We may assume that Damijada was a local ruler in Hazāra under the suzerainty of the 'King of Kings'.

The other Shahdaur inscription is also dated, but the date cannot be made out. It seems to contain the name Aya and may be somewhat later than the Taxila plate.

From these records we can draw the inference that the Saka empire in Maues' time comprised the country about Taxila, including the Hazāra district in the north, and probably extending southwards along the Indus. Old Kharoshṭhī inscriptions have also been found at Paṭhīvār and Kānhiāra in Kāngra, at Karnāl and at Mathūr, and it is possible that Saka suzerainty was acknowledged in these districts as well, but it is hardly possible to draw the eastern frontier-line of the empire.

We have seen that subordinate rulers, such as Damijada, held sway in the provinces of the empire, and such local governors are usually styled kshatrapas. We know the names of several such chiefs.

The Taxila copper-plate of the year 78 mentions Liṅka Kusulūka, who is characterized as a kṣaharāta and as kṣatrapa of Chukhsa, i.e. probably the present Chachh, immediately west of Taxila.

The designation kṣaharāta is well known from a different part of India. It is

\(^1\) JRAS, 1914, pp. 984 ff.
used about some members of another Saka dynasty, the so-called Western Kshatrapas of Kāthiāwār and Mālava. In a Nāsik inscription of the 19th year of Sūrya Pulumāyi, a Kṛhivastava, i.e. evidently Kṛhivastavāka, is mentioned, and it is perhaps most probable that kṣhaharāta was the name of a family or clan.²

The term kusuluka is also known from other sources. Liaka Kusuluka is evidently Kusuluka, the same person who has issued coins with the legend AIKAI KOZOA. These coins are imitations of those of Eucratides,³ but we are no more justified to draw chronological conclusions from this fact than in the case of Maues.

The Greek spelling shows that the actual sound was kusula, and this kusula is possibly the name of a family, as suggested by Professor Lüders,⁴ in which case the Kusulas must have belonged to the larger group of the Kshaharātas.

We shall see later on that the same designation kōωoła is used about the oldest of the Kushānas, who came to India not via the Indus country, but from the north-west. It is therefore probable that Liaka was descended from the ancient Saka rulers of Ki-piṅ, and that his family had not come to India from Seistān.

There is another detail which seems to point in the same direction. Liaka had a Jāva. son, Patika, who seems to be spoken of in the copper-plate as a jaṭīca, and this jaṭīca is most probably the same title which is used by the early Kushāna ruler designated Kōωoλā in the forms čoos, yauniga. We learn from Chinese sources that this title was used in a series of principalities extending from Wakhān and towards Kābul, i.e. in, and in the neighbourhood of, Ki-piṅ.

We shall see below that there is some reason for assuming that also Maues belonged to the old Sakas of the north-west.

The jaṭīca Patika is evidently the same person who occurs as the mahakṣhataravā Patika. Kusuluka Patika in the most important record which we possess of the Sakas in India, the inscriptions engraved on a sandstone capital from Mathurā, the so-called Lion Capital. Dr. Fleet held this Patika to be another person,⁵ but the use of the same designation Kusuluka, by the mahakṣhatarapa Patika and by the father of the jaṭīca Patika is a priori in favour of identifying them, and we should only be justified in separating them if it could be shown that they cannot be identified, which is by no means the case.

The Lion Capital contains the names of several Saka chiefs who are not known from other sources, such as the kṣhatarapa Mavakī Miyika,⁶ the kṣhatarapa Khardaa, Takshila Kronna, and perhaps Khaḷaśamuṣa. And it mentions the local dynasty of Mathurā and also a yuvrajā.

The local Saka ruler of Mathurā was the mahakṣhatarapa Rajula. He is certainly Rajula, identical with the mahakṣhatarapa Rañjuvula of the Brāhmi inscription on the Mora stone-slab in the Mathurā Museum,⁷ and with the ruler whose coins are imitated from those of Strato II and bear the Greek legend BACIAEΩC CWTHPOC PAIY BACIACI, where Paioθouolci may be a semi-Greek rendering of Rañjuvula,⁸ on the obverse, and the Kharoshthi text apratiḥatakahakrasa kṣhatarasā Rajuvulasa on the reverse. Other coins bear the Brāhmi legend mahakṣhatarapa Rajubulasā.

¹ Ep. ind., viii, p. 60. ² It is, however, possible that kṣhaharāta stands for kṣhahararāta, where kṣhaha may be a dialect form of kṣhatra.
⁴ SBAW, 1922, p. 351. ⁵ JRAS, 1913, p. 102f.
⁶ A coin bearing the name Mavaku has been traced by Professor Rapson, JRAS, 1894, p. 548.
Such features do not point to a high age, and, according to Sir John Marshall, the stratification of finds at Taxila seems to show that this ruler belongs to the beginning of the Christian era.

This dating, which is in thorough agreement with the results arrived at above, is also supported by other evidence. The inscription on the capital contains the name of Rajula’s son, the kshatrapa Šodasa, and this Šodasa is certainly identical with a chief whose coins bear the Brāhmī legend mahākshatrapa pulasa khatapasa Šodāsasa and who is mentioned in two Brāhmī inscriptions, one, from the Jail Mound, mentioning the treasurer (ganipavarta) of the svamin mahākshatrapa Šodāsas, the other, from Kaṅkali Tiḷa, being dated in the year 72 and during the reign of the svamin mahākshatrapa Šodasa. The date must evidently be referred to the Vikrama era and consequently corresponds to A.D. 15, and this dating is supported by the style of the carving on the stone, which Sir John Marshall assigns to the beginning of the Christian era.

It will be seen that we have two different titles, kshatrapa and mahākshatrapa, the latter being evidently the higher one, and we get the impression that a kshatrapa might, in the ordinary course of events, advance to the higher position after the demise of his predecessor. Such was certainly the case in the later Saka dynasty of the Western Kshatrapas, where kshatrapas as well as mahākshatrapas seem to have acknowledged the suzerainty of a ‘King of Kings’, as was certainly the case with the mahākshatrapa Kharapallāṇa, who is mentioned in a Brāhmī inscription of the third year of the Kushāna emperor Kanishka and in another undated record from Sārnāth.

We have not, however, any indication to show that such was the state of things from the very beginning of the Saka empire. The title mahākshatrapa is met with for the first time on the Mathurā Lion Capital and the coins of Rajula. The kshatrapas Hagāna and Hagāmasha, who may have been his predecessors, only use the inferior title, and the same is the case with Liaka Kusuluka. It is therefore possible that the higher title was not introduced long before the time of the Lion Capital. In other words, we are perfectly justified in drawing the inference that a certain period, say five to ten years, must have intervened between the date of the Lion Capital, when Šodasa was kshatrapa as subordinate to his father, the mahākshatrapa, and A.D. 15, when he had succeeded his father in the higher position as mahākshatrapa. But we have no a priori right to assert that a comparatively longer interval must separate the Lion Capital from the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78, to make it possible for Liaka Kusuluka to rise from kshatrapa to mahākshatrapa, and for his son, Patika, to become first kshatrapa and then mahākshatrapa. It is just as probably, or even more probable, that at the time of the copper-plate there were no mahākshatrapas at all, but only kshatraps, the lower position being that of the jātaka. And, as a matter of fact, there are some indications to show that the introduction of the title mahākshatrapa coincided with the abolition of the imperial title ‘King of Kings’, that at, or shortly before, the date of the Lion Capital the united Saka empire was replaced by a federation of Saka chiefs, the most important of whom assumed the title mahākshatrapa.

The events narrated in the Kalakāṣṭhāyakathānaka seem to bear witness to a considerable decrease of the Saka power in consequence of Vikramāditya’s success. From
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1 ASIAR, 1914-15, p. 27.
2 Lüders, List, nos. 59 and 82.
3 Cf. Lüders, Ep. Ind., ix, pp. 243 ff. Professor Rapson, The Cambridge History of India, i, p. 375, reads the year as 42.
4 The Cambridge History of India, i, p. 633.
5 Cf. Rapson, WK, p. c f.
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SAKA DECLINE. KHALROSTA

the use of Brāhmi in coin legends and inscriptions and of the Vikrama era by the kshatrapas of Mathurā we may infer that the national reassertion which took place in Malava also made itself felt in Mathurā. And danger was also threatening from another direction.

As we shall see later on, the Parthian empire, which suffered great losses after the demise of Mithradates II, soon began to recover, and one year before the date of the Taxila copper-plate an attempt was made to replace the reckoning of the Sakas by a new, Parthian, era. And some few years later we find Parthian rulers established in the Panjāb.

The Sakas seem to have been unable to resist the increasing pressure, and it may be surmised that an attempt was made to find recompensation in the east, by tightening the grip the Sakas held on Mathurā. The Lion Capital makes mention of military camps, and it is possible that it contains a reference to funeral solemnities after the death of King Moga. If the reading and interpretation of the difficult passage which seems to contain Moga’s name is accepted, it seems necessary to infer that the Lion Capital was put up on the occasion of a military expedition, during which the ‘King of Kings’ was killed or died.

The inscriptions on the Lion Capital twice mention a yuvāraja, i.e. heir-apparent, Kharoṣṭha. Kharoṣṭha, who seems to have been a person of some consequence, because the principal donor mentioned in the record, the chief queen of the mahākṣatrapa Rajula, takes care to define her relationship to him, and because it is expressly mentioned that he is giving his assent to the donations.

There can hardly be any doubt about the identity of this Kharaosta with the kṣatrapa Kharāhostes, whose coin legends have been dealt with by Professors Rapson and Lüders. The Greek legend is ΧΑΡΑΟΣΤΕΙ ΚΑΤΡΑΠΕΙ ΑΡΤΑ ΒΟΥ, and the Khraosthi Kharatrapa pra Khroastas Arasasa (or once Orisasa) purasa. The meaning of the syllable pra, which Lüders explained as an abbreviation of pratima but which may also be a reflex of prachākhasa, which is used in Strato’s coin legends, does not interest us in the present connexion. The importance of the coin legends rests with the fact that they show that Kharoṣṭha was not the son of Rajula, as has sometimes been assumed, but of Arṣa. The inscription on the Lion Capital has usually been interpreted to mean that he was the son of Rajula’s chief queen, who must accordingly formerly have married Arṣa. This very queen mentions her mother and her father’s mother as associated in the donation registered, in addition to Kharoṣṭha, who further has at his side a younger prince (kumarā) Kalamasa and a youngest brother (kanitha) Maja, and cannot have been quite young at the time of the record, being besides, as already indicated, a person of consequence. If he were about thirty years old, his mother could hardly be much less than fifty, and her mother again towards seventy, and even she had a mother-in-law alive. Moreover the general construction of the inscription seems to show that Rajula’s queen was the daughter and not the mother of the yuvāraja Kharoṣṭha. That such was the case seems also to follow from the fact that she as well as he are characterized as Kamutra, for such designations are inherited from the father and not from the mother.

It will be seen that Kharaosta cannot be characterized as yuvāraja in his quality as the heir apparent of the mahākṣatrapa Rajula. The latter’s son and co-regent, who in due course succeeded him, was the kṣatrapa Sodāsa. The title yuvāraja must bear reference to something different from the position as kṣatrapa or mahākṣatrapa, and so far as I can see, there can only be the question of the imperial throne. In other words, Kharaosta was the legal heir of Moga. And that was apparently the reason
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1 JRAS, 1905, pp. 792 ff.  
2 SBAW, 1913, pp. 423 f.
why Rajula had married his daughter and made her his chief queen; he wanted to strengthen his position among the Saka leaders.

At the time of the Lion Capital the state of things was apparently as follows: Maues, the King of Kings, was no more, and the yuvrajā, Kharaosta, had not been installed as his successor. One of the Saka chiefs had married Kharaosta's daughter, and, if Kharaosta was to die without male issue, he might reasonably hope that the imperial title would, in due course, pass over to his family. It is conceivable that the other chiefs were little pleased at this prospect. And, at all events, there is nothing to show that the title 'King of Kings' was continued with the Sakas after the demise of Maues. Instead of installing the yuvrajā as 'King of Kings', the Saka chiefs seem to have established a federation, with the two most important ones, Patika and Rajula, as mahākshatrapas, and subordinate kshatrapas in other provinces. Patika probably held sway in the old province of his father, in Chukhsa, which included Taxila, and it seems probable that Mevaki Miyika, whose name is associated with his in the inscription, was his co-regent and perhaps his son, just as Rajula's son, Šodasi, was associated with his father as kshatrapa in the Mathura country. In Taxila the Sakas were soon afterwards replaced by Parthian rulers. In Mathura Šodasi was still mahākshatrapa in the year A.D. 15.

I therefore think that the title mahākshatrapa was not introduced before the death of Maues, and that its introduction bears witness to the first stages of a dismemberment of the Saka empire in the Panjāb, following about half a century after the defeat of the Sakas in Mālava at the hand of Vikramāditya.

We still have to consider the question about Kharaosta's claim to the position as 'King of Kings'. He was not the son of Maues, but of another person, Arta or Orta, who is not known from other sources. Now we know from the history of the Western Kshatrapas that the succession among the Sakas sometimes passed from the ruling prince to his brother. It is accordingly possible that Arta was a brother of Maues and was destined to succeed him, but died before him, wherefore the right of succession was transferred to his son Kharaosta. But then we may infer that Maues was, like Kharaosta, a Kamaita. And if we bear in mind that mb becomes m, i.e. mn, in the dialect of the Kharoṣṭhī Dhammapada, and that u is used for the common o in Śuddāsa in the Lion Capital inscriptions, Kamaita can very well represent a Skr. kaimbojaka, i.e. Kharoaosta and Maues would belong to the north-western Sakas of Kipin and not to the branch which came to India from Scisṭān.

The history of the first Saka empire in India can accordingly be reconstructed as follows: Shortly after the death of Mithradates II in 88 B.C., the Sakas of Scisṭān made themselves independent of Parthia and started on a career of conquest, which took them to the Indus country. One of these events was commemorated through the establishment of a Saka era beginning, as I shall try to show below, about 84 B.C. Later on, about 60 B.C., the Sakas had extended their dominion to what the Kalakachāryakathānaka calls the Hindukadēsa, i.e. the lower Indus country, and thence to Kāthiāwār and Mālava, where they probably introduced their national era. In 57/56 B.C. they were here ousted by Vikramāditya, who celebrated his victory by establishing an era of his own, which we, about seventy years later, find used in Mathura. The centre of gravity in the Saka empire was then transferred to the Panjāb and further to the east, and we find a Saka chief from the north-west, Maues, as bearer of the imperial title. He continued the
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use of the Saka era, which we find employed as far north as Hazara. But soon the Parthians began to reassert themselves in the west, and the Sakas sought recompense in the east in an expedition towards Mathurā, their second stronghold in the north. During this expedition Maues died, and after him there was no more a Saka ‘King of Kings’, but only kshatrapas and mahākshatrapas. The Kālakachāryakathānaka speaks of a Saka reconquest, 135 years after Vikramāditya, and we shall have to occupy ourselves with this reconquest later on. But for the time being the unity and strength of the Saka empire had been broken.

With regard to the nationality of these old Sakas we have very little evidence, but such as there is, is to the effect that they were Iranians, speaking a language related to that of the Kushānas and the ancient Iranian inhabitants of the southern oases of Chinese Turkestan.

I have already mentioned the name saka and the designations jauva and kusuluka, and if karmitya corresponds to Skr. kambojaka, it is worth while remembering that we know from Yāska (Naig. ii. 2) and the Mahābhāṣya that the Kambojas said savati for ‘he goes’, and this base is the same as in the modern Persian šakdan.

The title sahānu sahī occurring in the Kālakachāryakathānaka is Prakritized and the sahānu sahī of the Allahābad prāṣasti is certainly a more correct rendering of the Saka title. The word sahī is clearly Iranian, and the terminations t of the nominative singular and ṇm of the genitive plural are the same as in Khotani Saka, where, however, the corresponding word is shan and not shahi.

Also many of the names of individual Sakas are clearly Iranian, as shown by Professors Thomas and Lüders. And the name which they use about their country in the Lion Capital inscriptions, viz. Sakaḥastana, is just as unmistakably Iranian.

We have seen that the imperial Sakas cannot be traced after Maues, and I have already indicated that I look on this development as the result of a Parthian expansion towards the Panjāb. This is not in accordance with the view held by other scholars, who look on the Saka and Parthian rulers of India as closely connected with each other. Vincent Smith has proposed to designate all those rulers as Parthians, and Professor Rapson holds a similar opinion.

After having explained how the struggle between the kings of Parthia and the Scyths was brought to an end by Mithradates II, who secured the suzerainty over the old Saka settlements in Seisṭān and Kandahār, the latter scholar goes on to say: In these subordinate governments Parthians (Pahlavas) and Scyths (Sakas) were so closely associated that it is not always possible to distinguish between them: the same family includes both Parthian and Scythian names. It is therefore little more than a convenient nomenclature which labels the princes of the family of Maues, who invaded the lower Indus valley, as Šakas, and those of Vonones, who ruled over Drangāna (Seisṭān) and Arachosia (Kandahār), as Pahlavas... In fact, all through the period of Saka and Pahlava rule the countries to the west and east of the Indus were governed by members of the same royal house. There were normally three contemporary rulers of royal rank—a King of Kings associated with some junior member of his family in Iran, and a King of Kings in India, and the subordinate ruler in Iran usually became in due course King of Kings in India.

So far as I can see, there is no clear evidence in support of this view, and it is not
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It is very likely that the Sakas and the Parthians should have dropped their old quarrels after the Sakas had made themselves independent of Parthia, as shown by their assumption of the imperial title, or after the Parthians had succeeded in re-establishing their suzerainty in the east. It is much more probable that the old contrast remained.

We do not know much about the history of Parthia after Mithradates II. Tigranes of Armenia is known to have annexed parts of the Parthian empire about the time when the Sakas asserted their independence. About the king Sinatruces, who seems to have been ruling between 77 and 70 B.C., we learn from Lucian (Macrobr. 15) that he had been staying with the Sakaraikai before he was summoned back to Parthia.

His son Phraates III (70-57 B.C.) was able to some extent to retrieve the fortunes of Parthia, and under his sons, Mithradates III (57-54 B.C.) and Orodes I (57-37 B.C.), the imperial title King of Kings again makes its appearance on Parthian coins.

This increase of Arsacid power was evidently also felt in Seisitan, and about the beginning of the Christian era we find that the Parthian empire comprised the whole country from Herat and eastwards, including Seisitan, but nothing to the east of Arachosia. Vincent Smith gives the following eastern provinces after Isidor of Charax: (1) Aria, with its capital Alexandria among the Arians, the modern Herat; (2) the country of the Anauoi, being a segment of Aria, with its chief town Phra, the modern Farrah; (3) Zarangiana or Drangiana, lying farther south, E. long. 60°, N. lat. 31°-32°, to the east of the Hamun or Zarch Lake; (4) Sakastana, to the south-east of the last, including Sigal, the Saka capital, a province to the north of the Helmund river; and, lastly, (5) Arachosia, which the Parthians called White India (Ivānkh Īskān), with its capital Alexandropolis, the modern Kandahar. So far extended, says Isidor, the realm of the Parthians.

We here get information about a state of things when the Gandhāra country was not subject to Parthian rule, while Seisitan had been reduced. We do not know whether this expansion had already been effected during the reigns of Mithradates III and Orodes I, but we shall see presently that a further expansion eastwards seems to have taken place about the times of Christ. This latter expansion, however, was apparently more the consequence of internal troubles within the Parthian empire, as had been the case when the Sakas set up an independent king, than of the increased power of the Parthian emperor.

Orodes I was to all appearances a powerful ruler, who was able to assert his power against the Roman legions. Crassus was defeated at Carrhae in 53 B.C., and Syria was invaded in 40 B.C. But the Romans soon got the upper hand, and the Parthians had to give up Syria.

Orodes was put to death by his son Phraates IV (38-2 B.C.), who was engaged in war against Rome till peace was restored in 36 B.C. The relations between the two powers were then comparatively friendly for some time, and we hear that Phraates sent his four sons to Rome about 10 B.C.

We hear, on the other hand, about internal troubles in Parthia. Justin (xii. 5) says that Phraates was banished by the Parthians on account of his cruelties, and that Tigrates was made king in his stead. Dio states (li. 18) that Phraates regained his throne in 30 B.C., when Tigrates fled for protection to Augustus, who was then in Syria. According to Justin, however, the flight of Tigrates took place when Augustus was in
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Spain, i.e. 27-25 B.C. According to Josephus (Ant. Indo. xvi. 5. 4) there was a new rival king Mithradates in 12-9 B.C.

Phraates IV was murdered by his son, Phraataces (3 B.C.-A.D. 4), who was expelled by the Parthian nobles and fled to Roman territory in A.D. 4.

The nobles then placed Orodes II (A.D. 4-6) on the throne, but according to Josephus (xviii, 2. 4) his cruelty soon led to his being assassinated. Then followed a time of internal war and bloodshed, till the Parthian nobles sent envoys to Rome and brought back Vonones I (A.D. 8-12), the eldest son of Phraates IV, as king of Parthia. Vonones, however, proved too refined and effeminate for his subjects, and a rival king appeared in the person of Artabanus III, who finally ousted Vonones and remained on the throne till A.D. 40.

The further development in Parthia proper does not concern us in this connexion. It was during the troubled reign of Phraates IV that we seem to meet with Parthian rulers in north-western India.

The oldest of them is apparently the ruler called Azes, Azilises in the Greek, and Aya, Ayilisha in the Kharoshthi coin legends. His name seems to occur, in the form Ayasa, in connexion with an illegible date, in an old inscription from Shahdaur, which has been mentioned above. The figures giving the year are, however, entirely defaced, so that the inscription cannot be utilized for chronological purposes. The stratification at Taxila, on the other hand, clearly shows that Azes, Azilises, succeeded Maues as ruler there.

The coins bearing these names are found in great abundance in the Panjáb, but do not appear to have been unearthed to the west of Bimarán near Jalalabad.

They present a great variety of types and also the legends differ. The obverse legend Βασιλικὸς βασιλικῶν μεγάλου ΑΖΟΥ is coupled with Kharoshthi legends of the same meaning on the reverse: maharajasa mahalasa Ayasa, maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa Ayasa, maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa Ayasa, maharajasa mahatasa dhramikasa rajatirajasa Ayasa. In some cases, however, the reverse legend runs maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa Ayilishasa. Similarly we have, on the obverse, the legend Βασιλικὸς βασιλικῶν μεγάλου ΑΖΙΛΙΣΟΥ, and on the reverse maharajasa rajatirajasa (or, rajarajasa) mahatasa Ayilishasa, but also maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa Ayasa.

From this state of things Mr. Vincent Smith has inferred that there were two kings of the name of Azes, probably related as grandfather and grandson, separated by Azilises, who was probably the son of Azes I and the father of Azes II. 'The proof', he says, 'that there were two kings of Taxila named Azes is easy. Azes I struck a few coins, of which three specimens are recorded, bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of his successor, Azilises or Ayilisha, in Kharoshthi, on the reverse. . . . The coins struck by Azilises as independent king in his own name alone are numerous and various. One silver coin of his with his name in Greek on the obverse exhibits the name of Azes (Aya) in Kharoshthi on the reverse. . . . These coins, when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate viceregal colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes, similarly, was subsequently the subordinate viceregal colleague of king Azilises. It is obvious that the two princes named Azes cannot be identical, and that they must be distinguished as Azes I and II. This necessary inference is fully confirmed by minute examination of the immense mass of coins bearing the name of Azes alone, which readily fall into two classes—one well

1 ZDMG, 60, 1926, pp. 63 ff.
executed, with good Greek legends, the other semi-barbarous with debased, and often corrupt, Greek legends.'

On this Mr. Whitehead remarks: 'Whether this evidence by itself is weighty enough to warrant so important a conclusion is a matter of opinion. I know it is generally held that Azes came before Azilises, but the coins are so far our only testimony, and the silver coins of Azilises are better executed and earlier in style than those of Azes. The best dirhams of Azes compare unfavourably with the fine silver coins of Azilises with Zeus obverse and Dioskouroi reverse, and with other rare silver types of Azilises. If Azilises preceded Azes, then, following Mr. Vincent Smith, we must have Azilises I and Azilises II, instead of Azes I and Azes II. The differences in type and style between the abundant issues of Azes can be adequately explained by reasons of locality alone, operating through a long reign.'

I quite agree with Mr. Whitehead in his criticism. Mr. Vincent Smith's argument is based on the supposition that Professor Thomas was not right in explaining Azes as a short form of Azilises, an explanation which leads us to the conclusion that Azes and Azilises was one and the same person, that we have neither two kings of the name Azes nor two kings of the name Azilises, a conclusion which seems to follow with necessity from a consideration of the coin legends discussed by Mr. Smith. When we find βασιλεύς βασιλεύν μεγάλος ΑΖΟΥ on the obverse and μαχαρ αγάμα ναραγαβα σαμαντα Αυθίλτα on the reverse of some coins, and βασιλεύς . . . μεγάλος ΑΖΙΛΙΣΟΥ on the obverse and μαχαρ αγάμα ναραγαβα σαμαντα Αυθίλτα on the reverse of others, the use of the imperial title on both sides raises a strong presumption in favour of identifying the two names.

And, as a matter of fact, there does not seem to be room for more than one king between Moga, who was on the throne in the year 78 of an era which cannot begin earlier than 88 B.C., and Guduvhara, the successor of Azes-Azilises, who was on the throne in the year 103, there being no apparent or likely reason for considering the era of the Guduvhara inscription as different from that used in the Moga record.

It has usually been assumed that Azes belonged to the same dynasty as Maues. This opinion cannot, however, so far as I can see, be reconciled with what can be inferred from our sources. Maues was certainly a Saka, while Azes seems to have been a Parthian. That follows from a series of coins, which bring him into connexion with a ruling family whose oldest representative bears the name Vonones.

According to Sir A. Cunningham, 'the coins of Vonones and his family come chiefly from the ancient Arachosia, or Kandahar and Ghazni. Some of them have also been found in Sistán, the ancient Drangthi. A few have been obtained at Kábul, but as not a single specimen was got at Begrám by Masson, during his three years' collection, it seems almost certain that Vonones could not have ruled there. For a similar reason the family of Vonones could not have ruled for any time in the Panjáb, as their coins are very rarely found there.'

There can be no doubt that Vonones was a Parthian. The name is, as we shall see, well known from the list of Parthian kings. There are, as we have seen, indications to show that he and his family for some time held sway in Kábul, and we have every reason for assuming that it was this Parthian dynasty which overthrew the Greek dominion in Ariana.

Some of these coins have, on the obverse, the Greek legend βασιλεύς βασιλεύν

---

1 p. 93.
2 Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, x, 1890, p. 106.
3 JRAS, 1906, p. 208.
4 Cf. Gardner, p. xli.
VONONES

megaleu OONNOY, and on the reverse, in Kharoshthi letters, either maharajaputra dhvaniyasa Spalahora or Spalakorputrasa dhvaniyasa Spalagadama; others give SPALAPICOU διαφορ υπο βασιλεων on the obverse and Spalakorputrasa dhvaniyasa Spalagadama on the reverse. Finally there is a series of coins showing the name Spalirises. Some have the legends βασιλεων διαφορ επιαρικο and maharajaputra dhvaniyasa Spalirisa; others βασιλεων βασιλεως megaleu SPALAPICOU and maharajasa mahataka Spalirisasa, and others, finally, βασιλεως megaleu SPALAPICOU and maharajasa mahataka Ayasa.

One specimen of the coins of the King of Kings, the great Spalirises (p. 101, no. 2 in Gardner’s catalogue) has been restruck on a copper coin of Spalyris and Spalagadama. In Professor Gardner’s catalogue it is stated that the original coin was issued in the names of Vonones and Spalalora or Spalagadama, but Mr. Allan has kindly examined the coin for me and corrected this statement. Spalirises is, therefore, evidently later than Spalyris.

The name Vonones occurring in some of these legends is, as remarked above, known from the imperial dynasty of Parthia. One of the sons of Phraates IV who were sent to Rome about 10 B.C. had this name, and he was, as we have seen, later on placed on the imperial throne of Parthia. His dated coins range between A.D. 8/9 and 11/12. We also know of another emperor, Vonones II, who does not seem to have left any coins. According to Tactus (Annales xii. 14) his reign was short and inglorious, and his accession took place in A.D. 51.

It has usually been considered impossible to identify either of these kings with the ruler mentioned on the coins under discussion, who has been described as an old king of Drangiana and Arachosia.

According to Professor Rapson the use of the imperial title shows that he must be later than the reign of Mithradates II. ‘The most trustworthy evidence as to the date of Vonones is supplied by the coins of Spalirises, “the king’s brother”. If “the king”, who is not named, was Vonones himself, as is usually assumed, the earlier coins of Spalirises, i.e. those struck by him before he became suzerain of eastern Iran in succession to Vonones, may perhaps afford a valuable historical indication. There are two classes of these. . . . In the first, Spalirises appears alone as “the king’s brother” without any distinctly royal title. In the second, he as senior (Greek legend) is associated with Azes as junior (Kharoshthi legend), both of them bearing the subordinate or viceregal title, “Great King”. Vonones was evidently reigning as Great King of Kings at this time. The relationship of Azes to Spalirises is not expressed in the Kharoshthi legend; and in such cases it seems to be assumed that the junior is the son of the senior: otherwise, i.e. when the junior is a brother or a nephew, the relationship is stated. We may conclude, then, that this Azes was most probably the son of Spalirises and the nephew of Vonones, and we may identify him with Azes II, who afterwards became suzerain of N.-W. India and ended his reign in A.D. 19. Vonones was at least a generation earlier; that is to say, he appears to have been contemporary with Azilises and possibly with Azes I. Until more definite evidence can be discovered, he may be supposed to have begun his reign c. 30 B.C. It seems impossible, therefore, to identify him with Vonones I of Parthia (A.D. 8–11).

1 Whitcomb, l.c., p. 144, draws attention to the first letter of the king’s name, which, he says, seems to foreshadow the use of the new letter ρ (kh) on the coins of Kanishka.

2 l.c., pp. 572 ff.
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been blended. The name of Vonones himself is distinctly Parthian; but the names of his brothers, Spalahores and Spalirises, and of his brothers' sons, Spalagadames and Azes, are Scythian. For the sake of convenience we may call this family "Pahlava", in order to distinguish it from the better known "Parthian" dynasty in Ctesiphon, although in reality the two terms are etymologically identical.

A characteristic feature of the coins of Vonones and his family is ... the association of the Great King of Kings with the viceroy of Arachosia, whose relationship to the suzerain is sometimes expressed in the Kharoshthi legend of the reverse. Thus Vonones ruled conjointly with his brother, Spalahores, and with his nephew Spalagadames, the son of Spalahores. ... If we may assume with Mr. Whitehead that the Scythian name, Spalahores (Spalahora), appears in a Greek guise as Spalyris, this brother of Vonones and his son also ruled conjointly as viceroys over the district of Arachosia in which coins bearing the type of Euthydemos, "Heraclis seated", were current. This district had formerly been under the direct government of the Great King of Kings, Azilises. ...

The rev. type of the coins which Spalirises issued as the successor of Vonones in the suzerainty of eastern Iran is "Zeus enthroned" ...; and, as it is evidently borrowed from the coins of Hermaeus, it may perhaps be interpreted as an indication that the kingdom of Kabul had now passed from the Yavanas to the Pahlavas. If so, it would appear that this last stronghold of Yavana power had yielded to an invasion of the Pahlavas of Kandahar.

There are some details in Professor Rapson's argument to which it seems difficult to agree.

I do not understand why the names Spalahora, Spalagadama, Spalirisa, and Azes are said to be Scythian and not Parthian. Professor Thomas ¹ expresses himself with the utmost reserve and is inclined to consider the three first of them as Pan-Iranian. At the present state of our knowledge we are quite entitled to put all these rulers down as Parthians, not only Vonones, about whose Parthian nationality there has never been any doubt, but also his brothers and their sons. And there does not seem to be any reason for doubting that Azes, who was the co-regent of Spalirisa, is identical with the successor of Maues in Panjab and the north-western frontier province, whom we accordingly a Parthian and not a Saka.

It is more difficult to settle the question about date.

Attention has been drawn to the varying shape of the Greek omikron on Greek and Scytho-Parthian coins. On the older Greek ones and on those of Maues it is always round. On some of the later Greek coins, e.g. those of Hippostratus, and on those of Azes, the square form begins to be used in addition to the round one. The same change took place on Parthian coins during the reign of Orodes I (57–38 B.C.), and the inference has therefore been drawn that coins showing the square o cannot be earlier than about 40 B.C.

Professor Rapson, however, rightly remarks ² that this test must be applied with caution. Square forms are also found earlier and seem to be characteristic of certain regions. To infer, on the other hand, from the use of the round o on coins that they are older than about 40 B.C. would be still less justified. The coins of the Vonones group all have the round o, but so have those of the Parthian emperor, Vonones I (A.D. 8–11).

It seems to me that the date assigned to the East-Iranian Vonones by Professor Rapson, c. 30 B.C., is a little too early. If Spalirisa was his brother, the imitation of the coins of Hermaeus points to a somewhat later date. Though this, the last, Greek

¹ JRAS, 1906, pp. 208 ff.
² l.c., p. 572; JRAS, 1903, p. 285.
king, may have ruled for a long period, Professor Rapson can hardly be right in assuming
that he 'may have been reigning for some time before or after c. 40 B.C.' We shall see
later on that Hermaeus was, for some time of his reign, associated with the Kushana
ruler Kujula Kadphises, who did not start on his career before about A.D. 25.

In such circumstances we must ask ourselves if it is not possible to identify the
East-Iranian Vonones with the Parthian emperor, Vonones I. When the latter mounted
the throne of Parthia in succession to his father in A.D. 8, he does not seem to
have been a young man. We learn from Tacitus' "Annals" ii. 2 that he was not fond
of hunting and riding, and that he preferred to be carried about in a litter. The
Parthians soon got disgusted and called in Artabanus III, who was of Arsacid blood
but was living with the Dahae. Vonones took refuge with the Armenians, who made
him king in A.D. 16. The Roman governor of Syria, however, reduced him to nominal
power, and later on, at the request of Artabanus, he was removed to Cilicia, and, when
he attempted to escape, he was killed in A.D. 19.

If we assume that he was then about sixty years old, he would have been about fifty
when he was placed on the Parthian throne, and such an age might reasonably be inferred
from Tacitus' narrative.

We have already seen that his father Phraates IV sent him and his brothers to
Rome about 10 B.C. It is hardly likely that this was merely the outcome of paternal
affection and anxiety for the safety of the princes. It looks more like an exile.

Phraates' favourite wife, the Italian slave-girl Musa, whom Augustus had presented
to him, seems to have exercised considerable influence, and she would naturally do what
she could in order to secure the throne for her own son, Phraataces, in preference to his
older half-brothers, who would, of course, be less dangerous in Rome than in Parthia.

On the other hand, the frequent internal troubles during the reign of Phraates IV
would more than once have offered an opportunity to his sons for setting up as indepen-
dent rulers in some part of the empire, e.g. in Arachosia, where we find the East-
Iranian Vonones. And if Vonones, the son of Phraates, had tried to do so, we should
understand better why he was exiled in 10 B.C.

I therefore think that the most likely inference from the available material is that
the East-Iranian Vonones was the same person who later on became the Parthian
emperor Vonones I. Some time before 10 B.C. he was in charge of the eastern provinces
and there assumed the imperial title 'King of Kings'.

This may have happened about the time when Mithradates rose against Phraates
in 12 B.C., or even earlier. If we were to ascribe the coins of Vonones with Špalahora
and Špalagadama to that period, the coins of Spaliris and Špalagadama would belong to
about the same time. After Vonones had been sent to Rome in 10 B.C., we should then
be inclined to date the coins issued by 'the great king' (βασιλευς μέγας) Spalirises and 'the
great king' (mahārāja mahātaka) Aya, in other words Aya would have been the joint
ruler of Arachosia and perhaps of Kābul from about 10 B.C.

Later on Spalirises assumes the title 'King of Kings', βασιλευς βασιλευς, in the west,
and Azes in the east. And it is perhaps possible to state with some confidence when
that latter event took place.

I have already stated above that we are in possession of information to the effect that
a Parthian ruler was established to the west of the Indus about the beginning of A.D.
the Christian era. This information is contained in a stone inscription found either at
Takht-i-Bāhī or at Shāhībhārgāh and dated in the 20th year of the mahārāja Guduvhara,
and, besides, in the year 103. The latter dating evidently refers to the same era which is used in the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78, and which cannot, as we have seen, have begun before 88 B.C.

The other date, in the year 26 of the mahārāja Guduvhara, has usually been interpreted as a regnal year of Guduvhara. What actually stands on the stone is, however, simply ' (during the reign) of the mahārāja Guduvhara, year 26 ', which can just as well be referred to an era instituted by one of Guduvhara's predecessors. And, as we shall see below, such must be the case, if we are not to assume the use of another era in the Guduvhara inscription, different from that of the Taxila plate. And such an assumption can hardly be justified, unless it can be proved that the ascription of both records to one and the same era leads to impossible results, which is by no means the case.

We know from archaeological evidence that Guduvhara's predecessor was Aya, Azes, and it seems to be an unavoidable inference that the first date of the Guduvhara inscription should be reckoned from the accession of Azes, which must accordingly have taken place in the year 103-26, i.e. 77 of the old Śaka era.

Now we have already seen that the initial point of that era cannot be earlier than 88 B.C., and we shall see later on that it can, with some probability, be assigned to the year 84 B.C. The accession of Azes, or rather his assumption of the imperial title in the eastern provinces, would then fall in the year 7-6 B.C., a date which will be found to be in agreement with what we have inferred from other sources.

The introduction of a new era by Azes may be interpreted to indicate that he now set up as an independent ruler and severed his connexion with the princes with whom he had formerly been associated. In such circumstances we understand that his dominions were not included in the list of Isidor of Charax.

On some coins bearing the obverse legend βασιλεὺς βασιλίων μεγάλοις ΑΖΟΥ, the reverse has Ἰνδραγवणपुत्रασα Ἀσπαवर्मासα στρατηγασα γαγαλασα. The use of the Greek title ἵππαρτος is of interest, as are also the semi-Indian form of the general's and the purely Indian form of his father's name.1

The same strategos is, on other coin-legends, associated with Azes' successor, Guduvhara, whose coins have been found in great abundance in the Panjāb, and at Begrām in Charikār, north of Kābul, which district must, therefore, have passed definitively from Greek to Parthian rule during his reign. The stratification at Taxila shows that he was the immediate successor of Azes, and his name, which corresponds to Persian Vindavāraṇa, 'the winner of glory', characterizes him as a Parthian.

It has long been recognized that this Guduvhara must be identical with a king called Gondophrarnes or Gondophernes, who plays a role in Christian tradition as associated with St. Thomas, the apostle of India and Parthia.2 It is told how the apostles divided the various countries between themselves, and that India fell to the lot of St. Thomas. He did not want to go, but then a merchant called Habbān came as messenger, for the purpose of bringing back a skilled carpenter, from an Indian king whose name is given as Gudnamphar or Gundaphar in Syriac, Γονδάφαρος, Τωνδάφαρος, or Τωνδάφαρος in Greek, Gundaforos or Gundoforos in Latin sources. Jesus appeared to Habbān and sold

---

1 The word Indra is also contained in the name Ἰνδραγवणपुτ्रασα on some Taxila coins described by Sir John Marshall, ASIAR, 1912-13, pp. 43, 49, plate XI, 23; 1914-15, pp. 27, 34, plate XXIX, 29; 1915-16, p. 32, plate XXXV, 10. Sir John reads Ἰδαρας.

St. Thomas to him for twenty silver pieces, and they started for Gudnaphar's country. The king ordered the apostle to build a palace, but he spent the money in acts of piety, in order to build a palace not made with hands. The king then cast him in prison. Now Gad, the king's brother, died and was carried by the angels to heaven, where he beheld the palace which the apostle had built through his good works. He was afterwards restored to life, and both he and the king were converted. Later on the apostle proceeded to another king, whose name is given as Mazdai, Misdaios, or Miseues, and an apocryphal work also brings him into connexion with a certain Labdanes, the sister's son of a king to whom he went.

There can hardly be any doubt about the identity of the king Gudnaphar and the successor of Azes in north-western India, and we can infer that the existence of this king, as ruling shortly after the death of Christ, had become known to the Christian world at an early date.

The coins of this ruler are of various types, and also the legends vary. He bears Gudnaphar's coins the titles 'king saviour' and 'great king of kings', and once. And some of his coins seem to characterize him as a Guđa or Gudha, which may be the name Gad, which is applied to his brother in Christian tradition. The form Gudasa has also been read on an intaglio and a pedestal found at Charsadda, where, however, the reading is uncertain.

The coins in question are said to come from Seistan and Kandahar, and they have been dealt with by Messrs. Cunningham, Gardner, Rapson, and Whitehead. They show, on the obverse, the Greek legend Ἰουδαίων μεγάλων ὈΡΘΑΝΗΚ, and, on the reverse, a Kharoshthi legend which is stated to be maharaja rajarajasa mahatasa Gudwhara sa gudana (or, guđa, gada, gudanasa), and, in some specimens, gudana without Gudwhara.

It has usually been assumed that Guda, Gudana is the name of a person, different from Gudwhara. Cunningham was the first to think of Gad, the king's brother, and Professor Rapson speaks of Gondophras as being associated in the subordinate rule as viceroy in Arachosis with Guđa or Gudana, 'who may perhaps have been his brother', and thinks that the coins on which Ortha may still appear as chief ruler but with Gudana alone as his subordinate, must no doubt be assigned to the period after Gondophras had succeeded Azes II in the sovereignty of N.-W. India.

Mr. Whitehead justly remarks that if Gudwhara Gudana means 'of Gudwhara and Gad', we should have to state that one of the names is in the genitive singular, the other in the genitive plural. 'On the other hand the word Gudana may be an epithet, or monetary denomination, or

---

1 Obverse: βασιλέως σωτηρός ΥΝΔΟΦΕΡΟΥ; reverse: maharaja Gudwharasa tratarasa.
2 Obverse: βασιλέως βασιλέως μεγάλων ΥΝΔΟΦΕΡΟΥ; reverse: maharaja rajarajasa tratarasa devvarada Gudwhara rc, maharaja rajarajasa tratarasa devvarata Gudwharasa; obverse: βασιλέως βασιλέως ... ΥΝΔΟΦΕΡΟΥ; reverse: maharaja rajarajasa mahatasa [drakma] devvarata Gudwharasa; obverse illegible; reverse: maharaja rajarajasa tratarasa Gudwharasa, maharaja rajarajasa mahatasa Gudwharasa, maharaja devvarata Gudwharasa, ... d[drakma] apadhati, sr devvarata Gudwharasa, maharaja mahatasa Gudwharasa.
3 Gardner, p. 174, plate XXII, 10.
5 Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, x, pp. 121 ff.
6 l.c. p. 578.
7 p. 109.
8 pp. 155 f.

Cunningham proposed, as an alternative, to read Gudwhara-sagabu ... i.e. Gudwhara-sagubhara, 'of the brother of Gudwhara', but Mr. Whitehead is certainly right in rejecting this reading.
again it may, as suggested by Dr. J. F. Fleet, give us the name of the tribe of Gondophares.’

It seems to me that Dr. Fleet’s explanation is the only possible one. We find the two variants Guduvharasa Gudana and Guduvharasa Gudanasa, i.e. probably Gudanasa, where Gudanasa must be an adjective characterizing Guduvharasa, wherefore we must necessarily infer that Gudana, which is the genitive plural of Guda, has a similar meaning. Now it is well known that we have an exact parallel to the doublet Guda, Gudana in the designations of the Kushānas. The Taxila silver scroll of the year 136 has maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputra kushanasa, while the coin-legends of Kanishka run shanana shao kaneshki koshano, where Kushanasa is the genitive singular of an adjective Kushana, while Koshano, i.e. Kushāna, is the genitive plural of a simplex Kusha (Kusha).

We know, e.g. from the Saka language of Khotan, that adjectives were formed from nouns by means of the suffix āna (cf. balyśi, Buddha; balyśāni, Baudhā), and it seems evident that Gudana, i.e. Gudāna, is formed from Guda just as Kushāna from Kusha. But then Guda must be the name of Guduvharas’s tribe, and Gudāna might be translated ‘Gudian’. The idiom Guduvharasa Gudana has an exact parallel in the coin-legend Kaneshki Koshano and means ‘of Guduvharas (of the tribe of) the Gudas’.3

We do not know anything about the family or tribe of the Gudas. If the initial is of the same kind as in Guduvharas, Gudāna may be the same word as Varadanas, the name of a son of Artabanensis III, who claimed the throne of Parthia after his father’s demise in A.D. 40. But we are not in a position to make any definite statement. We can only say that Guda was probably the name of Guduvharas’s tribe or family, and there is no improbability in the Christian account about the king’s brother Gad. He was, like his brother, a Guda.

The designation Orthanges, occurring on the obverse of these coins, is, as is well known, equivalent with Avestan vērthraghna, ‘victorious’, and the reverse of the coins shows a winged Nike with palm and wreath. Orthanges is usually considered to be the name of the suzerain, under whom Guduvharas held a subordinate position. Professor Rapson thinks that Guduvharas succeeded Azes as viceroy in Arachosia before he became his successor as Great King of Kings in India. The legend on the reverse of the Orthanges coins does not, however, point to a subordinate position. The titles of Guduvharas are exactly equivalent to those of Orthanges. In such circumstances it seems to me that Orthanges must be identical with Guduvharas, i.e., it is not a name but an honorific designation assumed after an important victory. And since these coins have been found in Seistan and Kandahār, we may perhaps assume that Guduvharas, as Great King of Kings, made a victorious expedition against the Sakas in the west.

On another group of coins, where the obverse shows a king on horseback with the right hand extended just as on the coins with the legend βασιλικος βασιλικος μεγάλου ΥΔΑΦΕΡΟΥ, the Greek is corrupt, while the Kharoshṭhī text runs maharajasa rajatirajasa (or, maharajasa devavradasa Guduvharas Sasasa. Cunningham4 ascribed them to a ruler, Sasan, while Mr. Vincent Smith5 regarded the word sasasa as an epithet or title. Mr. Whitehead5

---

1 Cf. Yavana sa Irilasa Gata na, of the Yavana Irila of (the tribe of the) Gatas (Goths); Yavana sa Chaitasa Gata na, in two Jannar inscriptions, Lüders, List, Nos. 1154 and 1182, and Konow, JRAS, 1912, pp. 379 ff.
2 Artabanus did not perhaps belong to the agamic line of the Arsacids, because it is stated that he ‘was of Arsacid blood but had grown up among the Dahae’; cf. Tacitus, Annals ii. 3 ‘Arsaci darum e sanguine apud Dahas adulutes’.
3 Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, x, 1890, p. 120.
4 Cat., p. 54.
5 p. 147.
draws attention to the fact that the word *sasasa* occupies the place of honour, where the name of the king is almost always situated, and reminds us of the fact that the name Sāśin is well known. Moreover, one of the coins described by Mr. Vincent Smith has the legend *[raja]sasa aparikatatakashasa devavradasa Sasasa* without *Guduvharasa*. There can hardly be any doubt that *Sasa* is a name.

Some Sasa coins were found by Sir John Marshall at Sirkap, where the obverse shows the bust of a bearded king, in which Professor Rapson has recognized the king Pacores, with whom we shall have to occupy ourselves below. The reverse bears the Kharoshthi legend *maharajasa Aśpabhakaputra tratarasa Sasa*, i.e., as explained by Sir John, ‘of the mahārāja, the brother’s son of Aśpā[varma], the saviour’. It thus becomes evident that Sasa is the name of a scion of the family of Aśpāvarma, the strategos of Azes and Guduvhara.

Other coin legends mention a nephew of Guduvhara called Abdagases. According to Gardner these coins have been found in the Western Panjāb. There are two different legends, viz., *bāsīlōn svarṣha ABΔAΓACOY* on the obverse and *maharajasa Avadagasa tratarasa* on the reverse; and *bāsīlōn bāsīlōn ABΔAΓAΣDY* on the obverse and *Guduvharabhakaputra maharajasa Avadagasa* on the reverse. The titles seem to show that he did not occupy an independent position. Mr. Whitehead registers a coin with the Kharoshthi legend *maharajasa rajatirajasa Gavdharabhakatra-putrasa Avadagasa*. If this reading is right, it shows that Abdagases may at some time have assumed the imperial title. To judge from Mr. Whitehead’s plate, however, the word preceding *Guduvhara* or, rather, *Guduvhara*, seems to be *maharajasa*.

The king Pacores, whose bust Professor Rapson has recognized on some Sasa coins, Pacores, on the other hand seems to have occupied an independent position. His coins come from Kandahār and the country to the west of Bhakar, and, according to Professor Rapson, they show that he was undoubtedly suzerain in Iran, for they bear the imperial title together with the type “Victory” which was first issued by Orthagnes... and his portrait combined on coins found at Takshaśila with the symbol of Gondophernes and the legend of the commander-in-chief, Sasa, proves that he exercised at least a nominal sway in India.

He cannot be identified with the king Pacores II of Parthia, because the bust on the latter’s coins is different and his date (A.D. 77–110) too late. Another Pacores, the brother of Vologases I (A.D. 57–77), is mentioned as having received the kingdom of Media Atropane after the accession of Vologases, but we have no means for judging of his possible identity with our Pacores.

Another king, Sanahares, whose coins bear the legend *bāsīlōn mēgas CANABAHIC*, Sanahares, does not seem to have held sway in India or in Kandahār, but only in Seistan. At Sirkap Sir John Marshall found an earthen jar containing one coin each of the Sapedana, reigns of Pacores and the Kushāṇa Wima Kadphises, and further some coins with the portrait and symbols of Guduvhara and legends in Greek and Kharoshthi, the former

---

1 ASIAR, 1912-13, pp. 44, 49 f. 2 l. c., p. 586.
3 Cunningham, l. c., p. 119, draws attention to the existence of a Parthian noble of this name among those who dethroned Artabanus III in A.D. 35, and thinks that this Abdagases may have been the father of Guduvhara and Sineces, the latter’s son again being the Abdagases of the coins. We have no means for judging of the probability or improbability of this suggestion.
4 l. c., p. xiv. 5 p. 154.
6 Cf. Cunningham, l. c., p. 122. 7 l. c., p. 586.
8 *bāsīlōn bāsīlōn Pacoresis, maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa Pakurasa.*
being partly illegible, the latter running maharajasa rajarajasa tratarasa dhramiasa Sopalamasa and maharajasa rajarajasa tratarasa Satavastria. We do not know anything about the identity of these rulers, but Professor Rapson is probably right in interpreting their coins and titles as showing 'that, even in the reign of Gondophernes, the allegiance of the governors to the suzerain was becoming merely nominal'.

The coins do not accordingly prove the existence of any independent Parthian suzerain in north-western India after Guduvhara. Such a ruler is, however, mentioned in the account of the visit to India of Apollonius of Tyana about A.D. 44, which is found in the romance of Philostratus (3rd century A.D.). We are there told* that the king then reigning at Taxila was Phraotes, who was independent of Vardanes, the King of Kings of Parthia (A.D. 41–43), and himself powerful enough to exercise suzerain powers over the satrapies of Gandhāra, though he found it necessary to pay subsidies to the wilder tribes on his frontiers in order to keep them quiet.

Phraotes is evidently the same name as Phraotes, which is used by several Parthian rulers about the beginning of our era, and we have not a priori any reason for discarding the statement in Philostratus' work, and we have every reason for accepting his description of the state of things in Taxila about A.D. 44: a Parthian emperor was in power, but 'wilder' tribes had begun to exercise pressure in the west, and these wilder tribes cannot have been other than the Kushāqas, whom we shall soon find as the successors of the Parthians in N.-W. India.

The result of the preceding discussion is that a Parthian dynasty rose to power in Arachosia in the first century B.C. A ruler of this house, Akses, established an independent empire in N.-W. India about 7 B.C., and his successor, Guduvhara, conquered the Sakas in Drangiana and Arachosia and also reduced the Greeks of Kabul. He may have had one successor as King of Kings, and his dynasty seems, at all events, to have held its own in Taxila about A.D. 44.

We have already seen that Guduvhara's name is found in a Kharoshthi inscription dated in the years 103 and 26, and I have stated that I take the first of these dates to refer to the era used in the inscriptions of the old Sakas, and the second to an era instituted by Guduvhara's predecessor, Akses. It follows that the record belongs to one of the first years of the rule of Guduvhara, perhaps to the very first, and it is in thorough agreement with such an assumption that he is simply designated as maharaya, and not with the imperial title. As we shall see below in the chapter about erjuna, the date of the inscription seems to correspond to A.D. 19. At that time Guduvhara had consequently become established as ruler. How long he remained on the throne we do not know. One of his coins* seems to bear the date sam 20, and if this means the twentieth year of his reign and his first year was A.D. 19, he must consequently have remained in power till about A.D. 40, shortly before the time when Apollonius is stated to have found his successor, or one of his successors, Phraotes, on the throne of Taxila.

Towards the end of the inscription of the year 103 we find the words erjuna Kapasa puyae, in honour of erjuna Kapas. Here erjuna is evidently the same word which we find as alyyanāi, eyyanāi in the language of the ancient Iranian population of Khotan, the same language which the great Kushāna ruler Kanishka later on employed in his coin-legends. For the correspondence u < 话剧, we may compare Saka kshāna, Kharoshthi kshuna.

---


* For the correspondence u < 话剧, we may compare Saka kshāna, Kharoshthi kshuna.
coins is called Kadapha, Kaphsa, Kapa, &c. In the inscription he is designated as erjuna, and as the corresponding aśvamati is used to translate Skr. kumara, we may infer that he was then a young prince, and perhaps without any official position.

If the identity of the erjuna Kapa and the Kushāṇa Kadapha, or as he is usually called, Kujula Kadphises proves to be right, we here for the first time meet with a family or tribe which later on plays a considerable role during the period covered by Kharoshṭhī inscriptions.

Several ancient rulers are designated as Kushāṇas, and they can be divided into two different lines, one comprising at least two kings, who are usually spoken of as Kadphises I and Kadphises II or as Kujula Kadphises and Wima Kadphises, respectively, from the names occurring on their coins, and another which begins with the most famous of all Kushāṇas, the emperor Kanishka, and remained in power over a large part of India for about a century, while in the north-west minor dynasties traced their descent from Kanishka down to much later times.

The stratification at Taxila shows that the Kushāṇas were the immediate successors of Guduvhara’s dynasty, and important Kharoshṭhī inscriptions bear witness to their rule. It will therefore be necessary to examine what we can learn about them, about their origin and history.

The very name Kushāṇa and its proper significance has been made the subject of name discussion. It is found in several slightly different forms. Greek coin-legends of Kadphises I give κοραρος and χροορος, where the Kharoshṭhī has kushāṇa or bhushāṇa; in Indian Kharoshṭhī inscriptions we find gushāṇa and bhushāṇa, in Central Asian Kharoshṭhī kushāṇa and kushāṇa,² and in a Brāhmī inscription from Māṇ near Mathurā kushāṇa(suta). A similar form seems to be represented by the Chinese kuei-shuang,³ with which we shall have to deal below.

All these forms point to an adjective formed with the suffix -a from a base beginning with a guttural, which may have been a fricative, and containing a sh or rsh. The short base is, as already remarked, contained in the genitive plural kushaṇa occurring in the coin-legends of Kanishka and his successors. It also seems to have occurred in the Sanskrit Buddhist text Kalpananāḍitikā of Kumāralaṇa, where King Kanishka is stated to be of the family (kula) of the Kūsha, i. e. evidently Kūsha,⁴ and perhaps also in other works.

Baron A. von Staël Holstein⁵ is of opinion that the adjective kushāṇa does not exist, the form being everywhere the genitive plural of kusha. Forms such as kushaṇasa he explains as kushaṇa sa, i. e. shah, ‘King of the Kūsha’s’, just as he explains the genitive Sasa discussed above in connexion with the Guduvhara coins as standing for saṃ sa, ‘of the King of Kings’. Even if we were prepared to admit the possibility of such a hybrid form as sa, genitive sasa, in a language which consistently distinguishes between s and sh, and in a script which possesses a separate sign for sh, which I do not think we can, the Chinese kuei-shuang and Central Asian names such as Kuschanasena, seem to prove the existence of the adjective kushāṇa, which bears the same relation to kusha as gurṣa to guda.

Not only the form but also the meaning of kusha, kushāṇa has been subject to The

---

2 Pronounced kjöxy-gang in Tāng times according to Karlgen, nos. 456, 923. Kj here means a vocaled š.
4 JRAS, 1914, pp. 79 ff, SBAW, 1914, pp. 643 ff.
doubt. The Baron saw in *kusha* the same word which the Chinese render as *Yüe-chi*, the tribe mentioned above in connexion with the old Sakas. I shall have to return to the question about this identification later on. In the present place it is sufficient to state that if the Baron were right, we should have to separate the word *kusha*, *kushāna* from Chinese *kuei-thuang*, and there is not, as we shall see, any sufficient reason for doing so. Moreover, the passages from the Kalpanāmanditikā referred to above seem to prove that the Kushas, Kushānas were a tribe or a family within a larger group, and I shall draw attention below to some facts which seem to prove that this larger group was the *Yüe-chi*.

In order to become able to judge about the Kushānas it will be necessary to examine the indications about their ethnic and linguistic affinity which can be gathered from the available sources. And in this respect Kanishka’s dynasty has played a prominent role in the discussion.

We know that, at a later period, the Turki kings of Gandhāra claimed Kanishka as their ancestor, and Kalhaṇa speaks in his Rājatarāṅgini I, 170, of Kanishka and the other members of his dynasty as Turushkas, i.e. Turks. Some of the designations used by the first Kadphises have also been explained as Turki. In inscriptions and coin-legends he is, as we shall see, characterized as a *yavu-ga, yasa, caos*, and in Chinese sources this title occurs as *hi-hou*, old pronunciation *xe-p-yu*. This title was identified by Hirth with Turki *jaghu*, and the inference was drawn that the Kushānas were Turks. Also the designation *kuṇāla* has been explained in a similar way. Professor Hultzsch compared Turki *gāji, *strong*, and I have thought of *guzel, *beautiful*. M. Sylvain Lévi has also drawn attention to the statement in Hemachandra’s Abhidhānachintāmani 959 that the Turks are *sākhi*, i.e. use the royal title *sākhi*, where *sākhi* is evidently written for *sāhī*, the title used by Kanishka and his successors in Brahmi inscriptions.

It has also been thought possible to find proofs of the Turki nationality of the Kushānas in the features presented by the likenesses on their coins. Thus Mr. Kennedy is positive that they ‘belonged to the great Turki family’, and speaks of Kanishka’s features as characteristic of his race. ‘He has the pointed cranium, the salient cheek-bones, the large, long and heavy nose, the thick beard... and his coins represent him as a powerfully built barbarian king, clad in the loose coat and huge boots which were the common dress of Turkestān.’

None of these arguments are, however, conclusive.

The large nose and the other features shown in the likenesses are characteristic of the so-called *Homo alpinus*, which is stated to be largely represented in the population of Chinese Turkestan. This type has been described by Mr. T. A. Joyce as follows: ‘A white-rosy race; very brachycephalic; stature above the average; with thin prominent nose, varying from aquiline to straight; long oval face; hair brown, usually dark, always abundant and curly; eyes medium in the main.’

Moreover, everything which we know about the history and ethnology of Chinese Turkestan is to the effect that the Turki element is comparatively late. Even at the present day the population has been described by Mr. Joyce as follows: ‘The majority

---

1 Karlgren, nos. 128 and 79.
3 ZDMG, 69, 1915, p. 176.
5 JA, IX, ix, 1897, p. 10 note.
6 JRAS, 1912, p. 670.
7 I. c., p. 1560.
8 Stein, Serindia, p. 1361.
of the peoples surrounding the Taklamakan desert have a very large common element... seen in its purest form in Wakhi. The fact that the Wakhi display so close a relationship with the Galcha proves that the basis of the Taklamakan population is Iranian.

Now Chinese Turkestan is, as we shall see, the probable home of the Kushānas, and we have not, therefore, any a priori reason for considering them as Turks.

At a later time, it is true, Turki tribes make their appearance in the country where the Kushānas were once the rulers, and this fact explains the statements of Kalhana and Hemachandra, which are based on a later state of things.

The supposed Turki origin of the titles or designations yavuga and kujula, finally, is more than doubtful. It has not proved possible to find a Turki etymology for the word yavuga. I have already mentioned that it seems to be used, in the form jatva, i.e. probably zethva, by the Saka Palika, and even if it were originally a Turki word, it seems more probable that the Kushānas had taken it over from the old Sakas than that it was a reminiscence of their Turki descent. We shall see later on that the Kushānas throughout behaved as the inheritors of the Sakas, and also other Saka titles are used by them. And besides it is more likely that the title yavuga is originally Iranian and has subsequently been adopted by Turki tribes than that the opposite should have been the case.

With regard to the designation kujula, it has already been seen that it is likewise used by old Sakas, and it is therefore common to the two tribes just as the title yavuga.

About its etymology and significance we do not know anything, but Lüders is probably right in thinking that it is the name of a family or a clan.

We must accordingly look out for other indications, and such as there are point to the conclusion that the Kushānas were Iranians. We seem to be justified in drawing this conclusion by the fact that several terms and designations used by them find their explanation in an Iranian language, which was once spoken and used in literature in parts of Chinese Turkestan, and only in it.

This language was called North-Aryan by Professor Leumann, who was the first to give a connected account of its peculiarities. French scholars, beginning with M. Pelliot, speak of it as East-Iranian, and Professor Lüders as the Saka language. I have formerly preferred the neutral designation suggested by Professor Kiste, Khotani, because we know that it was used in the Khotan country as an official language in the eighth century A.D., and seems to have been spoken there since the first centuries of our era. At an early date, apparently after the introduction of Buddhism, it was also used in literature in the southern oases.

Professor Lüders has shown that there are remarkable points of agreement between this form of speech and the language of the old Sakas, as evidenced by Saka names, and there can be little doubt that the designation Khotani is too narrow. It is a Saka

---

1 SBAW, 1924, p. 261.
2 Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur, Strassburg, 1912.
3 Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, 18, 1913, pp. 89 ff.
5 WZKM, 26, p. 395.

They might now be considerably enlarged. Of words and forms adopted from the old Iranian language in the Khāroṣṭhī documents I may e.g. mention vīta, vata (no. 292); vānati, 'were' (no. 272), which would sound vītāv, vītāvūdi in Khotan Saka; vānāti, 'in', 'near', corresponding to Pashto bandi, Khotan Saka hendī, &c.
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language, and the only Saka language about which we are more fully informed. I shall therefore speak of it as Saka or Sakish.

Saka literature cannot provisionally be dated farther back than about the fourth century A.D.,* and we know that an Indian language was used in administration in the south of Chinese Turkestan at least in the second and third centuries, as we shall see later on. But the Kharoshthi documents written in that form of speech bear witness to the existence of Sakish as a spoken vernacular, as indicated above. And they even allow us to state that a certain phonetic development had taken place between the second and the fourth century. For the word *vāṇī*ī, i.e. *vāṇī*, 'in', 'on', which is found as a 'loan-word' in the documents, has become *bēndi* in literary Saka. And a characteristic feature of the latter, the change of old *r* to *l* before *s*, and *ys*, seems to be later than the first century A.D. For the word *erjuna* in the Guduhara inscription of the year 103 is evidently, as remarked above, a shorter form, without the suffix *ka*, of *ubijana*, *usānai* in literary Saka.

We have already found some designations among the Kushānas, which can be traced with Saka as well, viz. *yavuna*, *kuja†a*, i.e. as shown by the Greek *koudo†a*, *kousla†a*, and *erjuna*. The word *ubijana* has been explained by Professor Leumann† as a middle participle of the base which we have in Greek *apexos*. I prefer to look on it as an adjective formed with the suffix *ano*, *anaka* from a simplex corresponding to Greek *apexos*, a leader, just as we have *balavānī*, *Bauddha*, from *balvai*, *Buddha*, and *kushāna* from *kusha*.

Other Saka designations are found in connexion with the later Kushāna branch, and especially with King Kanishka.

In an inscription of the year 11 found at Zeda this ruler bears the titles *muroda* and *marjaha*. Here *muroda* evidently stands for *murrayda* and is clearly the old Saka designation which we have learnt to know above. And *marjaha* can hardly be anything else than the Saka word *malasak†i*, which is used as a translation of Skt. *gṛihapatiratna*, 'who sees all treasures below ground and transfers those which have no owner to the king’s treasury', so that the designation characterizes the king as a ruler abounding in treasure.

And, finally, the coin-legends of Kanishka and his successors are written in pure Khotan Saka. They are written in Greek letters and can be transliterated as *shōnān-o shāo kanašiki koshano*. If we bear in mind that the Greek omicron often renders an Indian or Iranian short *u*, we may read the text as *shōnānu shau Kanašiki kushānu*. Here *shau* is a well-known Saka word for 'king', which is used in several documents of the eighth century, where it is written *shōhau*. It is formed from the same base as *shāhi, šah*; but with the suffix *van*, and *shōnānu* is the regular genitive plural of this

---

1 I shall show below that King Kanishka began to use Sakish in his coin-legends, and this fact may be taken as an indication that the language had begun to be reduced to writing. And we hear about Buddhist works being translated from the Kusāna language into that of Barchuk, i.e. the present Maralbash near Yarkand, and about other translations from the same language into Tocharian and thence into Turkish. But we are not told where this Kusāna language was used.

2 Cf. *cahanār*; 'four', but *chahak†a*, 'forty'; *brash†a*, 'asked'; but *pulām†a*, 'we ask'; *mušyad†i*, 'compassion', from *mrīld†a*, i.e., Leumann, l.c., p. 63.

3 See *m. v.* p. 63.


5 Cf. my remarks, ZDMG, 68, 1914, pp. 85 ff.


8 Cf. Sogdian, *χεχων*, 'king'.

---

*Sakish in Kushāna coins and inscriptions*
KUSHĀNAS AND YUE-CHĪ

word. As these words are Sakish, the same must be the case with the last word kushāna, which must accordingly be the genitive plural of kushi, where -ī is the regular Saka termination of the nominative and genitive singular; cf. my remarks about the word Gudāna in some of the coin-legends of Guduvhara.

The remaining word Kansheski can be the nominative or the genitive. The Greek legend Βουλευκος Βασιλίκος ΚΑΝΙΣΙΚΟΣ, however, shows that it is probably the genitive, i.e. we have before us an idiom which is well known from Chinese Turkestan, where names and titles are strung together in such a way that only the last is put in the genitive, the remainder standing in the nominative.¹

Everything accordingly points to the conclusion that the Kushānas were Iranians, at least in language, and the affinity with the Sakas leads us to think that they were a Saka clan or family. This inference would be proved if the reading oük-κουρσαυς on the coins of Heraus or Mious proves to be right.²

In order to arrive at more precise results it may be of interest to examine the Chinese accounts of the Kuei-shuang, i.e. the Kushānas. They are there mentioned in connexion with two other peoples, the Yüe-chī and the Ta-hia, and it is possible that they can be identified with one of these two.

We have already touched the history of the Yüe-chī in connexion with the Sakas, Yüe-chī, but now we must take it up in greater detail.

The Chinese seem to have been aware of the existence of the Yüe-chī since the second half of the third century B.C. We read in the Shi-ki:³ 'Originally they were strong and esteemed the Huáng-nu of small account. But when Mao-tün mounted the throne, he attacked the Yüe-chī and defeated them. When the shan-yü Lâu-shang had killed the king of the Yüe-chī, he took his skull and made it into a drinking-cup. Originally the Yüe-chī lived between Tün-huang and the K'ê-lien. After they had been defeated by the Huáng-nu, they went far away, beyond Ta-wan (Ferghāna). In the west they defeated the Ta-hia and made them subject to themselves. Thereafter they lived to the north of the Oxus river and established their head-quarters there.'

According to the same source, the defeat of the Yüe-chī must have taken place before 176 B.C., in which year Mao-tün informed the Chinese emperor of the fact in a letter.

The result was that the Yüe-chī made themselves masters of the Sai-wang country, as we have already seen. According to M. Chavannes ⁴ that happened in or about the year 165 B.C.

We have already heard that the Yüe-chī were not to remain long in the Sai-wang country. The Ts'ien Han-shu ⁵ contains the information that the king of the Wu-sun had an old grudge against the Yüe-chī and therefore attacked them and drove them out.

---

¹ Cf. mahamaua maharaya jihagha Vashmanka devaputra in Kharoshṭhī documents from the Nyo site (Konow, Acta Orientalia, ii), pp. 113 ff.; sikhan Shaniırā salya, in King Shaniya's year, in one of the Siha documents mentioned above, and, from Indian Kharoshti maharaja rajatiraja 'oveshkasa in the Wardak Vase inscription.
⁴ The Shi-ki-cheng-i quotes authority to show that the old country of the Yüe-chī comprised Lâng-chou, Kan-chou, Shu-chou, Kua-chou, and Sha-chou.
⁶ Ts'ang Pao, II, viii, p. 189; cf., however, Franke, Beiträge, p. 55.
⁷ Chap. 61, fol. 4 r°; cf. Franke, Beiträge, p. 15.
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south-west of Ta-wan (Fergâna) and south of the Wei water (Oxus). The farmers have towns and houses, and they have the same customs as the Ta-wan. The people have no supreme ruler, but the various towns appoint minor chiefs. The soldiers there are weak and fear warfare; they are skilled in trading and marketing.

We have already seen that the Chinese ambassador Chang K’ien found the Ta-hia subject to the Yüe-chi, and Lan-shî in the present Badakhshan as their capital. The Ts’ien Han-shu 1 adds about the Ta-hia that there were there five principalities, each under one hi-hou, which all depended on the Ta Yüe-chi, viz. Hiu-mi, with the capital Ho-mo; Shuang-mi, with the capital Shuang-mi; Kuei-shuang with the capital Hu-tsao; Hi-tun with the capital Po-mao, and Kao-fu with the capital Kao-fu.

In the Hou Han-shu the state of things is, as already remarked, different. Lan-shî is now the capital of the Yüe-chi, and the Annals go on to say: "Formerly the Yüe-chi were conquered by the Hiung-nu; they transferred themselves to the Ta-hia and divided that kingdom between five hi-hou, viz. those of Hiu-mi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shuang, Hi-tun, and Tu-mî."

It will be seen that this account differs from the old one in two respects: instead of mentioning the five principalities as existing within the Ta-hia country, it says that the Yüe-chi divided the Ta-hia empire between five hi-hou, and instead of Kao-fu it gives Tu-mî as the name of the fifth principality.

With regard to the latter point the Annals expressly state 2 that it is a mistake of the Ts’ien Han-shu to mention Kao-fu among the five principalities. It was only at a later date that Kao-fu was included in the empire.

On the other hand, it is possible that the Ts’ien Han-shu is right in its remark about the five principalities. They may have been in existence before the Yüe-chi subjected the whole Ta-hia empire. And it is clear that they were only a part of the Ta-hia country. 3

Professor Marquart 4 has identified Hiu-mi with the present’ Wakhan, Shuang-mi with Chitral, Kuei-shuang with the country immediately to the north of Gandhara or with Gandhara itself, Hi-tun with Parwan on the Panjshir, and Kao-fu with Kabul. Tu-mî should perhaps be substituted for Kao-fu, but the general localization is clear: the five principalities were outside the Ta-hia stronghold in Badakhshan, and in districts which are not very distant from the route which the Sakas must be considered to have followed on their way to Ki-pin. In such circumstances it is not even certain that the five principalities were peopled by the Ta-hia, or ruled over by them before the Yüe-chi conquest.

The third of them was Kuei-shuang, i.e. the Kushâna principality, apparently situated somewhere between Chitral and the Panjshir country.

We cannot say whether the Kuei-shuang had been settled there for a prolonged period when the events narrated in the Han Annals happened. The T’ang-shu 5 speaks of a Kuei-shuang-ni-kia in K’ang, midway between Samarkand and Bokhara; and though Professor Franke 6 does not think that the two names have anything to do with each other, it is not impossible that we have here an indication of the Kuei-shuang having come to their later habitat via Sogdiana, where Trogus, as we have seen, seems to speak of Scythian invaders, whom he calls Asiani.

---

1 Chap. 96 a, fol. 15 r; cf. Specht, JA, viii, ii, 1883, p. 323.
2 Chap. 118, fol. 11 v.
4 Érâmisahr, pp. 242 ff.
5 Cf. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiane (Turcs) occidentaux, St-Pétersbourg, 1903, p. 145.
6 Beiträge, p. 67.
TA-HIA AND TOCHARIANS. OLD TU-HO-LO

We have seen that some indications exist which seem to show that the Kushänas Ta-hia and were Iranians. In order to ascertain whether they belonged to the Ta-hia people, we shall have to examine what we know about the ethnic or linguistic affinities of the Ta-hia.

It has sometimes ¹ been assumed that the Ta-hia were the Dahae of classical literature. But there is nothing to show that the Dahae were ever settled in the Ta-hia country.

Most scholars seem to have accepted Marquart's identification² of Ta-hia with Tu-ho-lo, a designation which is, for the first time, met with in the history of the Northern Wei (A.D. 386-556) as denoting a western people on and beyond the Oxus, and about which we read in the T'ang-shu: ³ "It is to the west of the Ts'ung-ling (Pamir) and to the south of the river Wu-hu (Oxus). It is the old territory of the Ta-hia."

According to Karlsgren ⁴ the T'ang pronunciation of Ta-hia was tāi (or dāi)-ya, and that of Tu-ho-lo tao-xu-i-la. ⁵ Both names have a guttural fricative and not h as the second consonant, and Marquart has explained the short form Ta-hia by reference to a well-known tendency in old Chinese accounts to avoid using more than two characters in the rendering of foreign names, while Haloun ⁶ thinks it possible that the name of the Tocharians was identified with an older Chinese designation Ta-hia.

There are some notices in old Chinese sources which seem to speak of a Ta-hia in Old north-western Kan-su, on the south-eastern border of Gobi. Professor Franke tried to establish the identity of these Ta-hia with the people conquered by the Yüe-chi,⁷ but Chavannes ⁸ may be right in thinking that they have nothing to do with each other.

The strongest argument in favour of Professor Franke's theory is the reference to an ancient Tu-ho-lo four marches east of Niya in Chinese Turkestan, at the present Endere, by Huan-tsang. Sir Aurel Stein has, however, shown excellent reasons for doubting that such an ancient Tu-ho-lo has ever existed.⁹ Just as the people of the present day speak of the ruins of Chinese Turkestan as the Kalmaks' houses, or 'township of the old Chinese', &c., thus Huan-tsang's guides may have spoken of 'Old Tu-ho-lo', because the designation Tu-ho-lo had come to be used about the empire of the Yüe-chi and their successors, the rulers of the so-called Tocharistan, and ancient remains were vaguely ascribed to their times.

The Ta-hia were the old inhabitants of the Yüe-chi empire, and their name continued to be used also after the Yüe-chi conquest, just as classical authors speak of the Tocharians.

We can thus provisionally abstract from the accounts of an old Ta-hia or Tu-ho-lo settlement in Chinese Turkestan or even farther east. The only place where we are sure that this people was settled in ancient times is the country to the south of the Oxus. And we can assume that it was the same people which classical authors called Tocharian.

Now the modern exploration of Chinese Turkestan has brought to light numerous Tocharian fragments and documents written in an Indo-European language, which we have every reason for bringing into connexion with the Tocharians.

There are two dialects, one of which, usually designated B, was used as the language of administration in Kuchi in the north-east of Chinese Turkestan in the seventh

¹ Cf. O. Schrader, Reallexikon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde, 2. Auflage, sub voc Tocharer.
² Eränkö, pp. 199 ff.
³ Chap. ccxxi b, fol. 4 v°; cf. Chavannes, Documents, p. 155.
⁴ Nos. 935, 136; 1187, 93, 569.
⁵ Gustav Haloun, Seit wann konnten die Chinesen die Tocharer oder Indogermanen überhaupt I. Leipzig, 1926.
⁶ Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, viii, pp. 117 ff.
⁷ Les mémoires historiques de Sir Ma T'ien, ii, p. 148.
⁸ Cf. Steudel, pp. 286 ff.
century A.D., and was also probably spoken in Turfan, while the other, dialect A, is used in Buddhist texts and evidently belongs to Tocharistan, the western country of the Ta-hia. Some of these texts have been further translated into Uigur, and such translations are occasionally stated to have been made from the loxri language, and loxri cannot be anything else than Tocharian. The dialect A can accordingly be characterized as the literary language of the Tocharians.

It is an Indo-European form of speech, but does not belong to the Aryan group and has nothing to do with Sakish or any other Iranian tongue.

Now there is one peculiarity about this language. The designation loxri is only used about it in Uigur translations. In the texts themselves the language is designated as arsi pguata, the Arsi tongue.

F. W. K. Müller has shown that this arsi can very well be a rendering of the same word which Strabo gives in the form Aras, and from which the adjective Asiati is evidently derived. We thus again arrive at the conclusion that the Asiati, the rulers of the Tochari, were identified with their subjects, just as was the case with the Yüe-chi and the Ta-hia, and it seems necessary to infer that the Arsi, the Aras, the Asiati must be identified with the Yüe-chi, the loxri, Tocharians, with the Ta-hia, as has already been indicated above.

But now the question arises: is this arsi-loxri language originally the language of the Aras, i.e. the Yüe-chi, or that of the Tocharians? In the former case the Arsis brought their language to the Tocharians, who then gradually adopted the speech of their conquerors. In the latter we should have to state that the Tocharian language was renamed after the kings, their new rulers, much in the same way as French and Russian have got their names.

In favour of the former explanation it may be urged that the Tocharian language does not seem to possess guttural fricatives, and that the ethnic name is therefore apparently in disaccord with the laws of the language. The name Tocharian, loxri, seems to be more in its place with Iranians, and we might draw the inference that the Tocharians were Iranians, who had abandoned their old language in favour of their non-Iranian conquerors. Moreover, the existence of a dialect of the same language in and near Kuchi might be taken as an indication of the way by which the language has come to the Tocharians. We have no traces of any material change in the population of Kuchi from the time when it first emerges into the light of history and down to the Turkish conquest, while there has evidently been considerable movement in and about Bactria. It therefore seems possible to assume that the arsi-loxri language originally was the speech of the Arsi or Aras, i.e. of the Yüe-chi.

It has also been thought possible to find support for this opinion in the Chinese name Yüe-chi, which has been much discussed.

The first of the two signs with which it is written is pronounced ūē in Mandarin, ūē in Cantonese, ūē in Hakka, gētsu or guatsu in Sino-Japanese, ngōat, nūēt in Anamese, nūl (written nūner) in Korean, and had the sound ngēwer in the T'ang period. In transliterating Indian words it is used to render vi, ur, and ū. The final ū of the T'ang form may further represent an ū in the original.

---

1 Cf. Lévi, J.A., xi, ii, 1913, pp. 311 ff.
3 Cf. Sieg, SBAW, 1918, pp. 560 ff.
4 SBAW, 1918, pp. 566 ff.
The second sign ¹ sounds shi in Mandarin, shi in Cantonese, ti in Sino-Japanese, and was a ｔｉ in the T'ang period.

Klaproth has stated ² that we sometimes find the second sign written ti, Cantonese tai, T'ang tii. He would therefore read the whole name as yue-ti and identify this with the Yutes of Dzungaria and the II country, while other scholars, who accepted his reading, thought of the Getae and Massagetae.

Franke has shown that Klaproth's reading cannot be accepted, but drew attention to a statement in Chinese commentaries to the effect that shi in this name should be pronounced as the sign ⁴ which means 'branch', Mandarin tê, Cantonese lê, T'ang period lêj. He thinks that this pronunciation represents an attempt at preserving the final t of the first part of the name, so that it is not excluded that we have to do with 'the people of the Yet or Get', which may have something to do with the Getae and Massagetae. Yue-chi might, he says, be a comprehensive term, something parallel to the denominations Scythian and Getae, denoting the peoples to the north and east of Pontus Euxinus and the Caspian Sea, from Haemus to Thracia and far into Central Asia. Marquart ⁶ starts from a pronunciation got-ti and compares this with the Πασαρός of Strabo, which he corrects to Πασαρός and considers as a simple variant of Αἶορος and of Prolemy's Αἶορος.

Baron A. von Staël Holstein infers a pronunciation kur-shi or gur-shi and identifies this with kushti, the simple form of the name of the Kushānas. A. Herrmann ⁵ accepts this identification, reading the Chinese name guat-si.

Professor Charpentier ⁷ sees in Yue-chi, which might be translated as 'the moon-clan', the rendering of an unknown name, which was once used to denote the people called Tocharian by classical authors and Tu-ho-lo by the Chinese.

F. W. K. Müller maintains that Yue-chi is probably a rendering of the same word which we have learnt to know in the form arš as a designation of the language of the Tocharians, and Franke has subsequently ¹ accepted this explanation.

It is impossible for a non-sinologist to weigh these opinions against each other. Professor Pelliot ⁸ is, however, of opinion that none of the suggested forms is probable in the Han period, and Professor Karlsgren has been good enough to point out to me:

(1) That the initial ng- in later times often weakened and disappearing, was quite strong and important in ancient times and cannot simply be overlooked in our identifications. It is true that the T'ang time ng- sometimes transcribes words without initial guttural, but then these latter begin with a labial sound (ng(ı)w- for foreign w-, w-, ı-), and the whole of ngw- cannot reasonably be simply skipped (ngiw)pt = ar(š), with abstraction from both the guttural ng- and the labial ıw- (the medial t is generally of no account in the transcriptions). ng- may stand for foreign ng- or g-, probably the latter (Chinese has only aspirated g', and therefore ng- had to serve for ordinary g'), and we have to expect a gw- or a g- or a w- in the foreign word transcribed.

(2) The principal vowel of the word in pre-Christian time is impossible to determine. It was probably an a or an o.

(3) The final t was decidedly a t in pre-Christian time, not an r, as in certain northern dialects in T'ang time (whence Korean nguer). The reasons for this statement are given by Professor Karlsgren, JRAS, 1928, pp. 789 ff. Thus the approximate

¹ Karlsgren, no. 879.
² Karlsgren, no. 984.
³ Eränkö, p. 205.
⁴ ZDMG, 71, 1917, p. 375.
⁵ BEFEO, v, 1905, p. 443.
⁶ Tableaux historiques, pp. 287 ff.
⁷ Karlsgren, no. 1219.
⁸ I.c., sub voce Sacaraucae.
⁹ Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, vi, pp. 83 ff.
transcription value of the first syllable would be (u)gwaṭ or (u)gwaṭ, pointing to a foreign gwaṭ, gwaṭ, or gat, got, or gut, or wot, or ute, or ute.

(4) Franke is certainly right in pointing out that the second syllable has to be read, according to the ancient phonetic gloss, like chi, ‘branch’, T’ang time tse. This, however, comes from an older *čja (*č = palatal explosive, not affricative; cf. Karlgren, p. 25), and can transcribe a foreign *ti (or possibly *ti?), or, of course, *ti (čia?), but certainly not *ti in ʔarsi.

No certain inference can, accordingly, be drawn from the Chinese name, and we can only say with some confidence that the ʔarsi, the *Arosa, or Asiani were in reality the Yüe-chi, but that the designations themselves can hardly be identified.

The reasons for assuming that the ʔarsi-ʔoṣrɪ language was brought to Tocharistan by the Yüe-chi from Chinese Turkestan and for seeing in the Kuchi dialect remnants of the ancient speech of the conquerors are hardly conclusive. The Chinese are absolutely unaware of any connexion between the Yüe-chi and the population of Kuchi. The same annals which contain the account of the wanderings and conquests of the Yüe-chi have much to say about the history of Kuchi, but the Yüe-chi are always mentioned as a different people and sometimes as the enemies of the Kuchians.

Moreover we have not sufficient reason for assuming that the Tocharians had been settled for a very long time to the south of the Oxus, when the Yüe-chi conquered them. We have seen above, p. xxi, that Strabo speaks of the Tocharians as one of the nomadic tribes who made an end to the Greek dominion in Bactria. In the Chinese accounts, on the other hand, the Tocharians are described as settled in towns and engaged in trade. It is perhaps possible to reconcile these varying statements by assuming that the Tocharians were originally immigrants from Chinese Turkestan, in which case the Kuchi and Turfan settlements might indicate the localities from which they had come, localities where the Yüe-chi had never been settled.1

This Tocharian immigration into the Oxus country must have happened before the Yüe-chi exodus, i.e. they must have lived for some time in the neighbourhood of Iranian tribes. And if the guttural fricative in their name is really unwarranted in their language, the form of the name taken over by the Chinese as by classical authors may have been coined by their neighbours.

It seems to me that this is a much more likely explanation than to assume that the Tocharians were originally an Iranian tribe, which was conquered by non-Iranians from Turkestan, the Yüe-chi, and adopted their language. There can hardly be any doubt about the ethnic and linguistic unity of the Little and the Great Yüe-chi. And in the country of the former we have no traces of the Tocharian language, but, as already remarked, direct evidence to the effect that an Iranian tongue, practically identical with the speech of the Kushānas, was used as a vernacular, at least since the first centuries of the Christian era. The natural inference is that the Little Yüe-chi as well as the Great Yüe-chi were Iranians, and that the Tocharian language was originally spoken by the Tocharians, the subjects of the Great Yüe-chi in the Oxus country, who had perhaps formerly been settled in the northern oases of Chinese Turkestan, while the old home of the Yüe-chi was farther to the east. When the Chinese first heard about the Ta-hia,

1 Some scholars have thought it possible to draw a similar conclusion from the association of the Tocharians with eastern peoples in later classical texts (Dionysius Periegeta 752: καὶ Τοχάροι Φρούνων, Ῥώμης Ῥώμης; Pline, Nat. Hist. vi. 55: ab Attacaris gentes Thuni et Thocari, i.e. probably *Funī et Thocari, where *Frōnōn, Funin, have been explained as meaning the Huns, Hüng-nü) and from the notice in the Mahābhārata, II. 1856f, about the Tukhāras bringing fur, iron, and silk to Yudhishṭhira.
KUSHĀNAS AND SAKAS

i.e. the Tocharians, they were mentioned in connexion with the Yüe-chi, of whom the Chinese had previous knowledge, and the name of the people was probably transmitted through them. In this connexion it is also worth remembering that the designation toxri of the language is found in Uigur texts, i.e. the Uigurs used a name known in the east, while the Tocharians themselves speak of the language as Āršī, i.e. the speech of the Ārona, their masters.

A priori it is also most probable that the Yüe-chi conquerors in Tocharistan used the language of their subjects, just as the Kushānas did in India. The subjects were no doubt more numerous than the conquerors, and their whole administration seems to a large extent to have been continued by them without material change.

If toxri is the old language of the Tocharians, and Āršī is the same word which classical authors render as Ārona, the conquerors of the Tocharians, we must probably draw the inference that the designation ārśī was borrowed by the Tocharians from their rulers. In that case the word ārśī must be a loanword in Tocharian.

The comparison of ārśī and Ārona is not, of course, quite certain. It seems a priori difficult to explain the absence of r in the Greek form. The connexion between Ārona and Asianī, on the other hand, cannot be doubted: the latter is a regular adjective formed from the former by adding the suffix -āna.

Now it may be asked whether it is possible to trace any connexion between this adjective and the word ēryāna, alyṣānai mentioned above in connexion with the first Kushāna ruler of India.

The Sakā word alyṣānai shows some peculiar features. I have already mentioned that it seems to have had the form āryṣānai, i.e. ārṣānai in older times. The later form ēryānai now shows two things: in the first place that the compound rys, lys had a tendency to become y, i.e. the r must have been weakly sounded. And moreover the e seems to show that the initial had become long and that there was a y after the voiced s. For there is a rule in Sakā according to which a y causes a preceding a to become i and ā to become ā: cf. kānta from kāntya, 'in the town'; bēḍa from bēdyā, 'at the time'. We can thus infer the existence of an adjective āryānai, or shorter āryāni, and from this a simpler ārṣyi, which in Sakish must become āršī.

Now such a word, with the base ārṣya, would naturally be borrowed by the Greeks as āršio, while the Tocharians, whose literary texts belong to a period when the word had become ārš in Sakish, could only borrow it in the form āršī, because there were no voiced sibilants in their language.

If these deductions are accepted, the necessary conclusions are that the Tocharians were an Indo-European tribe, but not Aryans, while the Yüe-chi were Iranians, and, to judge from their language and their later history, Sakas. And just as the Sakamurunḍas or Sai-wang were designated as such because their chiefs used the title murunḍa, in the same way the Yüe-chi might be called Asioi, because their leaders were designated as such. And to judge from the probable connexion with Greek ἄρχος, ἄρχω, this word simply means 'leader', 'chief'.

Now we have seen that the Kushānas were almost certainly Iranians. They cannot, accordingly, have been Tocharians, but must be related to the Yüe-chi, i.e. those Sakas whose chiefs were designated as Ārona, Asianī, āršī, alyṣānai. It is in good accordance with this view that the great Kushāna Kanishka seems to have started on his career in the Khotan country, where we have every reason for locating some of the Little Yüe-chi.

On the other hand, the Kuei-shuang principality seems to have existed before the

Yüe-chi conquest of the Ta-hia country was completed. It is therefore probable that
the family or clan (kula) of the Kushānas had a comparatively large distribution among
the Sakas, and some of them may have been with the Sai-wang who went to Ki-pin
some time before 160 B.C.

The Kuei-shuang principality was made the starting-point of a development which
led to the establishment of a large empire in India and the Indian borderlands.

The passage in the Hou Han-shu quoted above (p. lvi), which speaks about how
the Yüe-chi divided the Ta-hia kingdom between five kiu-hou, continues as follows: 'More
than a hundred years after this the kiu-hou of Kuei-shuang, called Kiu-tsu-k'io, attacked
the four other kiu-hou; he styled himself king; the name of his kingdom was Kuei-shuang.
He invaded An-si and seized the territory of Kao-fu; moreover he triumphed over
Pu-ta and Ki-pin and entirely possessed those kingdoms. Kiu-tsu-k'io died more than
eighty years old. His son Yen-kao-chen became king in his stead. He again conquered
T'ien-chu and appointed a general there for the administration. From this moment the
Yüe-chi became extremely powerful. In all the kingdoms they were spoken of as
"King of Kuei-shuang", but the Han stuck to their old designation and called them Ta
Yüe-chi.'

As shown by Marquart, both the rulers mentioned in this passage can be identified.
Kiu-tsu-k'io was still in the T'ang period pronounced kiu-tsu-chiao and is evidently
identical with the Kushāna Kujula Kadphises, known from coins, and Yen-kao-chen, his
son, is the Wima Kathphīsa (or Kaphthīsa) of coins, whose name occurs in a Kharoshthi
inscription of the year 187 in the form Uvima Kavthisa.

Kiu-tsu-k'io or Kujula Kadphises thus started on his career by bringing all the
neighbouring principalities under his rule, and this happened 'more than hundred years
after' the events narrated in the preceding passage, which runs: 'Formerly the Yüe-chi
were conquered by the Hiung-nu; they transferred themselves to the Ta-hia and divided
that kingdom between five kiu-hou.' Because the Yüe-chi are in this very passage stated
to have their capital at Lan-shi, we may infer that the hundred years are reckoned from
some date subsequent to Chang K'ien's visit, when the Yüe-chi capital was still to the
north of the Oxus. On the other hand, the Hou Han-shu deals with the events that
happened in and after the period Kien-wu (A.D. 25-55), and Kujula Kadphises' conquest
cannot, therefore, have taken place before the year A.D. 25. If Kujula Kadphises is the
same person which is mentioned in the Takhti-Bah inscription of the year 103, i.e.
probably A.D. 19, he had not then reduced the four other kiu-hou, and it is even possible
that he had not yet risen to the rank of kiu-hou. In such circumstances the designation
erjhuja characterizing him in the inscription is quite intelligible, for the corresponding
Saka word alyawanai translates the Indian kumara, 'young man', 'prince'.

After having reduced the other kiu-hou Kujula Kadphises is stated to have invaded
An-si. An-si is, as we have seen, the usual Chinese name for Parthia. But here
we cannot think of the Parthian empire of Ctesiphon. We have already seen, however,
that Parthian rulers had shortly before the beginning of our era established themselves in
the Indian borderlands and were menacing the Greek dominion in Kābul. Now the
immediate result of the invasion of An-si is stated to be the seizure of Kao-fu, i.e.
Kābul, and we necessarily infer that An-si must mean the Parthian dynasty in the
east, to which Guduvhara belonged.

Most scholars are apparently now agreed that it was the Parthians who made an

1 Eriniahr, pp. 208 f. 2 Karlgren, nos. 406, 232, 491.
3 Tang pronunciation jain-khau-khau, Karlgren, nos. 247, 308, and 1191.
end to the Greek power in Kābul. 1 The last Greek king of Kābul was Hermaeus. His coins bear different legends, but he is usually designated as ‘King Saviour’, Βασιλεύς σωτήρ, maharajasa tratarā. One group, however, adds the syllable sv after σωτήρ, at the same time mutilating this word to σωτός. The reverse has either the legend maharajasa mahatasa Heramayasa or maharajasa rajarjasa mahatasa Heramayasa, but on some of them, with the bust of Hermaeus on the obverse, we find the reverse legend Kujula Kasasa Kushaṇa yavangasa dvaramattmatha. On some of these coins the obverse legend is corrupt, but apparently intended to run Κυραυα (or Καυα) Κοζουλα Καδφαν. Sir John Marshall found some new specimens of this group at Sirkap, where also the Kharoshthi legend is corrupt. On one of them it seems, however, possible to read [Κυ] Καν η [θα] ρα[τ] [θα] μαθι.

On other coins the king’s bust is different, but the Greek legend seems to be the same, while the reverse apparently runs Kuyula Kausa Kushanasa.

In this connexion we must also consider another type, showing on the obverse a royal head resembling that of Augustus in his last years, with the legend Χοραν συ ζαου Κοζουλα Καδφαν. On the reverse is a king seated on a chair, and the Kharoshthi legend Khushanasa yavangasa Kuyula Kaphasa sa:hadhramathitasa. And, finally, we have coins with a seated person, and a corrupt legend of which the words Χοραν συ can apparently be read on the obverse, and a god, which has usually been identified with Zeus, and a Kharoshthi legend which seems to run Khushanasa . Kuyula Kadphasa on the reverse.

These coins seem to bear witness to a certain connexion between Hermaeus and Kujula Kadphises, who seem, for some time, to have ruled conjointly.

M. Senart2 has discussed this question and drawn attention to the fact that the word tratarasa, which usually occurs on the reverse of Hermaeus’ coins, is absent where the obverse shows the corrupt Greek legend σωτός συ. This coincidence precludes, he thinks, the idea of σωτός συ being simply a corruption of σωτήρ. Since now the coins of Kujula Kadphises are the oldest Indian coins where we find an ethnic designation, he thinks it possible that συ has a similar meaning and may stand for Ζωος, of the Syrian, supposing that Syria had, for those far-off Greeks, come to stand as the last representative of the independent Greek power. He compares the sv occurring in the Kharoshthi legend, su Theudomasa, on an engraved stone from Bajaur.

Other explanations of the corrupt σωτός συ have been given by Professor Rapson,3 who thinks that it may be a rendering of στερασσα, Skr. sthavirasaa, ‘of the elder’, while Χοραν συ may stand for kushanasa: Professor Thomas,4 who suggests the possibility of seeing in συ a genitive suffix corresponding to Tocharian ʦe; Professor Kirste,5 who sees in the sv of σωτός συ an abbreviation of αβοβον, and Baron Staël Holstein,6 who takes συ to be the genitive of a word corresponding to Persian ʦhah, comparing the forms ʦuhrp, ‘Shahpur’, where ʦh is rendered as σ, and ʦuhrp Ζευς, where v stands for the genitive suffix.

The explanation of sv as an abbreviation of αβοβον is the only one which does not lead to the assumption of a clumsy or mistaken orthography. But the position of the syllable might be intelligible in the seal-legend su Theudomasa, where we have Kharoshthi letters, but hardly in Βασιλεύς σωτός συ Βρομαν συ Χοραν συ ζαου Κοζουλα Καδφαν. At least we should have to assume that the abbreviation had been mechanically taken over from other legends. But as a matter of fact we do not know of any other instance of its use on Indian soil.

---

2 Smith, Catalogue, p. 56, no. 3.
3 JRAS, 1897, pp. 319 ff.
5 JRAS, 1913, p. 632.
6 SWAW, 182, 2, 1917, pp. 45 f., 59 ff.
7 JRAS, 1914, pp. 82 ff.
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

It seems to me that the syllable must have been felt to be of some importance. And it is of interest that the corresponding Kharoshthi legend sometimes has the imperial title rajaraja. I think that this may be significant. If we further bear in mind that Hermaeus is on some of these coins associated with Kujula Kadphises, who was a Kushāna, we become inclined to think that the addition of the syllable σω bears witness to an alliance between Hermaeus and Kujula Kadphises, through which the former tried to strengthen his position and make himself independent of the Parthian suzerains, who had oppressed him. In that case, however, σω must evidently be a Kushāna title, and it becomes natural to think of the word skau used by Kanishka and his successors and also by Iranian rulers in Chinese Turkestan.

I am therefore inclined to interpret these coin-legends as follows. When Kujula Kadphises invaded An-si, i.e. the Parthian realm in and near Kabul, Hermaeus entered into an alliance with him and perhaps actually supported him. But the Kushāna ruler did not long leave him free to enjoy his new independence. He had to share the government with him, and was soon entirely replaced by Kujula, about whom the Chinese annals state that he seized Kao-fu, i.e. Kabul. To begin with he retained the bust of Hermaeus, but later on he replaced it, and now also began to introduce the syllable σω in his legends.

It is impossible to settle the chronology, but these events cannot have taken place before Kujula Kadphises had risen to the rank of hi-hou, because the title yavuγa is used on the coins he struck conjointly with Hermaeus, and we may infer from the statement of Fan Ye that this happened some time after A.D. 25.

Further conquests.

After the conquest of Kao-fu K’i’u-tsu-k’i’o is said to have triumphed over Pu-ta and Ki-pin and to have brought these kingdoms entirely under his sway.

Pu-ta has not been identified. Franke and Marquart compare Παθονή, which they locate to the north of Arachosia, while Chavannes thinks it possible that the city of Balkh is meant. It seems probable that Pu-ta cannot have been too distant from Kabul and Ki-pin, which must comprise parts of the Panjāb. The stratification at Taxila shows, as already remarked, that there Kadphises succeeded the Guduvhara dynasty, and his conquests brought the Kushāna empire at least so far towards the east.

In corroborative of the Chinese accounts we have a Kharoshthi inscription of the year 122, i.e. according to my chronology A.D. 38, found at Panjtar on the Indus, and mentioning a maharaja Gushāna, and another record from Taxila of the year 136, i.e. A.D. 52, mentioning a maharaja rajatiraja decaputra Khushaqa. We have seen that the Guduvhara dynasty still seems to have held sway at Taxila about A.D. 44, and the two inscriptions therefore seem to bear witness to the gradual growth of the Kushāna empire.

There are further some coins which must be mentioned in this connexion.

At Sirkap Sir John Marshall found a new type, with the bust of a king ‘resembling Wima Kadphises’ and a corrupt Greek legend on the obverse, while the reverse shows a Nike and the Kharoshthi legend maharaja rajatiraja Khushaqa yavugasa. Another group of coins have on the obverse a humped bull and an illegible Greek legend, and, on the reverse, a two-humped Bactrian camel and a Kharoshthi text with slightly varying wording: maharajasa rajatirajasa Kujula Kaphasa, maharajasa mahatassa.

1 Pronounced Puk-d’dt in the T’ang period; cf. Karlgren, nos. 760, 936.
2 Beiträge, p. 99.
3 Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran, ii, pp. 175 f.
4 Song Pa, ii, vii, pp. 513 f., viii, p. 191.
5 ASIAR, 1912–13, pp. 44, 54.
KUJULA KADPHISES

Kushaṇa Kuyula Kaphasa, maharayasa rayarayasa deveputrasa Kuyula Kara Kaphsasa, and maharayasa rayatirayasa Kuyula Kara Kapasa.

In my opinion all these records belong to the reign of Kujula Kadphises. For there does not seem to be any reason for discrediting the Chinese account according to which there were only two Kadphises kings, father and son, of whom the first was more than eighty years old at his death. And since the second Kadphises seems to have been ruling in the year 187, he can scarcely have succeeded his octogenarian father as early as the year 136.

The evidence of the coins and inscriptions has, however, been interpreted in a different way.

Professor Rapson considers Kujula Kara Kadphises (Kuyula Kara Kapa, &c.) to be different from Kujula Kadphises, and states that he seems to have succeeded the satrap Zeionises in the kingdom of Pushkalavati, and he may have been contemporary with Wima Kadphises. It seems to me that the imperial title used on his coins precludes the idea of his having been a subordinate ruler. And the Chinese annals only know two old Kushānas with imperial power. I therefore think that the addition kara cannot prevent us from ascribing these coins to Kadphises I. We do not know anything about the significance of this kara. I have mentioned above that a Sirkap coin of Kadphises I, showing the bust of Hermaeus on the obverse, seems to have the Kharoshthi legend... jula kara dharmathā, and here there cannot be the question of another person than Kujula Kadphises. Kara may be a title, of a similar kind as the unexplained kāla preceding the name Kushanasena in the Niya document, no. 399, where the comparison with agu Kushanasena in nos. 136, 193, 198, gubhara Kushanasena in no. 320, &c., makes us inclined to think of a title. Moreover, the word kara is sometimes absent from the coins in question.

Also the Sirkap coins with a bust resembling Wima Kadphises' have been disassociated from Kujula Kadphises and ascribed to his successor. In his description of them Sir John Marshall, who does not feel confident about their connexion with Wima Kadphises, draws attention to the simultaneous use of the titles yaungha and maharaja rajatiraja, which he thinks throws some doubt on the current view that the title yaungha was replaced by the imperial designation maharaja rajatiraja after the conquest of India. But it seems possible to explain the coin-legend in a slightly different way. Kujula Kadphises started on his career as a yaungha, and the use of the old title on the coins seems to me to be intentional, to bear witness to a feeling of pride at the success which led him from such beginnings to the position of emperor and master of the famous town of Taxila.

To judge from the published plate and from casts, which I owe to the courtesy of Sir John Marshall, the similarity of the bust on the obverse to that of Wima Kadphises is not, moreover, striking.

Professor Rapson states that most of the coins of Kujula Kadphises show clearly both by their types and their fabric that they were struck in the Kabul valley. It seems natural to assume that the Sirkap coins were struck after the conquest of Taxila, partly in imitation of the coins of the Guduvhara dynasty, where royal busts are a common feature on the obverse.

1 The Cambridge History of India, i. p. 5821; cf. Indian Coins, p. 17.
2 See the reproduction, ASIAR, 1912-13, p. 52, no. 49.
3 Cunningham, Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, xii, 1892, pp. 65 f.
4 Cambridge History of India, i. p. 584.
Moreover, we have not the slightest reason for supposing that the title maharaja (rajatiraja) Khushâna was ever used by Wima Kadphises. It reminds us of the remark in the Hou Han-shu that K’iu-tsiu-k’Io assumed the title ‘king’, the name of his kingdom being Kuei-shuang, and Sir John Marshall is evidently right in saying ¹ that ‘it would be natural for the first emperor of the dynasty to be styled “the Kushan Emperor” without any further appellation, while it would be equally natural for his successors to be distinguished from him by the addition of their individual names’.

Against ascribing the Taxila inscription of the year 136 to Kujula Kadphises it has been urged that the silver scroll on which it is written bears the monogram ˄, which is characteristic of the coins of Wima Kadphises. Sir John has, however, drawn attention to the fact that it is also found on coins of Kujula Kara Kadphises.²

For the reconstruction of the history of the first Kushâna ruler we may accordingly use the following dates. To judge from the introduction to the Hou Han-shu the reduction of the four hi-hou can hardly have taken place before A.D. 25. In an inscription of the year 103, i.e. according to my chronology A.D. 19, Kujula Kadphises is mentioned as erjhuna, i.e. a junior member of the ruling caste or clan, at a time when twenty-six years had passed after the establishment of an era by a Parthian ruler, presumably Azes, and when Azes’ successor, Gudauhara, was on the throne.

Nineteen years afterwards, in the year 122, corresponding to A.D. 38, we find him, as the maharaja Gushâna, in the inscription from Panjtâr in the Peshâwar district. The invasion of An-si, the seizure of Kao-fu, and the attack on Pu-ta and Ki-pin must be dated in this interval and, to all appearances, after A.D. 25. The conquest of Ki-pin cannot, however, have been completed. For we have seen that the Parthian dynasty seems to have been in power in Taxila in A.D. 44. And since the Hou Han-shu limits K’iu-tsiu-k’Io’s conquests to Ki-pin in the east, we must take Taxila in this connexion to belong to Ki-pin.

After further fourteen years, in the year 136 corresponding to A.D. 52, Taxila has been reduced and the former hi-hou now meets us as the great king, the King of Kings: his conquests have been completed, the Kushâna empire has been established.

We do not know how long time after the conquest of Taxila the inscription of the year 136 was executed. A priori it seems likely that it belongs to the first years of Kushâna rule there.

Kujula Kadphises’ conquest of Ki-pin can be characterized as a re-establishment of the previous Saka dominion in that country, for the Kushânas seem to have acted as the heirs and successors of the Sakas in India.³

We have no further dates to guide us. If we assume, however, that the erjhuna Kapa was about twenty years old at the time of the Taktî-Bâhi inscription, we should be entitled to conclude from the Hou Han-shu that his death must have taken place about sixty years later, i.e. about the year A.D. 79.

According to the Hou Han-shu his son and successor was Yen-kao-chen, who can hardly have been a young man at his octogenarian father’s death.

Of him we learn that he ‘again’ conquered T’ien-chu and appointed a general there for the administration.

In the Cambridge History of India⁴ it has been taken for granted that T’ien-chu

¹ JRAS, 1914, p. 928.
² It is also met with on coins of Zeionies.
³ Cf. Lüders, SBAW, 1913, p. 426. If M. Sylvain Lévi, JA, cclii, 1923, p. 52, is right in explaining the name Kadphises as ‘the Kapiâ man’, one might even infer that the Kushâna hi-hou was considered by his people as entitled to the throne of Kapiâ, i.e. in this connexion perhaps Ki-pin.
⁴ Vol. i, p. 584.
denotes north-western India. The description of the country given in the Hou Han-shu, however, points to the Indus country, the ancient stronghold of the Saka empire in India. The text runs: 'The kingdom Ti'en-chu is also called Shen-tu. . . .' The kingdom is situated on the banks of a great river. The inhabitants mount on elephants in war; they are weaker than the Yue-chi; they practise the religion of the Buddha; it has become a habit with them not to kill and not to fight. Parting from Kao-fu, which belongs to the Yue-chi, and turning towards the south-west one comes to the western sea; in the east one comes to the kingdom of Pan-k'i; all these countries form part of Shen-tu. Shen-tu has several hundred other towns (besides the capital); in each town a governor has been appointed; there are several tens of other kingdoms (besides the principal kingdom); in each kingdom there is a king. Though one observes some small differences in each of their kingdoms, they are nevertheless all called Shen-tu. At that time (i.e. probably when Pan Yung wrote, or towards A.D. 125) they were all dependent on the Yue-chi; the Yue-chi had killed the king and installed a general to govern the population.'

Though this description is somewhat obscure, because it also mentions countries to the west and east, it seems clear that the country conquered by Yen-kao-chen was situated on the Indus.

These districts were, as we have seen, under Parthian rule at the time of the Periplus, i.e. some time during the second half of the first century A.D. It is therefore possible that Yen-kao-chen effected his conquest by ousting the Parthians, though there may also have been other rulers.

At an earlier period the Indus country had been ruled by Sakas. Now we have seen that the Hou Han-shu states that Yen-kao-chen 'again' conquered Ti'en-chu, and we get the impression that his conquest is described as a reconquest. It has been maintained that the word rendered as 'again' should, in this passage, be translated as 'further,' 'in his turn'; since there is no indication in the Hou Han-shu of a previous conquest, which was repeated by Yen-kao-chen. It is impossible for a non-Sinologist to judge about the merits of these translations. But from the point of view of Indian history the meaning 'again' is thoroughly intelligible, since we know that there had been a previous conquest by kindred tribes, so that the Kushānas may here be considered as repeating the deeds of their Saka cousins.

And we have also seen that the Kālakāhāryakathānaka speaks of two Saka conquests. The Sakas of the Indus country conquered Surāśṭra and Mālava shortly before the beginning of the Vikrama era; they were ousted by Vikramāditya, but after a lapse of 135 years a new Saka came and re-established the Saka dominion.

There is such a remarkable similarity between the accounts of the Hou Han-shu and the Kālakāhāryakathānaka, that it seems natural to assume that they both contain the same indigenous tradition, so that they can be used to supplement and explain each other.

If we apply this principle, it follows that Wima Kadphises' conquest must have been effected about the year A.D. 78, and that he was the founder of the historical Śaka era, since the Kathānaka states that this reckoning was established in consequence of the second Saka conquest. Moreover, the Khalatse inscription of the year 187, i.e.
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1 Tang pronunciation ʂiɛn-ɗuːk, Karlsgren, nos. 869, 645.
3 Professor Karlsgren kindly informs me that the text unmistakably has 'again, anew, extinguished Ti'en-chu', and not 'in his turn'.
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HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

A.D. 103–104, shows that Wima Kadphises was on the throne long after the beginning of the Śaka era, which cannot, accordingly, have been instituted by Kanishka, his successor.

Under this supposition it also becomes intelligible that the era, which was intended to commemorate the re-establishment of Saka power, was later on known as the Śakakā or Sakanripatikā, and that it was only used in those districts where the Śakas, and their old era, had been replaced by national Indian rulers.

We learn from the Hou Han-shu that Yen-kao-chen appointed a general to rule in his stead. We have no indication to show that he himself resided in India, and the Khalatse inscription is the only one which mentions his name. His governors in T‘ien-chu were no doubt the so-called Western Kshatrapas, with whom we shall have to occupy ourselves later on, though their rule did not comprise the districts where Kharoshthi inscriptions have been found.

Yen-kao-chen’s empire was not, however, limited to T‘ien-chu. He also inherited his father’s kingdom in the north-west, and also there he seems to have appointed other persons to carry on the government. That such was the case must be inferred from numismatic evidence.

Wima Kadphises’ coins are much more uniform than those of his father. They show, on the obverse, the king’s head or figure, sitting or standing, and commonly Śiva on the reverse. The obverse legend is ब्राह्मण औष्ध वासिकाय in gold, साहित्य वैदिक in silver, and ब्राह्मण वैदिक in copper. The corresponding Kharoshthi legend runs maharajasa rajādīrajāsa svaratāgāvvaraṇa mahārājasa Wima Kathphikaśa tradarasa. The form of the king’s name has been discussed by Professor Rapson. The v of Wima has an apparent bottom line, which has led former scholars to read hima. Professor Rapson has shown that the same sign is of common use in the Kharoshthi documents from Chinese Turkestan. It looks almost like era and evidently indicates a modified sound. The double w of the Greek legend and the writing wima in the Khalatse inscription lead us to think of something like the English w, while the apparent r-stroke reminds us of the use of a subscript r in several Kharoshthi letters where it seems probable that we have to do with a strongly fricative sound. We might therefore transliterate wh, but I shall, for practical purposes, write w.

The compound letter in Kathphika consists of a ph, sometimes p, above a St. Andrews’ cross which reminds us of the usual sign th. It would be just as natural to read phth as thph, and the Khalatse inscription evidently has th, which form might also be supported by the Chinese kāu-t‘iēn. I shall not, however, make any change in the usual rendering, which is, in its turn, supported by the Greek form Kadphises.

We may note that the designation Kushāna is absent from these coins. The Chinese notice that it became usual, in all the kingdoms, to speak of the empire of the two Kadphises kings as that of the Kushānas cannot accordingly be taken at its face value. But we know that the designation Kushāna came to play a great role in historical records, notably in Armenian sources.

The title ब्राह्मण बालिकान्त सांत्री Pitṛ used on Wima Kadphises’ copper coins occurs, in a slightly different form, as ब्राह्मण बालिकान्त सांत्री Pitṛ, as the only legend, without the addition of a name, on numerous coins, which are exceedingly common all over the
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1 Actes du XIV° Congrès des Orientalistes, i, p. 219.
Panjāb, as well as in Kandahār and in the Kābul valley' and 'are found as far eastward as Mathurā'.

Professor Rapson rightly remarks that these coins show a symbol of the kind which is characteristic of Wima Kadphises, and that it cannot be doubted that they are related to him in point of time.

Mr. Whitehead draws attention to the fact that these coins are found in extraordinary abundance, and over a wide stretch of country extending from Peshawar to Mathurā. These facts point to great power and a long reign, and are much in favour of the supposition that we must look for Soter Megas amongst the most important of the kings and satraps known to us, as it is very improbable that such a great potentate would be nameless and unknown except from these coins. The style of the coins, which are in copper only, and the absence of square forms, point to a period about the Kushān conquest, so that Soter Megas was probably a contemporary of one of the two Kadphises'. He also thinks that 'it is possible that these coins were struck by more than one ruler, and that the differing types issued from distinct localities. Such rulers might have been subordinate to a single suzerain'.

I accept these suggestions. The fact that these coins are only struck in copper can be interpreted to show that they were not issued by a suzerain king, but by a ruler acting for him. The Greek legend βασιλεύς βασιλείαν means 'king exercising royal power', 'ruling king'. Those who used the coins were not likely to observe the difference between βασιλεύς βασιλείαν and βασιλεύς βασιλείων, the less so because the reverse occasionally bears the Kharoshthi legend maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa i tradarasa.

Certain types almost invariably exhibit in the field the Kharoshthi akshara vi. Though Mr. Whitehead is of another opinion, I think it probable that Cunningham was right in thinking that this vi was the initial of a name, and it seems probable that it denotes Wima Kadphises, as the suzerain of the ruler who styles himself Soter Megas.

Sir John Marshall is of opinion that there was an interval between Wima Kadphises and Kanishka, and it is conceivable that the Soter Megas coins cover both the reign of Wima Kadphises and this interval, or part of it, so that the coins bearing the akshara vi chiefly represent the issues during Wima's reign.

After the death of Wima Kadphises there are indications to show that a disintegration of the Kushāna empire began to set in, similar to what took place after the demise of Moga. For the Taxila inscription of the year 191, i.e. A.D. 107–108, seems to show that Jihonika, i.e. Zeionises, the kshatrapa of Chukhsa, i.e. the Taxila country, was then the actual ruler of Taxila. The result seems to have been a decline of the Kushāna power, which after some time led the chiefs to make an attempt at strengthening their position in another direction, through an alliance with the Sakas in the Khotan country, as we shall see below.

In the new provinces added to the empire by Wima Kadphises the government was The Western Kshatrapas apparently also carried on by a viceroy, and these viceroys are known as the Western Kshatrapas, who held sway in Surāshtra and Malava. It is in the records of these rulers that we find the first certain instance of the use of the historical Śaka era, which was, in my opinion, instituted by their suzerain Wima Kadphises.

The provinces ruled over by the Western Kshatrapas do not belong to the territory of Kharoshthi inscriptions. There are, however, some features in their records which
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1 Cf. Cunningham, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3rd series, x, 1890, pp. 115 ff., with the addition:

His Mathura coins were of local coinage, which is not met with elsewhere.

2 *Indian Coins*, pp. 16 ff.

3 p. 160.

4 ASIAR, 1912–13, p. 8.
seem to throw light on the further history of the Kushāṇa empire in the north, and these features must be taken into consideration.

Professor Rapson is evidently right in holding that the oldest of the Western Kṣhataṇas, Bhumāka and Nahapāna, were kṣhataṇa of the Kūṣhāṇas. They are both designated as Kṣhaharāta, as was also the case with the Northern Kṣhataṇa Liaka Kusuluka. This designation as well as the use of Kharoṣṭhī in their coin-legends in a country where Kharoṣṭhī was not in common use point to the conclusion that they had come from the north-west.

Bhumāka uses the titles kṣhaharāta kṣhataṇa, while Nahapāna is designated rāja kṣhaharāta on his coins, rāja kṣhaharāta kṣhataṇa in his inscription of the year 42, and rāja mahākṣhataṇa svāmi in his inscription of the year 46. The position of Nahapāna accordingly seems to have been more independent than that of Bhumāka, and I have no hesitation in accepting Professor Rapson's view that Bhumāka was the earliest known member of the dynasty.

The name Bhumāka is certainly not good Sanskrit, but looks like a clumsy attempt at translating a foreign name.

Now we have another, somewhat later, Western Kṣhataṇa named Chashṭaṇa, of whom we possess inscriptions dated in the year 52, i.e. A.D. 130, where he is mentioned together with his grandson Rudradāman, both being designated as rājas. Chashṭaṇa strikes coins both as kṣhataṇa and as mahākṣhataṇa, and also his son Jayadaṇa has issued coins as kṣhataṇa, but never seems to have risen to the rank of mahākṣhataṇa. Since Nahapāna occurs as kṣhataṇa in the year 42 and as mahākṣhataṇa in 46, and Chashṭaṇa's grandson Rudradāman is mentioned as rāja in 52, Chashṭaṇa cannot have become kṣhataṇa before the year 42 and mahākṣhataṇa before 46, and his son Jayadaṇa can only have held office for a very short period.

Chashṭaṇa's name has been explained by Professor Andreas as corresponding to Pashto chashkhan, 'a master', and since Pashto is certainly in some way connected with the ancient Saka language of Eastern Turkestan, we may draw the conclusion that he was by race a Saka.

In his inscriptions and coin-legends Chashṭaṇa is characterized as the son of Ysamotika, and this Ysamotika is evidently derived from the Saka word yṣama, 'earth'. I therefore agree with M. Sylvain Lévi in identifying Ysamotika with Bhumāka, seeing in the latter name a clumsy attempt at translating the Saka name into Sanskrit.

In the year 52 Chashṭaṇa ruled conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman and cannot, therefore, have been less than towards sixty years old. He was accordingly born about the beginning of the Saka era, and his father Ysamotika-Bhumāka must have held sway about that time, i.e. he must have been the first kṣhataṇa appointed after Wima Kadphises' reconquest.

At that time Western India, at all events Mālava, had been under national Indian rulers for a considerable period, and we easily understand the reasons which led to his name becoming Indianized as Bhumāka. When Chashṭaṇa came into power, the state of things was somewhat different.

The Sakas had been ruling for more than forty years. The Western Kṣhataṇas seem to have suffered defeat at the hands of the Andhras some time during the reign of Nahapāna, but they appear to have partly reasserted themselves under Chashṭaṇa. We

\[1 \text{ WK, pp. cv ff.} \]
\[2 \text{ Cf. Ep. Ind., xvi, pp. 19 ff. I cannot accept Mr. Banerji’s interpretation of these records.} \]
\[3 \text{ JA, xi, v, 1915, p. 191.} \]
\[4 \text{ Cf. Rapson, WK, pp. cx, cxv.} \]
may therefore look on Chashțana's use of the indigenous Saka form of his father's name as a sign of increased Saka self-assertion.

Now there is one detail which points in another direction. Professor Lüders has drawn attention to the use of the compound ʃʃ in the word Ysamotika to render the voiced ʃ, an orthograph which has its only parallel in the Saka language of Chinese Turkestan. He justly remarks that such a device can hardly have been invented independently in two different places, and is inclined to think that it was done in India, when the attempt was made to adapt Brāhmi to the exigencies of the Saka language. His chief reason is that Chashțana's reign falls in the second quarter of the second century A.D., while the manuscripts in Central Asian Saka are several centuries later.

I have, however, already pointed out that the use of this language in Kanishka's coin-legends may be taken as an indication that it had begun to be reduced to writing at an earlier period; and, at all events, it is certain that it is only in Chinese Turkestan that we know that the writing ʃʃ for ʃ, i.e. the voiced ʃ, was in common use.

In such circumstances we must ask ourselves whether there are any indications to show that Saka power had made such progress in Central Asia that it could have been felt by the Sakas of Kāthiāvar and Mālava. The only sources in which we can hope to find any information are the Chinese Annals.

We have seen that the Chinese continued to speak of the Ta Yüé-chi after 'all the countries' had begun to use the designation Kushāna. The Hou Han-shu contains several references to them, and these tend to show that they began to take an increasing interest in Chinese Turkestan, whence they had once come and where the Little Yüé-chi were still living.

China gradually lost its hold on the Western Countries, and during the time between the periods Kien-wu (A.D. 25–55) and Yen-kuang (A.D. 122–125) the connexion with China was interrupted and resumed no less than three times. From the period Yang-kia (A.D. 132–134) the imperial prestige gradually dwindled, 'the different kingdoms of the west became arrogant and negligent; they oppressed and attacked each other alternately'. Some attempts at reasserting Chinese authority were occasionally made, especially by the generals Pan Ch'ao and Pan Yung, but they did not lead to lasting results.

In these events the Yüé-chi seem to have played a certain role, rarely, however, in connexion with the north-eastern oases, but repeatedly in the western and southern ones.

At the time of the consolidation of the Kushāna empire Yārkand was the most important power there, and is stated to have exercised supremacy over all the countries to the east of the Pamir.

In A.D. 60, however, Khotan revolted against Yārkand, and a Khotanese noble, Hiu-mo-pa, established an independent kingdom. He was killed in an attack on Yārkand, but his brother's son Kuang-tê succeeded him and gradually became so powerful that thirteen kingdoms, from Niya to Kāshgar, are stated to have been dependent on him.

In A.D. 75 the Chinese general Pan Ch'ao is stated to have brought Kuang-tê over to the imperial side, and in the ensuing years Khotan repeatedly supported him in his operations.

In the eighties Pan Ch'ao nominated a new king in Kāshgar, but the old one found support with the K'ang-ku (Sogdiana) and hoped through them to enlist the assistance of the Yüé-chi.

1 SBAW, 1913, pp. 407 ff.
2 Cf. Chavannes' translation, T'oung Pao, II, viii, 1907, pp. 149 ff.
3 Cf. the translation of their biographies by Chavannes, T'oung Pao, II, vii, 1906, pp. 216 ff.
Pan Ch’ao was able to prevent this by sending rich presents to the Yüe-chi ruler, but when the latter sent ambassadors with presents to ask for the hand of an imperial princess, Pan Ch’ao had the envoys stopped, and from this time there was enmity and resentment between the Yüe-chi and the Chinese. In A.D. 90 the Yüe-chi sent their viceroy Sie, i.e. according to M. Sylvain Lévi ¹ a sākhi to attack Pan Ch’ao, who, however, succeeded in defeating him. The Yüe-chi are said to have become frightened and to have offered tribute every year, but we need not attach much importance to this statement.

It is stated, in this connexion, that the Yüe-chi came from a distance of several thousand li and had crossed the Pamir. It is evident that the Kushāna empire is meant, and the ruler in question may accordingly have been Wima Kadphises. In his days the Kushānas had therefore begun to mix in the affairs of Eastern Turkestan.

They seem to have entertained certain relations with Kāshgar. For we hear that the Kāshgar king, An-kuo, sent his maternal uncle, Ch’en-p’an, in exile to them in the period Yüan-ch’u (A.D. 114–116), and that they placed Ch’en-p’an on the throne of Kāshgar after An-kuo’s death.

These events are apparently alluded to in an unverified notice quoted by Klaproth, ² according to which the king of Kāshgar was deposed by the Yüe-chi about A.D. 120, and that his subjects, on that occasion, embraced Buddhism.

At the introduction of Buddhism in Kāshgar Khotan seems to have co-operated, and there are certain indications of relationship between Khotan and the Yüe-chi.

According to the Tibetan work Li-yul-gyi, Lo-rgyas-pa, ³ the daughter of the king of Ga-hjag, the queen of Vijayasimha, king of Khotan, was helpful in propagating Buddhism in Shu-luk, i.e. Kāshgar. We should after this be justified in dating King Vijayasimha about A.D. 120.

Now Tibetan sources ⁴ tell us about Vijayasimha’s son, Vijayakirti, that he joined King Kanika and the king of Guzan in an expedition to India, on which the city of Soket (Sāketa) was overthrown. Here Guzan can hardly be anything else than Kushāna, Kushāna, and we thus apparently have a reference to relations existing between Khotan and the Kushāna empire, perhaps with the successor of Wima Kadphises. And there were other indications to the same effect.

Sir Aurel Stein has brought home from Central Asia a long series of Kharoshthi documents, written in a debased Indian Prākrit, which has been published by Messrs. Boyer, Rapson, and Senart. ⁵

The Indian language used in these documents certainly takes us to the western Panjab, and its use as the common administrative language points to a strong influx of Indian civilization.

The Chinese pilgrim Hsuan-tsang tells us about local traditions in Khotan, according to which the oasis had received a considerable portion of its earlier population through immigration from Takshaśilā in the days of Asoka. ⁶ It is questionable whether this is a genuine old tradition or a later myth based on the existence of Buddhism and the use of names such as Asoka and Kunala ⁷ by the local population. At all events we seem to be justified in stating that a considerable influx of Indian elements took place during
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² Tableaux historiques de l’Asie, p. 166.
⁴ Cf. Thomas, Ind. Ant., xxxii, 1903, p. 349.
⁵ Khar. Inscr.
⁶ Cf. Stein, Ancient Khotan, i, pp. 156 ff.
⁷ Cf. Thomas, Festschift Jacob, pp. 57, 64.
the Indo-Scythian period, and it was evidently at this time that Buddhism was introduced in Khotan.

The oldest Kharoshthi text discovered in Eastern Turkestan is a manuscript of a version of the Dhammapada, which seems to belong to the second century A.D. The language is here still a pure Indian Prakrit. It bears witness to the existence of canonical books in the north-western Prakrit and to their use in Chinese Turkestan.

At an early date, however, Sanskrit was introduced as the sacred language of Buddhism in Turkestan. At Ming-Öi, west of Kuchi, Brāhmī fragments in Sanskrit have been found which belong to the second century, and in the Kharoshthi documents mentioned above, most of which come from the Niya site, we occasionally find quotations from Buddhist Sanskrit works such as the Udānavarga and the Prātimokshāsūtra.

We can with some confidence draw the conclusion that the Buddhist monks of Eastern Turkestan began to take up the study of Sanskrit about the time of Kanishka, while Prakrit was largely used for administrative purposes. The clerks and officials were mostly non-Indian natives, and they were not in possession of the same learning and religious interest as the Buddhist monks. The language of the documents has, consequently, lost its correctness and seems to be strongly influenced by the local vernaculars.

Professor Thomas has maintained that the language of the Khotan country in old times was a form of Proto-Tibetan, and that the Saka speech, which we later on find in use in books and documents, must have been introduced some time between Sung-yün (A.D. 518–522) and Huan-tsang. I cannot accept this statement.

Already the Dhammapada manuscript presents some features which seem to indicate the existence of Sakish in the Khotan country at the time when it was written, and there are more such indications in the Kharoshthi documents. I have already mentioned the use of words such as vāṇīti, ṛti, vīlaṁti, which find their explanation in the Saka language, and in another place I have drawn attention to some phonetic and grammatical details which point in the same direction. I may add the curious double dot sometimes found in Kharoshthi documents and which also occurs in the word Hashkhunā in the Wardak Vase inscription; it seems to be of the same kind as the frequent double dot of Khotanī Saka.

There are, so far as I can see, so many details which remind us of the Iranian tongue of Chinese Turkestan, that there cannot be any question of a mere accident. If we further bear in mind that Chinese sources state that the Little Yüe-ch’i were settled, together with Tibetan tribes, in the south of the country, and that the Yüe-ch’i seem to have been Iranians, it seems almost necessary to assume that their ancient language had been preserved, perhaps side by side with Tibetan dialects, and made its influence felt in the official language represented by the documents. And we know that Sakish later on became the language of administration in the Khotan country.

In his Serindia Sir Aurel Stein raises the question whether the far-spread use of Kharoshthi and an early Prakrit was not partly a result also of the political influence which the powerful Indo-Scythian dominion established both north and south of the Hindukush seems to have exercised for a time in the Tarim Basin during the early centuries of our era, or of that even more important cultural influence which must have
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1 Cf. Lüders, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, Berlin, 1911.
3 Asia Major, ii, pp. 253 ff.; Festgabe Jacobi, pp. 45 ff.
4 Cf. my remarks, Festschrift für Ernst Windisch, pp. 85 ff.
5 SBAW, 1918, pp. 821 ff.
6 Cf. e.g. Boyer, Rapson, and Senart, JA, xi, xii, 1918, pp. 319 ff.
7 p. 243.
accompanies the Buddhist propaganda carried eastwards from the Oxus region about the same period.

It seems to me that we have certain indications to the effect that the Kushānas exercised considerable influence in Eastern Turkestan in the first centuries of our era. Not only do we find several names containing the word Kuhana, as already mentioned, but such documents as are dated show a remarkable correspondence with Indian Kushāna inscriptions and coins in the titles used and in the arrangement of the dates. Thus when we read in the Kharoshthi document, no. 581: sa-ni-vatthore a mahārāja-mahāravyayā-ras(r)a ma-hāmautis(r)a jayantis(r)a dharmiyās(r)a sachihrāmaṭiṣṭhadīs(r)a uṇava mahāravyā Amkva[r](r)a devaputras(r)a kshuṇaṃmi mas(r)e 4 diivas(r)e 10 4, we are at every step reminded of the Indian Kushānas, and we involuntarily draw the inference that the latter had left a strong mark in the administration of Chinese Turkestan.

It will be seen that the date of no. 581 first gives the year as referring to the reign of a 'King of Kings' and then mentions the kshuṇa of the mahārāja Amkva[r](r)a. In one document, no. 661, which was found in what was evidently an early structure at Endere, the suzerain is styled Khotana mahāravya rayatiraya and named Hinajha Avijādasiṃha.

In such circumstances we must ask ourselves whether it is not possible to assume that all the different mahārājas acknowledged the suzerainty of one overlord, and since no. 661 speaks of a 'King of Kings' of Khotan, Sir Aurel Stein may have been right in thinking that we have throughout to do with Khotan rulers.

We should then have to assume that all these rulers were more or less contemporaneous and exercised some special function, indicated by the term kshuṇa, in rotation.

Now kshuṇa is evidently the same word which occurs as kṣhāna in certain Saka documents from the Khotan country and as kshum in Tocharian documents from Kuchi, where it means 'rule', 'term'.

It would then be possible to identify the ruler Amkva[r](r)a with the Khotan king, An-kuo, or, according to the pronunciation of the T'ang period, An-kuok, the son of Kien, who, according to the Hou Han-shu, came on the throne in A.D. 152 and is mentioned again in A.D. 175.

In a paper read in the Berlin Academy on the 28th July, 1927, Professor Lüders has, however, shown that most of the rulers mentioned in the documents do not belong to the Khotan realm, and in a lecture at the Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists Professor Rapson arrived at similar results.

It is, therefore, impossible to identify Amkva[r](r)a with the Khotan ruler An-kuo and utilize this identification for chronological purposes. The documents only give the name of one Khotan ruler, Avijādasiṃha, the remaining rulers do not seem to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Khotan. We must try if it is possible to arrive at some approximate dating from other sources.

The Hou Han-shu states that Khotan, Kūshgar, Yarkand, and other countries tendered their submission to China in A.D. 127. Two years afterwards, however, Fang-ts'ien, king of Khotan, enlarged his influence against the wishes of the Chinese. He
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2 Ancient Khotan, i, p. 366.
5 Karonen, nos. 4 and 480.
6 *T'ang* pronunciation *Kjon*, Karlgren, no. 373.
8 *T'ang* pronunciation *Pjoung-dujen*, Karlgren, nos. 26, 1077.
was subsequently, in A.D. 132, defeated by the Kâshgar king, whom the Chinese induced to attack him, but the event shows that Khotan's power was on the increase.

The Chinese tried to interfere in Khotan in A.D. 152, when they killed Kien, king of Khotan, but the Khotanese placed Kien's son, An-kuo, on the throne, and after these events, we hear, Khotan became arrogant.

Now we have seen that Tibetan sources speak of an expedition against India undertaken shortly after A.D. 120 by the Khotan king Vijayakirti in connexion with King Kanika and the king of Guz̄an. If this statement is based on genuine tradition, it seems necessary to infer that the Kusânas, some time after the demise of Wima Kadphises, succeeded in enlisting the support of Khotan for a forward policy in India. We have, as we have seen, reason for assuming that the population of Khotan was partly of the same stock as the Kusânas, and their joining hands in a great undertaking would naturally lead to a strengthening of their position both in Khotan and in India. It is perhaps not a mere accident that we meet with rulers using the same titles as the Kusânas in Turkestan at the same time when the Western Kshatrâpa Châshâna begins to use the Saka form of his father's name instead of the barbaric Sanskrit rendering used on the latter's coins.

We do not know who the king Kanika mentioned in the Tibetan tradition was. It seems a priori likely that he was a member of the royal family of Khotan. The Khotan king Kien mentioned above bears a name which reminds us of Kanika, and we may draw the inference that such names were used in the royal family.

It seems probable that King-Kanika was the famous Kanishka, though Târântâha, as stated by Professor Thomas, distinguishes between them, and says that the latter, whom he dates in the Maurya period, as a young man was chosen as sovereign in the land of Tili and Malava. For Kanika was, according to the Mahârâjanikanikaleha, a northern king of the Kuśa race, and Kuśa can hardly be anything else than Kusâ, the ethnic designation used in Kanishka's coin-legends.

It is a well-known fact that Kanishka is not mentioned in Chinese historical sources. Kanishka. Now we know that the Chinese were well aware of the happenings in the Western Countries down to about A.D. 125, but not after that time. It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that Kanishka rose to power after the year A.D. 125. And if he is identical with King Kanika, he must have started on his career from the Khotan country. And there are indications in Chinese Buddhist texts which point in the same direction.

The most important notices about Kanishka in Chinese texts have been brought together by M. Lévi. Now we read in the Chinese translation of Kumāralâta's Kalpa-śāstra, which was composed shortly after the reign of Kanishka, * In the family of the Ku-sha there was a king called Chen-tan Kîa-nî-ch'a. He conquered Tung Tien-chu (i.e., according to Messrs. Huber and Lévi, Eastern India) and pacified the country. His power spread fear; his good fortune was complete. He set out to return to his kingdom. The route passed through a broad, flat land.*

Professor Lévi is inclined to explain Chen-tan as connected with Chandana, which, according to Sarat Chandra Das, in Tibetan texts is stated to be an old designation of
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1 *Ind. Ant.*, xxxii, 1903, p. 349.  
2 Cf. Thomas, *l.c.*  
6 The fragments of the Sanskrit text have kula.  
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Khotan: 'The original Chen-t'an or Chin-thän would be Kashgaria; and Chen-t'an Kia-nî-chå would be Kanishka, king of Khotan. I cannot,' he says, 'avoid believing that the cradle of the power of the Tukhâra-Turushkas is to be found in that region.'

At all events the Kalpanamānditikâ refers to Kanishka as a Kusâna coming from a country outside Tung Tien-chu, and if we compare the statement of the Mahârâjâkânikalekhâ, according to which King Kanika, of the Kuśa race, came from a northern country, we become inclined to think of Khotan.

Such was also the opinion of Dr. Fleet, who said 1 that Kanishka belonged 'to a separate clan, sept, or ruling house of the Kushân tribe, which made its way from Khotan into Kashmir, and thence to India'.

Now the Tibetan text quoted above is to the effect that King Kanika, i.e. probably Kanishka, undertook his expedition to India in connexion with the Guzan king and King Vijayarâkâri of Khotan. This tradition seems to bear out the inference drawn above that the Indian Kusânas some time after Wima Kadphises' death tried to strengthen their position by joining hands with their cousins beyond the Pamir, and the result was evidently a large consolidation of Kusâna power, and the introduction of a new era, which may have been used both in Turkestan and in India, where it is usually spoken of as the Kanishka era.

It seems probable that Vijayarâkâri was not the ruling king of Khotan when he left for India, and that Vijayasîsinha was then still alive. In that case it is tempting to identify Vijayasîsinha, which is evidently a biruda and is only known from Tibetan sources, with the Khotana mahârâja râya itsiraya Hinajha (?) Avijîdasinâha of the Turkestan document no. 661, the only document which gives the name of the 'King of Kings'. The uncertain Hinajha may be the proper name of the ruler, who may or may not be the Fang-tsîen of the Hou Han-shu, who attacked his neighbours in A.D. 129. But it seems natural to infer that the era used in the Turkestan document, no. 661, is the same as the Kanishka era and was established on the occasion of the great consolidation of Kusâna power which led to the expedition to Eastern India.

If Kanishka came from Khotan, it will be necessary to accept the theory of Baron A. de Staël Holstein, 2 that he did not belong to the great (Ta) but to the Little (Siao) Yüe-chî. The Ma-ming-p'u-sa-chuan, the biography of Asvaghosa, which was translated into Chinese before A.D. 412, expressly states that Asvaghosa's patron, i.e. Kanishka, was king of the Siao Yüe-chî. And in its description of the Little Yüe-chî kingdom of its own time the Wei-shu gives the information that its capital was Purushapura, i.e. Peshâwar, and that for this reason they were called the Little Yüe-chî. The Baron is probably right in explaining this curious statement as meaning that Peshâwar was known as the ancient capital of the Little Yüe-chî, and that therefore the designation Little Yüe-chî might later be transferred to other tribes using the same capital. Now it was certainly Kanishka who first made Peshâwar the capital of the Yüe-chî empire, and the remark in the Wei-shu accordingly adds strength to the theory that Kanishka was a Little Yüe-chî.

Such indications as have been mentioned above point to the conclusion that Kanishka belongs to a second Kusâna wave, and that he invaded India some time after A.D. 125. After Sir John Marshall has shown, from the unmistakable evidence of archaeological stratification, that Kanishka followed after Wima Kadphises, and was perhaps even separated from him by an interval, there cannot any more be the question of dating his inscriptions in the Vikrama era. Nor can he be the founder of the Saka era of A.D. 78–9.

1 JRAS, 1903, p. 334. 2 SBAW, 1914, pp. 643 ff.
because Wima Kadphises was, as we have seen, reigning long after that date. We must necessarily assume that the era in which his and his successors' records are dated begins at a later date, and the silence of Chinese annals is strongly in favour of the assumption that it cannot begin earlier than A.D. 125.

We possess quite a large number of records in Kharoshthi and Brāhmi dated in that era. We have inscriptions of Kanishka between the years 1 or 3 and 23, of Vasishka between 24 and 28, of Kanishka II in the year 41, of Huviskha between 33 and 60, and of Vasudeva between 74 and 98.¹

Now we know from Chinese sources that the Ta Yüe-chi Po-tiao sent an embassy to the Chinese emperor in the year 230 and received the title 'king of the Ta Yüe-chi allied to the Wei'. According to Chavannes,² Po-tiao can very well be a rendering of Vasudeva, and it has been maintained that, if such be the case, we should be able to fix the beginning of the Kanishka era approximately between A.D. 130 and 170.³ And 170 is certainly, in that case, the very latest possibility, but the earliest one may fall before 130, because we do not know whether 98 was Vasudeva's last year, and because there seem to have been more than one Vasudeva. I shall show in the chapter about the 'eras that there is some reason for fixing the epoch of the Kanishka era in A.D. 128–129.

The fact that Po-tiao is designated as a Great Yüe-chi does not, on the other hand, militate against the theory that Kanishka, the founder of the dynasty, was a Little Yüe-chi, for his Indian conquests made him the successor of the Great Yüe-chi, and to the Chinese of a later date, who had long been out of touch with the Western Countries and had no records of his conquests, he and his successors would be the Great Yüe-chi, just as was the case with the first Kushānas.

Among the Chinese texts mentioning Kanishka, the translation of the Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā is the most important one, because this work was written shortly after his demise. It apparently refers his expedition to Eastern India to the first years of his reign, and the Tibetan accounts of King Kanika's achievements are to the same effect.

Now we have an Indian inscription, on the relic casket found in the Kanishka stūpa near Peshawar, which seems to be dated in the first year of the Kanishka era, i.e. according to my chronology in A.D. 128–129, and the natural inference is that Kanishka entered India via the Peshawar country and presumably from Central Asia. The different sources accordingly seem to be in thorough agreement with each other with regard to this point.

And the agreement goes further. The next inscriptions dated in the Kanishka era are of the year 3 and have been found at Sarnāth.⁴ Here also we learn to know the names of two of his governors, the mahāśatrapa Khararpalāna and the kshatrapa Vanasparā, and we are again reminded of the Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā, which states that he conquered Eastern India and pacified the country.

The same text contains the information that Kanishka subsequently set out to return to his country. His route passed through a broad, flat land, where he observed a stūpa, which proved to belong to the Jainas. It is here natural to think of Mathurā,

¹ In the Mathurā inscription of the year 77, Lübkers' List, no. 62, Huviskha is mentioned, not, however, as ruling, but as having given his name to a Vihāra in Mathurā.
⁴ Lübker's List, nos. 925 and 927.
where the inscriptions from the Kanikāli Tīla have so many references to Kanishka and his dynasty and to the Jainas. And in Mathurā the Kanishka era came to replace the Vikrama Samvat, which was used by Śodāsa, just as was the case with the era introduced by Wima Kadphises after his reconquest, in the provinces which he again brought under the rule of the Sakas.

The narrative in the Kalpanamaṇḍūkā makes us inclined to think that Kanishka went back to his own country, i.e., as we have seen, probably to Khotan. Now we soon find inscriptions, dated in his era, in the west, from Zeda and Hidda in the north to Sui Vihār in the south, and in the Zeda inscription we find the earliest known instance of the use of the words iste kṣuṇāma after the date, which may, as already indicated, point towards Khotan.

We may draw the conclusion that Kanishka retraced his steps towards Peshāwar, which became a Kushāṇa capital, and that the new state of things led to the introduction of his era in that neighbourhood, while the ancient Buddhist centres farther to the north, at Hashnagar, Jamālgarhi, and Loriyan Tangai, which were situated outside his proper sphere of action, retained the old reckoning, as they had done after Wima Kadphises' reconquest, in addition to the new era, which we find used at Māmān Dheri in the Chārsadda district.

We find Indian inscriptions dated during the reign of Kanishka down to the year 23, the first month of the summer season, i.e., A.D. 151, while a record of the year 24, the fourth month of the summer season, i.e., A.D. 152, belongs to the reign of his successor Vāsishka. The natural inference is that Kanishka died in the interval between the summer 151 and the summer A.D. 152.

We have seen above that the Hou Han-shu states that the Khotan king Kien was killed in the year A.D. 152. The name Kien was pronounced Kipon in the T'ang period, and if we compare the Chinese rendering of Kapa, the name of the first Kushāṇa, as Kip, we are justified in restoring the Khotan king's name as Kana, and this Kana can very well be a shortening of Kanishka, Kanika.

It is therefore possible that Kanishka actually returned to Khotan and assumed the suzerainty there, some time before his death in A.D. 152, and in this connexion it is worth while recalling the fact that Hilān-tsang states that Kanishka 'governed by his army a wide territory, even to the east of the Ts'ung-ling mountains.' If such be the case, Kanishka's reign led to a great consolidation of the Kushāṇa power in India and in Turkestan, and after his return to Khotan he and his successors were acknowledged as the suzerains over the whole empire.

Kanishka's conquests accordingly resulted in a considerable strengthening of the power of the Kushāṇas. And in India itself the idea of a great empire was again brought to life. And it seems probable that the consequences were greater openings for learning and literature, which show a flourishing development in and after his days.

He did not, however, any more than the Kadphises kings, come to India as the bearer of a new civilization. He adapted himself to that of his subjects, and in this way his rule became of importance, because he gave protection to Indian religions, Indian art, and Indian scholarship. And, on the other hand, he and his dynasty in all earnestness opened the way for Indian civilization to Central and Eastern Asia. The mediums of this propaganda were above all Buddhism and Sanskrit.

Already Kujūla Kadphises seems to have shown favour to Buddhism, and we repeatedly find references to Buddhist propaganda carried on by the Yüe-chi in Chinese
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scales. But the state of things becomes quite different when Kanishka enters upon the
stage. And here it is exactly his conquest of the east which seems to have been of
greatest importance. There he came into contact with Brahmanic learning and civiliza-
tion, and above all the famous Aśvaghosha became associated with him.

According to the Chinese biography of Aśvaghosha, which in this detail seems to Aśvaghosha,
be supplied by fragments of a Sanskrit text found in Chinese Turkestan, he was
originally not friendly towards Buddhism, but was converted by the patriarch Pārśva.

The Śrīdharmapiṭaka-kānīdānāsūtra, which was translated into Chinese in A.D. 472,
narrates how Chen-t'an K'i-ni-ch'a defeated the king of Paṭaliputra and demanded a
large indemnity, but agreed to accept Aśvaghosha, the Buddha’s alms bowl, and a
naturally compassionate cock instead. Later on the king of An-si, i.e. Parthia, attacked
Kanishka, but was defeated after a sanguinary war, and now Aśvaghosha expounded the
law to him.

We may infer that Aśvaghosha became associated with Kanishka on the occasion of
his expedition towards Eastern India and later on strengthened him in his sympathy
with Buddhism.a

According to Buddhist tradition a council was held under Kanishka’s patronage in Kanishka’s
Kuvaṇa near Jālandhara or in Kuṇḍalalavana in Kashmir. The purpose is stated to have
been to collect or to comment on the Sacred books, and the leading monks are said to
have been Pārśva and Vasumitra.

It seems probable that there was a codification of Buddhist canonical works about Kanishka
this time, and that the language in which they were written down was Sanskrit, while the
north-western church language previously seems to have been the old Prakrit of the
Kharoshthī Dhammapada and Kharoshthī inscriptions, one of which, the Kurram casket
record of the year 20, contains a quotation from a canonical work in that language.

The date of that inscription may perhaps indicate that the Sanskrit reduction belongs
to the last years of Kanishka’s reign, and a trace of the new state of things is perhaps
found in the Peshāwar inscription no. 21, which seems to belong to the time of Kanishka’s
successor and where a Sanskrit blessing is added at the end. At all events, Sanskrit
seems to have spread over the territory where Kharoshthi was used, at an early date.
Thus we have already seen that Sanskrit stanzas are occasionally found in Kharoshthi
documents from Chinese Turkestan, and together with Sanskrit the Brāhmī alphabet
begins to replace Kharoshthi.

With Kanishka, therefore, a development sets in, which gradually led to the dis-Sanskrit
appearance of Kharoshthi in the old Yüe-chi empire. In the Indian provinces it lingers
Kharoshthi,
on in out-of-the-way places such as Hashnagar, Jamalgarhi, and Lorīyān Tangai, and
also in Taxila we find Kharoshthi records of a late date at Jauli. But a birch-bark
Brāhmī manuscript in Sanskrit found at the same place tends to show that we have only
to do with a survival of bygone times. And the latest dated record from more central
districts is of the year 61.

Among Kanishka’s successors only Vāsishka and Huvishka are mentioned in Kanishka’s
Kharoshthi inscriptions. Those two kings also seem to have held sway in Kashmir.b
In Kalhaṇa’s Rājatarangini, i, 168 ff. we read: ‘There were in this land three kings,
Hushka, Jushka, and Kanishka, who built three towns named after them. That wise
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1 Cf. Lüders, Bruchstücke der Kalpaśāṅgadītikā, p. 33.
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4 Above, p. lxiii.
king Jushka, who built Jushkapura with its Vihāra, was also the founder of Jayasvāmi-
pura. These kings, who were given to acts of piety, though descended from the
Turushka race, built at Sushkalattra and other places Mathas, Chaityas, and similar
(structures). During the powerful reign of these (kings) the land of Kashmir was, to a
great extent, in the possession of the Baudhās, who by (practising) the law of religious
mendicancy had acquired great renown. At that time one hundred and fifty years had
passed in this terrestrial world since the blessed Śākyasūghta had obtained complete
beatitude. And a Bodhisattva lived (then) in this country as the sole lord of the land,
namely the glorious Nāgarjuna, who resided at Śaḍāravandava.

Kalhaṇa’s dating of these kings is clearly wrong, but it is certain that his Jushka is
identical with Vāslashka, his Hushka with Huvishka.

It is curious that Kanishka comes last in Kalhaṇa’s list, and it is possible that
Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri is right¹ in thinking that he is not the founder of the
dynasty but a later king of the same name.

We know that Kanishka made Peshāwar his western capital, and it is possible that
the conquest of Kashmir was effected from that base, after Kanishka’s return from his
eastern expedition. The account of the Rājatarangini may be interpreted to mean that
the actual conqueror of Kashmir was Hushka, i.e. Huvishka, who was perhaps a younger
brother of Jushka, i.e. Vāslashka. To judge from the Rājatarangini Jushka’s place in
Kashmir’s history seems to have been more prominent than was the case with the two
other rulers of the dynasty, and he may have been the first Kushāṇa emperor who resided
for some time in Kashmir. The last king in Kalhaṇa’s list may then have been his son,
a second Kanishka, different from the famous Kushāṇa king of that name.

And we have a Kharos̱hṭhi inscription of the year 41, found at Aṛā on the Indus,
which bears witness to the existence of a second Kanishka. It is dated during the reign
of the mahāraja rājātirāja devaputra kāśāra Vajheshkaputra Kanishka, i.e. the ruler
uses the old Indian title mahāraja, the imperial, originally Iranian, rājātirāja, the semi-
Chinese devaputra, and the Roman kāśāra, i.e. caesar.

Mr. Banerji, who first published the inscription,² without, however, recognizing the
title kāśāra, was of opinion that we are here faced with the founder of the Kanishka era,
who ‘after a period of ten or fifteen years spent in campaigning in Eastern and Central
India . . . might have left the government of India in the hands of his eldest son and
crossed the Indus to attend to pressing affairs on his northern and north-western
frontiers’.

There is not, however, any foundation for such an assumption, and most scholars
are of opinion that there were two rulers called Kanishka. This conclusion seems
unavoidable in the face of the facts to which attention has been drawn by Professor
Lüders ³ that Vāslashka uses the imperial titles mahāraja rājātirāja devaputra shahi during
the period when, according to Mr. Banerji, Kanishka was still the supreme ruler, and
that the emperor Kanishka of the Aṛā inscription is characterized by the mention of his
father’s name, which is never the case with other Kushāṇas, so that we must assume
that it was done in order to distinguish him from another ruler of the same name.

Dr. Fleet,⁴ it is true, thought that the Aṛā inscription and another one from Māṇi-
kiāla, of the year 18, belong to a later revival of the line of the great Kanishka after
the death of Vāsudeva. But the palaeography of the two records shows that they cannot

¹ Political History of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1923, p. 255.
² Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 58 ff.
³ SBAW, 1912, p. 847.
⁴ JRAS, 1913, pp. 95 ff.
be so late, and, besides, Dr. Fleet's theory leads to the assumption of a new and elsewhere entirely unknown era for these two inscriptions.

We must, therefore, evidently assume the existence of a second Kanishka, the son of Vajeshka. Now Kalhana's Jñātaka shows that the ś of the name Vāsishka must have been voiced, and such a pronunciation is reflected in the form Vajeshka. In other words, the father of the king Kanishka of the Āra record was Vāsishka, the successor of the great Kanishka, and it is quite likely that this second Kanishka was the ruler mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī.

The Āra inscription of the year 41 falls between the years 33 and 60, for which we have records of Huvishka. There is, apparently, a certain overlapping of the reigns of these kings, and in this connexion it is of interest that the wording of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī leads us to think of three contemporaneous rulers.

Professor Lüders assumes that Vāsishka succeeded the great Kanishka, and that at his death, the empire was divided, Kanishka II, the son of Vāsishka, ruling in the north, while Huvishka held sway in India proper. Later on, however, Huvishka also became master of the north, for in the year 51 he is mentioned as emperor in the Wardak inscription.

This theory is the only one which leads to satisfactory results. It must, however, perhaps be slightly modified.

It can hardly be doubted that Vāsishka was the immediate successor of the great Kanishka. The latter's last date is in the year 23, and already the following year we find Vāsishka mentioned with the imperial title. He was probably the son of Kanishka, since his own son bears this same name, and succeeded his father in the natural course of events, wherefore he did not issue coins in his own name.

His last recorded date is in the year 28, and he may have died about that time. I think that we may assume that he was succeeded as emperor by his son Kanishka II.

Huvishka may, as we have seen, have been the actual conqueror of Kashmir, perhaps as the great Kanishka's general, and he was probably a brother of Vāsishka. After the latter's succession to the position of emperor, or after his death, he seems to have become governor or viceroy in the eastern provinces, at least as early as the year 33. It is noticeable that he is not characterized as emperor (rājātirāja) before the year 40. Until then he is simply styled mahārāja devaputra.

It is therefore possible to assume that he did not make himself independent before that date, and that may have been the occasion when he began to issue coins in his own name.

We cannot tell whether Kanishka II survived this new departure of Huvishka by more than a year, or if it was brought about by rumours of his approaching death. We only know that Huvishka was later on recognized as suzerain also in the north, for he bears the imperial titles in the Wardak inscription of the year 51.

Huvishka is the last of the great Kushānas who has left traces in the north-west. The dynasty was continued after his demise, and also later royal houses claimed Kanishka as their ancestor. But already Vasudeva seems to have become quite Indianized, and the Sanskrit language and the Indian civilization connected with it gradually became the leading factors in the ancient empire of the Indo-Scythians. Kharoshthi ceased to be the prevailing script of the north-west, though it lingered on in out-of-the-way places, and the ancient north-western Prākrit was gradually brought under the strong influence of the languages of the Middle Country and lost its power of resistance, after it ceased to be used in literature and administration.

---

1 The form of the name will be discussed in the chapter devoted to the inscription below.
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From a historical point of view, therefore, Huvishka’s reign closes the period covered by Indian Kharoshthi inscriptions, though the dynasty remained in power also after his demise, and though the empire may have increased still more. Thus the extension of Kushania power westwards, which we can infer from the inscriptions and records found at Sui Vihar, at Mohenjo Daro, and even so far west as Tor Dherai in the Loralai district of Baluchistan, may have been continued by Kanishka’s successors. For the shahī Yola Mira mentioned in the Loralai record seems, from palaeographical reasons, to belong to the time of Vásudeva or even later. But the strong Sanskritization of that inscription bears witness to the new development which began with Kanishka.

THE ERAS USED IN KAROŠTHI INSCRIPTIONS

A little more than thirty Kharoshthi inscriptions are dated, in years, months, and days, but without any indication of the era or eras used. It has sometimes been maintained that we have throughout to do with one and the same reckoning. Palaeographical considerations, however, make it impossible to accept that opinion. For if we compare e.g. the letters of the Taxila plate of the year 78 and the Sui Vihar plate of the year 11, there can be no doubt that the latter is later than the former and must, accordingly, be dated in an era which was established some time subsequent to the year 78 of another, older, reckoning.

Most scholars are now agreed in thinking that we have to do with at least two different eras, and, in accordance with the current view, I shall provisionally arrange the dated records in two groups.

A. OLDER GROUP.

1. Maira: [sam 58].
2. Shahdour A: ra[ja]no Damijadasa saka-sa ... [shashi ... 60]. Reading uncertain.
3. Shahdour B: [maharayasa?] Ayasa sam ... .
4. Mānehra ... adhashaḥ ... .
5. Farang: sam 68 Prāhavatasa masasa divase shodaśe 16.
6. Taxila copper-plate: saṁvatsāraye aṭhasataṭimae 78 maharayasa mahānītasa ...
   Mogasa Panemasa masasa divase paṁchame 5 etaye purvaye.
8. Kala Sang: [sam 100]. Reading uncertain.
13. Mārguz: [vashe 1*] 17.
15. Taxila silver scroll: sa 136 ayasa Aṣaḍaṣa masasa divase 15 īṣa divase ... maharajasa raṭaṭaraṇya devapuruṣa Khushaṇasa arogadakṣiṇe.
18. Taxila silver vase: ka 191 maharajasa [bhrata Manigulasamputrasa*] Jīhoṇikasa Chukh-
   sasa kshatrapasa.


23. Skāraḥ Dhēri: vasha ekṛṇaḥdaśatuṃma Ḍāṣadasi masasa di[vase 27].

B. LATER GROUP.


27. Manjikāla: sahi 18 Kārtiyasa majhi[c] divase 20 etra purvaḥ maharajasya Kaṇeṣh-


31. Hīda: saṁbatsaṇe ṛaṭhaviṇaṃatiḥ 28 masye Apelac sastehi daṣaḥi 10 iṣ[e] kṣa-


34. Wardak: sahi 51 masy[e] Arhamisiyā sastehi 15 imeṇa gāḍṛigreṇa ... maharajasya rajatiraja Hoveshkaṣaṛa agrabhagare.

35. Und: sahi 61 Chetrasa mahasa divase aṭhaṇi di 8 iṣa kṣaṇuṇi ... Purvashade.

36. Māmāṇe Dhēri: sahi 89 Margaśiṣtrapar iṣa 5 iṣa kṣaṇuṇi.

An incomplete date, masasa di 25, is further found in the Kaniza Dhēri inscription.

It is a well-known fact that the Brāhmī inscriptions of the Indo-Scythian period present a similar state of things. If we abstract from some uncertain cases, we have on one side the Amohini tablet of the year 72, during the reign of the Svāmin, the mahākṣatrapa Sodāṣa, and on the other a series of records dated in years ranging between 3 and 98 and giving the names of the Kushāṇa rulers, Kanishka, Vāsishka, Huvishka, and Vāsudeva. The former is usually considered to be dated in the Vikrama era, while the other series should evidently be brought together with our group B, and the prevailing opinion is to the effect that these records should all be referred to an era instituted by the famous emperor Kanishka. There is still a Mathūra inscription, no. 78 of Professor Lüders' List of Brāhmī inscriptions, dated in the year 299 and during the reign of some mahārāja rajāṭarāja, which has been interpreted in different ways.

The existence of a Kanishka era is, as already stated, admitted by most scholars. Various in other respects opinions have differed to a great extent, and even at the present day views no solution has been found which has met with general acceptance.

Edward Thomas⁴ proposed to refer the dates of Kanishka and his successors to the Seleucidan era of 312 B.C. or to the Parthian era of 248 B.C., with omitted hundreds, 3 to 98 standing for 303-398 in the former and for 203-298 in the latter case. Cunningham⁵ and Bühler⁶ also thought of the Seleucidan era as an alternative. The

¹ Academy, 16 Dec. 1874; ASWI, ii, 1878, p. 31.
² Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, xii, 1892, p. 44.
³ Indische Paläographie, § 19 B.
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latter scholar, however, also proposed to refer these dates, and also the Taxila plate of the year 78, to the same era as the Śodāsa inscription of the year 72, again operating with omitted hundreds.

The Seleucid era has also been adduced by Professor Vogel in explanation of the dates of the Lorijān Tangai and Hashnagar pedestals, while M. Foucher is inclined to refer the Taxila copper-plate to the Parthian era, supposing the figure for 100 to have been suppressed.

Vincent Smith once thought of the possibility of referring the date of the Takht-i-Bāshī inscription to the Caesarean era of Antioch, which ran from 49 or 48 B.C., or to some other foreign era.

The theories which reckon with eras established and used by foreign rulers outside of India are not a priori likely. We can understand that the Seleucid era may have been used on a coin of Plato, who may have had some traditional connexion with the Seleucids. But it would hardly be intelligible that it should have been used by the Sakas and Kushānas, who had never had anything to do with the Seleucids, or by their subjects in the Indian borderlands in their private records. With regard to the Parthian era, it should be borne in mind that the Saka empire in India was the result of a weakening of the Parthian empire, which led to their former subjects, the Sakas, making themselves independent, and it is hardly likely that the latter should go on using the Parthian era after that event. Moreover, the Parthian rulers themselves generally use the Seleucid era on their coins, the Parthian era occurring only rarely and sporadically before 38 B.C., and with regularity only from A.D. 41.

With regard to the supposed omission of the hundreds, with which some of these theories operate, I may further recall the remark made by Professor Dowson, that it has never, even at the present day, been customary to omit the hundreds in formal records, because 'it would entirely defeat the object of putting a date upon a monument intended to endure for a long period'.

Most scholars have operated with Indian eras, instituted in or near India by national or foreign rulers.

Vincent Smith tried to establish the use of the Saptarshi era, with omitted hundreds and thousands, and Messrs. Banerji and Foucher brought a supposed Mauryan era of 322 B.C. into the field, assuming the hundreds to have been suppressed. Against these theories we have the same objection about the omission of the hundreds, and with regard to the supposed Mauryan era, I can only repeat the statement of the late Dr. Fleet that there is not any evidence whatever to the effect that such an era has ever existed.

Attempts have, further, been made to separate one record, the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78, from the rest and to date it in an unknown Indian or semi-Indian era, which Sir John Marshall thought was instituted by Moga about 95 B.C., and Mr. Banerji
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1 WZKM, x, p. 173.
8 ASIAPP, 1903-4, p. 55; ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 259.
3 L'art grec-boudhique du Gandhāra, ii, p. 488.
5 It should be borne in mind that we have no information about this ruler, and that the solitary coin bearing his name is stated to have been procured somewhere in Central Asia; cf. Numismatic Chronicle, New Series, ii, 1876, p. 2.
6 Cf. the remarks of M. Foucher, i, c., p. 490.
7 Cf. Fleet, JRAS, 1913, pp. 983 ff., with further references.
8 JRAS, N.S., viii, 1875, p. 382.
9 JRAS, 1902, p. 175; 1903, pp. 1 ff.
10 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 67.
11 l. c., pp. 484 ff.
13 JRAS, 1914, p. 986.
14 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 67.
by Vonones c. 100 B.C., while Professor Rapson\(^1\) referred the date to an era which 'may possibly mark the establishment of the new kingdom in Seistan after its incorporation into the Parthian empire by Mithradates I, c. 130 B.C.' Against all these theories it must \textit{a priori} be urged that we are hardly justified in assuming the use of a separate era for one individual record, where there cannot be the question of an individual regnal era, unless it is impossible to date it in the same way as the remaining inscriptions of about the same time, and we have seen in the Historical Introduction that such is not the case with the Taxila plate.

The well-known historical eras of India, the Vikrama reckoning beginning in 57 B.C. and the Śaka epoch of A.D. 78, have been adduced by several scholars.

Professor Dowson\(^2\) proposed to refer the date of the Takhti-Bahi inscription to the Vikrama era, and Cunningham\(^3\) started the theory that that reckoning was established by Kanishka, a view which was consistently maintained by Dr. Fleet,\(^4\) who tried to show that the only era used in Kharoshthi inscriptions was that of 57 B.C.

Dr. Fleet draws attention to the undoubted fact that the Vikrama Samvat is the great historical era of Northern India, and that it has never been an astronomical era, so that 'there is no reason for thinking that, like the Kaliyuga era of 3102 B.C., it is an artificial reckoning, invented at some later time and set back to its starting-point in 58 B.C. We have no good grounds for believing otherwise than that—like the era of A.D. 78 ...—it existed from its very beginning'.

Dr. Fleet is no doubt also right in maintaining that 'all our knowledge of Indian eras teaches us that it was founded by a king, not by a people'..

On the other hand, it cannot any more be maintained that the Vikrama era was instituted by Kanishka, after we have learnt to know that this ruler was later than Kujula and Wima Kadphises and cannot have ascended the throne before some time in the second century A.D.,\(^5\) as stated in the Historical Introduction.

Nor does it seem possible to follow Sir John Marshall\(^6\) in ascribing the institution of the Vikrama era to Azes, a view which has been endorsed by Professor Rapson.\(^7\)

Sir John's theory is based on his interpretation of the date of the Taxila silver scroll, \textit{sa 136 ayasa Aṣhadasa masasa divasa 17} as 'in the year 136 (of the era) of Azes', &c. But the objections to this interpretation raised by Dr. Fleet and others are unanswerable: whenever a ruler is mentioned in connexion with a date, he is always the king or chief actually reigning at the time of the record, and there is no single instance in old inscriptions where a ruler is mentioned without a title.

It should be borne in mind that both the Kanishka and the Azes theory are without any foundation in Indian tradition, and simply based on general reasoning. On the other hand, we have an Indian tradition to the effect that the era was instituted by Vikramādiya, a ruler of Malava, who made an end to the dominion of the Sakas and began to rule in 57 B.C. As stated in the Historical Introduction this tradition i. in
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3. ASI, ii, p. 68.
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thorough agreement with everything which we know from other sources, and there is no a priori reason for disbelieving it.

It is true, as maintained by Dr. Fleet, that in A.D. 405, and for nearly five centuries from that time on, the era was known as the reckoning of the Mālavas, the years of the Mālava lords, the Mālava time or era, but no such designation is used in the oldest record where it has been traced with great probability, viz. the Śodāsa inscription of the year 72. And we have no sufficient reason for accepting the suggestion of Professor Thomas, that it dates from the foundation of the tribal independence of the Mālavas. But it may reasonably be inferred that it was founded by a ruler of Mālava, and according to Indian tradition Vikramaditya was such a ruler.

Dr. Fleet maintained that later research has shown that there was no such King Vikramaditya. But the tradition about him is certainly old. Haraprasād Śāstrī has drawn attention to the fact that he is mentioned in Hāka’s Sattasaṭ. And the fact that it was the Gupta conqueror of Mālava, Chandragupta, who revived the title supports the tradition according to which he was a Mālava ruler.

There is also another detail which supports the theory that the Vikrama era was a national Indian reckoning: it is evidently based on the old Sāvana year, with its three chāturmāsas. That such was the case I infer from the designation kṛita used in ancient records about the Vikrama years.

Kṛita years.

This term has been explained in different ways. Professor Bhandarkar thought that it means ‘made’ and characterizes the era as ‘invented by the people of astronomers for the purpose of reckoning years’. Against this explanation Dr. Fleet aptly objected that the Vikrama era was never an astronomical reckoning. His own explanation, however, that kṛita may be connected with Kī-li-to, the name of a race which, according to Hūlan-tsaziig, seized the sovereignty of Kashmir after the death of Kanishka, is hardly preferable.

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī says that kṛita is the name of the first year of a cycle of years which was used in the Vedic Period, the cycle comprising four years. In that case every year designated as kṛita should be ‘divisible by four after the deduction of one’. That is not, however, everywhere the case.

Moreover, a date such as that of the Bijayagad inscription of Vishnuvardhana: kṛitasu chaturśū varṣavatātesu ashtāviniśtesu, shows that every year of the era, and not only every fourth, was designated as kṛita.

In such circumstances, I still think that my own explanation is the only possible one: kṛita is the best throw in the play of dice, when the number of points is divisible by four, and a kṛita year is a year divided into three seasons, each comprising four months. That is the arrangement in all the Brahmi dates of the Kushāgas and in the Śodāsa inscription, which all are subsequent to the epoch of the Vikrama era, but not in Kharoshthi inscriptions.

If the designation kṛita is old, it is evidently chosen in order to distinguish the era from another, older one, and that must have been a Saka reckoning, if Indian tradition is right in stating that the Vikrama era was instituted by Vikramaditya in order to commemorate his victory over the Sakas.

In such circumstances it becomes unlikely that the Vikrama era is used in any of
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1 JRAS, 1914, p. 414
2 Ep. Ind., xii, p. 326
3 JRAS, 1913, pp. 966, 998
4 Gupta Inscriptioins, p. 253
5 Cf. SBAW, 1916, pp. 812 f.
6 Ind. Ant., xiii, 1913, p. 165
7 Ep. Ind., xii, p. 319
8 Ep. Ind., xiv, p. 140
the inscriptions of the Sakas and Kushānas. The Kanishka series cannot come into
discussion for the reasons already mentioned. And it is just as unlikely that the older
group of inscriptions should be dated in an era instituted to commemorate the overthrow
of the Sakas during whose reign those inscriptions were issued. It is *a priori* more
likely that Professor Thomas¹ was right in thinking of an unknown era, an old Saka
reckoning. And if the word *saka* occurring after the name of the ruler and before the
year in the Shahdaur inscription should be restored as *sakasambattare* or some equivalent
term, this explanation becomes certain.

The chief reason for referring the older Kharoshthi records to the Vikrama era
seems to be that it seems necessary to assume an epoch in the first century B.C., as is the
case with the Vikrama Śamvat, and most scholars are disinclined to assume the existence
of two eras beginning about the same time. But the result has been, as already
indicated, that it has proved necessary to assume a separate era for the Taxila copper-
plate of the year 78, which is evidently older than the Ģodāśa inscription of the year 72.

Professor Rapson,² it is true, reads the date of the latter record as 42, but Professor
Lüders³ has proved that the numerical figures must be read as 72. Dr. Fleet, on the
other hand, wanted to distinguish between Patika, the son of the kshatrapa Liaka
Kusulika, and the mahākṣatrapa Kusulua Patika, the contemporary of Ģodāśa’s father,
the mahākṣatrapa Rajula. But such a distinguishing can only become likely if it
proves impossible to identify them, and we have seen in the Historical Introduction that
such is by no means the case.

The result of the above discussion is that the Vikrama era cannot well have been
used in ancient Kharoshthi inscriptions, and that the older group was probably dated in
an undefined Saka-reckoning.

We must now examine the claims of the well-known Šaka era of A.D. 78. Šaka era of
A.D. 78.

James Ferguson⁴ started the theory, which is still the prevalent one, that Kanishka
was the founder of that reckoning, wherefore the inscriptions of Kanishka and his
successors should be referred to its epoch. Professor D. R. Bhandarkar⁵ went further
and referred both the Ģodāśa inscription of the year 72 and all Kharoshthi inscriptions
to the Šaka era, operating with omitted hundreds, viz. 200 for the records of the Kanishka
group.

This theory has been discussed at length by Dr. Fleet,⁶ whose arguments have
never been refuted. The era is emphatically a southern reckoning. According to the
Akbarnāma,⁷ the Vikrama era was specially connected with Mālava, Delhi, &c., the Šaka
era with Gujarāt and the Dekhan. The latter is, besides, the second astronomical
reckoning of the Hindus.

‘The name of the era’, he says, ‘is found first, with certainty, in an astronomical
date of the year 427, falling in A.D. 505, apparently from Gujarāt, which speaks of it as
the Šaka-kāla, “the Šaka time; or the time or era of the Šakas”. But the era itself is
traced, without a name, from the year 41 to the year 310, in the inscriptions of Nahapana
from Nāsilik and in the inscriptions and on the coins of his successors, the so-called
Western Kshatrapas or Satraps, from Kāhīlawār and the northern parts of Gujurāt.
And so foreign was the use of it to Northern India outside those territories that, apart
from a few cases in astronomical writings, the first known instance there is found in the
Deogad inscription of A.D. 862 from the Lalitpur District, United Provinces, in which,

⁴ JRAS, New Series, xii, 1880, pp. 259 ff. ⁵ JRAS, 1913, pp. 987 ff.
⁶ JRAS, 1913, pp. 636 ff. ⁷ Transl. by Beveridge, ii, p. 22.
however, the Śaka year 784 is given only as a subsidiary detail alongside of the Vikrama year 919, which gives the real dating of the record.  

In such circumstances it is a priori unlikely that this Śaka era should have been used in Kharoṣthī inscriptions. The older group can, of course, be left out of consideration. The question, however, remains whether the Kanishka group should be referred to it.  

Dr. Fleet has shown that the tradition according to which the Śaka era of A.D. 78 was instituted in commemoration of the overthrow of the Saṅgas by Vikramādiya is of North-Indian origin and later than the southern version according to which it dates from the anointment of a Śaka king, and he aptly remarks that 'our general knowledge of Indian eras teaches us that this— the anointment of a king, the beginning of his reign, not his overthrow—was the real origin of the reckoning'.  

Several such rulers have been suggested. Professor Bhandarkar¹ thought of Vonones, Messrs. Boyer² and Fleet³ of Nahapāna, and Professor Jouveau Dubreuil⁴ of Chashtana. Vonones, however, was a Parthian and older than Azes, and Nahapāna and Chashtana, with inscriptive dates between the Śaka years 42 and 52, are evidently too late to be the founders of the era. And besides, none of them seems to have exercised suzerain power.  

Most scholars are of opinion that Kanishka was the founder of the Śaka era. But we have no information to show that he held direct sway in the provinces where the reckoning had its home. Moreover, his time was probably, as we have seen, the second century A.D. and, finally, the Khalatse inscription shows that his predecessor Wima Kadphises was still ruling in the year 187 of the old era, i. e. long after the establishment of the Śaka era of A.D. 78.  

Now it should be borne in mind that there is not a scrap of evidence in favour of the Kanishka theory, which is simply based on general historical considerations.  

The wording of the oldest Śaka dates, those of the Western Kshatrapas, point to the conclusion that its calendar was more Indian than is the case in the Kharoṣthī dates. They give the year, the month, the pākṣha, and the day, and the mention of the pākṣha is an Indian feature. The seasonal details found in the Śodasa record and the Brāhmi inscriptions of the Kanishka group, on the other hand, are missing.⁵ We thus get the impression that we are faced with a Śaka reckoning which had, in some details, been influenced by an older Indian era. And we have direct information in the Kālākārṇyakathānaka, which is supported by the Hou Han-shu, to the effect that the historical Śaka era was introduced, in order to replace the Vikrama Samvat, by a ruler who effected a reconquest of the old Śaka dominions in India, and this ruler can hardly be anybody else than Wima Kadphises, a theory which has already been suggested as an alternative by Professor Gardner.⁶  

My results are so far purely negative. We have no good grounds for identifying the eras used in Kharoṣthī inscriptions with any reckoning known from other sources. We are evidently faced with two different eras, and since the records are so often connected with the names of Indo-Scythian rulers, it is a priori likely that they had both been established by Indo-Scythians, presumably by Sakas, since the Shahdāvar inscription seems to characterize the year as a Śaka year.  

It is conceivable that some information can be derived from the arrangement of the

¹ JBoBrRAS, xx, pp. 280 ff.  
² JRAS, 1913, p. 992.  
³ JRAS, 1914, p. 992.  
⁴ Ancient History of the Deccan, pp. 36 ff.  
⁵ Cf. my remarks, Ep. Ind., xiv, pp. 140 ff.  
⁶ JAI, ix, 1897, pp. 120 ff.  
⁷ p. li, foot-note.
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dates, which is the same in both groups of inscriptions. The details given are the year, the month, and the day, and there is no mention of the season, which is always given in the Brâhmi inscriptions of the Kanishka group, probably in imitation of the national Indian calendar used in the Vikrama Samvat, since that era was formerly used in Mathurā, the place where most of these records have been found.

The year is called samvat as in the Vikrama era, while varsha and synonymous. The years terms are employed in the later Śaka era of A.D. 78. This latter word is, however, occasionally used in Kharoshthī records, viz. in the Muchai inscription of the year 81; in the first date of the Guduvhara epigraph of the year 103, where the second date has the usual word; in the Kālārāra record of the year 113; on the Skārah Dheri image of the year 399; and probably in the Mārguz inscription of the year 117.

It is impossible to draw any inference from this state of things. It only shows that both terms were used in North-western India, and that samvat was probably the common one in connexion with the calendar.

Nor have we any right to infer from the occasional use of the word varsha that the Beginning of the year began with the rains. I agree with Dr. van Wijk,¹ that the occasional use of Macedonian months makes it probable that the year began in October, as in the Macedonian calendar. It is possible that this points to a certain influence exercised by the Macedonian calendar, though there was also an old Indian year beginning in the autumn.²

The names of the months are mostly Indian, but sometimes occur in forms which do not appear to be quite regular in the dialect. Thus we find aśādha for aśādha; tāvanā, for which we should expect śāvanā; aśatū for āsūyā or āsūyū. It is possible, though perhaps not likely, that such forms are due to a secondary adoption of Indian months in an originally un-Indian calendar. Such an assumption might be supported by the fact alluded to above, that we occasionally find Macedonian month-names: Apelaios (Hidda), Artemios (box lid, Wardak), Andunaios (Kurram), Daisios (Sur Vihār), and Panemos (Taxila copper-plate). A priori it is quite likely that the foreign invaders, during whose rule these records were executed, adopted the calendar of their predecessors, the Greeks.

We are on safer ground when we want to ascertain whether the months began with Beginning full or with new moon. The Zeda inscription of the year 11 is dated on the 20th of the Ashādha, and the nakshatra is given as Uttaraphalgunī. Professor Jacobi has kindly informed me of the fact that that nakshatra belongs to the śukla pāksha, where it may occur between the fifth and eighth day. If, therefore, the twentieth day of the month falls in the beginning of the bright half, in our case on the fifth day after new moon, the full-moon day must be the first day of the month.

The same result can apparently be derived from the Takht-i-Bahi inscription, where the first Vaiśākha seems to be characterized as [puhā] pākha, evidently because it was the Buddha's birthday, which tradition sometimes gives as the full-moon day of Vaiśākha.

Another peculiarity of the calendar is the through reckoning of the days of the Numbering months, without the Indian division into pākas. Thus we have the 20th Ashādha of days. (Zeda), the 27th Proshṭapada (Loriyān Tangei), the 25th Jyaishtha (Āra), &c.

This is a distinctly un-Indian feature, and taken together with the other indications it shows that the calendar used by the Indo-Scythians was characterized by a blending Macedonian calendar.

¹ Acta Orientalia, iii, p. 82; cf. Dr. Fleet, JRAS, 1905, p. 234.
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of foreign, Macedonian, and Indian principles, the latter being most clearly traceable in the use of Indian names for the months. In other words, we are faced with the initial stages of that fusion of Greek and Indian notions which found its final formula in the system of the Siddhantas.

In such circumstances we are justified in putting the question whether any conclusion can be drawn from calculations, based on the Siddhantas, of such details as may be contained in inscriptional dates. The existing Siddhantas are no doubt later than our inscriptions. According to Thibaut, the Surya Siddhanta and some other Siddhantas must be at least some centuries older than a.d. 500. That more than two or three centuries are necessary, might be maintained, but might also be doubted. We cannot, therefore, bring their system back to the period covered by the older Kharoshthi inscriptions, but then this system was not definitely framed from the very beginning, but gradually evolved in a country where Greek and Indian notions could influence each other, and such was the case where the Kharoshthi inscriptions are found.

If the results of calculations according to the Siddhantas are in agreement with all ascertainable facts, a strong presumption is raised in favour of the correctness of these results.

The era used in the older group of Kharoshthi inscriptions cannot, for reasons set forth in the Historical Introduction, have its epoch earlier than the demise of Mithra dates II, in 88 B.C., and hardly later than 60 B.C., the traditional date of the establishment of Saka power in Ujjaini.

Most of the inscriptions of the older group are dated in such a way that no inference can be drawn as to the epoch of the era, and none of the rulers mentioned in them can be the founder of the era, the oldest recorded dates being the years 56 (Maira) and perhaps 60 (Shahdor). There is only one date which contains an addition to the usual wording, viz. the Taxila silver scroll, dated 56 ayasa Ashadasa massa divase 15.

Here the addition ayasa distinguishes the date from all other Kharoshthi dates. In the discussion of this record below it will be shown that the only probable interpretation of this word is to take it as an equivalent of Skr. adyasya and as distinguishing the month Ashadhya as the 'first Ashadhya', i.e. there must in that particular year have been a second, intercalated, Ashadhya.

Intercalated months are well known in the Jyotisha and in later works. According to the Jyotisha there was an intercalated Ashadhya every five years, but we cannot well apply the rules of the Jyotisha to a calendar which is evidently half Greek. We must calculate accordingly to other rules, and, as already indicated, the system which presents itself is that of the Siddhantas.

Dr. van Wijk has done so, on the supposition that the epoch of the era cannot be earlier than 88 B.C., and that the date of the silver scroll cannot be later than a.d. 78. He has shown that, within those limits, only two years, viz. a.d. 52 and 71, had an intercalated Ashadhya. And of these only the former gives a likely dating. The latter would give an initial point about 65 B.C., and the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78 would belong to the year a.d. 13, only two years before the Sodasa inscription, and two years are insufficient for covering the intervening events.

The interpretation of the Taxila silver scroll not being certain, these results can only be considered as a working hypothesis. It is, however, remarkable how well it suits all ascertainable facts.

---

1 Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik, pp. 45 ff.
2 Acta Orientalia, iii, pp. 79 ff.
OLD SAKA ERA. OLDER INDIAN ERAS

If we assume that the year 1 of this old era, which may be designated as the old Corresponding Saka era, corresponded to 84-83 B.C., Dr. van Wijk’s calculations show the following correspondence:

1. Maira: [saam 58] = 27-26 B.C.
2. Shahdaur A: ... 60 = 25-24 B.C.
3. Shahdaur B: ?
4. Mānsehā: 68 = 17-16 B.C.
5. Fatejang: 16 Proshāhpada, 68 = 18 July, 17 B.C.
6. Taxila copper-plate: 5 Panemos, 78 = June, 6 B.C.
7. Muchāi: 81 = 4-3 B.C.
22. Hasshtnagar: 5 Proshāhpada, 384 = 7 June, A.D. 300.

As mentioned in the Historical Introduction, no. 10, the Takht-i-Bahi inscription The Azes also has another date, in the 26th year (during the reign) of the Mahārāja Guduvhara, era, and I have tried to show that this date should be referred to another era, instituted by Azes, the first Parthian ruler in North-western India.

This Parthian era is not used in other known records, and even in the Guduvhara inscription the corresponding year of the old Saka era is treated as the real date, the month and the day being given in connexion with it. It is evident that the old Saka era had got such a firm footing that it could not be replaced during the short-lived Parthian dominion.

It also, as will appear from nos. 16-23, continued to be used after the establishment The old of the later Śaka era and the accession of Kanishka, and such was apparently sometimes Saka era also the case outside of the area covered by Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions. For the Mathurā eras overlap. Brāhmī record of the year 299 must evidently be referred to this reckoning. It is not difficult to account for this state of things. The old Saka era was clearly the first secular era ever introduced in India.

We know from the inscriptions of Aśoka and Khāravela that ancient Indian rulers Older Indian dates dated their records in regnal years, and we can infer from these documents and from the Purāṇas that records were kept of the happenings in the different regnal years of individual kings and of the length of their reigns, which were also grouped together in dynastic lists. The Jaina stanzas quoted in the Historical Introduction are such an account of the duration of the different dynasties of Mañula intervening between Mahāvīra’s Nirvāṇa and the beginning of the Vikrama era. Such summaries can be characterized
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as lists of dynastic eras, but these 'eras' have never been in actual use; they are simply a summing up after the events.

We might even say that the idea of a secular era for practical purposes is un-Indian. The history of the Aryans had theoretically no beginning. Aryan civilization had developed in an unbroken line, chiefly under Brahmical influence, and the fact that the Aryans had once come into the country from outside had long been forgotten. Their history in India was assumed to be as old as creation, and there was no reason for marking out any event, such as the coming into power of an individual king or dynasty, otherwise than in the records of the royal offices.

It was only when new religions arose, which did not claim to continue Vedic tradition, that we can trace the use of real eras in India, viz. those of the Jainas and Buddhists. And it is characteristic that, in both cases, the starting-point is not the birth of the founder or the time of his illumination, but the moment when he disappeared from the world of men and was reabsorbed into the eternal reality of Nirvāṇa.

Such eras might be used by the clergy, or by clerks who were under their influence, for the purpose of dating secular events. Thus it has been assumed that there is a reference to the Buddhist era in the figure 256 in the Rūpāth edict of Aśoka, and that some of the events registered in the Khāravela inscription have been dated in the Jain era. But there is not the slightest indication to show that Indian rulers thought of imitating the Jainas and Buddhists in instituting dynastic eras. There was never, as stated above, a Mauryan era. If it had existed, we should certainly expect to find traces of it in the inscriptions of the Mauryan emperor Aśoka. And nobody has ever suggested the existence of any other old dynastic era.

It was on the north-west frontier that conditions prevailed which led to the cropping up of such eras. Brahmanism did not play the same role as in the east, and foreign conquerors had held sway for a considerable period. The Greek predecessors of the Indo-Scythians had of old a secular era, the Seleucid, which was also largely used by the Parthians, the overlords of the Sakas before they made themselves independent. There can hardly be any doubt that such models were at work when the Sakas, whose calendar was to a great extent based on that of their predecessors, began to continue the regnal era of an individual ruler after his death and thus established the first secular era in India.

This era naturally got a strong footing, and it has clearly served as a pattern, when later eras were introduced.

The Vikrama era seems, as we have seen, to have received the designation kṛita in order to distinguish it from the old Saka era, while the mention of the season and the seasonal months was introduced into the dates in accordance with the purely Indian calendar. But the year was called samvatsara and was Kartikādi, and the days of the month were counted through, as in the old Saka reckoning.

The Śodāsa inscription of the year 72 seems to show that the Vikrama era was also introduced in the Mathurā country, but we seem to be justified by the inscription of the year 299 in inferring that the old reckoning was not quite forgotten.

According to the Kālakāchāryakathānaka the Vikrama era in Mālava was subsequently replaced by a new era, instituted by the Saka king who made an end to Vikramāditya's dynasty. This is the historical Śaka era of A.D. 78. In the inscriptions of

SAKA AND KANISHKA ERAS

the Western Kshatrâpas we again find the month-names, but the months are divided into pakshas, and in other old inscriptions in the era we find seasonal months instead of the month-names. Vikramâditya's innovations have left their traces.

This new era was intended for use in the country which had been reconquered, and it was not introduced in the provinces where the old Saka reckoning had not been abolished. We therefore find north-western inscriptions, and even the Kharoshti record of the reign of Wima Kadphises, dated in the old Saka era also after the introduction of the second Saka era of A.D. 78.

In Malava itself the Vikrama era does not appear to have gone out of use. And Mathura we have already seen that it was introduced in Mathura. Here we should expect to find the new Saka era employed. It is, however, evident that Wima Kadphises did not make his power felt to any considerable extent in Mathura, and even in Malava and Kathiawar the Indianization of the name of the first kshatrapa as Bhumaka points to a growing influence exercised by Indian notions.

It was only later, after a fresh wave of Saka conquerors, that a new Saka era was really established in the Mathurâ country. The new conqueror was the famous Kanishka, and his introduction of a new era is a striking parallel to what happened after Wima Kadphises' conquest. This new era also conquered the north-west, though the old reckoning remained in use, side by side with the new one, in the northern provinces, just as it had done after Wima Kadphises' reconquest.

The Mathurâ inscriptions of Kanishka's dynasty remind us of the oldest Saka records after Wima Kadphises also in another respect, in so far as the seasonal months were retained, while the west stuck to the old Saka calendar.

The Saka era of A.D. 78 and the Kanishka era thus came to replace the Vikrama reckoning in such provinces where the Saka power had declined or had never been established. The great importance of Kanishka, however, led to his era being introduced also in the west, in those districts where his power was most strongly felt.

The first date in the Kanishka era has been found in the Kanishka stupa near the Peshâvar and is of the first year of the era. It is therefore evident that he brought it to India from his old home in Chinese Turkestan, and in the Historical Introduction I have tried to show that it was established on the occasion of an Indo-Scythian coalition some time after Wima Kadphises' death, which resulted in a powerful expedition to Eastern India under Kanishka.

It now remains to examine whether we have any indications which allow us to arrive at a conclusion as to the epoch of this, the third, Saka era.

And an examination of the records dated in this era will show that in two of the inscriptions the nakshatra current on the day when they were executed is mentioned. The Zeda inscription of the year 11 couples the Uttarakalpagni with the 20th Ashadha, and the Upd record of the year 61 the nakshatra Purvâshadha with the 8th Chaitra.

Such features do not occur every year, and in the case of these inscriptions, which are not too much removed in time from the Siddhântas, it seems to be comparatively safe to apply their methods to our calculations.

Dr. van Wijk has done so⁴ and arrived at the result that the only set of years within the limits with which we can reasonably reckon which fulfils the conditions is Kaliyuga 3240 for the Zeda and 3290 for the Upd inscription. The initial year of the Kanishka era would accordingly be A.D. 128-129.

Such an epoch seems to suit the circumstances. It was in A.D. 129 that the Khotan

---

1 Acta Orientalia, iii, pp. 83 ff.; v, pp. 168 ff.
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king Fang-ts‘ien attacked the neighbouring Kiū-μi, it is about this time that the Western Kshatrapa Chashani evinces an increase in his national pride in reintroducing the Saka name Ysamotka for his father, who called himself Bhūmakā, and we have every reason for believing that Kanishka started on his career in the year A.D. 128–129.

Assuming the epoch of the Kanishka era to be that year, the second group of dated Karoshṭhī inscriptions has been calculated by Dr. van Wijk to correspond to Christian dates in the following way:

25. Sui Vihār: 28 Daisios, 11 = 7 June, A.D. 139.
27. Māṇikāla: 20 Kārttika, 18 = 9 October, A.D. 145.
28. Box lid: 10 Artemisios, 18 = 20 April, A.D. 146.
33. Āra: 25 Jyaishtha, 41 = 24 April, A.D. 169.
34. Wardak: 15 Artemisios, 51 = 25 April, A.D. 179.
36. Mamāne Dheri: 5 Mārgaśīra, 89 = 1 November, A.D. 216.

I accept these identifications as a working hypothesis in my edition of Kharoshṭhī inscriptions.
GRAMMATICAL SKETCH

The Kharoshthi inscriptions have been found over a wide territory, from the Swat country in the north to Sui Vihār and Mohenjo Daro in the south, from Mathura in the east to Wardak and Loralai in the west. Nevertheless, the language is fairly uniform everywhere.

It would, however, be premature to infer that this vernacular was the current speech over the whole territory in the centuries before and after the beginning of our era. We must evidently exclude the Mathura country and perhaps districts such as Pāthiyār, Kanhiāra, and Karnāl in the east, and probably Wardak in the west. With regard to Khalatse and Loralai we are not in a position to judge with confidence.

If we abstract from such outlying districts, it will be seen that the linguistic area covered by these inscriptions roughly coincides with the territory where we, at the present day, find Lahndi and Dardic, or Iranian languages. The language of the inscriptions is not Iranian, but an Indian Prákrt, and it is evident that the border line between Indian and Iranian has formerly run farther west than at the present day. With regard to the relationship between this old Prákrt and the Indian vernaculars of the present day, there can hardly be any doubt that we must rather think of Dardic than of Lahndi, which latter language seems to owe its present-day form to a strong influence exercised by the languages of the Middle Country, farther east.

As already stated, the language of the inscriptions is fairly uniform. We cannot, however, expect to find an absolute consistency. In the first place the area is very extensive, and there are consequently minor dialectic variations. Some traces might also be expected to be found of the different ethnic elements who lived in the country in the centuries when the inscriptions were written. As a matter of fact, however, there is nothing to remind us of the Greeks, if we abstract from some Greek names and titles, and the case does not seem to be different with regard to the Scythians and Parthians. On the other hand, we must reckon with a certain influence exercised by literary languages.

The Kharoshthi country was the home of Pāṇini, the famous Sanskrit grammarian, and Taxila was an old seat of learning. The Sarvāstivādins, who made extensive use of Sanskrit, were an influential community in the north-west, and they are repeatedly mentioned in Kharoshthi inscriptions. We might, therefore, reasonably expect to find some Sanskritisms in the language. As a matter of fact we find a complete Sanskrit sentence in a Peshāwar inscription, and the language of the Tor Dherai records is almost pure Sanskrit.

The north-western Prákrt was itself at an early date used for literary purposes. An old manuscript of a version of the Dhammapada has been found near Khotan, and parts of it have been edited by Messrs. Senart¹ and Oldenburg.² I shall designate this important text as Dhp., giving my own readings but retaining M. Senart’s numbering of the leaves as A, B, C, m¹ and m² respectively, and marking the quotations from the leaf published by Professor Oldenburg as O. The Dhammapada was not, however, the only canonical text translated into the dialect. The Kurram casket inscription contains a

¹ JA, ix, xii, 1898, pp. 193 ff., reprinted by Benimadhab Barua and Sailendranath Mitra, Prakrit Dhammapada, Calcutta, 1921.
² Predvaritelnaja samotka o buddijskoi rukopisi, Sanktpeterburg, 1897.
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quotation from another work, and also elsewhere, as for instance in the Wardak inscription, it is perhaps possible to find traces of canonical writings.

Such works were evidently translated from a more eastern language, which might, in this way, come to exercise a slight influence on the local vernacular when used in written records. But the chief influence was evidently exercised by the north-western book-language itself.

The Dhp. shows a remarkably consistent system of noting the various sounds of the dialect. But it is evident that some difficulty was experienced, because some of the sounds were foreign to other Indian languages. In the inscriptions this difficulty has led to some inconsistency, and it is not always possible to be absolutely certain about the nature of some of the sounds, which may, moreover, have been slightly different in the different districts. On the whole, however, it seems possible to draw a fairly accurate picture of the dialect.

The vowels are, broadly, the same as in other Prākrits. Long and short vowels are, it is true, only rarely distinguished in writing, but the metrical Dhp. shows that they were distributed as in other Prākrits. There are no long diphthongs, ai and au having become e and o, respectively; thus Vēsakha, Skr. Vaiśākha; Praṭahavada, Skr. Prauṣṭhapadā. In foreign words we occasionally find ai for a; thus Daśika, Greek Deīov (Sūr Vihār); kātraka, Latin caeae (Āra).

Short and long a are both written a; thus praṇa, Skr. praṇa (Tor Dherai). An initial a is occasionally dropped; thus vi ya, Skr. api cha (Lion Cap.), rāja, rathā, Skr. aranya (Kurram, Hidda, Jamālgāri). In the Dhp. a sometimes becomes i in the neighbourhood of y; thus ni, Skr. ayam; brāhmaṇa, Skr. brahmaṇya. Similarly we find ayimita for āyimita (Lion Cap.); bhūi for bhūyah (Zeda), but also bhūya (War dak). In a similar way a sometimes becomes u in the neighbourhood of labial and nasal sounds; thus Kusūluka (Patika), Kusūlau (Lion Cap.), evidently derived from Kusula. In the case of kshūna, for which Sakia has kṣāna; Tocharian kshyan; urjhyana, Sakia akshyanai (Takht-i-Bahi), it is possible that we have to do with a change of ā to u before n, of a similar kind as in Pashto.

Such stray irregularities may be considered as indications of a tendency towards a certain harmonization of neighbouring sounds. The case is different with doublets such as atra (Patika), itra (Dewai), etra (Maṇkiāla), because here we may have to do with formations from different bases. And the form sarvajña (Wardak) for the usual sarvajña is evidently due to contamination, while the apparent i-stroke in Sudāna side by side with Śudāna (Lion Cap.) is probably a sign of reference.

I and i are both written i, cf. divasa, sārīra. There cannot, however, be any doubt that the length of the vowel is the same as in Sanskrit. In pukarāṇi (Kālārāṇa), as compared with pukarili (Pāṭhāyār) we have the same tendency towards assimilation of neighbouring sounds which we noticed in the case of a. The same is the case with khanasa, Skr. kṣhaṃ, *kṣhyanasa (Dewai), cf. e.g. parasa, Skr. parasmin. Dhp. A. 6. In Vāṣṭikā, Skr. Vāṣṭikha, on a Jamālgāri pedestal, we have the well-known open sound of the Prākrits before a double consonant. Cf. also the form etsa mentioned above. The form maheśhri, Skr. mahishi, on the Lion Cap. has its parallel in Pāli maheśhri. It is more difficult to judge the e in foreign names such as Kanṣhika side by side with Kanṣhika (Kanṣhika casket, Sūr Vihār, Zeda, Mānikāla, Āra), Honeška (Wardak), Vajheška (Āra). It is possible that the actual sound was the same as Saka a and was difficult to render with the available signs. The Peshāwar inscription, no. 21, seems to

1 Cf. my remarks, Festschrift für Ernst Windisch, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 85 ff.
have u in Vajkhushka, cf. Kalhaṇa’s Jaukhka, and this writing also points to a difficulty in rendering the actual sound. Of a similar kind are the doublets Minjunukrita and Munjunukrita on the Sirkap silver plates and the writing i for Greek e in Migandra, Menandros (Peshawar, no. 1938).

The treatment of u, ū is quite parallel; cf. <i>hu</i>, Skr. bhavatu, puyar, Skr. prājyai u and ū. (Taxila silver scroll). In kutiṃbha, kutumbīni, Skr. kutumbīni (Dharmarājikā, Sui Vihār) we seem to have a case of harmonizing. The isolated o in Bodhās (Tirath), as compared with the common Budha, is comparable with the e in Vasetha, and the o of Hoveshka (Wardak) has its parallels in the e of this and similar names. The u of Theiddama (Bajaur), Theiddora (Śwät casket), Theiddara (Sirkap) renders a Greek o, just as o is used for u in Greek legends such as xophus, kujula; pavoro pao, shavānu shaw, &c.

The vowel ri seems to have had the same development as in other Prākrits; thus ri guha, Skr. griha (Taxila silver scroll); kata, Skr. krita, upakacha, Skr. upakṛitiya (Zeda); tashu, Skr. triśśu (Kurram); kiti, Skr. kriti (Kumrahār). After p an old ri apparently becomes ra in pradhṛavi, padhṛavi (Lion Cap.); pradhṛavi, padhṛavi (Dhp.), for Skr. pṛitkiśu. Forms such as Krishayasa (Kanhiāra), Krīṣa (Karnāl), matapiśrinam (Tor Dherai) are probably Sanskritisms.

Old e is well preserved; thus tena ime (Taxila silver scroll). E also represents old e, ai, as already stated. In atura, Skr. antahpura (Lion Cap.), o is hardly derived from an old a. The e which is used in the nominative of a-bases in several inscriptions will be mentioned in connexion with the inflexion of nouns. The e of evṛkha (Takht-i-Bāhi) finds its explanation in the phonetical tendencies of the Saka language, to which the word belongs; cf. Saka alyānai, eyānai, ’prince’. In the locative singular of a-bases we sometimes find i for e; thus athami (Und), ekachaparīśā (Ārā), masi (Mamāne Dheri), panihami (Hashtnagar). Such forms are probably due to analogy, influenced by the parallel form in -ami. In the Dhp. there is a certain confusion between i, i.e., ṣ, and e; thus balanebu, Skr. balānīkam O 29; adea, Skr. aṣṭāda C 38; imi, Skr. ime A 4; savishu bhudeku, Skr. savasāshu bhūteshu B 39, &c. It is uncertain whether such writings represent a tendency in the dialect or are due to the influence of Sakish, where old e regularly becomes i.

O regularly represents Skr. o and au; cf. loo, Skr. lokaḥ (Taxila gold plate); dorma- o, nasta, Skr. daṃmamasya (Kurram). As in most western Prākrits the Sāndhi form o has become universal in the nominative singular of masculine a-bases over an extensive territory of the Kharoshṭhi area. As in the Dhp., o is often written instead.

The u, i.e., probably ū, in names such as Śudasa, Muki (?), Kamunia (Lion Cap.) probably finds its explanation in the rules of the Saka language, where old o becomes ū.

As in other Prākrits we find instances of the change of aya, ayi to e, aya to o; thus aya, aya, ḍhavati, Skr. sthāpayati; <i>hu</i>, Skr. bhavatu; Budhoruma, Skr. Buddhavarma, &c.

The rules of Sāndhi were evidently the usual ones. Late forms such as jināsa Sāndhi. for jineṣa; vamāra for virāna (Jauḷā) do not prove anything for the genuine vernacular.

With regard to consonants, we find many of the usual Prākrit features: preservation Consonants. of initials, dropping of finals, and assimilation of compound stops. Thus kuva, Skr. kūpa; khada, Skr. khāta; chadu, Skr. chatur; jadi, Skr. jāti; tena, Skr. tena; dhatu, Skr. dhatu; pada, Skr. pada; Buddh, Skr. Buddha; aṣṭati, Skr. aṣṭayuj; uta, Skr. ukta; salati, Skr. saptati; samunputra, Skr. simunputra. In <i>hu</i> (Taxila scroll), side by side with bhavatu in other records, we have the change of bh to k which is common in this base.

It will be seen that the treatment of compound stops is the usual one, the first being merged in the second. The result is a doubled consonant, which is not further changed. This fact and the metrics of the Dhp., where syllables ending in a double consonant are
long, show that we cannot think of a state of affairs like that in Sindhi and Dardic, with a single consonant and a preceding short vowel, as has sometimes been assumed.\footnote{Cf. Griswold, JRAS, 1913, pp. 141 ff.}

With regard to intervocalic stops the state of things is less clear. Double stops remain, as already remarked, unchanged, as in other Prakrits. In the case of uncompound intervocalic stops the state of things is more complicated. We find the usual tendency towards voicing; replacing by \( y \), and final disappearance. Some features, however, point to a tendency towards a fricative pronunciation of such sounds, not only in the case of labials, where it is common in all Prakrits, but also elsewhere. We cannot here expect to find a consistent system of writing outside of the literary texts. For the alphabet had no proper signs for such sounds, and, besides, the mental picture may sometimes, as in other languages, have differed from the actual sound, and there may also have been some difference in the different districts. We cannot, therefore, do more than draw attention to such features as seem to be of interest, and it will be necessary to analyse the state of affairs in some detail.

With regard to intervocalic \( k \) we must distinguish between different cases. In the first place we have the numeral \( eka \), where the \( k \) is always preserved, but where we have perhaps to do with the common Prakrit form \( ekka \). The case is different in the compound \( pratyeka \), for which the Taxila scroll has \( pra\text{ch}[e^*]ga \).

Then we have those cases where an intervocalic \( k \) stands at the beginning of the second part of a compound and may have been treated as an initial, as is often the case in the Prakrits; cf. \( punakara \) (Panjâr), \( upakaca \) (Zeda), \( dharmakathi \) (Sui Vîhâr), \( navakamika \) (Patika), etc. The Dhp. shows that this treatment is not the only one, for we find forms such as \( sagarauka \), Skr. \( samkâraûka \) C\textsuperscript{2} 3; \( uthanal\)ālā, Skr. \( uṭhānakālā \) A\textsuperscript{3} 9.

Where intervocalic \( k \) belongs to the base, it is usually modified; thus \( pra\text{ch}[e^*]ga \), Skr. \( pratyeka \) (Taxila scroll); \( tōra \), Skr. \( tōka \) (Kurram); \( sakra \), Skr. \( sāka \) (Lion Cap.). On the other hand, we have \( oke \) (Jamâlgarhi); \( svakīya \) (Tor Dherai), where it is possible to think of the influence of Sanskrit, and \( Pravasakura \) (Peshawar, no. 20), which I cannot analyse.

Most instances of intervocalic \( k \) occur in the suffix \( ka \). In the first place there is a series of foreign names and words such as \( Diaka \), Mevuki, Miyika (Lion Cap.), Patika (Patika, Lion Cap.), \( Liaka \) (Patika, Zeda), \( Motka \) (Panjâr), \( Urasaka \) (Taxila scroll), \( Granabhryaka \) (Mânjkiâla), \( Jihonika \) (Taxila silver vase), \( Daśika \) (Sui Vîhâr), \( Avadunaka \) (Kurram); \( Kusulika \) (Patika); \( horaka \) (Lion Cap.), \( marjakâ \) (Zeda). Here the \( k \) is usually preserved. Forms such as \( Kusulua \) (Lion Cap.), \( Moga \) (Patika), for which the Lion Cap. seems to have \( Muki \), seem to show that also here there was a tendency to modify the sound.

In purely Indian words we likewise often find \(-k-\) preserved; thus \( sabhâyuka \), Skr. \( sabhâryaka \) (Taxila Meridarkh plate), \( navakamika \), Skr. \( navakarmika \) (Patika), \( Iṣaraka \), Skr. \( Iṣvaraka \) (Taxila ladle), \( tauraka \) (Panjâr, uncertain), \( upakâ \) (Sui Vîhâr), \( karavaca \), \( sanvordhaka \) (Mânjkiâla), \( tanwasaka \) (Kurram), \( Makaḍaka \) (Mount Banj), \( Udītaka \) (Jamâlgarhi), \( nagarâka \) (Jauliâ). In other cases, however, \(-k-\) is changed to \( g \); thus \( nayaga \), \( navakarmiga \), \( apanaga \) (Mânjkiâla), \( jalayiga \), \( avashadriga \), \( yetiga \), \( mithyaga \), \( mahanâmigha \) (Wardak), \( Vashištu \) (Muchai). In the Wardak vase inscription we often find \( gra \) instead; thus \( gadriga \), \( kadalayiga \), \( matiga \), \( sambhatigra \), \( navagra \), where the \( r-\)stroke has a slightly different shape from \( r \) in old \( gra \). In a similar way the Lion Cap. has \( saman[u]môtrakra \), Skr. \( samanumodaka \), \( nukra \), Skr. \( nagarâka \), with \( kr \) for old \(-ka\).
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cix

In a few cases -k- is replaced by y; thus samvatтарaye (Patika, Mount Banj, Pāñāj, dakshe[?])nayae (Taxila Meridarkh plate), ekadasa[?][s]i)mayae (Pāñāj), ekaśītmaye (Muchai), Karīya (Mānikiāla). More frequently, however, the -k- has apparently disappeared; thus loo (Taxila gold plate), satatimae (Patika), mahasaghītana, nabarasa, utrasma, Khwarda, Kamanīa (Lion Cap.), sambatśara tisatimae (Takhti-Bāhi), edno (Kala Sang, uncertain), Kasna (Panjūr, uncertain), Bahalí, taṇyāva (Taxila scroll), Takshaśīla (Taxila), dharmarāya (ibidem), navakarmī (Kanishka casket, Hidda), sambatśara ekachatpariśat (Ārā), shawana (Jamālgerhi, Pāñātī Dheri), Podwa (Jamālgerhi), satimae (Skāraḥ Dheri), Sīhāf[?][s]a, Ab[?][s]ar[?][s]a (Lotyān Tangail), &c.

It is of interest to compare the treatment of intervocalic g. We find g in nagara, Intervocalic bhagavā (Patika), bhagavā, parichagga, nagara (Taxila scroll), Nagadatta (Sui Vihār), &c., bhagavā (Mānikiāla), nagaraka (Jauliā), pariyaga (Tor Dherai); gr in bhagavata (Swāt vace, Bimarān, Kurram, Wardak), -marogra, bhagva side by side with bhaga (Wardak) and kr in nākraśta, nākraśa, bhakrava (Lion Cap.).

If we compare the state of things in the Dhp. we find -k- preserved in moyaka, Skr. mochaka; shavaka, Skr. śravaṇa, &c.; changed to y in kṣiravaya, Skr. kṣirapaṭa, &c., and dropped in suka, Skr. vyāka; athagā, Skr. ashtaḥgīka, &c. For -g- we usually find k; thus raka, Skr. raga; uraka, Skr. uraga. Occasionally -g- becomes y; thus mūya-madī, Skr. mrigamātrīka.

Now we shall see below that old -y- is occasionally also represented by k, gr, and it is possible that we have to do with a strongly fricative sound, approaching that of a voiced guttural fricative. The natural inference is that intervocalic k had a marked tendency towards voicing, and that both -k- and -g- were further reduced to a fricative sound. And in this connexion it is worth remembering that guttural fricatives are found in modern Khovā.1

Intervocalic bh is partly preserved, as in Vēṇaka (Takhti-Bāhi, Dewail), subha (Sui Intervocalic Vihār), and the frequent danamukha; partly changed to k, as in suka (Pāñāj, Kanishka casket), danamukha (Dewail, Bimarān). Similarly we find suka and suha in the Dhp. It is possible that we have before us a tendency towards a fricative pronunciation of a similar kind as in modern Khovā.

With regard to intervocalic gh we have no inscriptive material. The Dhp. has Intervocalic forms such as lāhu, Skr. laṅku; oha, Skr. oga.

Intervocalic cha is sometimes preserved; thus ekačaparīṣat (Ārā), acharya (Kanishka Intervocalic casket, Sui Vihār, Kurram, Wardak, Tor Dherai), Kedachā (Peshāvar, no. 20, Mānikiāla), patalas. Elsewhere it is replaced by y; thus ayaria (Lion Cap.), sahāraya (Muchai, Kala Sang). The initial of cha, 'a, shows the same inconsistency; thus thsya cha sagharama cha (Lion Cap.), Chukkasa cha, bhaṅkavasa cha (Patika), tatra cha (Panjūr), mata cha (Sui Vihār), Buriyana cha, bhuddhi cha, shavahecha (Mānikiāla), mithyagaya cha, parīvara cha (Wardak), but viyā (Lion Cap.), avi ya, jalayuga ya (Wardak). After an old anusvāra cha is the rule; thus sarīha cha (Shahdaur), samgharamani cha (Patika), imo cha (Ārā), oya cha (Kurram), yo cha (Wardak). We may compare the state of things in the Dhp.: twaya, Skr. tvaccham; šadnya cha, śrīyeshu cha, dīva ya radi cha, Skr. dīva cha ratrimi cha, &c.

Intervocalic j is quite parallel; thus frequently raja, maharara, with the same tattusa form as in modern vernaculars, yavara (Lion Cap.), aṇḍara (Wardak), where j stands at the beginning of the second part of a compound, but maharaya (Patika, Takhti-Bāhi), pynya (Patika, Lion Cap., Takhti-Bāhi, Taxila scroll, and Meridarkh plate, Dharmarajika, Kālīrn, Jamālgerhi, Wardak) yuvarya (Lion Cap.), vavira (Mount

---
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Banj). In dhmaratva (Taxila scroll) the sound is not noted before i. In words such as Rajula (Lion Cap.), Urumujja (Panjtar), j may stand for ū or for a.

The Dhnp. regularly has y for j; thus vīravā, Skr. vīrajas, teṣasa, Skr. tejasā. And it seems probable that intervocalic ch and j had a sound which was very near to that of y, if it did not actually coincide with it.

Intervocalic chh is properly a compound and is consequently not changed; cf. pali-chhina (Lion Cap.), pachchi. (Mansehāra).

Intervocalic t occurs as dr in gadrīgra, e.g. Skr. ghāṭikā (Wardak), and as t in kūṭinbha (Sui Vīhar), kūṭibhi (Dharmarajika). To judge from Dhnp., where we find d throughout, the latter is probably a Sanskritized writing. Intervocalic d remains unchanged; thus edua (Kalā Sang), shoḍaṣa (Fatehjang). In Kurram and Wardak it is written dr, perhaps to indicate a fricative sound; thus shadrayadana (Kurram), padriyamsā (Wardak).

Intervocalic dh occurs as dh in padhravi, pradhravi (Lion Cap.). In the word Aśadha it is always deaspirated; thus aśadha (Taxila scroll, Zeda, Und, Skārah Dheri).

In the Dhnp. intervocalic t always becomes d with the exception of ghadhedi, Skr. ghatayati O 19; kusidhu, Pali kusto C17; samidha, Skr. svanātā A1; saṅghadhāna, Skr. sāṃskṛtadharma C14, 14, where we have dh, and chaṭrī, Skr. chaṭurādha A4; aśhā, Skr. abhāt B7; phāṣā, Skr. spatiṣa A10, where it has apparently disappeared.

In Kharoshthi inscriptions -t- very often remains unmodified; thus stitiye, pratiye, bhagratavo (Swāt vase), etaye, kshharatavo, pratihaveti, mālapairav (Patika), chatu (Takhti-Bāhi, Taxila ladle, Tor Dherai), hota, mālapitū (Taxila scroll), tathagato (Jaulā), bhavatu (Kanishka casket, Sui Vīhar, Hidda, Wardak), satimā (Skārah Dheri), &c. In other cases it becomes d; thus chadu (Bedadi, Pālāṇa Dheri, Skārah Dheri), madu pita (Takhti-Bāhi), hidamātta (Pājā), karavīde (Panjtar), pauthi, aya de (Taxila scroll), salokidha (Dharmarajika), khavāde (Peshāwar, no. 20), karavīde (Peshāwar, no. 5), pratihaveti (Peshāwar, no. 4), hida (Kanishka casket), niyati (Bimarān), eda (Manikāla), paritavida (box lid), shadrayadana, jādi, ikkhi (Kurram), edeva (Hidda), khaddo (Shakardara), khade (Zeda, Ārā), madu (Zeda), kadalayēra, bhagratavo, mālapidāra, bhrodara (Wardak), ginda (Loriyan Tangai), Podanā, pratihavīde (Jamālgāhi), bhāradu (Skārah Dheri).

On the Lion Cap. we always find tr for -t-; thus dhittra, matra, pitramahi, pratithavito, bhagratavo, chaṭrā, niyati, niyatra. Similarly we have Sivarākṣhatra, bhagratavo (Bimarān) and apparently pratihavīde (Swāt vase). Finally -t- has apparently disappeared in pratihavīte (Taxila gold plate), pratihavīde (Jamālgāhi), niyati (Mamāne Dheri). In all these cases it is possible to think of a kind of dissimilation.

It may be of interest to compare the treatment of intervocalic d. It usually remains as d; thus podari (Tirath), panchadadra (Pājā, Peshāwar, no. 20), Khudachā (Peshāwar, no. 20, Māṇikāla), sarvastivadana, vedana, uṣṇadāna, sammadacca (Kurram), Vasudeva, Idrāmeda (Peshāwar, no. 21), sāda (Māṇikāla, Wardak), Pratihavata (Hashtnagar, Loriyan Tangai), pade (Skārah Dheri). In some cases, however, we find t instead; thus Pratihavata (Fatehjang), sarvastivatana (Kanishka casket), samayamāte (Kurram), Theilata (Sirkap). On the Lion Cap. we regularly find t instead; thus pratvāda, sarvastivatara, saman[d]matra, uṣṭra.

We get the impression that there was a traditional writing in accordance with the Sanskrit system, but that the actual sound of intervocalic t was voiced, and that -t- and -d- both tended towards a fricative sound. And in this connexion it is of interest that modern Khowār with its r and Kalāshā with its t for old -r- seem to presuppose a similar state of affairs.

1 Cf. Festschrift für Ernst Windisch, pp. 88 ff.
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That intervocalic \( t \) was voiced might also be inferred from such cases where it becomes \( d \) in the neighbourhood of \( r \); thus \( padi, padi \) (Māṇikīlā, Wardak). Also intervocalic \( d \) is apparently treated in the same way in meridakha (Taxila) side by side with meridarkha (Swat). Whether the fricative sound prevailed over the whole territory and whether it was strongly pronounced we cannot say.

Intervocalic \( th \) is generally retained; thus Rāthitara (Pāthyrā), dharmakathē (Sui Intervocalic Vihār), yathā (Kurram), tathāgata (Jauliā). In the neighbourhood of \( r \) we find the same cerebralization as in the case of \( t \); thus paḍhama (Panjīrā), paḍhāna (Jamālgharī), and perhaps prathama (Takhlīr-Bāhī, prathravī and pādhravī (Lion Cap.)). The Dhp. has añhy B 8, O 6, 15, añhy B 7, 24, āvī 21, prathama O 14, paḍhama C 5, &c. It seems probable that \( th \) represents the traditional writing and that the actual sound was voiced. The cerebralization was probably accompanied by a disappearance of \( r \) as a separate sound, so that paḍhama, paḍhāna, prathama, paḍhama are all different attempts at rendering paḍhra.

Of intervocalic \( dh \) the only example is devadhāma (Kanishka casket, Mamāne Dheri, Tor Dherai). In the Tor Dherai record the \( dh \) here looks like \( kh \).

Intervocalic \( p \) is sometimes retained; thus kṣatrīpa (Patika, Taxila silver vase, Intervocalic Zeda, Māṇikīlā), ēvakṣitā (Taxila scroll, Sui Vihār, Arā), Būsāparo, Uṛvarāparo (Lion C. Cap.), arpaṇaya, upasakā thāpākchari (Sui Vihār), upakacchā (Zeda), kuṣa (Arā), karapakā (Māṇikīlā), prātisapita (Hidda), upajaya (Mamāne Dheri), ṭṛpa (Tor Dherai). In other cases it becomes \( v \); thus prāvahava, prāvahava (Fatehjang, Hashtnagar, Lorīyān Tangai, kṣatrīva, prāvahavītra, ēvakṣitā (Lion Cap.), thvau (Lion Cap., Taxila vase), jhva (Māṇikīlā), karavāka, dhv (Kaldarā, Panjīrā, Peshāwar, no. 5), sāvita (Taxila scroll and Meridarkh plate), prēkhavide (Jamālgharī), -sāvita (Taxila vase), -śavidi (Peshāwar, no. 4), -śaveti (Kurram, Wardak), prēkhavetiye (Taxila gold plate), namarvau, upadana, upagrasu (Kurram), kavita (Māṇikīlā), avadhāra ḍravā (Wardak), kuva (Peshāwar, no. 21, Shakardarā). In kṣv (Muchai, Mārgu, Peshāwar, no. 20, Zeda) \( p \) has apparently disappeared. In karavhā (Māṇikīlā) and Dīvahakara (Nowshera) the \( v \) has become aspirated, and the same sound is perhaps intended in Mahāphatirona (Kurram). In thvau (Kurram, Hidda, Taxila Meridarkh plate, Wardak) and perhaps tubaga (Lorīyān Tangai) \( b \) is written for old \( ḍ \).

Intervocalic \( b \) occurs as \( b \) in -rodhibalasa, alibalana (Maira), and is perhaps changed to \( v \) in sāvalakṣadāpithā (Shahdaur).

We again get the impression that the voiceless and the voiced sounds are treated in the same way, and in the Dhp. we throughout find \( v \); thus paśe B 5, akavanrakha B 30, aśalaha A 7. But we must infer that the writing \( p \) is traditional or, in compound words, influenced by the initial \( p \), and that forms such as thvau owe their \( b \) to the fact that intervocalic \( b \) was pronounced as \( v \), or else ṭhapa has become thunpa and further thumha.

We have not sufficient materials for judging the treatment of intervocalic Intervocalic aspirated labials. We have Utraraphaguṇa (Zeda), ahbhiknte (Hidda), and in the Dhp. kha, bh forms such as labha B 21, nabhimardadhi A 7, pravahaguna C 3, salavha B 20, avica B 7, navishai O 23, abhiyau B 30. From the treatment of \( p \), \( b \) it would be natural to infer a pronunciation \( v \).

Some of the words quoted above show signs of a weakening of the difference between aspirated and non-aspirated sounds. Cf. padigra as against Skr. ghatika (lion and redundant aspiration). Wardak), asaḍha, Skr. uṣabha (Taxila scroll, Zeda, Skārah Dheri), upajaya, Skr. upaṣṭhə, dekṣaya (Mamāne Dheri) and, on the other hand, karadakha (Māṇikīlā), Maṃkpatia (Kurram), Dīvahakara (Nowshera), dhv side by side with drh for drakhma (Taxila silver plate). There are several further examples in the Dhp. They are not, however, sufficient
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N and ɐ.

For judging with confidence. It is possible that they are due to the influence of the Iranian tendencies of some of the individuals who made use of the language.

With regard to nasals the most difficult question is about the distribution between the dental and cerebral sounds. In the Aśoka inscriptions we, on the whole, find a state of things similar to that in Sanskrit. In Māṇeshrā, however, we have ūṇi for ūṇi, ṣaṇiṇa for ṣaṇiṇa, and in Shāhāzgarhī forms such as kṣahanaya, garaṇa, avipraṇiki, pranatika, and always ɐ in inflexional terminations after ū, ū, and ɐ, but, on the other hand, propunati and, once, devana priye.1 It seems as if the state of things in the north-west was not any more quite the same as in Sanskrit.

In the Dhp. old ɐ remains as a dental when it is an initial or doubled, while every single intervocalic ɐ becomes ɐ.2

In Kharoshthi inscriptions the state of affairs seems to be rather complicated, and it is possible there were local differences. We must also, a priori, reckon with the possibility of a certain influence exercised by Sanskrit, and also by the languages of the Middle Country, where later Śauraseni shows that there was a tendency to cerebralize every ɐ.

In distinguishing between ɐ and ɐ I shall throughout follow Bühler’s system of transliteration, which suits the state of things in the Aśoka inscriptions. It is, however, conceivable that the role of the two signs has sometimes been inverted.

Such is possibly the case in the inscription on the Śūta relic vase, perhaps the oldest of all these records, where we read Thēudorena, meridarknēta, but sakauman, janā. It seems probable that ɐ and ɐ, written ɐ and ɐ, respectively, are here distinguished as in Sanskrit. The same is perhaps also the case in the old Tirath inscription, where sakaumanisa pana may stand for sakaumanisa pana. It is, however, also possible that we have to do with a state of things as in modern Khowār, where an ɐ prevents the cerebralization of intervocalic ɐ.

If we leave these old records aside it is advisable to examine the various inscriptions in geographical arrangement, beginning from the east.

In Mathurā, which is situated outside of the territory where the north-western Prākrit was spoken and belongs to the Śauraseni area, we are only concerned with the Lion Cap, because the elephant inscription does not contain any ɐ or ɐ, while the Rāwal record is only a copy of the Shakardāra epigraph. The Capital has no ɐ; the dental ɐ occurs both as initial (nisima, vakranā, Nada) and as intervocalic, and here both correspond to Skr. ɐ (atrenā, pariṇaṇa, praghana) and to ɐ (sarrastvaṇrana, mahasaghīna, budhana, &c.). The Capital was set up by members of the local Saka dynasty, but in connexion with Saka chiefs from Taxila and other places. The inscription may have been drafted by a Saka, and in the Saka language ɐ is a secondary sound. It is not, however, possible to use the forms of the Capital with confidence.

In Māṇikiālā we enter the area of the north-western Prākrit. We there find ɐ as an initial in navakarmigena, but ɐ in naga; ɐ as intervocalic in Kayeskasa, Gushana, dada-

1 Cf. Hultsch, Inscriptions of Aśoka, pp. xcviii, lxxv.
2 Cf. Festschrift für Ernst Windisch, pp. 87 ff.
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Rohiniṃitreṇa according to the Dhp. rule, but Panemasa, mahadanapati, savabudhana in accordance with Sanskrit. It is possible that an attempt was made to follow the Sanskrit rules. The form bakamunisa, however, shows that there was a tendency to cerebrate an intervocalic n. The volute bracket inscription has regularly niyatīte, but Savatratena.

The silver scroll only knows n, both as initial and as intervocalic (thus Intasahria-putraṇa Bahuṭheṇa Naḥaḥaḥ yagare vastavena), and in the Sihila vase, the Meritarkha, the Dharmarājikā, and most Sirkap inscriptions only intervocalic n occurs. In Jauliā, n and ū seem to be used promiscuously (danamukho 2, 4, 5, danamukho 7, 8, 10; vanasa 7).

In the Hazara District we find only n, in cases where also Skr. has n at Shahdaur (rajana, vaḍhān...), and throughout at Bedāṭi (dana, acharyana, Kashyapiyana). Here accordingly -n- and -n- seem to have the same value.

Farther to the west we find the Dhp. rule observed at Shakardarra (nokrame, droni-vadana, danamukho, saharaya). In neighbouring districts only intervocalic n occurs, the cerebral ū in Fatejhāng (Vadhāṭṭirāṇa, sahāyana, danamukho), Panjāṭ (Śravanas, Gushayasa, dana, āūkāvara), Zeda (Phaguna, Kānishtaka, danamukho, pujane, dāya, aṇgraheṇa), Mārguz (dārana), and Ārā (kshunāmi, Dastavahereṇa, putraṇa, pīḷaṇa, atmaṇa, aṇgraheṇaḥ, sarvasad-paḷīṇa), the only exception being in the foreign name Kanishtaka of the last-mentioned record. The distribution accordingly seems to be as in the Dhp. Yakubi has only -n- (danamukho, jīnakumaro), as is also the case in Ujjj (kshunāmi).

A similar state of things is found to the north of the Indus, where all examples are again of intervocalic n, which occurs as ū at Mount Banj (danamukho), Kala Sang (...yāraṇa Pīpadakhaṇa), Muchai (saḥyayaṇa Vāshiṣṭiyaya), Kāldrata (putraṇa, Thāṭ-doreṇa, pukaraṇa, sapāṇa, śravanas), Pājā (Śravanas, Ananda-puṭraya, Sānghamitrena, sarvasataraṇa), and Takhti-Dāhi (Beyanasa, shadhdaya, erjñaya), while Lōriyān Tāngai (danamukho 4901, 4860, 5059; danamukho 4993) and Jamālārhi (danamukha, image halo; thuna, pillar base; danamukha, so[ta]*[j]īka, dākṣapīla...), pedestal, but shavaena, Podaeion, stone inscription) seem to use -n- and -n- promiscuously.

In Hashtnagar we find n for Skr. ū and ū in Shahrī-Nāpurāṇ (shamayasa, daṇamukhe, -n- in Ghaz-Dheri (danamukhe) and Pālāṭī Dheri (shamanana, danamukhe, Kāṣṭāpyaniyana), and once (in samatuyayan) ū in Mamāṇe Dheri, and -n- at Skārah Dheri (ekūna, tayayeshu).

From the Peshāvar District we have -n- and ū on the Kanishka casket (Kanishka or Kanakeshaka, sarvasataraṇaḥ, Mahasanasa, acharyana, sarvasatavatiṇa; but apparently yagavara, navakarmiṇa), i. e. the state of things is the same as in the Dhp., but the role of the two signs is inverted; we find -n- on the Shāh-ji-ki-Dheri brick (Budhasena), and in the Peshāvar Museum inscriptions, nos. 20 (Travaṣakuraṇa, daṇamukha, khapatvede), 21 (kshunāmi, khavade, Vasmudvena, Idraścaputraṇa, vastavena, bramhaṇeṇa, danas [y]e) and 1938 (Mipāṇārāse). Still farther west we have n both assimilative and between vowels at Bimarrān (niyaṭide, daṇamukhe, sarvabuddhaṇa) and Wardak (yagavara, imeṇa, oroḍakṣiṇīya, &c.), while Kurram (numarwa, tanuvakarni, acharyana, &c.) and Hidda (navakarmiṇa, &c.) have ṇ in both positions.

In the south we have the Sui Vihār inscription with its marked Sanskritization, where ū and ū are distinguished as in Sanskrit (Nagadatta, Kaneshkasya, Damaṇe, &c., but añharasyamūnyī), the Mohenjo Daro fragments (mano, i.e. probably brahmano) and Tor Dherai (acharyana, sarvasatavāni, pitrinā, sarvasatavāni),

The impression left by this state of affairs is that intervocalic ū and ū had the same sound at least over the greater part of the territory, and that the sound was probably a
cerebral. The significance of the two letters was consequently lost sight of, the traditional writing acting as a check on the development of a consistent orthography. It is probable that the Dhp. most clearly shows the actual state of things in the greater part of the Kharoshthi area, but it would be unjustified to correct the actual texts. I shall, therefore, stick to the transliteration used by Professor Büchner, in order to preserve the actual evidence of the records, and only occasionally add suggestions within parentheses.

With regard to other nasals we may note that there is no sign for the guttural ŋ, which can only be expected to occur before k and g sounds. The palatal ŋ is found both as an initial and between vowels and will be mentioned below in connexion with compound consonants.

M is used both as an initial and between vowels. In the Dhp. intervocalic v sometimes occurs as w; thus nama, Skr. māma B 35; sabhānu, Skr. sābhavam A 3, O 18. Such is occasionally also the case where v is derived from p; thus viṇamāṇi, Pāli viṇṇapānī O 23; pramāṇi, Pāli pāpāṇi A 3. This is also the case with the p of the enclitic punah; thus va manā B 24, cf. no mina in the third pillar edict of Asoka, &c. We may perhaps draw the inference that there was a tendency to pronounce intervocalic m as a nasalized v, but no indications of such a pronunciation can be found in Kharoshthi inscriptions.

A final m should be expected to become n; thus sārīram, matapataram (Patika), ayan (Taxila vase), &c. Very frequently, however, the anusvāra is left unmarked; thus sarvabuddham (Patika), sarvasateṣṭa (Pājā, Taxila scroll, Wardak, &c.), prama (Lion Cap.), &c. Before vowels such an m is sometimes treated as m; thus evam asa (Kurram), tāram artha (Skārah Dheri).

The same is occasionally also the case in the Dhp.; thus pariṣṭhāna ida ruva C rō 3, yam eva C rō 5, tam ako B 3, &c. Writings such as jiṇāvito B 41 ll.; puṣṭav ita C rō 1, and mukhāv ēva C rō 21 point to the same pronunciation as in the case of m. And frequently final am is treated in the same way before vowels as before consonants, where it occurs as a, o, or u; thus jhaṇa aprahāsa B 16, maga alasu A 9, kuru anuvicchāda B 23; cf. lohagūda gīḍh B 34, aho broma B 1, artha dharmu ji B 11. The last example shows that the presence of the nasal was still felt, because the ch of cha does not become f after vowels.

It is probable that the same is the case in Kharoshthi inscriptions, cf. aya de, Skr. ayam te (Taxila scroll), yo cha, Skr. yuh chā (Wardak), ima cha, Skr. idam cha (Ārā), where yo, ima seem to represent yam, imam, respectively, with the same o as we have found in the Dhp. Cf. also nimma (Lion Cap.).

With regard to the treatment of compounds consisting of a nasal and a stop, our materials seem to point to a state of things of the same kind as in Sanskrit; thus dhīthaka (Nowshera), if this stands for Dipankara; paṭika (Patika, Pājā, Peshawar, 20, Hashtnagar), and perhaps prakhu (Patika, Panjiār); maharānta, puyānito (Patika), ateśvāna (Lion Cap.), paryata, aśīvara (Wardak); sangha (Patika, Pājā, Taxila, and Bedadi ladles, Takht-i-Bahi, Shah-i-Nāpurān, Pālāpu Dheri, Tor Dherai), sagha (Lion Cap., Jaulia, Zeda, Pālāpu Dheri, Sahri Bahlol, Loryān Tangai); murodā (Zeda), dāda (Mānkila), a[n]yada, avasāhāgīrā (Wardak), Khaṇḍa (Loryān Tangai), and perhaps Bhadu (Shahdor); Aṇātī (Pājā), dēra (Peshawar, 21), Dharmānāti (Jaulīa), Balamāṇī (Sui Viḥār); bāmīhāna (Patika), kāṭkāhāra (Lion Cap.), dukkaṭkāhāha (Kurram); kuni-bīni (Dharmarājika), kuṭūhābīni (Sui Viḥār); saṃbhāthiga (Wardak), saṃbhāskara (Hidda).

Some few instances, however, point in another direction, viz. aya de, Skr. ayam te (Taxila scroll), where t in the enclitic te is treated as belonging to the accented word, and perhaps muṇjaśāmanda, muṇjaśānda (Bimarān), if this corresponds to Mitjavanta; Kamūna (Lion Cap.), if it represents Skr. Kāmbojika.
In the Dhp. the rule is to pronounce voiceless stops with voice and to nasalize voiced stops after nasals. Thus *paṇa, Skr. paṇkha A¹ 5; saṅghai, Skr. saṃkhyāya B 27; paṇa, Skr. paṇkha B 37; auḍadora, Skr. anantara O 14; saṅku, Skr. saṃpādayan C³ 26; kuṇara, Skr. kuṇāra A² 4; daṇa, Skr. daṇḍa B 39; vinadi, Skr. vinadati A³ 9; banha, Skr. banḍha O 29; udumareśa, Skr. udumbarēśu B 40; gauhira, Skr. gamhāra B 6. In the case of āg, āgh we find a modified g, gh with a curve above or a hook below, which may signify a sound approaching ū; cf. athag'io, Skr. ashtāṅgikah A³ 4; saṅkha, Skr. saṃgha A² 6, with a curve above g, gh, respectively.

A similar state of things can be traced in modern north-western dialects,¹ where we have every reason for thinking of an old language of the same kind as the old north-western Prākrit, but overlaid by the vernaculars of the Middle Country, and where it is evidently old as shown by the Greek Χάγγα.

In such circumstances it seems probable that the Dhp. represents the actual tendencies of the dialect better than the inscriptions, where the influence of tradition has been at work. It should not be overlooked that most instances of nasal compounds occur in Buddhist terms and names and in the date portion of the records, where the influence of the east is a priori likely to be felt.

Before semi-vowels and sibilants the anuṣvara seems to have been sounded. With v we find sanvāraḥaka (Māṇikāla), sanavatara- (Patika, Mount Banj, Pāja, Sui Vihār), and, with change of v to b, sanabhātara (Takhti-Bāh, Ārā, Hidda); cf. sīka ba, Skr. sīkham eva Dhp. A¹ 6, &c. With ū we have aśkavāte (Sui Vihār, viṣami (Shakardara), ekācāpataśā (Ārā), pādiśā, uska (Māṇikāla), but aṭhavāśatikā (Hidda), prachāmaśā (Hidda), prājyavāte (Tor Dherai), praśārayṣa (Wardak). In the Dhp. us becomes ṭū, i.e. mit, in ahitta, Skr. aṁitā A³ 8; satama, Skr. samana A³ 9; satvara, Skr. sāṃśvara A² 6, &c. The same ū seems to occur in the Peshāwar inscription, no. 347, where I read sāṃśāra.

There are some few words where Skr. has a nasal preceded by a stop. ūṅ seems to become ū; thus jātvānae and probably īṇāga (Patika), īṇi (Taxila scroll, Dharma-rajkāla), īcīttraya, yuvāraḥ (Lion Cap.), viṇāra (Kurram), cf. prāṇa Dhp. B 16. In Wardak we have matgra for jñātika as in later Sauraseni, but then there are also other indications that the Wardak inscription does not represent the local vernacular, but a more eastern language brought to the country by foreign settlers.

I'm in the word ātman has been preserved in Ārā (atmanaya), while it becomes ā in Māṇikāla (apamage) and ā in the silver scroll (atvaro) and a Dharma-rājikā inscription (atvaraya); cf. atvāna Dhp. A² 5. On a Sirkap seal we find ata, and in the Tor Dherai inscriptions tatiya should perhaps be restored as ataniya, Skr. atmanīya. The ā in this word is already found in the Mānehrā edicts of Aśoka. The Ārā form is a Sanskritism, and the old genuine form is evidently atva, which became oppa in the east and tended to become alta in the west.

Y is not changed to j as in later literary Prākrits; thus yuvaraṇa (Lion Cap.), ayuv (Patika), ayam (Taxila vase), aya (Taxila scroll), &c. We have already seen that -aya-, -aya- occasionally become e, as in other Prākrits, and also in other respects we can trace a weakening of intervocalic y; cf. the dative termination of a- and o-bases (hidasu, nivāsa, pūya, Taxila scroll), forms such as ae for ayam (Karnā), Apelae, dharmabhai (Hidda), Dharmiprīna, Budhapiressa, but upajyasa (Mamāne Dheri), bhui (Zeda), Aśpau, dhramaite, Udulakehi (Jamalgarhi). On the other hand, prachagra, Skr. pratiyaya;
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uvagrasya, Skr. upayasa (Kurram); udakavaya, Skr. udaya vaya (Dhp. B 13, C° 18), dhoreka, Skr. dhauriyā (ibidem, C° 39) point to a strongly fricative sound, which may, however, have been a local feature adopted in the literary form of the language.

Compounds containing a y are, broadly, treated as in other Prakrits.

Kṣy probably becomes ḷk; thus Śakamuni, ni (Pattika, Lion Cap., Tirath, Jaulī), but Sanskritized Śakyā (Kurram, Wardak). Gy appears as ġ in arjava (Taxila scroll, Dharmarajika, Shahī- Nāpursān, Jamālgāri, Wardak), and jy as j in Jetha (Ārā, raja (Panjātī, Zehda).

Ty regularly appears as ḷt; thus prach[ṛ]ṣga, mitramacha, paricahga (Taxila scroll), thapaṭhaṁ (Sui Vihar), upakachha (Zehda), prachagra, patichasammyuṭate (Kurram), prachaniṣte (Hidda), sacha (Yakubi). Forms such as padīṣa (Manikīlā), padriyaṇa (Wardak) are doublets due to the cerebrilizing influence of r, and pratiyaṇaśa, pariyagyata (Tor Dherai) are Sanskritisms.

Thy only occurs in mitṭyaga (Wardak). The Dhp. form michha A' 3 is, however, certainly the regular one.

Dy appears as j in avija (Kurram). If ayasa in the Taxila scroll represents Skr. adyasya, the development has been adya, ājja, āja, āya, as would be natural considering the connexion with āḍi. With regard to the Pali doublet adiya cf. the treatment of ārya.

Dhy is found as j in uṣpayasa (Māmāne Dheri), where we should expect jh-

Pṛy occurs in arupya (Wardak), but the Dhp. ṣ, i.e. ṣṇ, in forms such as lipati O 22, is probably more genuine.

Of nasals in connexion with y we have puṇa, Skr. punya (Punjātī and perhaps Takhti-Bahi), rāṇa, Skr. arṇya (Kurram, Hidda, Jamālgāri), and sana, Skr. sanyak (Taxila scroll). Cf. from the Dhp. puṇa B 3, uṇasamadi C° 7.

R is generally well preserved. In patichhina (Lion Cap.), jalyuga (Wardak) it has become t between vowels. Stray examples of this change are found in most Prākrits. In Kharraosta (Lion Cap.) the doubled r perhaps denotes a modified sound; cf. rr in Khotani Saka.

Also in compounds r shows great power of resistance, and this feature is a marked characteristic of this dialect, which distinguishes it from other Prākrits and reminds us of modern Dardic. I shall begin with such compounds where r is the first part.

There are no examples of rk; but the Dhp. has udarka O 5; ṭṛk is found in the foreign title meridakha (Swat vaste), where, however, the r has been transposed and has cerebralized the preceding d in the Taxila plate (meridakha); ṭṛg occurs in s, ṭṛgade (Skārah Dheri), where we must probably read svarga-, and ṭṛgh in dirgha (Tor Dherai). Cf. from the Dhp. mago A' 3 ff., dirgha O 20.

In connexion with palatals we find r in the foreign loan-words erjhuva (Takhti-Bahi) and marjaka (Zehda), where jh seems to denote a voiced s.

Rt is preserved in Kartya, karamurta (Manikīlā); rth in anugraharte (Ārā), hidassabhant (Kanishka casket), artha (Skārah Dheri); rd in Kharda (Lion Cap.), chatudisa (Tor Dherai), while it becomes d in chatudisa (Lion Cap.), and chatudisa, chatudisa (Taxila and Bedadi ladles, Takhti-Bahi, Palaṭi Dheri, Sahri-Bahlol). Of ṭṛdh we have sardha (Shahdaur), vardhīya (Patika), vardinsshe (Zehda), samardhaka (Manikīlā), but sadha (Lion Cap., Manikīlā), suadvāyari (Loriyān Tangai), vadhā- (Shahdaur). The Dhp. has nivarthi O 16, anyvavati C° 33; artha B 11, O 25, atha C° 7 ff., C° 14; nabhimardādi A' 7, abhimadadi C° 35; vardinsshe C° 34, vadhādi A' 8. The r accordingly seems to have been weakly sounded and to have had a tendency to coalesce with ṭh to ṭh.

Rm is sometimes preserved; thus dharmā (Kanishka casket, Sui Vihar, Hidda,
Māmāne Dhērī, Jaulīa), but dhama (Lion Cap., Taxila scroll, Dharmarājikā, Pālāṭi Dhērī, Jamālgārhi); karmi- (Kanishka casket, Māṇikiāla, Hidda), but kami- (Patika), varma (Kurram), tasma (Skārah Dhērī). Late forms such as Bsaβaruma (Lahore, no. 255), Budsavaruma (Jamālgārhi), Budharuma (Shahr-i-Nāpursān, Loryān Tandagi), Sahghoruma (Loryān Tandagi) point to a sounded r. The Dhp. has both rm and m: dharmā O 25, B 22, &c., dhama A 15, A 6 ff. It is difficult to judge about this state of things, but it is noticeable that the oldest inscriptions have m.

Ry occurs after long vowel as ri: bharia (Jamālgārhi), ayaria (Lion Cap.), but also as ry: bharya (Dharmarājikā, Āra), acharya (Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Kurram, Wardak, Tor Dherai), and even as y (bhaya-, Taxila Meridarkh plate). After a short vowel we have ry in paryata (Wardak). Similarly in the Dhp. ariṣṭa A 13, savia A 3; viṣya C 17; saṁyena O 17, brahmāyīrya O 9; brahmāyīya B 27, vijaya C 17, kuya C 32, jyādī C 21, &c.

R is usually preserved; thus purva (Patika, Māṇikiāla, Und), sava (Patika, Lion Cap., Pājā, Taxila scroll, Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Kurram, Hidda, Āra, Bimārān, Jamālgārhi, Wardak, Tor Dherai), nirvāna (Hidda), &c. Only occasionally we find sava (Taxila vase and volute bracket) and sanva (Māṇikiāla), gīvāna (Taxila scroll).

The compounds rs and rsh will be dealt with below; rh occurs in arahānya (Taxila scroll), where it has been treated as in other Prākrits.

Also after stops r is usually preserved.

Kr occurs in nukrama (Shakardarra), Kronina (Lion Cap.), Munjukrita, Minju- krita (Sirkap silver plates); gr in agra (Lion Cap., Māṇikiāla, Hidda, Wardak); graha (Lion Cap., Kanishka casket, Jamālgārhi, Zedra, Kurram, Āra, Sahri-Bahlol, Wardak, Tor Dherai), Vagra- (Wardak), grama (Yakub). The state of things in the Dhp. is similar; cf. akrodhu B 2, graddhi A 2.

Tv is of frequent occurrence. Thus atvā (Patika, Shakardarra, Wardak), itvā (Dewāl), yatvā (Sui Vihār), etvā (Māṇikiāla), tatvā (Panjārā), pātra (Patika, Lion Cap., Mount Banj, Takht-i-Bahl, Pājā, Kāldarra, Panjārā, Taxila scroll, Sirkap vase, silver cups, and seals, Dharmarājikā, Sui Vihār, Māṇikiāla, Kurram, Āra, Bimārān, Peshāwar, no. 21, Wardak), mītra (Shahdadār, Pājā, Taxila scroll, Sirkap seal, Dharmarājikā, -da, Hidda, Wardak, Shahr-i-Nāpursān, Loryān Tandagi, Jaulīa), ekhatrava,-pa (Patike, Sirkap vase and seal, Lion Cap., Zedra, Māṇikiāla), -trata (Sirkap volute, Sui Vihār), -tretā (Sirkap seals), Chetara (Und), Travaśakura (Peshāwar, no. 20). Śvetra (Kurram) is perhaps a slip for Śvatra. In itatimae (Takht-i-Bahl) and taena (Māṇikiāla) we can, in face of this overwhelming evidence, which is also supported by the Dhp. (trevi, treviyo O 7, akotatra B 7, &c.), hardly see anything else than mere slips.

Dr is found in Indrdeva (Peshāwar, no. 21), Imdraṇeṣa (Dharmarājikā), Mudrādāra (Sirkap seal), drumivadra (Shakardarra), where the final drā perhaps also represents dra. Cf. drumapatra Dhp. B 28, bhadrau A 15.

Pr is also quite common. Thus pradhaga (Kurram), prachn (Patika, Panjārā), pratristra, prama (Lion Cap.), prati- -di- (Patika, Lion Cap., Taxila scroll, vase, and Meridarkh plate, Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Māṇikiāla, Kurram, Tor Dherai, pratiskhyā (Sui Vihār), Praṅavāda, -da (Fatchjang, Hashtnagar, Loryān Tandagi, Shakardarra), prīma (Māmāne Dheri). I have already remarked that an r sometimes coalesces with a following t and th; thus padī (Māṇikiāla), padri- (Wardak), pradhraavi, padhraavi (Lion Cap.), padhama (Panjārā) as compared with prathama (Takht-i-Bahl), padhama (Jamālgārhi). From the Dhp. we may compare prīdhipramojju B 13, prāṇasa B 17, padī B 18, &c.

Br is represented by bramhaṇeṣa (Peshāwar, no. 21), Bramadatas (Sirkap seal),
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bramha (Mohenjo Daro), cf. bramkaya Dhp. O 1 ff. For bh we have bhrtkta, -da (Patika, Lion Cap., Taxila vase, Wardak, and perhaps Sirkap silver vase and Manjikiala), but bhameshau (Vakubi); cf. abha Dhp. A 3. Bhvr is probably the correct writing.

With regard to t it may be noted that there are no indications of the existence of a cerebral t. Lg becomes g in Utaraphaguna (Zeda).

V is well preserved both as an initial and between vowels, though there are, as we have seen, instances of m for intervocalic v in the Dhp. If Pischari (Lion Cap.) has anything to do with vi:vusa, the change of v to p must be explained as an anticipation of the following p in sp. In the Peshawar Museum inscription, no. 4, we seem to have ga:vara, which perhaps stands for bhagava; cf. Makavdha Dhp. A 1 and Dhivakara (Nowshera).

Old tv is well preserved; cf. satva (Pajha, Taxila scroll, Kanishka casket, Sui Vihar, Kurram, Hidda, Wardak, Jamalgarhi), which is also found in the Dhp. (e.g. B 1). Only in Arak (ekachapartikia, saf paja) and Kaldra (sapa) we find p instead. The v-sound, however, seems to have been little pronounced in unaccented terminations. For the Dhp. has gerunds such as pramajeti A 3, parivajeti A 8, baheti B 27, and in uvvar i B 37 tv is written for t, cf. Pali uttarim. A similar conclusion seems to be derivable from Dhp. writings such as vi:vura, which apparently stands for vidhura (C 18) and udhvaradha for uddharadha (A 5). We are therefore justified in explaining forms such as harita, abhurasa, ayimita (Lion Cap.), where t and not the modified tr is written so that we cannot well think of an old intervocalic t, as gerunds.

The chief peculiarity of the dialect, which distinguishes it from all other Prakrits and has its nearest parallel in the modern Dardic languages, is the preservation of the three Sanskrit sibilants s, sh, and s, which are mainly distributed as in Sanskrit; thus sarv, pratrva (Lion Cap.), sha:ata (Fatehjang), asa:assa (Taxila scroll, Zeda), masa: (Patika).

When Skr. saka occurs as sak (Shahdaur, Lion Cap.), the reason is the word is an Iranian loan-word in its indigenous form. The terminations -isa, -usa of i- and u-bases have their s from the a-bases. The s in Basaparo (Lion Cap.) is also found in Skr. busa, while Bavarum (Lahore pedestal) is an un-Indian name, only the last part of the compound being Indian. In Vipsa (Manjikiala) we have the well-known continuation of the articulation of the preceding p, cf. Dhp. vispa B 25. The apparent h for s in mahasa (Urd) is probably misread for s.

There are, on the other hand, some indications which seem to reveal a tendency towards a voiced pronunciation of intervocalic s. Thus we find majh[e] for Skr. masa (Manjikiala) and several other instances in the form of the dialect occurring in the Turkestan documents.\(^1\)

Forms such as Vajheka (Arz), erjhu (Takhti-Bahi), marjhaka (Zeda) seem to show that jh was used in order to render an intervocalic s, a sound which was foreign to most Indian languages, while j seems to be used for both intervocalic and initial s in Kujula (coins), jauvaia (Patika), cf. Greek koçako, kaxw, and Yticonia, i.e. Zeionises (Sirkap vase). We also know of other attempts at rendering the sound, viz. y in Ayə, Azes (Shahdaur and coins), ya:nga (coins), and s in Kusuluka, Kusulua (Patika, Lion Cap.) as compared with the Kujula, koçako of coins.

In addition to the form majh[e] for masa we also find masye (box lid, Hidda, Wardak),

---

\(^1\) Cf. Turner, JRAS, 1927, p. 233, where attention is drawn to a similar voicing of intervocalic s in some dialects of Shin. A similar state of things is also found in Tirahi; cf. spax, 'sister'; azr, 'mouth'.
and it seems probable that also *sy was used in order to render an intervocalic ə. The reason must then be that old sy in certain circumstances became ə.

In the paper quoted above Professor Turner has tried to show that such was actually the case inter alia in the genitive termination -asya, and he has drawn attention to the fact that -asya is, in the Turkestan documents, frequently written asra or, in the transliteration of the editors, asya. The same orthograph is found in some Indian inscriptions (Wardak, once in Mamāne Dheri, Peshāwar, no. 1, and, alternating with -asya, in Tor Dherai). We must therefore apparently explain the sr in Piśpari (Lion Cap.) in the same way.

In the Turkestan documents we sometimes also find the same sign sr as an initial, in words such as sra, Skr. sa; sradhā, Skr. sārdham, sravā, Skr. sarvah. Similarly we find sra for sa (Wardak), sravā for sarva and sratva for satva (Tor Dherai). It is possible that also here the same sound is intended. In the Dhp., however, we sometimes find sh in similar cases; thus šha, where Pāli has ā Co 39 (but sr in the parallel passage A 3), šag'ā, ashag'ā (B 3). It is therefore possible that the sound had a cerebral colour, but we can hardly do more, at the present state of our knowledge, than to register the facts.

The state of affāirs in the Saka language of the Khotan country, which is largely influenced by the north-western Prākrit, also points to the existence of a tendency to pronounce intervocalic s with voice; cf. āysana, Skr. āsana; uvāysi, Skr. upāsaka. We cannot, however, decide whether this tendency was much pronounced or universal. Nor can we say whether it is due to the influence of neighbouring Iranian tongues or developed independently.

A similar voicing of intervocalic s might be inferred from the regular writing -sr- for -ś- on the Lion Cap.: āśra, āpaśtra, āchatrūṣṭra, but Šakamuni, Šārīra, Šūḍaṇa. In compounds with other letters the sibilants undergo certain changes, sometimes in t-compounds and sometimes at variance with other Prākrits.

Śy occurs as ś, i.e. probably śś; thus Kaśāriya (Taxila ladle), Kaśava (Jauliá), paśadi (Dhp. A 1).

Śy becomes śh; thus śamanā; na (box lid, Mamāne Dheri, Shahr-i-Nāpuršān, Pālātu Dheri, Jauliá), shavā (Mānikiāla, Jamālīgarhi), shadhāṇa (Takht-i-Bāhī). In the word śravāna it is always retained (Pājā, Panjār, Kālārara), probably as a learned orthograph. The śṛi of the Lion Cap. is not certain. The Dhp. has šamāna B 39, shavaka A 4, shuṭuṇa A 10; śravāna O 1, śavāna O 5, șēro A 4, &c.

Also rś seems to become śh; cf. phasha (Kurram), phashaī Dhp. A 10, phushamu B 25, samkāhādhi B 13, but darśa Co 37, bhayadaśima B 32.

Śh is preserved in Śvedārvarma (Kurram), but changed to śp in [śp]śpasa (Mānsehrā), satpa, Piśpari (Lion Cap.), Veśpa (Mānikiāla), Ṣhavaka (Taxila ladle), Viśpamira (Sirkap seal), Aśpāru (Jamālīgarhi). The Dhp. has viśpa B 26, &c., but aśa A 15. It seems as if the development began in the neighbourhood of i.

The cerebral šh occurs in several compounds.

Shk is found in foreign names such as Kanishka (Kanishka casket, Zeda, Sui Vihār, Mānikiāla, Ārā, Vajrasaṅga (Ārā), Hoceshka (Wardak). In pukāraṇi, pukārinī (Kālārara, Pāthyār, Karnāl) it becomes ə, while the Dhp. has puśkara (O 22), which is evidently the genuine dialect form.

Shh seems to be retained in shahī (Shahdaur), where, however, the reading is uncertain. Usually it becomes th; thus shāthi (Mānsehrā), aśtha (Dewai, Sui Vihār, Hīda, Uṇḍa, yathī (Sui Vihār). In adhahāthā (Mānsehrā) we find the change to dh,

1 Cf. Turner, l.c., p. 233.
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which is already found in the Aśoka inscriptions and which seems to be due to a shortening of the resultant th to fh, in the same way as ādyā seems to have become ājja, āja, āya in the Taxila scroll. The Dhp. has fh; thus pravīthasa B 12, 14.

Skth also becomes fh; thus kaniṭha (Lion Cap.), prathaṣṭada, -ta (Pachchhang, Hāsthnagar, Loryān Tangai), jēṣṭha (Peshāwar, no. 20, Ārā), Vāṣṭha (Jamālgarhī). In the base sthā this form is common where Skr. has sīh; thus prathiṣṭhavī (Taxila gold plate), pratiṣṭhava, -da (Swat vase, Patika, Lion Cap.), pratiṣṭhavī (Jamālgarhī, pratiṣṭhana (Sui Vihār), pradiṭṭhavī (Kurram, Peshāwar, no. 4), pratiṣṭhavī (Wardak). Sometimes, however, the forms of the uncompound stha have been preserved; thus pratiṣṭhavī (Patika), pratiṣṭhavī (Taxila vase), pratiṣṭavī (Taxila scroll and Meridarkh plate), pratiṣṭapāta (Hidda), pratiṣṭavīda (box lid), pratiṣṭavāyati (Mānikāla). The Dhp. usually has fh; thus sēṭha A 4, thauḷiḷi O 24, pravadātho, bhumatho A 16. Once, however, A 6, we find: dista (where Pali has utāṣṭhā), which seems to represent atiṣṭhā or utiṣṭhān.

Sth seems to occur in the foreign name Hashthunā (Wardak). Sth seems to become sk in Dhp. pūṣka C 1, if we have not here to do with a doublet pūṣka. The name Poshapurī (Ārā) is probably derived from this word.

Sth occurs as sk with a curve above in tasha (Kurram); cf. tasha Dhp. B 45. In Kanhiāra we have Kriṣhāyāya with a dot above the sk. Here the Brāhmī has syp, and it is possible that the dot is meant to mark s. It seems, however, more probable that syp became a modified, perhaps aspirated, sh. 1 shall transliterate syp.

Sthh seems to become ś in the Dhp.; thus manusāya B 4. The form manuska C 6 is shown by the metre to stand for māṇuska. Forms such as ehi B 35, kariśhadi A 6 may be due to a change of ya to i before syp became ś. In the inscriptions we have Kusakya (Bedaki Palaṭi Dheri) for Kāṣyapa, which seems to prove that sypa was felt and pronounced as ś. The writing śīṣya in the Sui Vihār inscription seems to be due to the marked Sanskritization of this record.

Kh occurs as sk; thus tasha (Muchai, Takht-i-Bahi, Kāldarra, Skārah Dheri). The Dhp. has vihaṣṭhī A 6, but sarṣhā A 22. The word kahapana (Shahdour) shows a different treatment in all Prākrits. It is a technical term, which seems to have been borrowed from one source.

The dental sibilant occurs in several compounds.

Sk occurs as k in kadhavara (Lion Cap.), kahīya Dhp. B 13. In saukāra (Kurram, Lahore school scene), dukhkalauadh (Kurram) there is a vertical above the ka, which may point to a slight aspiration. And the Dhp. has sukākha, i.e. probably satṣkṛtya O 4, saukhara, i.e. sanghara, Skr. sanākāra A 1, which point in the same direction.

Kṣ is usually preserved, though we cannot say exactly how it was pronounced. It is written with a sign which is different from the palatal ēth and is used for kṣ in Sanskrit texts from Niya. We have kṣhātra, -va (Patika, Lion Cap., Sirkap vase, Zeda, Mānikāla), kṣhāratā (Patika), Śicarakhśita (Shahdour, Bimarān, Taxila ladle and seal), Budharakhśita (Jaulā, Jamālgarhī, Loryān Tangai), Saṅgharakhśita (Bedadi), Raksła (Lion Cap.), Kṣema (Patika), Takṣaḥśita (Taxila scroll and ladle, Dharmarājīkā), dukśhita (Taxila scroll and Meridarkh plate, Dharmarājīkā, Jamālgarhī, Naugrām, Sahrai-Nāpuṣrāṇ, Wardak, Mamāne Dheri), pakshe (Takht-i-Bahi), kṣhāra, kṣhuma (Zeda, box lid, Kurram, Hidda, Ārā, Uqiq, Mamāne Dheri, Peshāwar, no. 21), bhiśkhu (Sui Vihār, Jaulā). Occasionally we find the Sauraseni kh; thus khaṃsasa (Dewai), Takṣaḥśita (Patika, Taxila vase), bhikku (Lion Cap.), akṣha (Mathurā lion), dharmakhac (Hidda). The state of things in the Dhp. is similar; thus kṣhaya A 3, chakṣhuma A 3, kṣhāravaya B 54, bhikṣhavo A 3, B 53, &c., but occasionally khaya A 4, pradimukh B 17, chakṣhuma A 3, B 53, &c.
bikku B 9, 17, and even avahe Cvo 31, which presupposes an uncompounded kh. These exceptions may find their explanation in the Ardhamāgadhī original from which the text was translated, and it is perhaps probable that the kh of the inscriptions is due to the influence of more eastern vernaculars, which was sure to be felt in the north-west and especially in Taxila, the old seat of learning.

Also kṣ occurs, in the local name of the Taxila country, Chukkha (Patika, Sirkap vaise), where the modern Chakha points to an old compound sound.

Tś occurs as tš in the common saṃvatsara, saṃbatsara (Patika, Mount Banj, Takhti-Bahi, Pājā, Sūi Vihār, Hidda, Ārā). In the Dhp. this development has taken place where tś was followed by y (matya Cxvi, 6, bhettidī Cvo 3), and also, as already stated, where t had been inserted between a nasal and s (ahīśi A 8, satkana A 9, satkara A 6, bhamaśi B 34). It is not found where t belongs to a postposition; thus akhusavina (Lion Cap), ussa (Dhp. Cvo 27).

St seems to become ṭh when initial and to be retained between vowels. Thus thunā (Jāmālgarhi), ṭhuna (Taxila vasa, Lion Cap.), and, with despiration, apparently tewa (Jāmālgarhi lamp), thuba (Kurram, Hidda, Wardak), and apparently tubaja (Loryān Tangai), while the apparent ṭhova (Mount Banj) seems to be influenced by the base sthā; further, sakrastana (Lion Cap.), sarvarūvadi, -da (Lion Cap., Kanishka casket, Kurram, Tor Dherai), vāstana (Taxila scroll, Peshāwar, no. 21, Yākubi), stasa (Mathurā elephant), Kharraosta (Lion Cap.), sasti (box lid, Hidda, Wardak). Similarly the Dhp. has astagadhadi O 15, hasta B 10, &c.

Of sth most examples belong to the base sthā and have been mentioned above. Other examples are stitiye (Swāt vasa) and śivathala (Panjār).

Of sp the only example is phasha, Skr. sparsa (Kurram), where it occurs as an initial. The Dhp. has phasha A 10, phusamnī B 25, but sviha B 20.

In the Dhp. sm seems to become so and further s; thus svadi, Skr. srṛiti A 5, A 2, Cvo 42, pradīvada A 9, apusvaro B 22 f.; sadana Cvo 43, tasa, yasa, Skr. tasmāt, yasmāt O 16, 17; asvi, parasa, Skr. asmi, parasmi A 6, isma, Skr. imasmi A 6. In samhashadi B 13 we apparently have mh for ism.

In Kharoshthi inscriptions we have only examples of the locative termination asmi. We find asi (written ṭasa and ae) in hasasi (Taxila gold plate) and khaṇasa (Dewai); amī in ima[ni] (Patika), rajami (Panjār, Zeda), gahami (silver scroll); raiṣmāmi, viharaimī, parigrahaimī, thubaimi (Kurram); kṣaṇami, kṣhunamī, &c. (Zeda box lid, Kurram, Peshāwar, no. 21, Hidda, Ārā, Mamāne Dheri), Khavdamrī, viharamrī (Wardak), &c. The reading athavākhatthi (Hidda) is suspect. If it is correct, it points to an aspiration, which is apparently also indicated in the writing mṛti. It seems to be difficult to explain the forms asi and amī as belonging to one and the same dialect and period.

Sy is common in the termination of the genitive singular. In Sūi Vihār we apparently have the Sanskrit form. In other cases sy in such forms seems to have become ss and, as already remarked, apparently further s.

H is on the whole well preserved; cf. hasasi, deha (Taxila gold plate). In Kharraosta (Lion Cap.) an h- seems to have been dropped. The late sadaviyari (Loryān Tangai) may represent sārdhamacchārīnī and cannot prove any tendency to drop intervocalic h. Hṃ seems to become mh: thus lamhayaṇa (Peshāwar, no. 21). Also hama; however, occurs (Sirkap seal, Mohenjo Daro 7), and the Dhp. has both bamaṇa and bamaṇa.

The materials at our disposal are not sufficient for a complete sketch of the in-Inflection of nominative flexional system, and I can only draw attention to some characteristic features.

There are no traces of a dual, if we abstract from dou Dhp. O 13. The plural is used instead; thus padāni (Tirath). There are some indications to show that the neuter
had a tendency to be replaced by the masculine. In the Dhp. we still have the nominative in anī; thus nirathā ba kadigaru Cṛ 14, sahāsa bi Cṛ 7, where the ensuing o shows that the anusvāra was sounded or felt. Other forms end in o (paramo suka Cṛ 24), and occasionally perhaps in e (puṇa, pava B 3). In the plural we have pavani kamanī Cṛ 26, pavana anvahakee O 1, and probably atīqi Cṛ 16.

In the inscriptions there seems to be a tendency to confound the neuter with the masculine. In Yākubi and Panjārī we can apparently distinguish between the nominative singular neuter, which ends in e (dayamukha, Yākubi; karavide śivahale, Panjārī), and the masculine in o (jinaukara rohito, Yākubi; prachu deo Panjārī). In most inscriptions, however, the form is the same in both genders; thus the frequent danamukha is not distinguished in form from male bases. In the plural we have padani in Tirath, but pratiśhavida ine tarīra in the Svāt vase.

Most examples belong to the a-declension, which shows the usual tendency to influence the inflexion of other bases.

The nominative singular of neuter bases in the Dhp. has already been mentioned. The corresponding masculine form ends in o, u, or a, and the metrum shows that the termination was long; thus akrodhi anvayasa vipramatu B 2, kaeyā savrundo bhikku B 8. In the inscriptions the state of things is as follows:

We find a, alone or together with o, in the following inscriptions: Kanihiāra (aravo), Patika (LIkho Kusuluke, patro Patika, prachu deo navakamico, kṣatrapa Liaka), Lion Cap. (aavacajo, Naivludo, Kharraastro, niyatriro, thuva, sagharama), Mount Banā (kuo), Kala Sang (kuo eduo), Taxila silver scroll (paríchage), gold plate (loo), vase (thuva pratiśhavito), Meridhalk plate (thuva pratiśhavito), Jaulī (Kāsavo, tathagato), Peshawār, no. 1, from the Khudu Khel country (tubo, doubtful): Māṇikiāla (gushanavasasamvardhaka Lala dadaunyago, horamurita, horamurto), Shakardarr (kuo, khaduo), Wardak (patra, Vagaramara, andajo, jalaunya, purīkara, agrabha, viharanji), parigraha, kadaliyagra, Tor Dherai (pratiyamśe, deyadharmo), Mohenjo Daro (मये).

To the neuter may belong dayamukho (Fatehjang, Mount Bhanj, Taxila ladle, Jaulī, where inscription 2 seems to have both the e and the o-mātra, Peshawār, no. 4, from the Khudu Khel country, Māṇikiāla, Shakardarr), dayamuhk (Dewai), tarīra pratiśhavito, dhakamadana (Lion Cap.).

E-forms are found in a series of records: Muchai (kuo), Pāja (kuo karte), Peshawār, no. 5 (karavide), no. 20 (kuo khanavide), no. 21 (khanavide), Kanishka casket (deyadharmo, dasa Agisala navakamico), Zeda (khade ku), Kurram (saumudae, pratiśhavato, phaxa, bhaux), Hidda (dharmakhae), Ára (khade, kupe), Mamāne Dheri (niyartade ime deyadharmo). Cf. the neuter bases dayamukha (Peshawār, no. 20, Loryān Tāngai, Jamālgārhi, Zeda), danamukha (Dharmarajika, Palatu Dheri), dayamukhe (Shahr-i-Nāpursān, Bimārān), danamukhe, -ka (Jamālgārhi, Zeda), danamukha (Palatu Dheri), prahavide dhakamute oke (Jamālgārhi), ula, viṇana, namaruva, shadrayadana, wudana (Kurram), tarīra pratiśṭāpīla (Hidda), niyaitide (Bimārān).

In Panjārī and Yākubi we have, as already stated, o in the masculine and e in the neuter; Mārguz has no neuter form, but a masculine in o (kuo), and only e-forms occur in Bedadi (dana) and Takhti-Bāhi (parīvara, shadhadana).

It will be seen that the o- and e-forms are distributed according to locality. The o-area in the north extends to the Indus, including the Mahābān range beyond the river, and in the south it comprises Mohenjo Daro and Tor Dherai. In Panjārī, Yākubi, and probably in Mārguz we have o in the masculine and e in the neuter. The districts to the west of the Indus have, with the above exceptions, e throughout. Only Wardak has o, another indication of an eastern origin.
INFLEXION

We can accordingly distinguish between an eastern o-dialect and a western e-dialect. The e-forms cannot therefore be considered as Māgadhism, but rather as links connecting the north-western Prakrit with Iranian forms such as we find in Sakish da, i, and comparable with the pronominal e-forms in modern Dardic.

The accusative singular of a-bases need not be further discussed after the remarks made above on the treatment of final au; cf. sāviraṁ, saṅgharamaṁ (Patika), Khallamasa kumāra, Māja kuniḍha, māmima, pratretro, kadhavaro, Budsaparo (Lion Cap.), sāvira (Peshāwar, no. 4, Kurram, Wardak), ḫava (Māṇkiśala), pratīthanaṁ, purīvaraṁ (Sui Vihār), &c.

The instrumental is of frequent occurrence and ends in -ena, -eṇa; thus utareṇa (Patika), Sihilena, Siharakshitena (Taxila vase), &c. Only in two inscriptions we find a shortened form in e, i.e. probably ḫ, viz. Īdudi kṣetrava (Lion Cap.), Moike Uru- munjapatro (Panjār). Lüders thought of a pluralis majestatis. The form alas in the Dhp. (A² 9), where the instrumental usually ends in -eṇa, shows, however, that we have to do with the singular.

The dative ends in as, where the metre in the Dhp. shows that the a was long; thus hitas (Shahdour), suhas (Pāṇḍa), niṇgaya (Taxila scroll), sambhavas, prachhāhār (Hidda), hitas, anugrahāḥ (Ārā), bhugas, padriṣās (Wardak). The Sanskritized Sui Vihār plate has sahāya, and in Zeda we seem to have upākachaas.

The only example of an ablative is khaverbs (Wardak); cf. from the Dhp. sadharmas B 22, but also forms such as padayādo, maraṇaṁ C¹⁷ f., suhadu C²⁹ 39.

There are numerous examples of the genitive, which usually ends in asa as in the Dhp., where the metre shows that the syllable before s was long. A few examples will be sufficient: Śivartheṣa (Shahdour), māsa (Patika), Prabhavadaśa (Hashtnagar). In the Sanskritized Sui Vihār record we have -asa; thus maharajasa. Here we may have to do with the Sanskrit form. In Tor Dherai, where asa is used side by side with -asa (e.g. Mirasva and Mīrasva), which is the common form in Wardak (e.g. Vagromāgranavasa)and occurs once in Mamāne Dheri(māraṇaasa), we may be faced with a change of sy to s, as already remarked. And if dayasa and not dayasya stands in the Sanskrit passage in Peshāwar, no. 21, this pronunciation was perhaps also prevalent in the local Sanskrit.

The usual form of the locative ends in e; cf. the common saṁvatsare, &c. In addition to this we also have the pronominal termination asin, which partly appears as aśi, asa, partly as anī, anini, aner, i.e. probably anhi, as already stated. Forms such as paṁchami (Hashtnagar), aṁkami (Und) have been influenced by this termination, which may also be found in aṭhavinsatīhi (Hidda), if the reading is correct. Ekahaparīśi (Ārā) and maśi (Mamāne Dheri) perhaps are mere slips.

In the nominative plural we have pradistavita (Taxila scroll), pradhagra, sanīkara, uvagrāsa (Kurram); padayi (Tirath), sāvira pratīthavidra (Swāt vase).

Of the accusative plural we find bhavata sarva (Patika), saṁmunaṁvakra (Lion Cap.).

The instrumental plural ends in ehi; thus sāhae Ṣitiyakehi (Jamālgaṛh), budehi, shavakehi (Māṇkiśala), satehi (box lid, Hidda, Wardak). The form sarīkhi in the Bimarān inscription is perhaps a dative.

The genitive plural usually ends in ana, ana; thus budhaya (Taxila scroll and vase, Bimarān), budhara (Patika, Lion Cap.), &c. Only in the Kanishka casket, the Sui Vihār, and the Tor Dherai inscriptions we have anām.

1 SBAW, 1913, p. 418.
The locative plural ends in eshu; thus sachaṣhamaṃteṣ[ṇ] (Yākubi), taṇayesty[ṇ] (Skārah Dheri).

Feminine a-bases form their nominative in a; thus karavita (Kaldrar), uposika, Balafoya (Sui Vihar), odevana, tashka (Kurram), ṭanva (Jamālgari), ṭroppa (Tor Dherai). Other forms are, Accusative: prama (Lion Cap.); Instrumental: Aḥakalae (Lion Cap.), jaiwaṇa (Patika); Dative: puya (Patika, Lion Cap., &c.), dakshiyα, dakshiyetae (Taxila scroll, Dharmacārīkā, Jamālgari, Shahr-i-Napursān, Naugrāh, Wardak, Mamāne Dherai); Genitive: Śirae (Taxila gold plate), Śivae, Sūpake, bhūrāi (Jamālgari); Locative: purwai (Patika), purve (Māṇgikāla), Taḵkhaṣilae (Patika, Taxila vase), Taḵkhaṣilae (Taxila scroll and spoon), if these forms do not represent Skr. Taḵkhaṣilae; Locative plural: [vi*]-ṇpāsu (Mansehra).

Of i-bases we have, Nominative: jati (Taxila gold plate), jadi (Kurram); in the Sanskrit portion of Peshāwar, no. 21, assapitar; Accusative: yathin (Sui Vihar); Instrumental, apparently abhiphit (Hidda); Dative: stījīve (Swāt vase), vardhīe (Patika); Genitive: manse (Wardak), but usually the a-base termination, thus munisa, munsis (Tirath, Swāt vase, Patika, Lion Cap., Kurram), Svarabudhisā (Māṇgikāla), Dharmabudhisā (Jauliā, uncertain), Mevalisā (Lion Cap.).

Old ika or iya- bases have partly been confounded with the i-bases; cf. Kalvi (Lion Cap.); Veṭpāsisa, side by side with Veṭpātiscan, Khaṇḍakhiṣ[ṇ] (Māṇgikāla) and Locative: Arhamisīya (box lid, Wardak), perhaps influenced by feminine i-bases.

The case is similar with old in-bases; thus Bulaṃsa (Takhti-Bāh, soamisa (Peshāwar, no. 1), Dharmanadisā (Jauliā), sadavayarsa (Lorīyan Tangal), dharmakhaṭisī (Sui Vihar).

Of feminine i-bases we have Nominative: pukhari (Paṭṭyār), pukarni (Kaldrar), kutiṅhi, vihaṛaṃvomuq(e) (Sui Vihar); Instrumental: pilvawaihi Pīḷpāsri (Lion Cap.); Genitive: prehavaiiṣe (Taxila gold plate).

Of u-bases we find, Accusative: dhatu (Taxila gold plate); Genitive: bhadusa (Shahdāur), bhikhusa (Lion Cap.), bhikshusa (Jauliā), bhikṣusya (Sui Vihar), Aṣṭāsura (Jamālgarhi, where an old consonantic base has been transferred to the u-class); Nominative plural: dhatu (Taxila scroll).

Most examples of ri-bases belong to the compound māṭāpiṛi, which is often treated as a singular. Thus Accusative: matapiḷi (Paṭika); Genitive: matapiḷa (Taxila scroll, Meridarkh plate, volute); madu pīḍa (Takhti-Bāh), and, with transition into the ʀ-class, matapiḷa (Paṭa). Plural forms are matarapilaryay (Ārā) and matapiṭrinai (Tor Dherai), the latter a clear Sanskritism. Of other instances we have the Nominatives dhiṭra, motra (Lion Cap.); Instrumental: motra, bhṛatra, ḍhiṭra (Lion Cap.) pītra (Shahdāur); Genitive: bhṛata (Māṇgikāla), bhṛadara (Wardak); Accusative plural: bhṛatara (Patika).

Of an-bases we have Nominative: yuvayay (Lion Cap.), Sveṭvarvarma (Kurram); Genitive: rojana (Shahdāur), yuvareṇa (Lion Cap.), atyaṇa (Taxila scroll).

An an-base is perhaps contained in the dativī vardhase (Zada). Of ut-bases we find Instrumental: bhagavata (Kurram); Genitive: bhakravatro (Lion Cap.), bhagavata (Paṭika), bhagvata (Swāt vase), bhagvata (Taxila scroll), bhagvata (Bimarān), bhagavata (Wardak), aropayata (Sui Vihar). In consonantal bases we can, however, trace the common tendency towards vocalic inflexion; thus oke (Jamālgarhi), sarmam (Skārah Dheri), atayasa (Dharmacārīkā), atmayasa (Ārā); puyayavita (Patika), mahānitasa (Patika), bhagavatasa (Kurram), arahatīṣyā (Taxila scroll).

In connexion with the inflexion of nouns we may note the tendency to string names and titles together into a quasi-compound, with only one case suffix at the end;
thus, *pitramahi Pīpāsra, Hana dhīva, putra Śūdaśe (Lion Cap.), mahadānapati Patikasa (Patika), erjhunā Kopasa, Mira Boteṣa (Takht-i-Bahī), Gushayavatasaśivardhaka Lala dadayayago (Māṇikīla), maharaja rajatiraja Hoveshkasra (Wardak). Note also the double genitives in *Nagudatasya arapayata (Sui Vihār), *Sirae prethavetivye (Taxila gold plate).

There are only a few pronominal forms in the inscriptions.

Of personal pronouns we have the genitives *mahiya (Wardak), encticit me (Panjītār, Ārā, Wardak) of the first, and de (Taxila scroll) of the second person.

The demonstrative bases sa, ta are represented by Nominative su (Māṇikīla, Wardak, Uṇḍ) and once with the modification of the initial mentioned above, sra (Wardak); Instrumental: tena (Taxila scroll); Genitive: tasa (Taxila gold plate, Patika, Māṇikīla); Genitive plural: tesha (Hidda). Cf. from the base esha Nominative: esha (Wardak); Instrumental: edeṣa, ssa (Māṇikīla, Hidda); Locative feminine: eteṣe (Patika).

Of the nearer demonstrative we have Nominative: ayaḥ (Taxila vase), aya (Taxila scroll, Kurram), yai, i.e. *yai as in Sanskrit after o (Tor Dherai), ae (Karnāl), ime (Māṃāne Dheri); Accusative: imāni (Sui Vihār), imo (Lion Cap., Ārā); Instrumental: imena (Taxila scroll); Genitive: asa (Kurram); Locative: imani (Patika). The forms īka (Lion Cap., Taxila scroll, Hidda, Wardak, Uṇḍ), īla (Zeda, box lid, Kurram, Peshāwār, no. 21, Ārā) are used in the same sense; Nominative plural: ime (Swāt vase, Taxila scroll).

Of the relative we find ya (Māṃsehrā), yo (neuter, Taxila gold plate, Wardak); Genitive plural: yesha (Hidda).

The word *aima is, as in other dialects, also used as a pronoun. Another word meaning ‘own’ is tanauka; cf. tanuca (Taxila scroll); tanuca(nim) (Kurram).

Only a few numerals occur: {dā} (Jamalgarhi), prāthama (Takht-i-Bahī), pradhama Numerals.

(Panjītār), padhamamamiti (Jamalgarhi), tena (Māṇikīla), chatu- (Lion Cap.), chadu- (Bedadi, Paḷāṭū Dheri), cātu- (Taxila ladle, Takht-i-Bahī, Tor Dherai), panchama, -ni (Patika, Hashmnagar), aṭhama, -ni (Dewai, Uṇḍ), dasaṭi (Hidda), ekaḍaṣa (Sui Vihār), panchadaṣa (Pājā, Peshāwār, no. 20), saḍaṣa (Fatejhang), vaṣami (Shakardarā), athaviśe (Sui Vihār), athavamsattiti (Hidda), ekachaparśi (Ārā), shashṭi ... (Shahdara), aḍhakapāṭi ... (Māṃsehrā), aṭhasatatiṣe (Patika), ekastiṃaye (Muchai), tiṣatiṣe (Takht-i-Bahī), ekadaśa[sa]ṣṭita (Pājā), ekasatatiṣe (Skāra Dheri).

Only a few verbal forms occur in the inscriptions. The Present, 3rd person Conjugation, singular, is represented by bhavati (Kurram), pratiḥavati (Patika), pratiḥavati (Peshāwār, tion. no. 4, Kurram), pratisivasati (Māṇikīla), parīthavati (Wardak). Of the middle we have the 1st person, arthava (Skāra Dheri), and the 3rd plural, dadaṭi (Sui Vihār).

The Optative is represented by siṭi (Taxila gold plate, Māṃsehrā), and the Imperative by hotu (Taxila scroll), bhavatu (Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Māṇikīla, Hidda, Wardak), bhavatu (Skāra Dheri), and, in Sanskrit, astro (Peshāwār, no. 21).

A Preterite is, perhaps, abhu (Shahdara).

Of Present participles we have pujyavanto (Patika) and aropyayata (Sui Vihār), and of Past participles passive katu (Zeda), karavita, -da (Panjītār, Kāldarra, Peshāwār, no. 5), karita (Pājā, Nowshera, khada (Ārā), khada (Shakardarā), khaṇvīda (Peshāwār, nos. 20, 21), pratiḥavita (Patika), pratiḥavita (Swāt vase), pratiḥavita (Taxila vase), pradistavita (Taxila scroll), pratiṣṭapita (Hidda), pratiṅvitra, niyatra (Lion Cap.), niyutita (Bimarān), likhita, uta (Kurram) niryāde (Māṃāne Dheri).

The Gerund is represented by karita, abhuvavita, avitita (Lion Cap.), ṣhapāchana (Sui Vihār), and likhiya (Ārā); and the Infinitive by ṛavitrave (Lion Cap.).
CONTENTS OF KHAROŠTHĪ INSCRIPTIONS

If we abstract from coins, seals, and seal-dies, almost every Kharoṣṭhī inscription records some donation or pious act.

The digging of wells is frequently mentioned. Sometimes it is dedicated by an individual person (Pājā, Mount Banj, Peshāwar, no. 21, Zeda, Ārāś; in other cases by some association (the Vashiṣṭga, sahayaras, i.e. sahāvaraś, Muchai; the Pipalakhaśa [sahaśya], Kala Sang; some undefinable association, sahayas or sahayaras, Mārguś; the Travaśakura sahayaras, Peshāwar, no. 20; the Druṇivadra sahayaras, i.e. probably sahayaras, Shakardarra). To the latter class we must probably reckon the Fatehjang inscription with its mention of a donation of the Vadhitira sahayas.

Of a similar kind is the dedication of tanks (pūṣkharīya) mentioned in the inscriptions from Pāñhār, Karnāl, and Kālārāra.

It is less clear what is meant with the 'water-giver', vayośa, mentioned in the Dēwa and Zeda inscriptions, in the latter one in connexion with a well (kūr). We should perhaps think of some appliance for drawing water from the well or some vessel for drinking. In the Tor Dherai records a pāpā is spoken of as the pious gift (deyadharma). These inscriptions were written in ink on pots or vessels, of which now only fragments remain. Pāpā corresponds to Skt. prāpā, which is usually rendered as 'drinking saloon', a shed on the roadside containing a reservoir of water for travellers'. In the Tor Dherai inscriptions such a place would be exceptionally appropriate, because the Loraliar district is an extremely arid land.

In one inscription, from Kanhiāra, there is the question of an arama or grove; the object of donation in the Takht-i-Bahi record is a parivāra, i.e. probably an enclosure, and in the Sui Vihār inscription we hear about the raising of a staff (yathā), the foundations of the staff, and an enclosure, while the Jāmalgarhi inscription of the year 359 speaks of some sort of religious building (dhamaṇāte okē).

Some religious building is apparently also meant in the Panjātā inscription, which speaks of a śivathāla, and the dedication of a stūpa is mentioned in the Patika plate and other Taxila inscriptions (Sīhila, Meridarkh), and in the Lion Capital inscriptions, together with a Saṅgharṣāma and adjoining ground.

Several utensils are the objects of donations: lamps (Jāmalgarhi), ladles (Bedadi, Taxila), jars (Palaṭu Dheri, Sahr-i-Balol, Takht-i-Bahi), silver vases, plates, and dishes (Taxila), volute brackets (Taxila), &c., and we occasionally get information about the value of such gifts, reckoned in stateras and drachmes (Taxila).

Images and sculptures are often dedicated, especially in later records: Kumrāhar, Peshāwar, nos. 21, 347, 1938, Lahore, no. 255, Jāmalgarhi, Yākūbi, Hasmunagar, Shahr-i-Napurān, Ghaz Dheri, Palaṭu Dheri, Takht-i-Bahi, Loriyan Tangai, Nowshera, Skārāh Dheri, Jauliā, Mamāne Dheri.

Buddhist relics are frequently mentioned: Swāt vase, Patika plate, Taxila gold plate and silver scroll, Lion Capital, Mānikiāla, Box lid, Peshāwar, no. 4, Bimārān, Kaniška casket, Kurram, Hidda, Wardak, and perhaps Uṇḍ. Also the footprints mentioned in the Tirath inscription may be classed with relics.

We often also hear about the aim which the donor had in mind.

Of a general kind is the initial sidhi of the Karnāl inscription. More definite is the statement that the donation is made for the purpose of pūjā. This pūjā may be
directed towards all the Buddhas (Patika, Lion Capital, Bimarān, Sihila vase, Silver scroll), the Pratyekabuddhas and Arhats (Silver scroll), the Dharma and Saṅgha (Lion Capital), or towards venerable persons: the parents (Patika, Taxila silver scroll, Meridarkh plate, volute bracket, Takhti-bahi, Pāṇa, Āra, Wardak), a brother (Patika, Wardak), relatives and friends (Patika, Silver scroll), a teacher (Mamane Dhēri), some dignitary (the mahākṣatrapa Kusulua Patika, the kṣatrapa Mervaki Miyika, etc., Lion Capital; the ērāhuṇa Kapa, Takhti-bahi; the kṣatrapa Liaka, Zeda). More general is the pājā of the home country (sarvasa Saṅkratanasa puya, Lion Cap.), or of all beings (Taxila scroll, Kaldarra, Kurman, Jamālārghi, Wardak).

The donor’s purpose is sometimes stated to be to ensure increase of life and strength: kṣatrapasa saputradarasa ayuhalavardhik (Patika), sarvastivadattivardhase, vardhase Saṅghamitrarajasa (Zeda); or health: atvaṇo arogadakshinā (Silver scroll), atvaṇasa īnatimitaroladiya arogadakshinā (Dharmarajika), matalptu... aghadakshinā (Taxila Meridarkh plate), maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa Khusyaṇasa arogadakshinā (Silver scroll), sāmīṣa arogadakship (Jāmalārghi),... læv arogadakshinā (Naugram), Budhurumasa aroga... (Shahr-i-Napursān), samanuyāya arogadakshinā (Mamane Dhēri); or luck and happiness: Mitavasāthapitrālī (Shahdār), sarvasapaya Īlṣahu hiya (Āra), sarvasatvamāna hidasuḥa (Pāna), sarvasatvamāna hidasuḥhartham (Kanishka casket), sarvasatvamāna hitasukha (Sūr Vihār), cf. bahujaṇūstilye (Swāt vase); dīrghayu... (Tor Dherai).

More general terms are also used, thus atvaṇasa sabharyasa saputrasa anyagraharthae (Āra), upakacchā madu (Zeda).

On the other hand, the aim can be of a special nature, e.g. to ensure protection to children (Śkarāh ḃhe), perhaps one’s own children in special dangerous circumstances.

A more religious colouring has the wish for the chief lot: maharajasa rajatirajasa Housshkasra agravhaga bhavatu (Wardak), mithyagasa cha agravhaga bhavatu (ibidem), rajasa agrapraksha (Hidda), bhūtara Svarabhuddha agrapradiał (Mānkiāla), mahatya agravhagrapadriyānasā, sarva aśashdíriya agravhagrapadriyānasā (Wardak), agre matalptimāni pratiyānśo sarvasatvamāṇi agre pratiyānśo (Tor Dherai).

In the Taxila gold plate we hear of a sacred relic deposited in a crystal hamsa, a symbol of the souls of the donor’s parents, in order to ensure Buddhahood for them, and in a similar way the aim is sometimes stated to be to lead on towards Nirvāṇa (gicayān kedu aya de samaparichaga, Taxila silver scroll; sarvasatvamāṇi nirvanasaṁbhara, Hidda).

There cannot be any doubt that we have throughout to do with Buddhist donors, Buddhists, and in several cases (Lion Capital, Takhti-bahi potsherds, Taxila and Bedazi ladles, Pāllaṭi ḃhe jars, Sahr-i-Bahlol potsherds, Tor Dherai) the gift is offered to the Buddhist Order of the four quarters.

Nor can it be doubted that it is the Hinayana which is represented. The wish for Nirvāṇa does not, of course, prove that. But the names of the Buddhist schools mentioned in the inscriptions do not leave any doubt. The Sarvāstivādins are mentioned on the Lion Capital, the Kanishka casket of Peshāwar, at Zeda, Kurman, and Tor Dherai, and the Kāśyapiyas in records from the Uttarārāma in Taxila, from the Urāśatījya (Bedazi), and from Pāllaṭi ḃhe. The Mahāsaṅghikas had a settlement in Wardak, and they are also mentioned on the Lion Capital, but not as being in possession of the Vihāra.

About the state of things in the Buddhist monasteries we do not get much information. We learn about the existence of a mahādānapati (Patika), and he is evidently
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also called *kovanurita* (Manikiala), clearly a Saka translation of *dinapati*. On the
Lion Capital a *korakaparivarṇa*, i.e. probably a 'hall' or 'chapter' of alms-lords is
mentioned. A *navakarmika*, or superintendent of works and repairs, is repeatedly mentioned
(Patika, Kanishka casket, Manikiala, Hidda), and we sometimes (Patika, Manikiala)
get the impression that he himself took care to have his name entered in the
record.

The Kurram inscription points to the existence of canonical writings in the north-western
Prakrit of the Kharoshthi inscriptions, and it is possible that similar indications
may be found in the Wardak record.

The Mamane Dheri inscription enables us to date a Gandhara sculpture in the 89th
year of the Kanishka era, and the palaeography of inscriptions on other sculptures shows
that they broadly belong to the same period. This fact is of importance for the history
of Gandhara art.

It is of interest to note that the aim is sometimes indicated in a sentence which does
not fit into the ordinary context, or even in a stanza or in a rhythmic sentence. In the
Taxila silver scroll the donor is in the last sentence spoken of in the second person, i.e.
the sentence contains a separate blessing by a different person; in the Arà inscription
some special results seem to be hoped for in consequence of the writing down of the
record; in Peshawar, no. 21, the final blessing has been added in Sanskrit; in the Skara
Dheri inscription the blessing is clearly metrical, and in the Taxila gold plate it is
distinctly rhetorical, with rhymes.

It is perhaps possible to draw the inference from such indications that the inscriptions
were more or less considered as a kind of charm. And it is hardly possible to explain
the Rawal inscription unless we assume that such was the case. That record is a clumsy
copy of the Shakardarra epigraph, executed by a person who did not understand the
original. His only reason for copying what he could not read was evidently his belief in
the magic efficacy of the letters he tried to imitate in order to achieve some desired object.

Such charms can be conceived to act in different ways. In the case of the Tirtha
inscription it is perhaps to be assumed that the footprints became footprints of the
Buddha in consequence of the magic spell contained in the letters. Usually, however,
the inscriptions are intended to secure blessing for the donor from the higher powers.

Such records are not, therefore, historical documents or proclamations in the ordinary
sense. To quote M. Barth,¹ they are 'pious works which indeed admit of a certain
amount of publicity, but a publicity intended especially for the next world'.

It thus becomes intelligible that the inscriptions are sometimes dug down in stupas or
placed in such a way that it is evident that they were never meant to be seen by mortal
eyes. And we understand the care which was taken in order to have the names of the
donors written and to include many of their friends and relatives, and also why the nava-
karmika seems to have added his name subsequently in the Patika and Manikiala records.
This was, as says M. Barth,² something more than a gratification of vanity, and a
mystic efficacy was attributed to the recording of such names.

Such considerations must be kept in mind when we want to judge of the nature
of the Kharoshthi inscriptions. And that is also the case when a date is added. It is
not intended for historical purposes, but to assure the particular pious act recorded
against being neglected by the eternal forces that regulate the mystic results: it is
particularly this very deed, executed at such and such a moment, which should lead to
bliss, and the date is then just as good a way of identifying as the mention of a name or
of other circumstances.

VARYING SHAPES OF THE LETTERS

The period covered by the inscriptions published in this volume extends over five or six centuries, and the area within which they have been found is large. We should therefore expect to find both local and chronological differences in the shape of individual letters. Already in the inscriptions of Aśoka there is a considerable variety, bearing witness to a rather prolonged use of the alphabet.

We know from somewhat later sources that Kharoshṭhi was not only used in monumental records, but also in manuscripts and in official or semi-official correspondence.¹ We may accordingly reckon with the possibility of finding cursive and monumental forms side by side. And, as a matter of fact, cursive forms are already met with in old inscriptions, such as those on the Mathurā Lion Capital, and, on the other hand, monumental forms, of an earlier type, are sometimes to be found in late records, such as the Jaulia inscriptions.

It is hardly possible to state the existence of local varieties, the differences found within the same locality and sometimes in the same record, e.g. in Kāngrā and Taxila, in Wardak and Tor Dherai, being more marked than where we have to do with different parts of the Kharoshṭhi area.

With regard to the gradual development of individual letters it is not always easy to arrive at certainty. Several aksharas, such as a, i, ga, gha, ksha, pa, pha, ma, ra, va, show little or no difference in the various records, and there are only some few where we seem to be able to trace a certain chronological evolution.

We are not here concerned with the origin and earliest history of the Kharoshṭhi alphabet, all our records being posterior to the Aśoka inscriptions, where the alphabet is already fully developed. We must be content to draw attention to some features which seem to be of a later date.

In the Aśoka inscriptions a small stroke is frequently added at the foot of many letters. We find similar bottom-strokes, in varying forms, in the Pāthīr and Kanhiāra inscriptions and perhaps in the sra of Kālārā, a short sloping stroke below the ma of the Bajaur seal, and a bend of the vertical of some letters in Bimarān, but in other old inscriptions they are absent. The dot at the termination of several letters in the Taxila gold plate and some Taxila seals cannot be compared, because it is also found at the top. In later inscriptions, however, especially in such as have a cursive appearance, we find these strokes again, and we have no right to assume that they have ever gone quite out of use. In the Taxila ladle, silver copas, and silver sieve inscriptions we have something approaching an angle, similar to the bottom-stroke in Kanhiāra, and in Mānikiāla we partly have a right angle, partly a protruding, sloping line (ya, l. 2), partly a straight bottom-stroke (ya, l. 12). In other late inscriptions, the Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Zeda, Kurram, Wardak, Mamane Dheri, Tor Dherai, we have a forward bend as in Bimarān, and it is possible that the apparent anusvāras in some aksharas in Sui Vihār, Mānikiāla, and Wardak are in reality such misdrawn bends.

With regard to initial vowels only u, o, and e call for any remark. In the Swat vase and apparently in I 4 on the Lion Capital u has the old shape, where the u-mātrā consists of a short line sloping forwards from the bottom. In I 7 of the Lion Capital a loop has been added to the right of this stroke. Elsewhere we find a loop or, in the Bajaur seal, a triangle attached to the left of the bottom.

¹ Cf. the Kharoshṭhi Dhamma-pada, the birch-bark fragments found in Afghanistan and mentioned in the Ariana Antiqua, and the documents recovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan.
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With ə there is much greater variety. In the oldest records the e-mātrā is added near the head, and similar forms are found at all times. Already in the Taxila scroll, however, we also find the e-stroke at the bottom, and in Arab, Wardak, and other late records this has become the rule. In two instances in the Wardak vase the letter is still more cursive, being devoid of the usual head-curve. In Bimarān the e-mātrā is slightly rounded downwards, and in some of the e's of the Manikāla stone and the last one in Mamāne Dheri it has become a rounded downward angle, the result being an akshara resembling the compound ūphā.

O is fairly constant. Only in Mount Banj and Kala Sang we find slightly different forms, the bottom of the vertical having a gentle backwards bend in the former and a sharper one in the latter record, where the e-stroke is almost continuous with the upper part of the vertical.

No difference is made between long or short vowels, initial or post-consonantic. Only in the uṣa of Pañhyār, the ḫa of Shakardara, and the ṣa of the Jamālgāri pedestal it is possible that length has been marked.

Post-consonantic ɪ is usually indicated by means of a line crossing the head, generally on the left side of the letter. In the case of mā and ḫa, however, the ɪ-stroke crosses the upright. With ṭa, ṭa, and ḫa both devices are found. The ɪ of Dharmarajika has the stroke through the head, that of Sui Vihrā, if my reading is right, through the vertical. With ṭa the ɪ-mātrā crosses the head-curve or angle in the oldest records: Pañhyār, Swat vase, Tirath, Patika plate; the vertical in Bimarān and Shakardara, and is placed just at the edge of the head in Kaldarā, Sui Vihrā, Zeda, Peshāvar, 7, and the Jamālgāri pedestal. Also in ḫi we find the ɪ-stroke at the edge of the head in Sui Vihrā. Elsewhere it crosses the upper hook or curve or, where the letter has a more or less regular s-shape, the middle. In the case of ḫi we occasionally, in Zeda and Kurram, find the ɪ-stroke at the edge of the head instead of across the limb, and in Arabs and Naugrām it is placed just to the left of the head.

The old shape of the u-mātrā is still found in Pañhyār (ṭu, ṭu), Karnāl (ṭu), and the Swat vase (ḥu), occasionally also later, on the Lion Capital (nu), apparently in the shu of Arabs, Yakubī, and Skārah Dheri, and perhaps in the ḫu of Wardak. In ṭu there is a great variety of shapes, which will be mentioned in connexion with mā. The common u-mātrā, however, is a loop or, occasionally, a triangle, with some late varieties.

The e-stroke usually rises from the head, on the left side in case of aksharas such as ṭa and ʃe. The e of the Bajaur seal is, in this respect, irregular. In ṭe and ḫe the e-stroke protrudes from the upright, and in the e of ṭuṣa on the Takht-i-Bahi stone it is a curved downwards angle, like some of the e's of Manikāla and Mamāne Dheri. In ḫe we find a characteristic shape in several inscriptions, beginning with the Bimarān vase, viz., in Sui Vihrā, Zeda, Kurram, Arabs, Tor Dheri, Peshāvar, nos. 5 and 21, Skārah Dheri, where the e-mātrā is added at the bottom, while the akshara itself is reduced to an upright, bent to the right at the top. In the Peshāvar inscription of the year 168 this ḫe has a forward slope and is devoid of the upper bend.

In the case of ḫ the rule is to let the stroke protrude from the upright. The apparent ḫsho in the Taxila Meridarkh plate, with an e-stroke running down from the upper curve, is probably a mutilated ḥsh. Occasionally, however, the ḫ-stroke has a different position. Thus it runs down from the head of Ḫho in Fatehjang and Mount Banj, and usually from the upper curve of Ḫa; from the horizontal of Ḧa in Karnāl, Fatehjang, Shakardara, and Loriyān Tangai. It protrudes from the foot of ḫa in the Swat vase; from the left leg of ḫa and backwards in the Taxila gold plate, in Shahdour, and partly in Tor Dheri, where we, however, also find instances where it is attached to
the right leg. Where \( ya \) has a more or less horizontal head, as in Wardak, the \( e \)-stroke runs down from this horizontal. With \( ra \) the mātrā is attached to the horizontal in the oldest records: Patika plate and Lion Capital, and also in Mamāne Ďheri; to the point of jointure with the vertical in the silver scroll, and to the vertical in Dharmarajikā, Sui Vihār, Zeda, Wardak, and other late records. In \( ste \) the stroke runs down from the horizontal.

With regard to vowels we may still note the double dot above the \( na \) of Hashthunā on the Wardak Vase.

Among consonants some few may be considered as test letters.

\( Ka \) has a square shape, with distinct angles, in all old records, and frequently also in later inscriptions. A tendency to round the upper horizontal can be traced in the Peshawar inscription of the year 168 and becomes fully established in the Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Kurram, and Yākubi. The side limb shows a similar development. It becomes more or less rounded and sloping in some of the \( kas \) of the Lion Capital, in Kala Sang and Takht-i-Bāhī, the inscriptions just mentioned, and late records such as Shakardara and Wardak. In Kala Sang it is raised up to the top stroke, and similar cursive forms, where the top stroke and the limb form one continuous curve, are found in the Peshawar inscription of the year 168, the Kanishka casket, Shakaržarra, Wardak, and Nowshera.

In the Kurram casket and the inscription on the Buddha's writing-board, Lahore Museum, no. 206, we have a \( ka \) with the vertical protruding above the head, in words where Skr. has \( sk \), evidently marking a modified, probably slightly aspirated, \( ka \).

\( Kha \) retains the old shape, without any bend of the head, in the oldest records: the Swāt and Taxila Meridarkh inscriptions, the Lion Capital (where the head is angular), Kala Sang, Mount Banj, Takht-i-Bāhī, Taxila ladle and Sihila vase, and occasionally in late records. On the Mathurā elephant the head is angular and the top bent back into a long horizontal. In Fatehjang and the Patika plate the head curve is rounded downwards at the top, and this broad head curve is found in the Taxila silver scroll and silver vase, in Dharmarajikā, Shahr-i-Nāparsan, the Mānikāla bronze and Wardak, while the bottom of the head is angular in the Peshawar Museum inscriptions no. 20 (of saṁ 168) and 21, and Dewai. In late inscriptions, such as Jaulī, the Pālāṭi Ďheri and Jamalgāhi pedestals and once in Zeda, the head is quite angular, the upper stroke being a vertical bent downwards in a sharp angle at the top.

The akshara which corresponds to Skr. \( kṣa \) has the same shape throughout, if we except two Loriyān Tangai inscriptions where the vertical almost touches the right termination of the head curve.

In the oldest records, in Maira, Mānschā, the Patika plate and Paṭā, the lower limb of \( cha \) is curved down below the jointure with the vertical which connects it with the head: an obtuse angle in Maira, a curve in the other records. Already in Shahdaur the downward continuation is almost absent, and in the Sihila vase we almost have the later cursive shape, where the connecting vertical is immediately continued in the lower limb; cf. the Kanishka and Kurram caskets. In the scroll the connecting vertical also runs into the right end of the head, and this shape is common in later records: Sui Vihār, Mānikāla, Āra, Wardak, &c. In the Peshawar inscription of the year 168, the head has become flattened, and once in Mānikāla and once in Wardak it is a straight line. This same form also seems to occur in Yakubī, while Skārah Ďheri has a still more cursive form, where the damaged head is connected with the lower limb by means of a large loop.

\( Ccha \) is only found in Mānschā and the Lion Capital. The lower cross-bar has become a downwards curve, which on the Lion Capital touches the angle of the head.

\( ja \) usually has an angular head. A tendency to round it is noticeable in Shahdaur,
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in Bimarān, where we once, on the cover, find the limb connected with the vertical by means of a narrow loop, in the Taxila scroll, and, fully developed, in Wardak and Yākubi. The vertical is once bent backwards, from the point of jointure with the limb, in Ārā, and likewise in Jaulīā and Yākubi.

The oldest instance of ja is in Takht-i-Bāhi, where the lower horizontal of the limb protrudes to the left of the point of jointure with the short upright. In the Sirkap silver sieve and seals, in Mānikiāla and Ārā (where the connecting horizontal cannot be seen), the limb has still an outwards curve, while in Zeda it has become a right angle.

Na has always the vertical to the left; in the Jamālgāri inscription of the year 359, the vertical has a backwards curve at the top.

Ta is only found in two inscriptions, in Dharmarājīkā, where the left bar is placed as the limb of ja and the right at the bottom, and in Sui Vihr, where the top is damaged and the right bar seems to be missing. The cross-shaped ta given in Bühler’s plate is a tha.

The lower horizontal of tha is always without the vertical which rises from its termination in the Aśoka inscriptions. It is long and sloping in the Swāt vase and in Mānsehrā, but elsewhere of the same length as the top-line. The head is rounded in Mount Banj, Takht-i-Bāhi, Dewai, Kurram, and Ārā.

The cerebral nasal na has two different forms, which occur side by side during the whole period: one with a rounded, the other with an angular head. The former can be traced from Pāthyrā and Tirath down to Wardak, the latter from Karnāl and the Swāt and Taxila Meridarkh inscriptions down to Wardak and Jaulīā. Sometimes the head is almost rectangular; cf. Fatehjang, Kala Sang, sometimes in Mānikiāla, &c.

In ta the leg has a forward slope and about the same length as the horizontal or curve in old records: Pāthyrā, Swāt vase, Maira, Shahdaur, Mansehrā, Patika, Muchai, Pājā, Kāldarra, Taxila scroll and other Taxila inscriptions, &c. Occasionally, as in Kālī Darra and the Kanishka casket, the head is curved backwards. Already in the Meridarkh plate we can trace a tendency to lengthen the leg and do away with the forward slope, the result being a letter resembling ra. On the whole, however, the two signs are easily distinguished.

The oldest da shows a shallow upper curve, opening to the right, and, partly, a forwards slope of the leg; cf. the Swāt and Taxila Meridarkh inscriptions, &c. The jointure between curve and leg is more or less angular, and the bottom of the leg bent forwards, in the Patika plate, Bimarān, Takht-i-Bāhi, Pājā, while this bend is missing in Mount Banj, Taxila gold plate, Zeda (di), Mānikiāla, &c. Frequently all edges are rounded; thus already in Tirath, the Meridarkh inscriptions, Fatehjang and Mānsehrā, and the result is a more or less sloping e-shape, which we find in numerous records, from the Taxila scroll and onwards. This e-shape is flattened in Kālī Darra, and in the Peshāwar inscription of the year 168 we find a vertical bent backwards at the top and forwards at the bottom, which we can also trace elsewhere, especially in connexion with an i- or e-mātra. Thus in the di of Takht-i-Bāhi, Pājā, Sui Vihr, Mānikiāla, Skārah Dheri; in the du of Takht-i-Bāhi and Kurram, and in the de, with the e-stroke at the bottom and usually no forward bend of the vertical, in Bimarān, Sui Vihr, Zeda, Kurram, Peshāwar Museum, no. 21, Ārā and Skārah Dheri. In the Peshāwar Museum inscription of the year 168 this de seems to be mutilated, having a forwards slope and being devoid of the upper bend of the upright.

In the oldest records, such as Tirath, Shahdaur, Patika plate, and other Taxila inscriptions, dha has an angular shape, and the lower limb protrudes to the right. A more cursive, rounded shape is found in the Lion Capital, Bimarān, Ārā, &c.
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Na is comparatively rare. The upper curve is shallow in the Swat vase, Shahdaur, and sometimes, the Lion Capital, but deeper in Maira, the Patika plate and other Taxila records, Pajā, &c.

Pha only occurs in Zeda, Kurram, where it is once replaced by pa, and the Jamalgari halo, and oha only in Takhti-Bahi, the Taxila scroll, Mānikiāla, Āra, and perhaps Peshāvar Museum, no. 4, and Nowshera.

The oldest ba, in Tirath and the Swat vase, is not much different from ra, only showing a forward slope of the vertical. This form is traceable in records such as the Lion Capital, the Taxila and Bimarān vases, &c. In the Patika plate, Takhti-i-Bahi and the Taxila scroll, there is a deep indenture in the curved head, which becomes a narrow angle in Sui Vihār and some Loriyān Tangai records. The ba of the Wardak vase is evidently misdrawn.

Bha has a distinct top-stroke protruding on both sides of the vertical in most inscriptions where it occurs, from the Swat vase to the Kurram casket. In Bimarān, Sui Vihār, and sometimes in Wardak we find a cursive bha where the right termination of the top-stroke is continuous with the vertical. Here the letter becomes similar to ka, which, however, in these records has a rounded head.

Ma has almost the same shape throughout, if we abstract from minor details such as the lengthening of the right bar above the line in Mānsehra, Mount Banj, and Khalatse, the inwards bend of both bars in the Bajaur seal and Hashmargar, and the short stroke below in the Paris cornelian. It is only in connexion with the u-matā that we find considerable variety. The oldest shape is represented by the mu of the Swat, Tirath, and Patika inscriptions, and is formed by raising the right bar and adding the u-bar at the left extremity. In so doing the ma-curve has become a sharp angle in Swat, and the akshara slopes backwards in Tirath, where the left bar has, besides, become considerably shortened. This shape is evidently cursive, and is found in several records. It may be described as a raised upright, sometimes sloping backwards, rounded forwards and then downwards at the bottom. We find this shape, in addition to the older one, on the Lion Capital, and further in Bimarān, Fatehjang, Peshāvar Museum of the year 168, Taxila ladle and silver plate, and, with a backwards opening of the bottom-curve, in Zeda, Mānikiāla, Wardak, and several pedestal inscriptions.

In Mount Banj, Dewai, Yakub, and apparently Ghaz Dheri we have a ma with the right bar above the line and the u-stroke added below the termination of the left bar. This mu differs from ma only in the raising of the right bar. It is apparently this shape which is at the base of the square mu in Kurram, where the left bar is vertical and bent forwards at the top and the u-matā is a downwards continuation of the vertical. Similar forms are also found in Dharmarajika, where the akshara seems to be turned round, and in Jauliā, where the downwards continuation is missing, and where we also find other peculiar forms. Also in Loriyān Tangai the shape of mu is very different, as will be seen from the plates.

Ya has a distinctly angular form in the oldest inscriptions, a broad angle in Pāthyār, Mānsehra, Shahdaur, Patika, Kāldarra, Muchai, Mount Banj, Takhti-i-Bahi, Pajā, Mārguz, Taxila scroll and other Taxila inscriptions, a narrow one in Karnāl, Fatehjang, and later records, such as Sui Vihār and Zeda. In the Lion Capital, Kala Sang, and partly in Takhti-i-Bahi the head is slightly rounded, and in Kanhiāra we have two almost parallel uprights connected by a top-bar. In Bimarān, and later in Mānikiāla, the left bar consists of a line forming an upper angle with the right bar and bent or curved downwards about the middle. Similar forms are also met with in other, undated records. In the Peshāvar inscription of the year 168 this shape has developed to an akshara
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resembling .sat, and more or less .sat-like forms are met with in the Kanishka casket, Kurram, and Wardak, and, with the left upright rising above the head, in Arâ and Loriyân Tangai.

Ra is fairly constant. In Kâldarra the top-stroke is slightly rounded backwards, and in Loriyân Tangai it is sometimes continued below the horizontal.

In .sat the limb is usually rounded, and in a cursive shape, which already begins to appear on the Lion Capital, it is raised up to the top of the vertical.

Va retains its angular head in most inscriptions and is only rounded in such records as Kurram, Arâ, Wardak, Loriyân Tangai.

The old rectangular .sa is used throughout, occasionally with a shortening of the left leg (pamchadate Pâjâ, srâ Lion Capital, srâ Mânsehrâ, srâ Taxila ladle, srâ Kurram). Already in the Lion Capital we also find a cursive form, with rounded angles, and by narrowing the head the result is sometimes, in the Takhti-Bâhi pot-sherds and some of the .sas of the Wardak vase, a letter resembling .va.

With .sha we may note the rounding of the head-curve towards the vertical in Kurram, Yakubi, and the Pâlân Dheri jars and the occasional break in the middle of the head curve in Mânikâla and perhaps also in Shahdaur. In Kanhiâra there is a dot and in Kurram a curve about the head, where Skr. has .shâ. As the Kharoshthi Dhammadapa has .sha in such cases, and as the curve seems to be used elsewhere as a sign of aspiration, I assume that an aspirated .sha is meant.

The oldest form of .sa, with a closed head, is found in the Pâthya r, Tirath and Swât inscriptions, in the first with a rounded, in the others with an angular, head. In Kanhiâra, Shahdaur, Fatehjang, Mânsehrâ, Pâtika plate, Lion Capital, Muchal, partly in Takhti-Bâhi, in Pâjâ, Mârguz, Taxila scroll and other old Taxila inscriptions, &c., we find an intermediate shape, where the leg is prolonged in a straight or bent line, without however reaching the head, and this form is occasionally also met with in late inscriptions, e.g. in Jauli.

Already in the Lion Capital a more cursive form, without the prolongation, begins to be used and it gradually becomes the common one. There are several varying shapes of this .sa, down to quite cursive forms, where head and leg is only one wavy line, which is sometimes met with in Wardak, Tor Dherai, the undated Peshâwar inscription, no. 1, &c.

Ha has an angular base in several inscriptions, beginning with the Pâtika plate and extending down to late records such as the Jamâlgârhi inscriptions, side by side with a rounded .ha, which is first met with in the Swât vase, and later on, partly together with the angular .ha, in several inscriptions, down to Wardak and other late records. No chronological or geographical distinction can be traced. In Shahdaur we seem to have one instance of the shape, known from the Aśoka edicts, with the upright bent back and down about the middle. In Arâ the bottom-stroke twice appears to be missing.

The anusvâra is frequently omitted. Where it is marked, it consists of a curve running backwards from the bottom of the vertical and opening to the left. Sometimes, as in Mount Banj, the Peshâwar inscription of the year 168, Khalatse, the Jamâlgârhi inscription of the year 359, and some uncertain cases, the curve immediately continues the vertical. In the yamhi of the Sihila vase it is apparently replaced by a short sloping stroke.

Compound consonants are comparatively numerous, as is to be expected in a dialect like the old north-western Prâkrit. The increasing influence of Sanskrit in the Kanishka period even leads to an increase in the number of such compounds.
Ya usually seems to coalesce with a preceding consonant, if we abstract from the compound rya, where it regularly remains. Three instances of the writing of a post-consonantic ya are known from the Aśoka inscriptions, viz. in ṭhēṣuṭa v. 23 and samyga ix. 4. xi. 12 of the Māṇeshrā version. Here the subscript sign seems to be a flattened ya.

It is possible that this same device is used in the Māṇikiala bronze, where a ya seems to be attached to the vertical of vha. In all other cases the subscript ya is a loop attached to the bottom. Thus in ṭhya in Wardak, apparently in ṭhya in Tor Dherai, in pya and ṭya in Wardak, in ṭhya in Sui Vihār and in ya in Sui Vihār, Wardak and apparently also in some Taxila inscriptions and in Tor Dherai. In Sui Vihār we even find this ya-loop attached to the bottom of an a. We get the impression that this device is a later development.

A subscript va is indicated by a curved or straight backwards stroke attached to the foot. In Shakardarra it occasionally also protrudes in front of the vertical. In some cases, viz. in the kra of the Lion Capital, the gra of Bimarān, Kurram, and Wardak, the dra of Kurram and Wardak, the skra and tsa of the Lion Capital, the dra of the Swāt vase, the mra of Wardak, the tra and skra of the Lion Capital, and the dra of the Lion Capital, some Taxila records, Wardak, Tor Dherai, &c., the r-stroke seems to indicate a modification of the consonant, as mentioned in the grammatical sketch. In such cases its shape sometimes differs from the usual r-stroke, being added in an angle, while the ordinary r-stroke has a rounded joint. The various shapes of tra in the Lion Capital and Zeda have been noted in the edition of those records.

Ante-consonantic r is marked by means of a downwards curve in all old records: the Swāt vase, Shahdaur, Patika plate, Lion Capital, Bimarān, Pājā, Takht-i-Bahl and Kaldarra. From the Taxila silver scroll onwards, it becomes a loop attached to the bottom, the first examples being the rva of the scroll and the rya of Bedadi. In rma the old shape, with the curve above or crossing the right bar, which is usually raised, is found in the Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār (where the letter is misdrawn), Kurram, and Jauli, while the later loop is attached to the r-stroke of rva in Māṇikiala. In Māmāne Dheri ante-consonantic r is a double curve, resembling the symbol for vo, added in front of the other consonant.

A ve enters as the second part of a consonantal compound in tva in Pājā, Taxila scroll, Dharmarājikā, Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, Kurram, Wardak, &c., in tva in Kurram, and vva in Sui Vihār, Māṇikiala, &c. It is everywhere denoted by a narrow rounding of the vertical backwards, continued in an upwards slope. Tva has formerly sometimes been rendered as tma, but the certain tma in Ārā is a regular la above a ma.

Some few stops are used in compounds with other letters, especially with s-sounds. Thus we find kksa, with both letters easily recognizable, in the Patika plate and the Sirkap vase, and tsa in slightly varying shapes in the Patika plate, Mount Banj, Takht-i-Bahl, Pājā, Sui Vihār (where it looks like ḍkta), and Ārā, perhaps also in a mutilated akṣara in Shahdaur and on the Peshāwar writing-board. An s-sound is the first component in several compounds. Thus we have ṭpsa in Māṇeshrā, the Lion Capital, the Taxila ladle, and Māṇikiala always in a shape resembling a ko, with a downwards bend of the top-stroke. We further find some ska-compounds. In Shahdaur we have ksta, in Wardak apparently skta. The most frequent ska-compound is sbbu. The vertical of sba is broken and continued in a ko in the Kanishka casket, Sui Vihār, once in Ārā, and in Wardak. In Zeda and the first skb of the Ārā inscription the kall limb is simply attached to the vertical, wherefore the compound has sometimes been considered to be a skbva.

Finally we find sta: an akṣara resembling ṭha, but with a forwards bend of the top,
VARYING SHAPES OF THE LETTERS

in the Lion Capital, the Mathura elephant, the Taxila silver scroll, the Kanishka casket, perhaps in Zeda, in Mānikiāla, Kurram, the Peshāwar inscription no. 21, and Wardak. In the Swat vase the shape is irregular, as mentioned in the edition of the record. In Tor Dherai and perhaps in Hidda, an upright rises from the right end of the cross-bar, as often in the Niya documents, where it is, in such cases, customary to transliterate thā.

In the pta of the Peshāwar inscription no. 21 and perhaps in the ḫutta of Nowshera we have compounds consisting of two stops, a late development due to the increasing influence of Sanskrit. The curious compound which I have tentatively rendered as viṭha in Khalatse is not clear to me.

In addition to the akṣarās some few other signs are occasionally used. Some of them, such as the svastika in Paṭhyār, Kanhiāra, and the Peshāwar inscription of the year 168, the diagram or nandipada on the silver scroll and some Taxila seals, the Buddha footprints in Tirath, the Mathura elephant, the curious illustrations in Shākardairra, &c., can only be mentioned in passing. More closely connected with the alphabet are certain strokes and signs which are sometimes attached or added to the letters.

In Mount Banj there is a flourish above the left extremity of the initial ma, and in Sui Vihaṛ and Āra a dash across the right bar of ma, which I take to mark the beginning of the record. Similarly I take the flourish at the end of the Takht-i-Bahi record to mark the termination.

Some signs of interpunction seem to occur. Thus the short dash after the figures of the year and the sloping line with a projection after the day figures in Fatehjang; the St. Andrews’ cross after the figures in Muchai; the curious cha-like sign after the figures in Kala Sang, the hook after the figures in Pajā, the blurred sign after the figures in the Peshāwar inscription of the year 168, and perhaps the traces of a sign visible after the date in Hashtnagar.

In the Lion Capital and in Mānikiāla we apparently find signs corresponding to the later Kākapada and indicating that something should be inserted. Thus there are some bars, on the right side of ḫśa in B 1; below the ṭra of B 2; before the ḫa and connected with the jo of B 2; at the left side of ḫśa and across the head of ṣa in M 1 of the Capital; and one bar on each side of the ṭra of ṭhra in 1 1 in Mānikiāla, which I have considered as signs of omission.

Abbreviations are sometimes found in the dates. Thus we have a curious ḫa at the beginning of the Taxila silver vase, perhaps an abbreviation for ḫala; saḥi in Maiwa, Shahdadur, Fatehjang, Panjtār, Peshāwar, no. 20, Khalatse, &c., sa on the Taxila scroll and in Loryīyān Tangai, and perhaps saḥva in Kala Sang, all standing for sarvavatāre. Similarly we find di for dhiva in Takht-i-Bahi, Panjtār, Loryīyān Tangai, Sui Vihaṛ, Zeda, Kurram, Peshāwar, no. 21, Shākardairra, Āra, and Kānīza Dheri. Other abbreviations are ṭhra and ḫhra for drakkha, sa or sva for stater in the Taxila silver plates, and perhaps ḫi for līvi on the Peshāwar writing-board.

The numeral symbols occurring in our inscriptions are: one to three vertical strokes for 1, 2, 3, respectively; a St. Andrews’ cross for 4; a sign similar to the letter a for 10; a double curve which Bühler thought might be a cursive combination of two 10 for 20, and a symbol of varying shape for 100.

Other numbers are expressed by groups, which should be added, or, in the case of the hundreds, multiplied from right to left. Thus 6 = 1 4 4; 8 = 4 4; 9 = 1 4 4; 15 = 1 4 10; 78 = 4 4 10 20 20 20; 384 = 4 20 20 20 20 100 11.

When two or more verticals follow each other, they are usually of equal length, but in Fatehjang the last is longer and in Loryīyān Tangai shorter than the rest.
THE SIGN FOR 100

The figure 20 presents some variety in the shape, the fundamental form is, however, everywhere the same. The sign for 100 has different forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Barj</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takht-i-Bahi</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pījā</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādārān</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjiār</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadīlī scroll</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pešāwar 168</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālābāse</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowāi</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhrāp vāse</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lōyān Tāngāi</td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāmāl gari</td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastnagar</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Illustration" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. INSCRIPTIONS OF GREEK CHIEFS AND UNCLASSED NORTH-WESTERN RECORDS

Only two Kharoshthi records have been found which have been executed by or by the order of Greek chiefs. We are unable to tell to what extent the Greek rulers made use of Kharoshthi. They employed it, in addition to Greek, in coin legends, and it is possible that they went on using Greek in administration and business. We cannot tell. The only thing we know is that some of them at least made use of Kharoshthi and the north-western Indian vernacular for the purpose of recording pious acts and donations connected with Buddhism.

We are in possession of two such epigraphs, which we shall now proceed to discuss.

I. PLATE I. 1: SWĀT RELIC VASE INSCRIPTION OF THE MERIDARKH THEODOROS

No. L 4 of the Lahore Museum is a Buddhist stucco relic vase, 5 in. high and 5 in. in inner diameter, which was discovered by Mr. C. G. M. Hastings in a Pathan village in the Swāt Valley, where it was employed by the local banyan as a money-box.

Round the upper part of the box runs a Kharoshthi inscription, plate 1, no. 1, which has been edited by Professor F. W. Thomas from an inked tracing and two rubbings supplied by Professor J. Ph. Vogel.

The letters are well engraved, but the vase has been painted black, and some of the lines have become indistinct through the paint.

The characters are, as stated by Professor Thomas, archaic, and the general ductus of the writing is stiff.

_U_ has the same shape which we find in the Aśoka inscriptions, with a forward bend of the lower part of the vertical instead of the usual loop. _Kha_ is almost identical with the _ka_ of the Aśoka inscriptions and has not the backward bend, which we already find in the Patika plate. We may also note the shape of the _pre-consonantal_ _r_ , without the loop of later records. The central bar of _ph_ is longer than in the Patika plate, but devoid of the upward bend which we find in the Aśoka edicts. _Na_ has a pointed head, and the _a-mātrā_ crosses the head as in the Aśoka, Patika, and Tirath inscriptions. As in the last-mentioned record it perhaps denotes the dental _n_ , but I shall write _y_ for consistency’s sake. _Ta_ and _da_ are very similar, but _da_ is more curvilinear than _ta_. In the third _akṣhara_ an _o-stroke_ has been added at the bottom. _Bha_ has about the same shape as in the Patika inscription. The head of _sa_ is closed, and the _akṣhara_ has the same shape as in some of the Aśoka edicts. It seems to point to an earlier date than the Tirath inscription. The _u_ of _hu_ is a line and not a loop, just as in the Aśoka inscriptions.

On the whole there can be no doubt that our inscription is one of the oldest, perhaps the oldest of all Kharoshthi inscriptions, with the exception of those of Asoka, and it can hardly be later than the middle of the first century B.C.

With regard to reading and interpretation I agree with Professor Thomas in most details. I think, however, that he begins his reading in the wrong place. There is a longer interval than usual before the akshara the, and it seems certain that this interval marks the beginning of the record.

The first word is evidently Theudorena, i.e. perhaps Theudorena. The n has, as already mentioned, the old form with a bend of the vertical instead of the loop of later records. Professor Thomas says that the akshara may conceivably be a, but I do not know any instance where the o-matrā is not a separate line added to the vertical of a. Mr. Majumdar maintains that we must read a, but he has evidently overlooked the distinct bend of the leg.

The name Theudora is Greek. Professor Thomas says that Theodoros is no less Greek than Theodoros. So far as I can see, however, Theudora is a correct writing of the usual Θεοδώρα, the Greek η having been rendered as n, just as the Indian u is written o in Greek in words such as κεφώ, knjāla, Bodā, Buddha, &c.

The next word is, as seen by Professor Thomas, evidently meridarkhena, i.e. perhaps meridarkhena. All the letters are absolutely certain. Nor can there be any doubt about Professor Thomas’s explanation of the word meridarkha: it is the Greek title μεριδάρχης, which belongs to the Hellenistic and Roman period.

Professor Thomas says: ‘The lexicons of Hesychius and Photius gloss it (or rather the form μεριδάρχης) as μερίτης. It is known to occur, along with the abstract μεριδηρχία, in Josephus (Ant. Jud. xii. 5. 5 and xiv. 7. 3), where it is applied to Apollonius and Soemus; and in the first of Macrobius, x. 65, the same title is bestowed by Ptolemy Philometor upon Alexander Balaus. μερίς in the sense of “arrondissement” is also found in various inscriptions belonging to the Seleucid age and sphere: see Dittenberger, Orientis Graeciae Inscriptiones Selectae (Leipzig, 1905–5), index. The compound μεριδάρχης occurs also in the various papyri procured from Egypt. . . We may add that it does not seem certain that in Egypt μεριδάρχης was part of the normal official terminology.’

‘From the tenor of the present inscription it is clear that Theudoros was officially a μεριδάρχης, or “District Officer”, and that his district included the site of the deposit which is commemorated. He was, therefore, most probably in charge of a part of the Kabul territory (the Paropamisadae), or of Arachosia or Gandhara. As regards his date, nothing precludes the supposition suggested by the age of the writing, that he belonged to the period of Greek rulers preceding the Parthians and even the early Sakas. . . That a different person from the donor of the casket is indicated by “Thaidora, son of Datia” (of the Kādarra inscription) is abundantly evident from the forms of the aksharas which he employs and from the year (113) in which he dates.’

These statements are no doubt unobjectionable. We cannot, however, say whence the vase originates. It is just possible that it has been originally found in Swat, which may, for anything we know, have been dependent on the Greek rulers in Taxila.

The next word is pratīthavidura, with a comparatively large interval between pra and ti. The r-stroke under da is added in a sharp angle, and Professor Thomas refers us to Bühler, who mentions ⁴ two cases in the Asoka inscriptions where di shows “a curve to the right of the foot, which is probably nothing but an attempt to clearly distinguish da from na.” Professor Thomas adopts this suggestion and reads pratīthavida. It seems to me, however, that this bottom-line must be compared with the apparent r-matrā, which occurs in con-

⁴ Indische Palaeographie, para. 11, 8.
nexion with intervocalic i on the Lion Capital, with intervocalic k in the same epigraph, and with g in several inscriptions, &c. I have discussed such writings in the chapter about grammar and suggested that it is meant to indicate a fricative pronunciation. It seems to me that such is probably also the case here, and, if we bear in mind the change of intervocalic t to r in modern Khowar, we become inclined to think that our vase actually originates from the Swat country, and that there was, in the local dialect, a tendency to fricative pronunciation. It cannot be objected that -r is preserved elsewhere in the inscription, even in prati in the same word. The occasional writing padi for prati, which has been mentioned in the grammatical introduction, shows that here there was a tendency towards cerebralization, and words such as bhagravato, stilrye belong to the more formal part of the record, where traditional writing was bound to exercise a certain influence. The whole state of things seems to me to point to a voiced pronunciation of -r with a tendency towards a fricative sound. I therefore read pratihavida(r)a, indicating the sound-modifying function of r through the parenthesis.

The next word is ime, which Dr. Thomas takes to be the neuter singular, corresponding to Māgadhi imaun, Skr. idam. The form can also be the masculine nominative plural, as in the Taxila silver scroll. The decision depends on the reading of the ensuing word. Dr. Thomas read sarira, stating that the e of re is clearly visible on one of the rubbings. His plate shows a faint stroke above ra, but a similar stroke is also seen in front of the letter. In my materials, an excellent photograph and three rubbings, there is no trace of it, and, I therefore read sarva. This can correspond to Skr. sarvarā, and then ime would be the plural form. It should be borne in mind that we find neuter plural forms in -a already in the Shāhābāzgarhi and Mānehrā versions of the Asoka edicts, while on the other hand the nominative forms in -ant are widely used in the masculine accusative plural. Lüders has found that the nominative plural of a-bases in Old Ardhamāgadhi ended in -a, the accusative in -ant and that this state of things is also found in Mānehrā and Shāhābāzgarhi. The neuter forms in -a mentioned above bear witness to a beginning fusion of the masculine and neuter, which has resulted in the disappearance of the neuter gender in many of the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars. As stated in the grammatical introduction, the only other neuter plural of a-bases which is found in Kharoshthi inscriptions is padāni, in the Tirath epigraph. In the Dhammapada manuscript we have several forms in -ant, but they are all accusatives, and the isolated padāni does not prove that the regular nominative was formed in ant. I therefore read ime sarva and take this to be the common masculine-neuter form of the nominative plural.

Then follows takamunīta (i.e. perhaps takamunīta) bhagravato. The r-stroke of gor, which Professor Thomas does not transliterate, evidently indicates a fricative pronunciation of intervocalic g.

The last word of the inscription was read bahnjatiṣṭhitīye by Professor Thomas. The fourth letter is, however, certainly ya, i.e. perhaps na and not li. Professor Thomas was misled by the fact that the vertical of ya had been filled up through the painting of the vase. The fifth akṣara is not an ordinary sti. The head consists of a curve and not of a straight line. The bottom of the vertical is bent backwards, and the t-stroke crosses the vertical, parallel to the top-stroke. It seems as if the engraver had originally misread his draft and read hi, but subsequently tried to make sti out of it. The ensuing akṣaras are certainly tiye, and we must therefore read stitiye, though hitaye would be more in accordance with the usual formulas.

---

1 Cf. Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Asoka, p. xc.
2 Cf. Lüders, SBAW, 1913, p. 992.
3 l. c., p. 994.
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The whole inscription accordingly runs:

TEXT
Thelidorena meridarkhena pratîhavîd(r)a ime šarîra šakamunîsa bhag(r)avato bahujanastitiye.

TRANSLATION
By Theodoros, the meridarkh, were established these relics of the Lord Šâkyamuni, for the purpose of security of many people.

II. PLATE I. 2: TAXILA COPPER PLATE INSCRIPTION OF A MERIDARKH

To the west of the Dharmarâjikâ stûpa in ancient Taxila is the village of Shâhpur, which is surrounded by remains of eight small stûpas, numbered 9–16 by Cunningham.¹ They have all been opened long ago by the villagers, and, according to Cunningham, no. 17, to the west of Shâhpur, yielded 'a copper plate inscription, in three or four pieces, which was given to Major Pearse eight years ago, or about A.D. 1855'.

The first fragment of the plate, containing the beginning, has subsequently disappeared, while the remaining three pieces have found their way to the Calcutta Museum.

The first notice of the inscription was given by Rajendralâla Mitra,² who stated that the plate was found by Major Pearse himself and that Mr. E. Thomas thought that he could read the words ayaṇamāchātra, vīveka and vīphala. Then follows the note by Cunningham, in whose plate the inscription is reproduced as originating 'from Stupa in Jhaoli,' whereas it has become known as the Jhaoli copper plate. Jhaoli is apparently the village called Jaoli in Cunningham's Report,³ and described as 'situated in a gorge between two hills, about three-quarters of a mile to the south-east of Bâdarpur, and upwards of four miles to the east-north-east of Shah-Dheri'.

A new edition and reproduction was published by Haraprasâd Šastri.⁴ Then follow a note by R. D. Banerji⁵ and an edition by Professor F. W. Thomas.⁶ It is no. 70 in Majumdar's List.

Rajendralâla Mitra describes the plate as a narrow strip of copper 9½ in. by 8 in., broken into four fragments. The three pieces which remain are 3 in., 2½ in., and 2½ in. long, respectively. The inscription has been reproduced in plate I. 2.

The characters are of a fairly early type, but not so old as those of the Swât vase. The u-mātrā is intermediate between the short stroke of the Swât vase and the loop of later records; cf. tu and thu. Ka has the same angular shape as on the Swât vase, the Patika plate, the Lion Capital, &c. Kha agrees with the kha of the Swât vase, and still more closely with that of the Lion Capital. Na has the pointed top which we find on the Swât vase, the Muchai and Pājā records. It only occurs in such cases where also Sanskrit has n, and there is no instance of a dental ṅ. Ya has the angular shape which we know from the Patika plate and other old inscriptions. The head of sa is not closed as in the Swât vase, but the top of the leg is continued in a straight line upwards from the point of juncture as in the Mânsehrâ inscription of the year 68, the Muchai record of the year 81, the Pājā epigraph of the year 111, &c. On the whole the palaepigraphy points to a date in the second half of the first century B.C.

The opening word of the inscription has disappeared with the first fragment. Cunningham reads sanîcûtsara, but admitted that the first letter looks more like a than sa. In his plate it looks like la or ra, while Rajendralâla's plate distinctly gives a. The second

¹ ASI, ii, pp. 124 ff.; cf. plate LXI, no. 3.
² JASB, xxiv, 1855, pp. 328 ff., and plate XV, no. 3.
³ Lc., p. 146.
⁴ Ibidem, vi, 1910, p. 486.
⁵ JPASB, iv, 1908, pp. 364 ff. with plate.
is a distinct va in the former, while the latter shows a short vertical below the left-hand termination of the horizontal, so that we might think of a defective la. The third looks like the head of dha in Cunningham's plate, while the other reproduction shows a letter which might be read as tla, though the usual vertical top-stroke is missing. It is also conceivable that we have before us skha or a compound of ka and another letter, such as sa. Then there is room enough for two more aksharas.

Nothing can be made out of such a state of affairs. The only thing that we can say is that the first word contained a name in the instrumental singular, agreeing with the ensuing word. As a mere guess I may mention Alaksadreya or Alaskadrena.

The next word was read miti vona by Cunningham and metiakhena by Haraprasād Śāstri, while Professor Thomas recognizes that we have here the same title as in the Swāt vase inscription and read meridakhena = meridrakhena. There can only be doubt about the third akshara. I abstract from the apparent u-matrā, which is evidently due to what Haraprasād Śāstri describes as 'the twistings and indentations on the plate'. There remains what looks like ṝa or ṭa: a vertical, from which a horizontal protrudes towards the left, being terminated by a vertical rising above and continued below the horizontal. It seems probable that either the upper or the lower part of this vertical is due to a mistake of the engraver and I accept Professor Thomas's reading ṝa, as there cannot be any doubt that the word is a rendering of the Greek μεριδαρχή. It should be noted that the ante-consonantic r is omitted in this word, while the Swāt vase reads meridarkhena.

The same is the case in the next word, sabbhayakena, which certainly represents a Skr. sabhāryakena, together with his wife. We have no right to infer that the r was not sounded, the less so as its influence can be seen in the cerebralization of the ṭ of meridakhena.

Then follows tsuba, where bo comes in the break between the fragments, so that the vertical has disappeared. Moreover, there is a similar downward prolongation of the top-stroke as in ḍa of meridakhena, which fact makes it still more probable that our reading of that letter is the right one.

The next word is clearly meant for pratitavito, though it looks more like pravistavito. The apparent prolongation of the vertical of ti above the horizontal is accidental. The top of the letter is bent backwards, but this bend does not show in the estampage.

Then comes matapitu puyae, where pū comes in the break and has, consequently, become damaged.

The last word of the record was read agharachapuyaye by Cunningham, aghasa cha nayae by Haraprasād Śāstri and aghadathenayaye by Professor Thomas. There can be no doubt that the last reading is right, and Professor Thomas's explanation of the word must also be accepted, that it represents a Sanskrit arghadakhshiyai or is an error for the usual arghadaksheyai, Skr. arghadaksheyai; cf. the apparent aregha'yakshi in the Jamālgarhi Pedestal inscription and arghadaksheyai in inscriptions found at Miran in Chinese Turkestan.1

We thus arrive at the following:

Text

mer[da]khena sabbhayakena thubo pra[t]itavito matapitu puyae aghadaksho-(i)nyaye.

Translation

By . . . , the Meridarkh, together with his wife, the stūpa was established, in honour of (his) mother and father, for the presentation of a respectful offering.

1 Cf. Boyer, JA, x, xvii, 1911, pp. 413 ff.
III. Plate I. 3: BAJAUR SEAL INSCRIPTION OF THEODAMAS

In the village of Miankili in Bajaur, south-east of Jalālābād, some engraved stones have been found, which were acquired by the Assistant Commissioner of Mardan, Captain, later Major, Sir Harold Deane and transmitted to M. Émile Senart, who published them with a plate in 1889.¹

One of them, M. Senart’s no. 1, contains a short Kharoṣṭhī legend, reproduced in plate I. 3.

The stone itself seems to have disappeared. According to the reproduction, which is stated to be in double size, it is ¾ in. high and ¾ in. broad, and is slightly damaged on the right side and at the bottom. It shows a standing figure, facing towards the right. The right arm is bent, with the hand inclined towards the face, while the left hand holds a branch or a corn-stalk, or perhaps a sceptre. A line following the back is, according to M. Senart, probably meant to indicate the dress.

Behind the figure and along the left rim runs the legend, beginning behind the head and ending behind the middle of the leg. Five aṅkharas are visible, but M. Senart states that he thinks he can see traces of a sa in the damaged portion at the bottom.

The characters are well cut and clearly legible, but do not allow any certain inferences about the age of the seal. The u-mātrā has the shape of a triangle, a form which is found in isolated cases in the Zeda and Āra inscriptions. The e-stroke in the second aṅkhara ma is irregularly placed at the right end of the horizontal. Ma has a curious indenture on both sides, which has its nearest parallel in the Taxila gold plate. The sa shows a slight prolongation of the leg above the juncture and reminds us of the shape of this letter in Fatehjang, Muchai, Paja, and, especially, Marguz.

If any inference can be drawn from the characters, we may assign the seal to the first half of the first century of the Christian era, but such a dating can only be approximative.

The reading is not subject to doubt. It gives su Theudama or, if M. Senart is right in seeing a sa after ma, su Theudamasa.

I have discussed the meaning of sa in the Introduction, where I have suggested that it may represent an attempt at rendering the Saka word shau, king. At all events, it seems necessary, as M. Senart says, to compare it with the syllable sv occurring in the coin legends of Hermaeus and Kujula Kadphises, and it is a priori probable that Theudama was a contemporary of those rulers.

His name shows that he was a Greek, for Theudama evidently represents Greek Θεόδωμας, Θεόδωμας or Θεόδημος, with the same v for Greek o as on the Swāt vase. We do not know who this chief was, but it may be surmised that he lived in the Kābul country at the time when the Greek dominion was overthrown by the Parthians and, subsequently, by the Kushāṇas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>su Theudama[sa]</td>
<td>of King Theodamas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ JA, VIII, xiii, 1889, pp. 364 ff.
IV. PLATE I. 4: PARIS CORNELIAN INSCRIPTION

In the cabinet of medals in Paris is found a cornelian, of unknown origin, with a Kharoshthi legend. It was brought to the notice of M. Senart by M. Babelon and edited together with the Bajuar seal.1 I reproduce it in plate I. 4 from a cast, which has kindly been provided by the Paris authorities at the request of the Foreign Office. It is published in this place, because it seems to be broadly contemporaneous with the Bajuar seal of the Greek Thelidama.

The stone is oblong and rounded, \( \frac{6}{8} \) in. high and \( \frac{4}{8} \) in. broad. It shows a standing person, facing towards the right. The right hand is stretched out in front of the figure, the left carries a knotted stick or sceptre. The head-dress is provided with two long bands streaming backwards. The dress is fastened round the waist by means of a girdle.

M. Senart is of opinion that it is impossible to separate the stone by a long interval from the period of the Parthian rulers Gondophernes and Abdagases. With regard to the figure, he thinks that it must be some divine being. The corresponding figure on the coins of Gondophernes and Abdagases was described as representing Zeus by Professor Gardner,2 while M. Senart follows Wilson in leaving the question open.

In front of the standing figure, from the feet and upwards, runs a legend consisting of five Kharoshthi letters, \( \frac{3}{4} \) to \( \frac{3}{6} \) in. high. They have been read by M. Senart as Puñamataza.

The characters seem to be slightly older than those of the Bajuar seal. The \( u \) of \( pu \) consists of a short stroke projecting from the bottom of the vertical and provided with an upward bend. The \( sa \) has a rounded head and the lower vertical projects slightly towards the head. The nearest parallel seems to be the \( sa \) of the Pāja inscription of the year 111, and this agrees with M. Senart’s approximate dating.

The reading of the two first aksharas is absolutely certain, viz. \textit{puña}. The third is a rather square \textit{ma}, and below is a short horizontal stroke, which is well known from the coins of the Greek rulers, and which Professor Bühler was no doubt right in explaining 3 as a rudimentary indication of the vertical standing originally on the right. The fourth akshara is an angular \textit{la}. In M. Senart’s plate it seems to be provided with a short horizontal running backwards at the bottom. The cast from which the new plate is prepared shows that the original has no such stroke. The whole is, accordingly, Puñamataza, representing a Sanskrit Puñyamatasya.

We have no means for settling the question about the identity of Puñamata. It is even possible that the word is not a name but a title. We can do no more than to give the reading and translation of the legend.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Text} & \textbf{Translation} \\
Puñamataza & of Puñyamata \\
\end{tabular}

\footnotesize{1} JA, VIII, xiii, 1889, pp. 364 ff.
\footnotesize{2} Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India, pp. 103 and 107.
\footnotesize{3} Indische Palaeographie, para. 9 A, no. 12.
UNCLASSED NORTH-WESTERN RECORDS

In connexion with the epigraphs which seem to have some connexion with Greek rule in India I shall deal with two inscriptions from the north-west, which cannot be assigned to any definite period. In the first place there is a short inscription from Tirath, of a comparatively early date. In the second we know of the existence of a rock-inscription from Saddo in Swat, which it has proved impossible to copy, owing to the inaccessible-ness of the country.

V. PLATE I. 5: TIRATH ROCK INSCRIPTION

The village of Tirath is situated on the border of the Swat Kohistan. Near the village is a rock or boulder, showing two large pādakās and below them a Kharoshthi inscription of eleven letters.

We are able to identify these footprints with absolute certainty.
In his account of Udyāna Fa-hien mentions a spot where the Buddha coming to Udyāna 'left a print of his foot, which is long or short according to the ideas of the beholder'. Huan-tsang also speaks of the large flat stone with the Buddha's footprints, the size of which varied with the religious merit of the measurer. He locates it on the north bank of the Swat river thirty li to the south-west of the spring of the Nāga Apalā, the reputed source of the river, about 250 li to the north-east of Mēng-chieh-li, i. e. Manglaur.

Sir Harold Deane recognized that the locality must be looked for in the neighbourhood of the present head of the Swat river near Kalām. At Tirath he discovered the footprints and the inscription. Two estampages of the latter were prepared and forwarded on Sir Harold's behalf to the late Professor Bühler by Sir Aurel Steinh.,

Professor Bühler, who was under the impression that there are two inscriptions, published a facsimile of one of the estampages, reproduced in plate I. 5, with his reading of the inscription in 1898.

The characters are of ancient type. Ka has the short straight top-stroke of the Aśoka and Saka inscriptions and points to the same time as the Shahdair epigraph. Nī has a more pointed head than in the Aśoka and Patika records, and stands between the forms occurring in the Swat vase and the Taxila silver-scroll. The t-stroke crosses the curve of the head, as in the Swat vase, the Pāṭhyār and Patika inscriptions. Dha stands between the Aśoka and Patika forms, being less curvilinear than the former and less sloping than the latter. Similar forms are found in the Taxila gold plate, the Taxila vase, and the Fatehjang stone. Pa has almost the same shape as in the Patika plate. Bu has a less pronounced bend of the top than in the Patika plate and reminds us of some of the Aśoka forms and those of the Swat and Taxila vases. Mu stands in the upper line, and the right top-stroke is short as on the Lion Capital. The nearest parallel is, however, the mu of the late Jauliā inscription no. 10. The most

1 See James Legge, A record of Buddhistic kingdoms, being an account by the Chinese monk Fa-hien of his travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399-414) in search of the Buddhist books of discipline. Translated with an annotated, and a Corean rendering of the Chinese text. Oxford, 1886, p. 49.
3 JRAS, 1896, p. 655.
4 Cf. his Sritisindia, p. 8.
characteristic letter is sa, which has its nearest parallels in the Patñyār and Swāt vase inscriptions, the lower vertical being prolonged upwards in a straight line and almost touching the top.

On the whole there cannot be any doubt that the record is old, and especially the shape of sa seems to show that it is older than the Patika plate. We may tentatively assign it to about the middle of the first century B.C.

Reading and interpretation do not present much difficulty. It is possible that the akṣara which is used for the cerebral ॱ in the Aśoka inscriptions here and on the Swāt vase stands for the dental KANJI. As stated in the chapter about grammar I shall, however, transliterate the letter as 钊, leaving the question about the actual pronunciation open.

In one of Bühl's reproductions there is a short vertical hanging down from the head of the first akṣara. It is evidently an e-mātrā, of the same kind as in the Aśoka inscriptions,1 and Bühl was no doubt right in reading bo. In the Taxila meridarkh plate and in the Lahore inscription no. 25 the ॱ of bo is differently placed, and projects from the vertical. The form bodhasa is in accordance with a tendency which is well known in Indian Prākrits, where ॱ is sometimes used instead of ॱ before consonantal compounds.2

TEXT

Bodhosa Śakamunīsā padāni.

TRANSLATION

Foot-prints of the Buddha Śākyamuni.

VI. SWĀT ROCK INSRIPTION

Sir Aurel Stein 3 writes about another Kharoshthi inscription from Swāt: 'Among the paper estampages which had been brought to Colonel Deane by his native agents, and which he handed over to me early in 1898, there was one which showed a rock surface curiously cut up by natural cross lines, recalling the threads of some woven fabric. There were traces of some Kharoshthi characters also. Some place in the Upper Swāt Valley was vaguely indicated as the provenance. The publication of the estampage was prevented by the death of Professor Bühl, for whom it was reserved, and subsequently by the doubts which justly enough arose about the genuineness of the many 'inscriptions in unknown characters' supplied to Colonel Deane by the less scrupulous of his agents.'

Sir Aurel thinks that the impression has been taken on the rock where the Buddha was stated to have dried his clothes, referring us to Hsüan-tsang (i.e.), who says that the lines of the robe were still distinct like carving.

No further information has been forthcoming about this inscription.

VII. PLATE I. 6: SADDO ROCK INSRIPTION

The village of Saddon is situated on the left or eastern bank of the Panjikora river, to the west of the Katgala pass, on the road leading from Swāt to Chitrāl. On a rock is found a Kharoshthi inscription,4 engraved in large letters.

---

1 Cf. no. 27 ill in plate 1 of Bühl's Palaeography.
2 Cf. Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, para. 125.
3 Scrinia, p. 80a.
4 Majumdar's List, no. 57.
UNCLASSED NORTH-WESTERN RECORDS

The only information we possess about this record is a notice by Cunningham, who publishes a copy, reproduced in plate I. 6, made by his servants 'under great difficulties, and not without danger'. 'It is therefore much less distinct than it would have been if taken under more favourable circumstances.'

Cunningham goes on to remark: 'Enough has been copied to show that the record is not later than the first century of the Christian era', and gives a reading of the record, so far as it has been copied, stating that the letters 'are too scattered to yield any intelligible sentence'.

The plate shows remnants of four lines, but no sense can be made out.

Cunningham read the first line as *maṣa Chetra di*, supplying *vase* after *di*. His reading cannot, however, be maintained. The plate seems to give *matumihirana*, but it is possible that the apparent *miṃ* is misdrawn for *dhi*, so that we should read *matudhirana*, cf. the doubtful *dhihirana* in the Fatehjang inscription.

L. 2 was read as *ru...mudelama tiṃja*, but looks like *da...[mukha] damaśnoja*. Auchwa read this as *esama ...trā ...ṇajaya*, and  

" 4 as *yogatitāsa...ja.*

I refrain from attempting to improve on this reading, though I cannot accept it in all details.

1 ASI, v, pp. 62 ff., and plate xvi, no. 5.
B. INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

The bulk of Kharoshṭhī inscriptions belongs to the period of Indo-Scythian conquest, and the Indo-Scythians were, as we have seen in the introduction, the first to mark their founding of an Indian empire by introducing eras of their own.

There are, as stated above, two such eras, and the older one goes back to those Sakas who invaded the Sindh country in the first century B.C. and also established themselves in the western Panjāb. They were here succeeded by the Parthians, but the Saka era remained in use and was later on taken over by the Kushāṇas, who restored the Scythian empire. In the northern districts it was even continued after the rise of a new and still more powerful Kushāṇa dynasty in the second century A.D.

In the following we shall discuss the records dated in the old Saka era, and some undated inscriptions found in the same neighbourhood or otherwise connected with them.

VIII. PLATE II: MAIRA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 58

Maira is a small village in the Salt Range, Jhelum District, ten miles to the west of the Kallar Kahar Lake, in 32° 43' N. and 72° 40' E. In an old well at Maira Colonel Robinson discovered a Kharoshṭhī inscription, and both he and Colonel Bristow sent copies to Cunningham, who published them together with two more copies, prepared by himself and a native servant from paper impressions.1

The inscription was engraved on three slabs of kankar stone, on the east, north, and west sides of the well. The two slabs on the east and north sides have since been removed to the Lahore Museum, where they are now as no. I. 109. The north slab has been broken into two pieces, one 1 ft. 8 in. long, and 8 in. high, the other only 5 in. long. The east slab measures 2 ft. 2 in. by 7 in. The third slab seems to have disappeared, and the part of the inscription which it contained is only known from Cunningham’s rough plate. The remaining portion is reproduced in plate II from estampages and from a photograph.

The height of individual letters varies between 1½ in. and 2½ in. The state of preservation is not good, and it has not been possible for me to give a satisfactory reading and interpretation. I am indebted to Professor Thomas for some valuable suggestions.

Nor have I been able to form a clear idea about the age of the inscription. Some of the characters are, however, so similar to those of the Patika plate of the year 78 that it seems impossible to refer the record to the Kushāṇa period. The mutilated ekha has the distinct lower curve which we know from the oldest Kharoshṭhī records; da, da, na, ba, and la remind us of the Patika plate, and there seem to be traces of the upward continuation of the leg of sa which is characteristic of old inscriptions.

---

1 ASI, v, 1875, pp. 93 f., with plate xxviii; cf. Majumdar, List no. 35.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

The east slab, A, contains two lines of writing.

L. 1. The first akshara seems to be a mutilated sanī, though Cunningham may be right in reading su and Professor Thomas in reading sa. The second may be kra or pra, as read by Cunningham, the third and fourth ones are apparently mi and sa respectively. The most probable reading seems to be sanākrāmīsā, which may be the genitive of sanākrāmi. Sanākrāmīyatam can mean ‘to conquer’ and sanākrāmī may mean ‘engaged on an expedition of conquest’, ‘conquering’.

Then come the lower part of a cha, a damaged to or tu, a mutilated pu or ku, two aksharas which may be ra and ro; traces which point to a dha of the same shape as in the Patika plate; something which may be ba; and a fairly distinct la, whereafter there is room enough for one letter. Cunningham read dhainavodasa cha la, but his materials were much less satisfactory than mine. I think it possible to read chatupurarodhbalasa, whose army obstructs four towns, but that is little more than a mere guess.

L. 2 was read by Cunningham as apadalcha... nanayapa dana. The first word is, however, clearly atibalana. Then follows a deep groove, and two or three letters seem to have disappeared entirely. After the break comes a damaged letter which may be na, but there are traces of a line crossing the vertical, and one might think of rna. The next letter may be di or ni; the last ones of the line may be yapadana. We might guess at sanāvaranīyapādana, but Professor Thomas may be right in reading... niyatida... The north slab, B, is in a still worse condition. It contains remains of three lines.

L. 1. The first two aksharas, which are found on the small fragment, seem to be jata. Cunningham read savasa. Then there is a gap followed by signs which Cunningham seems to have been right in reading as sanī 20 20 10 4 4.

The record accordingly seems to be dated in the year 58, and if this date is referred to the same era as that of the Patika plate, it would correspond to the year 27–26 B.C. Though I feel great misgivings, I do not think that such an early date is impossible. It should be borne in mind that Maira is situated between the probable starting point of the Saka conquest of the Panjab in Sindh and Taxila, and that the district of Chachhi, which is probably the Chakhsa of the Patika plate, is in the immediate neighbourhood.

L. 2 was not read by Cunningham and is much damaged. Of the first akshara only faint traces remain, which cannot be made out. The second may be lpa, and the third again is hopelessly damaged. One might think of aspayusa, but I shall not try to restore the word. Then comes a defaced spot, followed by an illegible akshara and three signs, which may stand for 10 1 1, in which case we should have the day of the month, perhaps the 12th Aśvayuj.

L. 3. Cunningham read the first word as amami. I can only read the final mi, or perhaps, mami, which Professor Thomas proposes to restore as sanīgrhamami. Then Cunningham read yama yamathava. I can see śramaṇami, though the third akshara might also be m. Professor Thomas takes mi, for which we might also read ga, as the beginning of some Śramaṇa’s name. The last two aksharas may be diya, after which there is room for about four aksharas.

The next slab, C, was read by Cunningham as chhatrasa sva alva kha atta. His plate is too unreliable to make it advisable to attempt to read the line. It may only be noted that the first word might be mōsasa, i.e. ‘of Moga’.

Professor Thomas thinks that the inscription begins with the west slab, running on in the order of a pradakshina. He proposes to read the last two letters of the west slab astha, i.e. athapānicchate, whereof perhaps the se is to be seen in l. 1 of the north slab.
MAIRA AND SHAHDAUR INSCRIPTIONS

The initial sa of the east slab might, finally, be the termination of the Śramaṇa's name. I do not venture to do anything more than suggest a reading of A and B, without attempting to give a connected translation.

A

L. 1 sam[k]ramisa [chatupuraroḍhība]jā[sa*].

" 2 atibalana ...... yaspadana.

B

L. 1 ... [sa[sa]a] ... [sain 20 20 10 4 4].

" 2 [spa] ... 10111 ......

" 3 ... mi śramaṇami[di]va ....

IX. PLATE III. 1: SHAHDAUR INSCRIPTION OF DAMIJADA

Two Kharosthī inscriptions found in the Agror valley point to the conclusion that the Hazāra country belonged to the old Saka empire.

The name Agror is derived from Atyugrapura, which is mentioned by Kalhaṇa, Rajatarangini viii. 3402, and in his translation of that work Sir Aurel Stein has shown that a Prākrit form of this name, Atyugrapur may be at the bottom of Ṭhēyapura, mentioned by Ptolemy vii. 1, 45 as one of the towns of Ṭhērapa or Ṭhērapa, i.e. Uraśā, Urasa, which is already mentioned in the gapas to Pāṇini.

In the Oghi Kanungo circle in the Agror valley, two miles east of Shamdhar and about four miles due east of Oghi, is the hamlet of Shahdaur, shown as Shodaun on the half-inch to the mile sheet 43 F., N.W., of the Indian Atlas, in 34° 30' N. and 73° 4' E.

One mile south-east of the hamlet there is a narrow glen, descending from the Tanglai hill and containing some terraced fields. In one of these is found a rock or boulder of irregular shape, overlooking a small spring in a contiguous gorge. The boulder, which measures 13 ft. by 16 ft., marks the southern edge of a small field and is of grey friable sandstone with a rough surface.

It bears two Kharosthī inscriptions, one in two lines on the perpendicular side facing to the north, and another with remnants of five lines, on the top. According to Khan Bahadur Mian Wasuddin, who examined the site in 1924, the latter must have extended further to the south, where the surface is stated to be greatly disfigured from age and other causes. The estampages, however, do not lend support to this supposition.

In the hot weather of 1924, a villager of Shamdhar gave information about the inscriptions to Mr. T. B. Copeland, I.C.S., Deputy Commissioner of the Hazāra District, who informed the Director General of Archaeology of the matter in October and forwarded some photographs and rough tracings. A fuller report was submitted in November by Khan Bahadur Mian Wasuddin, who had found by excavation that there is no continuation below the surface to the inscription on the perpendicular side. Nor did an examination of the neighbourhood bring to light any further evidence or coins, but only some glazed fragments of coarse pottery. Local inquiries about coins were also in vain. Every patch of level space in all directions has been brought under cultivation and no ancient walls are said to be in evidence anywhere. "Burjs", however, are said to have existed before Government occupied the valley.
Estampages of the inscriptions were taken, and a paper was prepared for the Epigraphia Indica.\(^1\)

Since then I have received new and better materials from Mr. Hargreaves, and the plate which is now published shows that the inference drawn from the old estampages must be modified in some respects.

The state of preservation is not good throughout. There cannot, however, be any doubt that the inscriptions are fairly old. We may note the cha, which reminds us of the Mânehrâ and Sihila vase inscriptions; the angular bha, which has almost the same shape as in the Patika plate; the la, which has its nearest parallels in the Sihila and Lion Capital inscriptions, and the distinct prolongation of the leg of sa, which slopes upwards and forwards as in the Patika record.

The inscription on the perpendicular face consists, as already mentioned, of two lines. The first is apparently complete, is 6 ft. 2 ins. long and contains aksharas varying in size from 3 to 4 ins. The second, with aksharas 2 to 3½ ins. high, seems to have been of about half the length, and the last aksharas are badly defaced.

L. 1. The first akshara is evidently ra, of the same shape as in the Sihila vase inscription, and the second seems to be fa. There is, it is true, an apparent cross-bar, but the photographs which Mr. Hargreaves has placed at my disposal make me inclined to think that it represents an unevenness in the stone.

Then come two aksharas connected by a horizontal bottom-stroke. The first is apparently a na, and it is possible that the bottom-stroke connecting it with the ensuing letter is meant to represent an a-matrâ. If raja should not be read as räjama, we may compare the instrumental râma, mentioned by Siimharaja.\(^2\)

The photographs show that the head of the ensuing letter has become damaged. The reading is not certain, both na and da being possible.

The next akshara is certainly mi and not ga. Also here there is an apparent bottom-stroke, and such apparent strokes are also found elsewhere, e.g. both in the ensuing fa and in the following akshara, which I originally took to be na, but which is clearly identical with the first akshara of l. 4 of the second Shahdaur inscription, where the reading da seems to be certain.

Then comes sa, and the second word must accordingly be read as Namijadasa, or Damijadasa.

We do not know of any such ruler as the raja Namijad or Damijad. The title raja is also used by the Western Kshatrapas, where we also find a royal name ending in jada, viz. Dharma, also written Dhamycada, where jy has been recognized by Professor Lüders\(^3\) as denoting a voiced s. It seems probable that jada is identical with the jada or yada of Dhamjada, and that the name is, consequently, Iranian. Damijada may even have something to do with Dhamjada, wherefore I prefer to read the fourth akshara as da, and it is perhaps worth remembering that the syllables dami are sometimes found on the coins of Maues.\(^4\) At all events it seems probable that Damijada was a Saka ruler in the Agror valley.

The ensuing passage is not intelligible to me. The first akshara is sa; the second may be the lower part of a kr, assuming the lower horizontal to be the continuation of the flaw represented by the two strokes to the left of the akshara; the third again is sa; the fourth is quite uncertain. It reminds me of the la which stands later on in the same line, and if the lower projection is an o-stroke, we might read la. The head is, however,

---

1 Not yet published.
3 SBAW, 1913, pp. 466 ff.
4 Gardner, pp. 68, no. 4; 69, no. 9; 71, no. 18.
rectilinear, while it is rounded in the ensuing ści, and if the stroke about the head and the projecting horizontal are due to the roughness of the stone, we might think of reading vā. The fifth akshara might be the bottom of śa, but also a ści. It is placed lower down than the surrounding letters, and it is possible that we have to do with the compound ściśa. The sixth letter has disappeared. If we assume that it was rā, we might think of restoring the whole as sakasavatāre, in the Saka year, in which case our inscription would prove that the era used in the oldest Kharoshthi inscriptions is a Saka institution. If the fourth akshara is a l, sakasala might be a compound of saka and middle Persian sāl, year. The whole passage is, however, so defaced that I shall abstain from further attempts.

Then follow some aksharas which look very clear in the estampe, but which I cannot make out. The first looks like a. The photographs before me make me, however, inclined to think that the head is damaged. If there was another curve on the other side of the vertical, it would be possible to read sha. The second letter does not look like anything I have seen elsewhere. One might think of reading kṛi, but the upper horizontal is much too long and the right-hand hook much too small. The long horizontal reminds me of ṣha, and the short bar to the right of ṣa. The only thing I can suggest is to read ṣkṣṭī. The third akshara looks like the ṣa, no. 37 ii of plate i, of Bühlcr's Palaeography, however, might, also be a mutilated ṣtū. With the utmost reserve I therefore read ṣhasṭhīṣc, taking -has as to represent the suffix ṣha of caturtha, paṁchathā, &c., + ṣa. In that case the ensuing three signs, the last of which is mutilated, would be the figure twenty thrice repeated.

I feel so little confident about the reading, however, that I do not venture to assert that our inscription is one of the year 60, i.e. 25–24 B.C. The only thing which seems to be comparatively certain is that the passage following after Damijāda has contained a date.

Then follows sabhadūsa sabalavādhaśapārṣa, an akshara which seems to be rāda, and an unmistakable ṭa. The genitive sabhadūsa must apparently be connected with the preceding Damijāda and indicate some person associated with him. Bhaḍa may stand for Bhaṇḍu, in which case we might think of the word Bhaṇḍu, which occurs in the Gāy to Pāṇini iv. ii. 77 after Svāstva and Varṇa and may be the name of a country in the neighbourhood. Sabhadūsa would then mean 'together with the ruler of Bhaṇḍu'. Svalavādhaśapārṣa might represent Skr. sa- (or sva-) Balavārda (or Vyaḷavārdha) -pārṣa, or Svalavādhaśapārṣa. We may compare names such as Nandivardha and Mitra- 

vardha, and, with regard to the compound, saḍha Hanadhitra, together with his daughter Hana, on the Mathura Lion Capital.

If the reading of the akshara following after the ensuing sa as rāda is correct, sardha can hardly be anything else than Skr. sārdha, which is sometimes used at the end of compounds.

L. 2 opens with mitravādhya, followed by an akshara which seems to be na. I take Mitravādha to be a name; cf. Vakavadha in l. i and Sanskrit doublets such as Mitrāvārda, Mitravādhana; Nandivardha, Nandivādhanā.

Then follows an akshara which seems to be ṭa or pa, and further apparently tṛah[ṛ]a. I tentatively read ṭa[ṛ]a[ṛ]a.

The remaining portion of the line seems to be written in somewhat smaller letters. If we assume that the ṭa was followed by an e of about the same size, the next akshara would be represented by a horizontal crossed by an i-stroke, and remnants of a vertical, i.e. it was perhaps ei. Then comes a curved line, which reminds me of the pra of the Taxila silver scroll; further ma, ṭa and something which may be a damaged bhra.
apparent bottom-stroke is in some of my photographs separated from the vertical and of the same kind as the traces seen below the preceding ta. The following aksharas may be ta and ra, and with great reserve I read vipramahbrata, thinking that this may have been followed by some such word as puyae or puyayanto, cf. matapitaram puyayanto in the Patika plate.

This account of an important inscription I feel to be very unsatisfactory. This much seems to follow: that the Saka empire at a comparatively early date extended as far as the Agror valley.

TEXT

L. 1  rajah[sa] Damijadasa sakasa . . . . [shashtiææ 20 20 20] sabhadusa savalav-
dhaputra sardha cha

"2  Mitra[vadhanap[u]tra[hita[Æe]] [vijra[mata[bhratama]].

TRANSLATION

Of the râjan Damijada (in the Saka . . . sixty - 60) together with Bhadu, and together with (his) father Valavardha, for the welfare of his son Mitavardhana, . . . Brahmins, his mother, brother.

X. PLATE III. 2: SHAHDAUR INSCRIPTION OF ŚIVARAKSHITA

The second Shahdaur inscription, on the upper surface of the boulder, is much damaged and perhaps incomplete. There are altogether five lines, and I can see no traces of there having been more lines, as surmised by Mian Wasiddin.

L. 1. The beginning is quite illegible, and four or five syllables have disappeared. What can be read is ayya sahī, followed by traces of four or five signs. Sahī is probably the usual abbreviation of sahāvatsare, and the ensuing signs must in that case have been numerical figures. It would be possible to read them as 1101 15, i.e. 102, but also as 20 20 . . . e.g. as 80 and something or 90. If I am right in my explanation of sahī the preceding ayya must be the name or part of the name of a ruler, and it is tempting to think of Aya, Azes, in which case the defaced aksharas at the beginning of the line might be restored as maharaja or maharajasa. A priori there is no objection to assuming that our inscription belongs to the time of Azes, and some years between 80 and 102 would not be unlikely, if my explanation of the double dating of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription, as referring to the 103rd year of the Saka era and the 8th year after the accession of Azes, is accepted. Nor would there be any serious difficulty in assuming that our record is about forty years later than the Damijada inscription. The date of the latter is, moreover, quite uncertain. In view of the general uncertainty as regards the reading of the first line I cannot, however, do more than state that I think it probable that our inscription belongs to the reign of Azes, and I publish it in this place, in connexion with the other Shahdaur inscription, without attempting to arrange it chronologically.

L. 2. The first word is Śivarakshita, where the ta in the estampege looks like teva. There cannot, however, be any reasonable doubt that the apparent v-curve is simply a groove in the stone.

We do not know who this Śivarakshita was. During his excavations at Sirkap Sir John Marshall found a copper seal with the figure of Śiva in the centre and the legend
SHAHDAUR INSCRIPTION OF ŚIVARAKSHITA

Śivarakshtasa both in Kharoshṭhī and Brāhmī letters. The Kharoshṭhī aksharas are of the same type as in our inscription, but it is impossible to say anything about the possible identity of the Śivarakshta of the two records.

The ensuing akshara is not intelligible to me, and some of the strokes visible in the estampage are evidently due to the roughness of the stone. The vertical is evidently part of the akshara, and the same seems to be the case with the curve to the right of the top. The most likely reading is therefore śha or shu. The two ensuing aksharas are ta and sa, and shina may represent Skr. śrutasya. The reading is, however, quite uncertain.

L. 3. The first word seems to be adha, which may represent Skr. adhyasya, from adhya, rich, wealthy.

The next three aksharas are uncertain. The first may be dха, with its head protruding above the line, or va; the second seems rather to be na than a, and the third reminds me of later forms of tha, with traces of an e or i-mātrā. Then follows tasa, and as a mere guess, I read dhanathtasa, or onathitasa. Then comes an akshara which seems to be cha, of a later type than in the Damijada inscription and more like the cha of the Taxila silver scroll.

The ensuing letter seems to be i, but might be a mutilated hi. The rest of the line is quite defaced.

L. 4 opens with a comparatively clear dasali, evidently followed by kahapa and an akshara which may be na, but is made unrecognizable through several irregular strokes which are clearly due to the roughness of the surface. Then come fairly clear traces of a sa, an akshara which may be a blurred ṣa, but also a ṣa, and finally a sa, with traces of an e-stroke and perhaps also a r-stroke. I therefore read dasali kahapa vasasahasre[hi], for ten thousand kārṣāpanas, and infer that the inscription records a donation by the rich and wealthy Śivarakshta. The character and purpose of the donation must have been mentioned in the missing portion of L. 3 or of L. 4.

L. 5. The first akshara is probably a and the second bhu. Abhu may be the aorist of the base bhū, Skr. abhū, Ardhacāgadhi abhū, or else bhu may, as pointed out to me by Professor Thomas, belong to the ensuing yo, bhūyo corresponding to Skr. bhūyah.

Then comes yo Gotama, and three blurred letters and traces of at least one more. The first one may be sta, though the cross-stroke seems to run out in a long curve. If all the cross lines are accidental, we should have a va. The second looks like a sloping lo or ta and the third like a or o. We might think of Skr. sthalaja or sthālaka, the latter being a designation of some bones on the back. But I am unable to find any satisfactory explanation.

Reading and explanation are, accordingly, only tentative:

TEXT

L. 1 . . . . Ayasa sanī . . .
2 Śivarakshtasa [shu ?]asa
3 adha [dhanath]asa cha i . . .
4 dasali kahapa[na]sa[ha][re] . . .
5 abhu yo Gotama[stalo?] . . .

TRANSLATION

(During the reign of...) Azes, anno... (a donation) of Śivaraksita, the renowned (?) rich and wealthy one, took place... with ten thousand kārṣāpanas... which... of Gotama.

1 ASIAR, 1914-15, p. 35, and below, p. 102, no. 11.
XI. Plate IV. 2: MÁNSEHRA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 68

No. 5558 of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, is a slab, broken into two pieces, 4 ft. high and 4 ft. 5 in. broad. It was brought from Mánsehrra by Mr. Caddy and entered in the Museum's journal on February 1, 1898.

It contains a fragmentary Kharoshthi inscription, which has not been published before. The state of preservation is not good. The whole right-hand portion is missing, and the upper left-hand corner has broken off. There are eight drilled holes on the inscribed surface, and several letters are defaced. The size of individual letters is, on an average, 3 in.

The characters are of the Saka variety. Attention may be drawn to eka in l. 2, which has the same shape as in the Shahdari and Patika inscriptions; to the distinct chhi in l. 10; to the straight angle of the head and the forward slope of the leg of ta; to the broad angular shape of ya; to the slight upward slope of the head of la; to the square shape of sa; to the angular head and the straight upward prolongation of the leg of sa, and to the compound sapa in l. 8. The palaeography of the inscription seems on the whole to assign it to about the same time as the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78.

The beginning of the lines is missing, and this circumstance considerably adds to the difficulty of reading and interpreting the record.

L. 1. The three first aksharas are certainly adhaska and the fourth and fifth seem to be thi and a, respectively. Ardhamagadhi adhasthi, where we find the same double treatment of old sht, the form adha for ashta is already found in the Asoka inscriptions in the word adhasthikya, at intervals of eight kos, but does not seem to have been used unless ashta occurs in the beginning of a compound.

A numeral at the beginning of an inscription can hardly mean anything else than a date, and the inscription accordingly seems to belong to the year 68. If we refer this to the old Saka era, the corresponding year will, according to Dr. van Wijk's calculations, be 17-16 B.C., and there does not seem to be any serious objection to such a dating.

The missing portion at the beginning of l. 1 may have contained the name of a ruler and some word for 'year', but it is impossible to make any reliable estimate of its length.

What follows after adhasthi cannot be made out.

L. 2. The three first aksharas are etasa and the fourth seems to be ja. The fifth has almost disappeared in the hole excavated at this place. There seem to be traces of a lower vertical and of a head, and the reading sa is possible, but far from being certain.

Even if the reading etasaja were certain, the interpretation would be extremely doubtful. In the Jamālgarhi inscription of the year 359 we find aspatai for Skr. asvanyajj. But we are not justified in assuming that y might disappear in this word in an old record like the Mánsehrra one. Moreover 5a for Skr. sva would make difficulties, and o for u would be as difficult to explain as e for a. If we read etasaja it would be simpler to think of Skr. aśikṣa and ojas, and explain 'through the strength of Śiva', or sa should be separated from tā oja and taken together with the following. If the indistinct strokes following after the damaged letter represent a mu of the same shape as in the Fatehjang inscription, such must be the case. The next akshara is also damaged, but the lower part looks like the bottom of ḍha. Then follows a distinct ccha. If we read samuchcha-ccha, we must probably restore samuchchha, corresponding to Skr. samuchchhitya, having.

1 No. 40 in Majumdar's List.
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cut off, having exterminated. Esa ofa samuchhīka might accordingly mean: 'having exterminated the strength of Śiva, or, the royal strength'.

After cha there are traces of one or two letters ending in u, and room for still another akshara.

L. 3 begins with a distinct ti. The second akshara is quite uncertain. What is seen at the same level as the surrounding letters is a distinct a. But then the akshara seems to be continued in a narrow curve and then down to the bottom of the line below, so that the whole makes the impression of a huge th. Such an akshara, extending over two lines, would be unprecedented, and, moreover, dh has not elsewhere such a round head. I therefore read lia, and connect this with the ensuing letter which is certainly sa. Lia is either the end of a name or the whole name, and it would be tempting to think of the kšatrapa Liaka of the Patika copper-plate. But it is impossible to arrive at certainty.

Then comes a fairly distinct su, further what looks like a shortened śru, standing above a small hole, which may have existed when the inscription was executed. After śru stands a curve, which may be the upper part of śra, though it is much narrower than in the unmistakable śra of l. 1. The next akshara looks like the ṣa of the late Jamālāgarhi inscription of the year 550. Then follows a fairly distinct e, and I tentatively read the whole as tiṣṭa śrṣṭuṣṭhae, at ... lia's order of obedience.

The two last aksharas of the line seem to be dada, but both are provided with a short line protruding backwards from about the middle, so that they look like deda. In the last one, however, this stroke is straighter and longer and has perhaps crossed the letter. With great hesitation I therefore read devi. It should be remembered that forms such as dēti, dēi are old both in Pāli and in other Prākṛits.

L. 4 opens with a break, which is continued into the first remaining akshara, so that the shape has become distorted. We must, however, evidently read a. The next letter is tha, and then follows a long vertical which runs up into the akshara standing above. There are, however, faint traces of a curve in line with the head of the preceding tha, and if we can assume that the upper part of the long vertical is due to a later damage to the stone, we may think of reading athana, which might correspond to Skr. aśṭānām. It is quite conceivable that aṣṭha only became aṣṭha in compounds such as aṣṭashāthī, and also in the Aśoka edicts and elsewhere in Kharoshthi inscriptions aṣṭha is the common form.

Then follows a fairly distinct ha, something which may be ya and some blurred lines, which may perhaps be naṇa. With great hesitation I read athana hayana, Skr. aṣṭānāḥ hayana-nām, of eight years. The remaining portion of the line is much defaced. The first akshara is illegible, the second looks like e, and the third is certainly sa.

L. 5. The first akshara is perhaps dha of the same shape as in the Patika plate. Then follows ma, with the right extremity rising higher than the left and crossed by an upward curve. The nearest approach is the rna of the Jaulī inscription 1. The next letter is evidently ra, and then follows an akshara which looks like tha, or rather va, and further an almost certain e. One might think of Dharmaśāsanae as the name of a female person, but there cannot be the question of more than a mere guess. Then comes a distinct su, followed by two aksharas, which I cannot read, and two more, which seem to be yva.

L. 6 begins with ya veha arane, where ya is the relative pronoun, veha probably Skr. va iha or va iha. Arane in Pāli also means 'a monastery', &c., and some such meaning is perhaps intended. Then follows perhaps sa and mi or mīn, whereafter there
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

is a big hole, followed by traces which may belong to a na. What follows may be varena.

L. 7 opens with siati ya me and seems to end in yava. The intervening letters are illegible, though the second after me seems to be ha, perhaps the end of tha. Siati is the optative of the base as, to be, cf. siyati in the Taxila gold plate and the Niya documents.¹

L. 8. The first two aksharas are ḫpasu, which can be restored as vįpasi, Skr. viśvāsu. Then follow two letters which I cannot make out and then su. With every reserve I read imasus. The second, third, and fourth aksharas after su seem to be yaraye, the remaining letters cannot be read. We can only say that the second ya was apparently followed by su.

L. 9. The first akshara is doubtful. It may be ki or ve. Then comes a damaged spot, followed by pu or, perhaps, pra, tha and vi, one illegible letter, an apparent sa, another illegible letter, siati, and, finally, ya.

L. 10. The beginning is quite hopeless, about four aksharas being absolutely defaced. Then comes prachhi, which may be some form of prachchhis or of prachhi, further an akshara which I cannot identify, a hole, three letters which look like vehaa, and, finally, some strokes which I cannot make out.

It will be seen that reading and interpretation are throughout uncertain, and I am unable to make out any connected sense. There seems to be some mention of donations in connexion with an arāma, but the only certain information which we can gather is that the record is dated in the year 68, evidently of the old Saka era, and in this fact we can see an indication that the Mānschhā country was included in the Saka empire.

TEXT

L. 1 aḍhasathaia...

2 eśā ̃cja samuchhich[a]... u...

3 liasa su[śrussaṇa]e dec[i]]

4 ̃aṭha[na hayana]na... sa...

5 [dha]jmarav[a]... [ya]...

6 ya vēha [aráme] na... varena

7 siati ya me. ha... ya [ve]

8 [vi]jspasu [ima]su... [yarayasu]

9 ... pravhavi [sa]... siati ya

10 ... prachhi ... vēhaa...

TRANSLATION

L. 1 in sixty-eight...

2 having destroyed the royal strength (?)

3 at the order of obedience of... lia gives

4 of eight years

5 with Dharmarava

6 what here in the arāma

7 may be, what by me... or what

8 in all these

9 ... established (?)... may be, what

10 ... cut off (?)... or here.

XII. Plate IV. 1: FATEHJANG STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 68

Fatehjang is the easternmost tahsil of the Attock District and of its head-quarters, a village which is also known under the Hindu name Chāsa.1 It is now a station on the Rawalpindi-Kohat railway.

Four or five miles south of Fatehjang is the village Mahjia, situated in 33° 29' N. and 72° 39' E. No. I, 3 of the Lahore Museum is a stone, bearing a Kharoshthi inscription in one line, which was for some time left unregistered as presented by Cunningham from Majji, i.e. Mahjia.2

According to a letter from Cunningham to Vincent Smith of June 17, 1892, the stone 'may have been inserted in a wall, but could not have been the base of a statue'. It was 5 ft. 9 in. long and from 3 ft. to 1 ft. 9 in. broad and weighed 12 maunds 7 seers (1,008 lb. avoirdupois or 457 kg.), but was cut down to 4 maunds 3 seers before it was sent to Lahore. It is now 5 ft long and 4 in. high, and has been broken into two pieces. The inscribed portion is 3 ft. 1 in. long, and the size of individual letters varies from 1 to 2 in.

The inscription has been published by M. E. Senart,3 and M. Boyer4 has made a contribution to its interpretation.

The characters are Kharoshthi of the Saka variety. Kha has the backward bend which we already find in the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78, and the e-matra is suspended from the bottom of the head as in the Mount Banj inscription of the year 102. The lower horizontal of tha is slightly longer than the upper one, as in the Māneśhrā and Taxila copper-plate inscriptions. The head of ya is slightly rounded, but not continued so far downwards to the right as in the old Swāt inscriptions and on the Patika plate. The letter occurs three times, always between vowels, and in the final word dayamukho it has a bend of the vertical, so that we might think of reading na, but it seems to me that ya is preferable. Mu has the same shape as on the Mathura Lion Capital, and the same is the case with ya and sa, which latter, however, also reminds us of the Shahdaur inscription.

On the whole the alphabet, as maintained by Mr. R. D. Banerji,5 points to a fairly early age.

The opening portion containing the date does not admit of any doubt. It runs sang 20 20 4 4 Prothavatasa masasa dīvase skotase 10 1. We may note the t for intervocalic d' in Prothavatasa. The tha of this word stands in the break between the two pieces into which the stone has been broken, and it is perfectly clear. The e of dīvase is not visible in the stampage, but can be clearly seen in a photograph before me. The last figure of the date is longer than the preceding one, just as the corresponding 1 in the last date of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription.

After the figures denoting the year there is a short dash, which evidently marks a stop. M. Senart explained the curious hook following after the final figure of the date as a similar dash. M. Boyer, on the other hand, read it as de, and this reading was accepted by Mr. Majumdar. What stands on the stone is, as will be seen, a sloping

---

1 Cf. Cunningham, ASI, xiv, pp. 24 f.
2 Cf. Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, p. 37; Vincent Smith, JASB, lx, 1, 1892, p. 56; lxii, i, 1893, pp. 84 f.; R. D. Banerji, Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 46; J. F. Vogel, ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 249, 251; Majumdar's List, no. 10.
3 JA, viii, xv, 1890, pp. 129 ff., with plate.
4 JA, x, iii, 1904, p. 465.
5 JRAS, 1920, p. 205.
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vertical, with a horizontal protruding from the middle towards the right. A somewhat similar de, without any horizontal or bend of the top, is found in the Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168, but here the e-stroke joins the sloping vertical near the bottom. Moreover the distance between the sign and the next letter is unusually small. In such circumstances I am inclined to accept M. Senart's explanation and to follow him in thinking that the stroke has become enlarged by a flaw in the stone.

The reading of the remaining aksharas is quite certain: vadhitirana sahayana danamukho. M. Senart thought that the natural division of the words would be vadhitirana sahayana danamukho, but, failing to find any likely explanation of hayana, he finally treated Vadhitiranasahayana as a compound meaning 'of Vadhitirana and his companions'. M. Boyer explained Devadhitirana as a name meaning 'pious to the devas' and hayana as Skr. hayana, which occurs as a various reading instead of dayana, a covered carriage or palanquin, Amarakaśa 11, vili, 52. Mr. Majumdar, finally, translated 'gift of Sahaya, daughter (dhiti) of Deva'.

It seems to me that there cannot be any doubt about the explanation of sahayana. It corresponds to Skr. sahītām, of the companions, of the associates. We have four other Kharoshthi records of the Saka period mentioning well of, or presented by various associations of sahayas (sahayas) or sahayaras (saharyaras), viz. the Muchai (sahayara kse Vashisugaya), Mārguz (kse sahaya . . . darana), Kala Sang (yaraṇa Pipalakhaṇa kse) and Peshawar Museum, no. 20 (sahayara Travaśakuraṇa danamukho kse bhayavide viharam) inscriptions. I am unable to make any suggestion about the nature of such associations or fraternities. The qualifying additions are throughout unclear. On the other hand, the parallelism of the other records makes me inclined to think that the Fatehjang stone was originally intended to commemorate the dedication of a well.

The word Vadhitirana or Devadhitirana must contain a nearer characterization of the association of sahayas. Dhiti might be the genitive plural of a Prākrit word corresponding to Skr. duhitār; cf. matapitāraṇa in the Ārā inscription and the doubtful matudhitirana on the Saddo rock. In that case we should have to accept the reading devadhitirana, and we might think of some association of nuns designated 'the divine daughters', just as we find putra used about the members of certain groups or associations, e.g. in the Taxila silver scroll and Ārā inscriptions. As remarked above, however, the reading de is extremely uncertain. If we read Vadhitirana, the only explanation which I can offer is to take Vadhitiru as representing a Skr. vadhitra formed from vadhitra, which according to Ujjvaladatta on the Uṣṇisvinivṛti iv. 172 means manmatha, love. We should then have to think of some corporation connected with the worship of the god of love or the study of the Kāmasūtra. This explanation is, however, extremely uncertain, and we can scarcely do more than to state that we have to do with some kind of corporation, the explanation of its character being as uncertain as in the case of the other records mentioned above.

The date of the inscription must be referred to the old Saka era, and, according to Dr. van Wijk, it corresponds to July 18, 17 B.C.

I thus arrive at the following reading and interpretation:

Text


Translation

Anno 68, on the sixteenth, 16., day of the month Prauṣṭha-śapada: gift of the Vadhitiru companions.
XIII. PLATE V. 1: TAXILA COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF PATIKA

THE YEAR 78

In January, 1862, Mr. A. A. Roberts presented to the Royal Asiatic Society two copper-plates carrying Kharoshthi inscriptions. They had been brought to him by the villager Nūr, well known as treasure hunter in the mounds at ancient Taxila.

The exact find-place is not known. Nūr himself was later on examined by Cunningham,1 but his statements differed at different times. He first said that he had found the plates in the mound numbered 40 in Cunningham's map, on the Lundī Nala, some 500 yards north of the Janḍālī temple. Afterwards he spoke of another mound, Cunningham's no. 41, a little farther to the west. His wife, on the other hand, referred the discovery to one of the ruined tops of Gāngū or Chiti, she could not remember which. At Chiti Cunningham was informed by five different witnesses that no inscription of any kind had been discovered there, but they had heard that an inscribed copper-plate in two pieces had been found near Shah-Dheri. Later on the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Délmerick, was informed that the actual find-place was the village of Tofkī in Sirsukh, the third city in Taxila. This statement is not, however, more likely to be correct than the others.2

The plates were examined by Edwin Norris, who read the words Takīla nāgara and Śakyamuni and wrote some notes, which were read at one of the Society's meetings. At his suggestion the plates were sent to Professor Dowson, who saw that they belonged together and formed one single inscription.

In July, 1862, E. Thomas gave some information about the two scholars' results,3 and in December he sent a letter to the Asiatic Society of Bengal4 and a reproduction of the inscription, 'with a view to an independent translation being made, prior to the receipt of Professor Dowson's reading of the text'.

The result were some remarks by Cunningham,5 and about the same time Dowson published his reading in a paper read to the Royal Asiatic Society, February 16, 1863,6 and afterwards7 he added some remarks, which also took notice of Cunningham's paper.

A new note was published by Cunningham, with a reproduction of the plate, in 1871,8 and, in 1894, Professor Rapson edited a new and much improved rendering by Bhāg-vāñalī Indrājī.9

Then Professor Bühler contributed two short notes to the Academy10 and republished11 the inscription with a new plate, reproduced from a photograph taken by Mr. Griggs for Dr. Fleet.12

According to Bühler, the plate 'measures fourteen inches by three and weighs 3½ ounces. It is broken into three pieces, two large ones, right and left, and a small one fitting in between them. Some portions of the central piece, which is half eaten by verdigris, have been lost. Besides, the left-hand upper and lower corners of the plate are broken off,  

---

3 JRAS, xx, 1863, p. 108. 4 JASB, xxxvi, 1862, pp. 332 ff., with plate.
5 JASB, xxxvii, 1863, pp. 139 ff. 6 JRAS, xx, 1863, pp. 221 ff., with plate III, fig. 1.
7 JASB, xxxvii, 1863, pp. 421 ff. 8 ASI, ii, pp. 132 ff., and plate LX, no. 1.
11 Ṣp. Ind., iv, pp. 54 ff., with plate. 12 Cf. Majumdar's List, no. 69.
as well as a small bit of the lower portion of the large right-hand piece. The remaining portions are reproduced in the accompanying plate from new photographs placed at my disposal by the Royal Asiatic Society at the request of the India Office.

The inscription consists of five lines. The letters consist of small dots, punched into the plate, as in some other Kharoshthī inscriptions. The size of individual letters varies from half an inch on the average in ll. 1-4, to about one third of that size in l. 5. L. 5 does not begin at the right-hand corner, but in the interval between the 9th and 10th aksharas of l. 4. In the space thus left open are seen the dots of a series of letters engraved on the reverse and containing an endorsement. It is evident from this arrangement that l. 5 was only added after ll. 1-4 and the endorsement had been executed. It therefore seems as if ll. 5, which mentions the navakarnika, has been subsequently added. A similar state of things is met with in the Manikjala stone inscription, where the name of the navakarmika is inserted transversely in the right-hand corner. In both cases the navakarnika has taken care that his name should be associated with the meritorious deed recorded in the inscription.

The alphabet is Kharoshthī of the old Saka type. Ka, pa, bha, la and sa have straight lines and distinct corners as on old coins, and are not rounded as in later records. Na has the long upper curvature of the Aśoka inscriptions and other old records. Ba has the rounded shape and the deep indenture of older records. The m of mu has the same shape as in the Aśoka inscriptions. The same is the case with the broad, angular ya. In sa the upward continuation of the lower vertical is turned to the left, as sometimes in the Aśoka inscriptions, and almost reaches the head. Ante-consonantic r has the older shape of a curved cross-bar without the loop. The anusvāra is of frequent occurrence, in pani, bani, main, yani, rani, sani, kaṇi.

With regard to phonetics, we may note that ya and na are distinguished as in Sanskrit, if we except the writing sakamunīsa, which seems to show that the tendency to cerebralize an intervocalic n, which has become the rule in the Kharoshthī Dhammapada, was a feature of the spoken vernacular. It is also of interest that we find apratijāvita with th, but [praṭe]ṭaveti with th.

The reading of the record is, generally speaking, certain.

L. 1. The first two words are certainly sanvatsāraye athatasatīmae. The two first aksharas are apparently so much corroded that they are hardly visible. Then follow the numerical figures 20 20 20 10 4 4, i.e. 78, and mahaṇyasa mahatāsa Mogasa, of the mahārāja, the great Moga.

Of the ensuing word, which Dowson was able to read as Panemos, the second akshara is now almost invisible. The Greek month Panemos broadly corresponds to the Indian Ashāḷa. Then follow māsaṇa dīwase paniḥame, the figures 4 and 1, i.e. 5, and etaye purvaye, where only the akshara pu is slightly defaced.

The last word of l. 1 was read kṣaharasa by Dowson, and Bühlner thinks that this reading is perhaps right, though he also admits the possibility of reading kṣaharatasa, as done by Bhagvāṇlāl Indrājī. In the photographs before me the aksharas kṣaha are quite distinct, 7a is defaced, but legible, and the fourth akshara is almost certainly 6a. Moreover, the bottom of a fifth akshara, viz. sa, is clearly visible, the head having disappeared in the break at the end of the line. Kṣaharatasa cannot be anything else than the genitive of the well-known designation kṣaharata, which is also used by the oldest of the Western Katharapas.

L. 2. Though the first two aksharas are now much defaced, the reading of the three first words is absolutely certain, viz. chukhsasa cha kṣhatrapasa. The designations kṣaharatasa chukhsasa cha kṣhatrapasa remind us of kṣaharata kṣhatrapasa on
the coins of the Western kshatrapa Bhûmaka and of raño kshaharâtasa kshatrapasa in the Násik inscriptions of Nahapâna. The only difference is that in our inscription we find the addition chukhsasa cha between kshaharatasa and kshatrapasa. Here chukhsa might be parallel with kshaharatasa, and those who read kshaharasa at the end of l. 1 have all treated kshaharatasa and chukhsasa as parallel genitives, governed by kshatrapasa, and translated 'of the kshatrapa of Kshahara and Chukhsa'. Cunningham tried to identify Kshahara and Chukhsa with the present Sir-Sukh, where he thought that the copper-plate had been found. In the first place, however, the plate does not seem to hail from Sir-Sukh, and, in the second, it is difficult to see how Kshahara-Chukhsa could phonetically become Sir-Sukh. Bühler further objects that the locality where the plate was deposited is called Kshema in the inscription itself. And, finally, the reading kshaharatasa cannot, as we have seen, be maintained. If kshaharatasa and chukhsasa are parallel forms, we must explain chukhsa as having a similar meaning as kshaharatasa. The Násik inscription of the 19th year of Siri-Pulumáyí mentions the Khakharàtavasa, the Kshahara race, and it is probable that the Kshaharatas were a Saka family or clan, but the word might also denote a charge or dignity. Chukhsa could hardly have any such meaning. If kshaharatasa is the name of a family, the same person would be assigned to two or, as we shall see, even three families, and, if it is a title, we should have to state the use of three titles, kshaharatã, chukhsa, and kshatrapa, and the position of the intervening cha would be unusual. I therefore think that we must explain chukhsasa as a genitive dependent on kshatrapasa, the more so because the title Chukhsasa kshatrapasa is also used in another Taxila inscription of the year 191, and there chukhsa can hardly be anything else than the name of the locality over which the kshatrapa held sway.

Bühler thought it possible to read chuska and drew attention to the curious Sanskrit choska, which according to the Trikândasîsha means 'a horse from the districts on the Indus'. Choska might perhaps, like saindhava, a horse from Sindh, be a purely territorial name, denoting some particular district on the Indus, and a variant of chukhsa or chuske. If that were so, it would follow that the kshatrapa in question governed the Eastern Panjáb as far as the Indus.

Sir Aurel Stein, on the other hand, identified Chukhsa with the present Chach or Chachh, an alluvial plain in the north of the District and tahsil of Attock, lying between 33° 53' and 34° 59' N. and 72° 22' and 72° 44' E., i.e. in the immediate neighbourhood of ancient Taxila.

It seems to me that this latter explanation is the most likely one, though there are some phonetical difficulties with regard to the vowel. I therefore read kshaharatasa Chukhsasa cha kshatrapasa, of the Kshaharatã and kshatrapa of Chukhsa.

Then follows a series of parenthetical sentences: 4 Liako Kundluka nana, tasa putro Patiko Takhaśilaye nagare utareya pракhu desha Kshema nama, Liako Kundlukka by name, his son Patika. In the town of Takhaśila, to the north, the eastern region, Kshema by name.

The reading is absolutely certain. Only the ko of Patiko, after which there is room enough for one or two aksharas, so that we might think of reading Patiku nama, has almost entirely disappeared with the portion of the plate which has been broken off in this place.

The name of the Kshaharatã, the kshatrapa of Chukhsa, was accordingly Liako Kundlukka. There cannot be any doubt about the identity of this kshatrapa with the ruler

1 ASI, ii, p. 134; v, pp. 67 f.
2 Ind. Ant., xxv, 1896, pp. 174 f.
3 Ep. Ind., viii, p. 60.
who strikes coins in direct imitation of one of the issues of Evratides and bearing the legend AIAKO KOZOTAO, where the Greek rendering shows that the s was pronounced with voice and that the second u was long. As stated in the Historical Introduction, Liaka Kusuluka was evidently a Saka ruler, and we can infer from our inscription that he held sway in and near Taxila, while Moga was the Saka suzerain.

After Liaka the inscription mentions his son Patika, without any title. We shall see below, under l. 4, that he may have held a subordinate charge, and we know from the Mathurā Lion Capital that later on he became mahākāshātrapā, probably in Taxila. For he is evidently identical with the mahākāshātra Kusulua Patika mentioned in that record.

The last parenthetical sentence runs Tukhṣilayē nagare utarēṇa prachu dēto Kshema nama. Here Tukhṣilā is hardly the genuine dialect form. In other inscriptions we find Tukhṣilā which seems to be more in accordance with the phonetical system of the dialect. Tukhṣilayē can be the oblique form of Tukhṣilē or, like Tukhṣaśīliami in a later Taxila inscription, the locative of a Tukhṣilayā, Skr. Tukhṣilakā. As pointed out by Bühler, we should expect Tukhṣilāe nagara-nasa utarēṇa or utarēṇa with the accusative. The construction is, however, not strictly grammatical. The various words are put side by side, without the proper nexus: in the town of Tukhṣilā, to the north, the eastern region, Kshema by name, or, Kshema is its name. The form prachu, as compared with dēto, is in accordance with the practice in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada.

The locality called Kshema cannot be identified. Since Sirkap was the chief settlement of Taxila in the Saka period, we must look for it to the north-east of that place.

A new sentence begins with the last word of l. 2, which is atra. L. 3 begins with sē, which Bühler was certainly right in restoring as dēto. Buhler put it to be the beginning of a word and read sēpati, connecting it with the ensuing aksharas, and M. Senart thought that the actual reading might be sāvīrakṣa, a reliquary.

Then follows Patikē apratīhastika bhagavata Sakumuniśa sāvīrakṣa tithaveti, i.e., as seen by Dowson, pratikhaveti, saṅgharamas ca. The e of ve in tithaveti and the two first aksharas of saṅgharamas are now hardly visible.

The end of the line is clear: suravadhama puṣyate maṭapita-rāṇi puṣyantya. The e of puṣya has been added as a correction above the line. Bühler reads puṣya[mito], but I cannot see the final e-mātra and follow M. Senart in reading o, though a evidently stands for o.

L. 4. The two first aksharas are indistinct, but visible. The text runs: kṣatrapasa saputradarasa ayubalavardhike. There can only be some doubt about the last akshara, which looks more like a. The e-stroke seems, however, to be represented by a single dot, which runs into the dots representing the preceding akshara.

Then follows bhratara sarva ca, after which there is a small hole in the plate so that ca is not quite complete.

The next word is not distinctly legible. Dowson read satiga, a . . dhavasa, Bhagvānālī natiqākadhavasa, and Bühler restored natiqabahadhavasa, but remarked that nati is somewhat indistinct and that only the left side of the top of ga remains. I am much in doubt about the initial na. The old plate published by E. Thomas seems to show a vertical with a curving line to the left and a top-stroke, and it is possible that we should read no, as in the corresponding word in the Taxila silver-serroll. The ensuing words are certainly ca puṣyantya.

---

1 Cf. Rapson, WK, p. cii.
3 JA, viii, xv, 1890, p. 1361.
4 l.c. p. 121.
TAXILA COPPER-PLATE OF PATIKA

The construction is irregular, the participle puṣṭyaḥtae governing first the accusatives bhṛtara sarva, which I follow Bühlcr in explaining as corresponding to Skr. bhṛtṛta sarvan, and then the genitive. Mr. Pargiter\(^1\) proposes to explain bhṛtara as a genitive and to read 'sa-puṣṭyaḥtae (ayu-bala-candha) bhṛtara sarva-(cha)-naṭiga-[bam]dhavasa cha, the first cha being inserted parenthetically ... with reference to sarva-naṭiga, and the second cha being in its correct place grammatically but referring specially to (sarva)-[bam]dhava. These cha's are used more with regard to the sense than strict grammar'. It seems to me that such a construction could not possibly be intelligible to anybody, without a commentary.

Bühler explains the irregularity by assuming 'that in the Gandhāra dialect the verb puṣṭyaḥtae could take either the accusative or the genitive, like the Sanskrit namati?'. We have not, however, any reason for assuming that such was the case, and it seems more likely that the genitive is a mistake owing to confusion with the parallel construction which we find in sarva-budha sarva. It would also be possible to explain -bdhavasuchā as representing a Skr. bādha-vasatyā, in which case there would not be any grammatical irregularity. But we have no examples of an idiom such as satyaḥ puṣṭyaḥtae.

With puṣṭyaḥtae the context is at an end. The remaining portion of l. 4 contains a separate statement. The reading is perfectly certain: mahadanaṭati Patikasa jaiūvaṇae. There is room for one or two aksharas in the missing corner, but we cannot say whether anything is missing. Bühlcr explained jaivavānae as representing Skr. jayo varṣyaṭe and connected this with l. 5, which he read: Rohiṣjimitraṁya ya ima[hi] samkharama navakamika, translating the whole: 'the victory of the great gift-lord Patika is described by Rohiṣjimitra, who is the overseer of the works in this monastery'. The jaiū, he says, refers to the gift, by which Patika had become a dānaśāra. Lüders\(^2\) doubts 'very much the correctness of the reading jaiū vaṇāe. 'To say nothing of the supposed elision of i in vaṇae, which is by no means likely, I cannot bring myself to believe that jayo varṣyaṭe, literally "the victory is described", could ever mean "the record of the great gift was drawn up"'. I would rather, he says, suggest to read jaivavarṣya or some other equivalent of Skr. yuvarṣya instead of jaiū vaṇāe. 'During the time when the great gift-lord Patika was heir apparent' would be quite unobjectionable.' Lüders has further compared the title mahadanaṭati with the corresponding Saka word horamūrta in the Mānikīla inscription, horamūrta in certain Mathūrā inscriptions, and the short form horeka on the Mathūrā Lion Capital, and pointed out that these 'gift-lords' were evidently persons of consequence.

While agreeing with Lüders in his criticism of Bühlcr, I cannot accept his explanation. Sanskrit y never becomes j in the north-western dialect, and the reading jaivavānae is beyond doubt. It seems most natural to see a word corresponding to Skr. ajñayā in the last part of jaivavānae, and the remaining jaivav must then qualify the ajñā, the order, or the person issuing the order, i.e. Patika, as a title. The latter alternative seems to me to be the most likely one. In that case we may compare the well-known title yavuga, yuta, čaiva, i.e. zaika, savanga, used about the first Kushāpa ruler, Kujīla Kadhphiśes. There is nothing to prevent us from assuming that this was an old Saka title, which had been current in the old Tokharian country, and that it had also been used by the old Saka chiefs in India. If Patika, the son of the kshatrapa, bore this title at the time of the inscription, we must infer that the position as jaiūva was inferior to that of a kshatrapa.

I have already mentioned that the words written on the reverse were engraved immediately after l. 4 and before l. 5. They run Patikasa kshatrapa Liakā. Dowson,

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., xi. p. 215.  
\(^2\) JRAS, 1909, pp. 664 ff.  
\(^3\) SBAW, 1912, pp. 420 ff.
who read *patipasa* instead of *Patikasa*, explained them as an endorsement meaning 'Liako, Satrap of the lord of lords'. Bhagvanālā described them as the signature of Patika, with the addition of his father's name. Bühler suggested the translation 'of Patika, the satrap Liaka', meaning 'Patika's father, the satrap Liaka', and added: 'As Patika receives no official title whatsoever, he must as yet have been a private individual and as such unable to sanction or endorse an official document.' A comparison of the Kharoshthi documents from Eastern Turkestan, where we frequently find the genitive of a name, with or without the addition *dadavo*, to be given to, as an address on the cover, shows that we must translate: 'to Patika, the kshatrapa Liaka', and conclude that the deed was executed at Patika's request in Liaka's office and sent thence to Patika. In such circumstances it becomes more intelligible why the words *mahadanapati Patikasa jāivaṇāe* are added at the end of the deed. They are a kind of labelling, in order to secure dispatch to the proper person.

L. 5 has, as already remarked, been added after the words on the reverse had been engraved. As stated above, Bühler connected them with the last word of l. 4. But we have already seen that his explanation of that word cannot be upheld. Moreover, as shown by Lüders, the *navaśākārmiṇa* does not seem to have had anything to do with the drawing up of the record. He had to superintend the work, when a layman wanted to erect a building for the use of the order. Such was evidently also the case with *Roṣinimiṇa*, and l. 5 must probably be taken together with the words in l. 3, which record the establishing of the relics and the *saṁghārāma*. It is of course possible that it had originally been intended to insert the name of the *navaśākārmiṇa* in the body of the inscription. As stated above, however, we have an analogous case in the Māṇikākāla stone inscription, and it seems probable that l. 5 has been added by Roṣinimiṇa himself, or at his request, after the plate had been forwarded from Liaka's office. That it is a later addition is evident not only from the way in which it has been engraved, after the dots of the endorsement, but also from the smaller size of the aksharas, and from the form *navaśākārmiṇa*, where the *r* before *m* has been omitted and *k* in the suffix *ka* has not been changed to *g* or *y*, or dropped as in *sauvatisaraye, aṭhasatatiṁae, śaṭīga*. In the record itself *ka* in such position is only found in foreign names such as *Liaka* and *Patikasa*.

The reading of l. 5 is certain, with the exception of the akshara which Bühler read *hi* in *imahi*. It seems to me that we must read *mi* or perhaps *mṛi*, i.e. the same compound letter, which apparently denotes *mṛi* in later inscriptions such as the record on the Wardak vase. Also *ṣi* is perhaps possible. With every reserve I therefore read *imani*.

The question of the date has been dealt with in the Introduction, where it has been stated that it probably corresponds to some day in the year 6 B.C.

I now give my reading and translation.

**Text**

L. 1 [saṁva]ṭāraye aṭhasatatiṁae 20 20 10 4 4 maharayasa mahanatasa Mogasa Pa[ṇe]m[asa] masasa divase parīchame 4 1 etaye purvaye kṣaḥa[ra]{ar}[as]a
3 [de]*je Patiko apratiḥavita bhagavata Śakamuṇiṣa śariram [pra]*śiḥaveti [saṁgha]ramam cha sarvabuddhae payae matapitaräṃ puyayaṇiḥ[ö]*
4 [kṣatra]pasa saputradarasa ayubalavardhi[e] bhṛtara sarva cha [ṇātiyaḥ]aṇḍha]-vasa cha puyayaḥto mahadanapati Patikasa jāivaṇāe

1 JRAS, 1909, pp. 664 f.
5. Rohinimitraṇa ya ima[mi] saṅgharame navakamika
Reverse: Patikasa kṣhatrapa Lliaka.

Translation
In the seventy-eighth year (during the reign) of the Great King the Great Moga, on the fifth, 5., day of the month Panemos, on this first (tithi), of the Kṣaharāta and kṣhatrapa of Chuksha—Liaka Kusulaka by name—his son Patika—in the town of Takshaśila, to the north, the eastern region, Kṣhema by name—in this place Patika establishes a (formerly) not established relic of the Lord Śākyamuni and a saṅghārama (through Rohinimitra who is) the overseer of work in this saṅghārama, l. 5), for the worship of all Buddhās, worshipping his mother and father, for the increase of the life and power of the kṣhatrapa, together with his son and wife, worshipping all his brothers and his blood-relations and kinsmen.

At the jāiva-order of the great gift-lord Patika.
To Patika the kṣhatrapa Lliaka.

XIV. PLATE V. 2: MUCHAI INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 81.

No. I. 46 of the Lahore Museum is a slab of sandstone, measuring 3 ft. 11½ in. × 1 ft. 1½ in., and bearing a Kharoshthi inscription. According to Sir Aurel Stein’s catalogue of inscriptions in the Lahore Museum, quoted by Mr. R. D. Banerji, it was found in a hujra or cell in Muchai in Yusufzai, in 72° 20’ E. and 34° 21’ N., just to the north of Mār Karamar, south-east of Rustam, and north-west of Naogam. It is stated to have been referred to in the Report of the Explorations of the 10th Sappers under Captain Maxwell in 1882.

The inscription, which is no. 43 in Majumdar’s List, was discussed and edited by Mr. Banerji, and the reading was corrected by Professor Lüders.²
The inscription covers a surface 2 ft. × 9 in., and consists of two lines, the average size of individual letters being 2–3 inches.

The characters belong to about the same period as those of the Patika plate. We may note the square ka, the sloping it, the broad angular ya, the square sa, and the distinct straight prolongation of the lower vertical of sa, which almost touches the head. I fail to understand how Mr. Banerji could assign our inscription to the Kushāṇa period and the later Śaka era.

L. 1 is perfectly certain, viz. vashe ekasitimaye 20 20 20 20, followed by two lines crossing each other, but evidently only meant to mark a stop, in a similar way as in the Fatehjang inscription. It is of interest that the word vartha, which regularly becomes vasha in the dialect, is used in some records dated in the older Saka era, viz. in the Takht-i-Bāhī, Kālārreg, Sāraṅa Dheri, and probably the Mārguz epigraphs, but never in such as belong to the Kanishka era.

L. 2 was read sahayatena kve Vashtiṣṭegaṇa by Mr. Banerji. There cannot, however, be any doubt that Lüders was right in reading sahayarana kve vashtiṣṭugana. Sahayara represents Sanskrit sahaṭaka, companion, friend, associate. I am unable to say what kind of association the vashtiṣṭagas formed. Vashi probably stands for varti and suga may represent singa or perhaps even sūka. Kve, finally, is the nominative of the word corresponding to Skr. kūta, a well.

1 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 64.
² l.c., pp. 46, 64, with plate 11, fig. 1.
³ JRAS, 1909, p. 664.
With regard to the date of the Muchai record, it will be seen in the Introduction that it probably corresponds to the year 4-3 B.C.

**TEXT**

L. 1 vashe ekaśtimaye 20 20 20 20 1+
2 sahayaśe kuśa vaswisugana.

**TRANSLATION**

In the eighty-first, 81st year. Well of the Vashiśtiga companions.

**XV. PLATES VI-IX: THE MATHURĀ LION CAPITAL**

In 1869 Pandit Bhagvānlāl Indrājī found a red sandstone capital embedded in the steps of an altar devoted to Śītalā, on a site belonging to some low-caste Hindus at Mathurā. An account of the discovery is given in the Pandit’s paper on The Northern Kshatrapas.1 On the Pandit’s death in 1888 the capital was bequeathed to the British Museum, where it is now exhibited.

The capital is 1 ft. 7 in. high and 2 ft. 8 in. wide. It has been described by the late Professor Bühler2 as follows: ‘It consists of two lions standing closely joined together, back to back, on a pedestal, a square block of red sandstone forming an oblong 10 in. square at the top and 11 in. square at the base, and 1 ft. 8 in. in height. Above, at the point of the juncture of the two backs, there is a square flattened space with a hole in the middle, and there is also a corresponding hole at the bottom. It is thus evident that the sculpture belonged to the upper portion of some pillar, but did not stand quite at the top. And various representations on the slabs from the Amaravati Stūpa leave no doubt as to the exact position of the two lions and as to the nature of the object which they carried. For example . . . we have a pillar, surmounted by an architrave on which two lions couchant are placed back to back, and above them rises an enormous Dharmachakra . . . The arrangement seems to have been a very common one, the lions as supporters of the Dharmachakra being symbols of the Buddha, who is often called the lion of the Śākya race. The place where the pillar was set up seems to have been, according to the inscription H, the Guhavihāra, apparently one of the Buddhist monasteries at Mathurā, with which town the sculpture is also connected by the name of the Satrap Śūdras or Śodraśa. If the exact find-spot of the Lion Capital were known, it would be possible to identify the site of the Guhavihāra, which is not mentioned by the Chinese pilgrims.’

Professor Thomas3 states that ‘the state of the stone has been somewhat impaired by time and accident. In some cases, e.g. in the loss of the horn-like projections of the two heads, this has involved no curtailment of the text. The chippings of the two bottom corners have been, no doubt, equally harmless. But the front, which would be the most exposed portion of the stone, has in part so peeled away as to render some characters illegible.’

The bodies of the two lions and the top, back, and bottom of the block carry inscriptions in Kharoshthi letters. These inscriptions were arranged and read by Bhagvānlāl, whose interpretation was published by Bühler,4 who carefully compared his

---

1 Published by E. J. Rapson, JRAS, 1894, pp. 541 ff.; cf. also Cunningham, ‘Coins of the Sakas’, Numismatic Chronicle, 3. series, x, p. 123; Academy, 28 April, 1891, p. 397.
2 JRAS, 1894, p. 526.
3 Ep. Ind., ix, pp. 135 ff.
4 l.c., pp. 545 ff.
readings with the original 'and afterwards again with an excellent paper impression, presented... by Dr. James Burgess in 1889'.

A new edition, with plates, prepared from photographs of Cunningham, was published by Professor F. W. Thomas. Certain passages have been mentioned and discussed by Fleet, A. Barth, R. D. Banerji, F. W. Thomas, V. Smith, H. Lüders, L. Barnett, J. H. Marshall, and E. Rapson, and a new reading of the whole was suggested by myself.

I now edit the inscriptions from an excellent plaster-of-Paris cast, which the India Office has been good enough to place at my disposal, and which has been photographed by Mr. Varing of Oslo for reproduction in the accompanying plates.

It has been usual to distinguish a series of different records on the capital, and to mark each of them by a capital letter. It would not serve any useful purpose to change this designation, though I feel convinced that we cannot accept the arrangement of the various parts of the record or records in the alphabetical succession indicated by the capitals. Their distribution over the capital will be apparent from the sketch in plate vi, which has been drawn from the cast by Mrs. Hutten, of the Ethnographic Museum, Oslo.

M. Barth was of opinion that 'a considerable number of these inscriptions have nothing to do with the erection of the pillar, that they are not contemporaneous with the first consecration, and that they were engraved, not before the capital was put into place, but on various occasions after its fall'. As pointed out by Professor Thomas in his edition, however, the thoroughgoing uniformity of the characters and the similarity of the subject-matter of the records 'forbids any supposition of additions during the subsequent history of the stone'. Whether we assume that we have before us a series of different records, or agree with Lüders that the whole is one single inscription, recording the donation of the queen of Rajula and some minor donations made on the same occasion by her relatives, there can hardly be any doubt that the whole has been executed at the same time.

On the other hand, it is evident from the placing and arrangement of the inscriptions that they were not throughout meant to be legible or to be read. To quote M. Barth, 'most, if not all of them were... to be necessarily illegible when seen from the foot of the pillar, and two, A' and N, cut close to the two mortices, were even entirely hidden when the capital was once put into its place and surmounted by its appendage... The fact that those commemorations should have been thus engraved so as never to be read would, in any case, be no objection... nothing is more common with that sort of documents... These are pious works which indeed admit of a certain amount of publicity, but a publicity intended especially for the next world'.

The size of individual letters shows considerable variations. Professor Thomas distinguishes five groups:

1. The inscriptions B, E, F, I, J, M, on the front and back of the stone, with characters about 2-2½ in. in height;

---

1 Ep. Ind., ix, pp. 135 ff.
4 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 49, 55.
5 ZDMG, lxi, 1907, pp. 404 ff.
6 JRAS, 1913, p. 945.
7 SBAW, 1913, p. 415 ff.
8 JRAS, 1914, p. 985.
9 Ancien India, 1914, p. 158, with plates pp. 150 and 158.
11 l.c., p. 388 = 247.
12 l.c., p. 418.
13 l.c., pp. 386 f. = 246.
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2. G, N, P, E" on the back and under surface of the stone, \textit{circum} 1\frac{1}{2}–2 in.;
3. A (on the unpolished top and back of the stone), K, L (on the breast of the left lion), O, Q, R (underneath), J' (front, on the leg of the left lion), \textit{circum} 1\frac{1}{2} in.;
4. C, D, E' (on the back of the right lion), \textit{circum} 1 in.
5. H, H', slightly incised in small characters, of about \frac{3}{4} in., on the front. Similar small letters are also found in inscriptions I and J, and we shall have to discuss them in connexion with the records themselves.

Within one and 'the same inscription the characters generally maintain a fair average size, but sometimes they become a little cramped by limitations of space'. Professor Thomas is of opinion 'that the inscriptions in larger characters, 1, 2, and 3, were carved first, and those of a smaller size were afterwards crammed in wherever space offered.'

The characters are Kharoshthi of a comparatively old type. Bühler described them as closely agreeing with those of the Shāh-bāghārī and Mānsēhrā versions of the Aśoka edicts, and Professor Thomas as 'intermediate between the Aśoka forms and the cursive deviations of the Dhammapada manuscript and those discovered by Dr. Stein, to which approximate the vase scratchings from Mānikerāla and other places and the inscription of Sue-Vihāra'.

The shape of individual letters is not quite uniform, some of them having occasionally a cursive form, which fact may point to a comparatively extensive use of the Kharoshthi script by the people who set up the capital, leading to the introduction of cursive forms side by side with the old ones. I may mention a few details.

\textit{U} has the cursive loop-shape, which we have already found in the Shahdaur inscription, but in I 1 the loop is turned backwards, after the vertical has been bent forwards, and in I 4 we seem to have the Aśoka shape, without the loop and only with the bend, which we have also found in the Swat vase of Theûdora.

\textit{Kha} is without the backward bend of the top, as in the Aśoka inscriptions.

\textit{Cha} has the older form with the downward curve of the lower part. The head of \textit{chha} is angular, and there is almost no interval between the upper and lower parts.

\textit{Mn} once, in A 13, has the old Aśokan shape, with the \textit{n}-matra added to an ordinary \textit{ma}.

In A 3, 12, and E' we find the usual later shape.

\textit{Ya} is usually broad and angular, but in P 2, N 1 the top has become slightly broadened.

\textit{Sa} is usually cursive, without the upward prolongation of the lower vertical. Where the latter occurs, as in P 2, it is bent forward as in the Patika plate.

Anteconsonantal \textit{r} has the older shape, without the loop, in \textit{rda} (Q), \textit{rva} (I 1), \textit{rva} (F 2, J 1, P 1).

On the whole the palaeography of the inscriptions points to a time not much later than that of the Patika plate.

Professor Thomas has drawn attention to the numerous cases where a consonant is provided with a bottom hook or curve similar to the usual subscript \textit{ra}. The state of things is as follows.

\textit{Kr} is used for every intervocalic \textit{k} and \textit{g} in Indian words, and also in the name \textit{Sukastana}; thus bhakravatros A 12, somāma\'motakra E", nakravaasa F 1, nakrava-krasa N 1, Sakrastanaasa P 1. Intervocalic \textit{k} without the \textit{r}-stroke only occurs in un-Indian names and words such as \textit{Nada Dikasas A 5, horaka A 9, Mukī A 13, &c. It seems probable that Professor Thomas is right in assuming that \textit{kr} is used to represent a guttural fricative, 'analogous to the Persian \textit{f}'; more especially as in the name of Seistan (Pahlavi \textit{Sagastān}) this sound no doubt prevailed at the time'.

MATHURA LION CAPITAL

Gra only occurs where the corresponding Sanskrit word has gra, viz. in agra A 2, pagrana N 2, parivrakte A 16, J 3. There is no reason for assuming another value of gra than the usual Sanskrit one, the less so because the subscript ra here has the curved shape and not the sharp angle, which we find where gr seems to represent a guttural fricative, as e.g. in the Wardak inscription.

dhra occurs in the word padhravi A 10, padhravi M 2, where it only seems to mark the strong cerebral pronunciation.

The subscript r is especially frequent after t. Professor Thomas remarks that a ta, without the r-hook, only occurs in quite few cases, viz. in Takshilasa R 1, where it is initial, in auvrena A 9, where it is preceded by a nasal, in [a]bhusav[ta] A 13, karita J 2 E"", ayimin K L 3, and in the foreign name Patika G 1. Everywhere else ta is provided with a curved addition at the bottom. Professor Thomas compares the sign which was read tta by Bühler in the Asoka inscriptions. But that sign differs in showing an upward continuation of the lower curve and is now commonly read tva.

In most cases the sign in question consists of an ordinary ta with a small bottom curve towards the right; thus dhitra or dhitra A 3, matra A 5, pratrétra A 10, itro M 3, pratihratstra A 11, chatrudhrasa A 14, bhakravatra A 12, sarvastisthita A 16, F 2, J 3, N 2, saman[ay]mitrakra A 4, niyotrtra J 2, Budhatrevasa utraena K L 2, 3, havihrava N 4. If we abstract from dhrtra and matra, it will be seen that the compound represents a single intervocalic t (pratihratstra, chatru, bhakravatra, niyotrtra, havirvra) or d (pratrétra, sarvastisthita, saman[ay]mitrakra, Budhatrevasa, utraena) in the corresponding Sanskrit words. The state of things is, accordingly, exactly parallel to what we found with vra, and some presumption is raised in favour of the assumption that intervocalic t and d had a fricative sound. Cf. the remarks on the Swat vase of Theodora above. The dura of that record would then point to a voiced fricative. Moreover, we should be inclined to explain the stray instances of intervocalic t mentioned above as representing a doubled or compound t.

The two forms dhitra A 3 and matra A 5 can a priori be explained in two ways, either as instrumentals, corresponding to Skr. duhitra, mātrā, respectively, or as nominatives, i.e. the apparent tra may be an old intervocalic ta or an old tra. As to matra, it should be noted that this word also occurs A 6, where, however, the akshara tra is different, showing a short stroke sloping forwards from the lower curve. The same shape also occurs in bhvatra A 8; perhaps in dhitra A 8, and in pitamah A 7. Both the second matra and bhvatra are certainly instrumentals, and it seems natural to infer that the modified compound, with the short stroke, actually stands for tra, while the form without the stroke represents a dental fricative, derived from an uncompound intervocalic t. Pitramahi A 7 must then be a mistake.

It is characteristic that the r-mātrā in these last instances is not a curve but a more angular hook, i.e. we have the same distinction as in the case of gra in the Wardak inscription, where, however, the angular form seems to mark the guttural fricative and the curve the old gra. Also in purta B 2 we have an angular r-stroke, and here there are two short strokes in front of the akshara. Also here it is probable that tr and not a fricative is intended.

In the word kshatra we find a third shape, viz. the curve form mentioned above, with a small dot in front, cf. B 1, 3, M 1, Q 2. In G 1, 2 the dot is missing, and in A 1 the akshara has an exceptional shape, consisting of the same tra as in matra A 6, but with verticals running down from the upper and lower curve respectively and a short
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vertical, resembling an e-mātrā, rising above the horizontal. A somewhat similar akshara is found in l. 3 of the Zeda inscription. It is tempting to see in these varying renderings an attempt at writing the Iranian compound of a voiceless dental fricative, corresponding to English th, and r.

The remaining r-compounds are less numerous. We find pra in pradhraśi A 10, prātreṣṭa A 10, M 3, prātri- A 11; bhra in bhraśa A 7, where we have every reason for thinking of genuine compounds, and further rra in Kharraśti A 4; sra in śra A 10, -diśra A 15; shr in maheshri A 2, and sra in Piśapria A 7. The apparent r in Kharraśti was explained by Professor Thomas as perhaps representing rā. It might also be compared with the doubled r of the Saka language. The apparent sṛ, sār, and svr probably indicate some modification of the sibilants. We might think of a voiced pronunciation, but it is hardly possible to arrive at any certain results.

In such circumstances, we cannot do more than to reproduce the various signs in the transliteration. I shall, however, write the subscribed r within parentheses where it seems probable that it only indicates a modification of the preceding sound.

I now turn to the inscriptions themselves, retaining the designation by means of Roman capitals introduced by Bühlner.

A

The chief record, consisting of sixteen lines, is incised on the top (ll. 1–5) and back (ll. 6–16) of the capital, and contains the record of donations made by the chief queen of the mahākshatrapa Rajula and some of her relatives and surroundings. It has been known in the Historical Introduction that Rajula seems to have been the Saka ruler of the Mathurā country in the first years of the first century A.D.

Ll. 1–2 are perfectly certain: mahākṣatrapa Rajulas agraṃahes(r)ī Ayasī. L 3 was read Kamudhaa dhitra by Bühlner and Kamunsa dhitre by Professor Thomas. Though there are some blurred strokes at the bottom of the ka I cannot see any a-mātrā. The third letter is badly defaced. There is no trace of the short vertical at the top of the supposed sa. What we have before us is a curved head, running into the mortise in front, a long broken vertical, a curve, resembling the right portion of the top of sa, and a horizontal resembling an i-mātrā. The curve to the right of the vertical may be due to the peeling off of the stone, and it seems to me that it is possible to read i. The fourth akshara is no doubt a, though there is a distinct forward bend in the middle. With every reserve I read Kamuna and compare this word with Kamuna, which occurs in E' below.

The last word in the line is dhitre, where, however, the e-stroke is very indistinct and probably not intended. I read dhitra.

Ll. 4–5 are quite certain: Kha[r]aṇaṣa yuvarṣa maliṇṛa Naḍaṭasi. For Naḍaṭasi(Bhāgavān) read Naṭasaka sayan, Bühlner Naṭasaka Kasaye, and Thomas Naḍaṭa(? )aṣa. . . , thinking that Naṭasasi should be read, on the analogy of the other names, though the lower stroke of the last akshara is curtailed (being at the edge of the stone) in such a way as to produce the appearance of the curvate sa in Bühlner's Table, col. viii. After sa nothing can be clearly seen on the stone. The analogy of the other names would lead us to expect -sa'a.

There is room for two aksharas after -sa. The existing traces are very indistinct, but might be made out to be tasye.

1 Cf. Ernst Leumann, Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur, Strassburg, 1912, p. 41.
All previous interpreters have agreed about the general purport of these lines. The chief queen of Rajula has been described as the daughter of Ayasi (or Yasi) Komusa (or Komudha), as the mother of the yuvarāja Kharaosta, and as bearing the name Nadasiyaksa. Now Kharaosta has, as stated in the Introduction, been identified with Kharahostes, the son of Artha, who is known from coins, and I agree with Lüders that we have no reason for doubting their identity. Kharaosta cannot, accordingly, have been the son of Rajula, and, if the usual interpretation of the text is correct, we must accept Lüders' explanation that Rajula's chief queen had formerly been married to Artha, Kharaosta's father.

There are, however, grave objections to the traditional interpretation. The yuvarāja Kharaosta is mentioned again in inscription E, in such a way that we get the impression that he was a person of some consequence. It would be natural to infer that he was not a mere child. The chief queen, on the other hand, cannot have been an aged lady. She had a son, it is true, who may or may not have been the yuvarāja Kharaosta, but both her mother and her paternal grandmother were, as we shall see, alive at the time of the inscription and associated in the gift together with her brother and her, or her brother's daughter. Her son is not mentioned in this connexion, as we shall see, and it would be possible to draw the inference that he was still a minor, in which case he cannot, of course, have been the yuvarāja Kharaosta.

According to the usual interpretation the name of the chief queen is Nadasiyaksa, and this name is supposed to stand in the instrumental singular, and to be grammatically connected with the word agramaheshri of l. 2. It seems to me that it is difficult to assume a connexion between two words where so much comes in between. At all events we should have to read maheshtra with Bühler, because the semi-compounds of titles and names, where only the last word receives a grammatical termination, are never separated in this way.

Moreover we should have to state that the genitive of male bases ending in i and a could take the termination a: Yasti, of Yasi, Komusa-a or Komudha-a, of Komusa, or Komudha. We have not, however, any such forms in Kharoshthi inscriptions or in the Prakrits generally. Forms such as Datigputra (Kaldarra), Iudadhriputra (Taxila silver scroll), Kausikadhatrapasa (Māṇikiāla), Poshapuriaputra (Ārā), Kamagulyaputra (Wardak) are compounds containing nouns in -i, e. g. probably -ika, as the first part.

In such circumstances it seems impossible to take the two words following after maheshtra as genitives of male names, dependent on the ensuing dhit(r)ā. To think of the chief queen's mother is excluded, because she is mentioned as bearing a different name in A 6. It becomes necessary to take the words as giving the names of the chief queen herself. We may be uncertain as to the grammatical form, which might be the nominative or the instrumental. If we bear in mind the above remarks about the compound tara, t(r)ā, we must, however, prefer the former alternative, because the queen is in l. 5 called matv(r)ā, i.e. māṭā, the instrumental mātrā being written differently A 6. Dhit(r)ā must therefore be constructed with l. 4.

The name of the queen is accordingly Ayasia and, according to my reading, Kamwia. Here I take Ayasia to be the real name, and Kamwia to be a family or local name. In E the word Kamwio is written in smaller characters between ll. 1 and 2 and below the aksharas yeva of Kharaosta yuvaraya. It seems as if the addition is meant to characterize Kharaosta, who must, in that case, have been a Kamwia. If so, it would be a designation common to the chief queen and Kharaosta, and, as we have seen that the words

---
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Ayasia Kamuia are not genitives dependent on diit(r)ja, and this latter word must consequently be connected with the following Kharraostasa yuwaraja, it is necessary to infer that Ayasia was the daughter of Kharraosta, and that she bore the same designation Kamaia as her father.

It is impossible to say for certain what Kamaia may mean, since it is evidently some sort of a name. I shall only mention the possibility that it may be an adjective derived from Kamboja, Old Persian Kambdia, and meaning 'the Kambojan'. That would necessitate the assumption that these family names belong to a dialect of the same kind as that of the Kharoshti Dhammadapa, where old mh becomes m, i.e. mm. 4

In such circumstances it becomes of interest that the words Kharraostasa yuwaraja are arranged so as to occupy a separate line. The chief was of some consequence, and stress is laid on his name. That may also be the reason why diit(r)ja is placed before the genitive. Ayasia's relationship to the yuwaraja is emphasized.

The title yuwaraja is not met with in other Kharoshti inscriptions, nor in the inscriptions or coins of the Western Kshatrapas. Buhler says that 'the fact that Kharraosta bears the title yuwaraja indicates that he was designated to be the successor of Sudasa, be it because the latter was childless or because the order of succession went, as with the Western Kshatrapas of Chashana's family, from brother to brother'.

What we know about the order of succession with the Northern Kshatrapas is not in favour of the second alternative. Liaka Kusuluka was succeeded by his son Patika, and Rajula by his son Sodasa. It seems more natural to assume that the title yuwaraja did not belong to the kshatrapas, but to the imperial line, to which Moga belonged, and that Kharraosta was the inheritor to the position as 'King of Kings' after Moga. As mentioned in the Historical Introduction, his father Arta may have been a brother of Moga, and he may himself have been designated to succeed to the imperial title, which seems, however, to have been abolished after Moga's demise, the Saka chiefs not being able to agree about the election and therefore introducing a new form of government, with more than one mahakshatrapa at the head and with kshatrapas in the minor charges. It has also been pointed out in the same place that such a state of things would explain why Rajula married Kharraosta's daughter: he wanted to strengthen his claims through a matrimonial alliance with the imperial family.

It is impossible to speak with confidence about these matters. I shall only add that if Kharraosta, and his father Arta, were Kambjas, the same may have been the case with Moga, and we understand why the Kambjas are sometimes mentioned together with the Sakas and Yavanas. 5 They were a north-western people and spoke an Iranian tongue. M. Sylvain Lévi has suggested 6 the possibility of identifying the designations Kambja and Kapisa, and, if he were right, we should be forced to the conclusion that some of the imperial Sakas of the north-west hailed from the old Saka realm in Kipin; and in this connexion it may be worth while recalling the fact that the title jaiwai, which seems to be used of the Saka chief Patika in the copper-plate, points towards the country where later on the Kushânas rose to power.

The result of the above discussion is that the name of Rajula's chief queen was Ayasia Kamuia, and that she was the daughter of Kharraosta. The word mad(r)ja in L. 5 must then be connected with Nadadikasa, i.e. she was the mother of Nadadika, where nada may of course stand for nanda. The name is probably not Indian, but Iranian.

Ll. 1-5 thus contain a string of names and designations in the nominative. Now

---

2 Cf. e.g. Bimala Charan Law, Some Kshatriya tribes of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1923, pp. 234 ff.
3 JA, ccxii, 1923, pp. 32 f.
we shall see presently that the pious deed of Ayasia Kamūa which is recorded is described in a sentence where the verb is a past participle *prat(ṛ)piṭhavīt(ṛ)*. We should therefore expect the subject to be put in the instrumental, though Professor Thomas may be right in surmising that it would be possible to take *prat(ṛ)piṭhavīt(ṛ)* as an active participle with the subject *matā* in the nominative and a false concord. If I am right, however, in reading the defaced letters at the end of l. 5 as *taye*, we here have the instrumental required by the context, and the whole of ll. 1–5, before this *taye* would be one of those parenthetic or semi-parenthetic sentences mentioned in connexion with the Patīka plate.1

L. 6 begins at the top of the back slab and runs *sadha matra Abuhola[e]*, together with her *mōrā* Abuhola. The last akshara is perhaps *a* and not *e*, though I think it possible to see traces of an *e*-stroke sloping slightly backwards from the middle of the upstroke. I cannot explain the name *Abuhola*. Professor Thomas compares names such as *Abaharṇa* and Spalahora. Abuhola was the mother of Ayasia Kamūa and, if my interpretation of ll. 1–5 is right, probably the wife of Kharaosta.

L. 7 begins with *piṭramahi Piṭpas(ṛ)yia*, which must be connected with *sadha* of l. 6, *piṭramahi Piṭpas(ṛ)yia* forming a semi-compound, where the case suffix is only added once.

*Piṭramahi* must be Skr. *piṭamahī*, and we should expect the other form of the compound *itra*, which stands for intervocalic *i*. The writing has probably been influenced by the words *matra* in l. 6 and *bhartra* in l. 7ff. The second akshara of *Piṭpas(ṛ)yia* was read *ṣpa* by Professor Thomas, who, however, reads the second akshara of *saḷṣpa* l. 13, which to my eyes is identical, *ṣpa*. I cannot explain the name *Piṭpas(ṛ)yia*. It may be connected with the name *Viṭpasi*, which occurs in the Mūnikīla inscription, and represent a *Viṭvasikā*. If Ayasia Kamūa was the daughter of Kharaosta, Piṭpasi must have been the widow of Kharaosta's father *Aṛta*.

Then follows *bhartra Hayuaraṇa sadha Hana dhit[ra]a*. The *itra* of *bhartra* is quite certain, that of *dhitra* almost entirely defaced. The name *Hayuara* is no doubt Iranian. It is, however, probable that Bühler is right in connecting *Hayuaraṇa* to *Hana dhit[ra]a*. A semi-compound, where the personal name stands before the characteristic, cf. *sa-Valauadhapitra* in the Shahdaur inscription. It is not to be overlooked that the preposition *sadha* is repeated before *Hana dhitra* and nowhere else. It seems as if this daughter is in some way separated from the other persons associated with the queen. This leads me to think that she was the daughter of Hayuara and not of Ayasia Kamūa. In favour of this explanation I may draw attention to the alliteration between the names Hayuara and Hana, and also to the fact that the words *sadha Hana dhitra* are compressed more than usual so as not to transgress the line.

L. 9ff. bring the enumeration of the persons associated in the gift to a close: *atevrena horakaparivarena*. The *te* of *atevrena* was not read by Bhagvanīlal, and

---

1 Cf. the similar idiom in Old Persian, e.g. Behistun I, 13: *Sikayuvatit nāmā didā Nisāya nāmā dūāyānī Māsāiy avadāsīm avajanaum, a stronghold Sikayuvati by name, a province Nisāya by name in Media, there I smote him. It is curious how common this same idiom is in Marāṭhī, cf. *śva veśi Vījayū-rāgād Māhmuḍ Adilshāh Bādshāḥ ṣānī Śvājīṭa hāṣ Śāhāji yāḥ saivanta Karnāṭakāṃ phār ṣādha ṣāhā ḫād, at that time Māhmuḍ Adilshāh Bādshāḥ of Vījur—by him. Śvājī's father Śāhāji—his power in the Carnatic had been much increased, i.e. by that time the power of Śvājī's father Śāhāji in the Carnatic had been much increased by the Emperor Māhmuḍ Adilshāh of Bījapur, see Grant Duff, *History of the Mārāṭhās*, translated into Marāṭhī by D. Capon. New edition revised by Kādānāth Pāṇḍurang Parāb, Bombay, 1876, p. 34, and cf. Gāṇpatrao R. Navalkar, *The Student's Mārāṭhī Grammar*, third edition, Bombay, 1894, § 565, 3.*
Professor Thomas states that it looks like ṭra, which he considers to be miswritten for te. So far as I can see, te is certain, but there is an apparent continuation of the e-stroke below the bottom of the akṣara, the result being something looking like a closed sa. The t has not the usual r-curve, evidently because it was a stop and not a fricative, on account of its being preceded by a nasal, which is, as usual in our inscription, left unmarked.

Horakā has been explained by Lüders as a short form of horamurta, which is found in the Māñikīkāla inscription and evidently is a Saka rendering of the Indian dānapati.

Parivāra, Skr. parivāra, occurs in many old inscriptions. In Brāhmi records we find it e.g. in the Nasik inscriptions nos. 8 and 9, and in his edition of them M. Senart remarks: ¹ 'It is, I think, too precise to translate sa parivāra by “with his family.” If such were his intention, the engraver would rather have used special names of kinship or some generic word, as jāti, which occurs elsewhere. Parivāra may, together with the family or even excluding it, apply to companions of the donor, fellow-workers or caste-partners'.

The original meaning of parivāra is certainly ‘cover, covering; surrounding’. It can therefore mean the covering of a carriage, a surrounding wall or hedge, an enclosure, &c., and also the surroundings, train, suite, followers, &c., but the original sense is always felt through. Horakāparivāra might therefore mean ‘the horaka-enclosure’, ‘the horaka hall, or chapter’, and the term might therefore be of the same kind as astuvara, Skr. anukṛpa, the inner apartments and, secondarily, the occupants, just like the German Frauenzimmer.

I therefore explain the horakāparivāra as the chapter of the alms-lords, of the nobles who acted as donors, as suggested by Lüders, l.c., who thinks of the persons mentioned in inscriptions C–E below.

Then follows, ll. 10–12, the record of the pious act performed by the chief queen and her family and retinue: iva pradhavriviprat(v)rave(n)em isimite tavira pragat(e)ichavit(e)o bhav(r)avat(e)o Sākumunisa Bhudasa. For īsra my predecessors read īte or ītere, but there is no trace of the e-matrā, which, on the other hand, is quite clear in -pratīvērē. Instead of pradhavrivi we find pradhravi M 2. I have drawn attention to the inconsistent writing of such sounds in the Grammatical Introduction.

Nisime was read as nisimē by Bhagvānlī, who explained it as the locative of nissī, Skr. *nīsīḍa, ‘a place where a Buddha has sat’. The reading nisimē is, however, absolutely certain, and Bühler has justly remarked that the word also occurs in inscription J. He accepted the explanation of Pischel as nisima, Skr. nīsama, uneven, high, elevated, equivalent to stūpa. Professor Thomas thought of a stūpa outside the sima and compared the Pāli word nissimā.

There can hardly be any doubt about the identity of nisima and Pāli nissima. Moreover, nisima evidently qualifies pradhavrivipratīvērē both here and in inscription J. With regard to Pāli nissimā I have consulted the well-known Swedish scholar Mr. Helmer Smith, who refers me to the Vinaya Piṭaka, i, 122², 132³, 255⁴, &c.: imān bhikkhunī mukuttaṁ nissimāṁ netaṁ, take this bhikṣuṇi for a moment outside the limit (of the Viḷāra); ogantukhi nissimam gatā uposatho kālabbo, guests should go outside the limit and perform the uposatha; nissimatho anumodati, standing outside the limit he approves. The last passage is explained by Buddhaghosha to mean bahi upachāra- simāya thilo anumodati, while bahiṣmatagatassa, ibidem 1, 255⁴, is rendered as aṇāna

¹ l.c., pp. 420 ff. ² Ep. ind., viii, p. 77.
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sāmantavihāram gatassa. Nissāma therefore means 'lying just outside the limit', viz., of the Vihāra field proper, but close to it and evidently belonging to the Vihāra, because bhaṣṭa refers to what is farther off, belonging to another Vihāra.

L. 13 was read by Bhāgvanīlā-Bühler as mukhiṭayā satpae bhusati, it will conduces to eternal welfare, (vīra) liberation. Professor Thomas read māthura-kīte(h)ya(?)ya satpae bhusaveti(?), may it be for the eternal... of the Holy Śākyā sage Buddha.

The first akṣhara is almost identical with the mu of the Patika inscription. Muki cannot, however, be Skr. mukti, liberation, because kt becomes t, i.e. tt, in the dialect; cf. samkṣhatiya (Wardak), uta (Kurram).

The letter following after k cannot be hi or ti. The i-mātrā seems to be certain. It crosses a horizontal, which is bent downwards at the right end and below provided with an r-stroke. There is a faint line connecting the top of the i-stroke with the angle, but it does not seem to be intended. One might think of reading vṛt, if it were not for a distinct downward stroke from the left-hand termination of the horizontal. This stroke seems, in the plate, to be continued there the juncture with the horizontal, but the apparent continuation is not visible on the cast. With every reserve I read śri. Then follow ra and yo, the whole accordingly seeming to be mukṣṭirāya. This might be the dative of mukṣirā, but the dative regularly ends in ae. I therefore think that vṛya represents Skr. vṛja, and śri must then be Skr. śri, śrīrāja meaning 'illustrious king'. But then muki can hardly be anything else than the name of the king, and I cannot see any serious objection to explaining it as another form of Moga, where the g is certainly derived from k; cf. Sāsāsa B 2, where Brahmi inscriptions read Sāsāsa.

The next word seems to be satpae, but the e is not certain. The apparent e-stroke is placed above the top and not to the right of the vertical, and it seems to me that it is not impossible to read a. Satpae cannot represent Skr. satvate, even if we were prepared to assume the existence of an Indian satvati in addition to satvati, corresponding to Greek ἵστατε. For intervocalic t is in these records everywhere retained as tr. Satpae could hardly be anything else than Skr. satvīya, and if we could read mukṣirvāya and explain this as Mogavīrāya, satpae would perhaps be possible, though it would be strange to find vīrāya side by side with satpae. It will be seen that the vertical of sa is bent forwards and thus becomes different from the usual sa of these records. It is conceivable that we have to do with the old shape of the u-mātrā and should read satpae, though sa shows the usual loop-shape in G 1. Sāsāsa would correspond to Skr. suṣṭa, which occurs as a bahuvishti in Pāñjini v, iv, 120, together with suṣṭāya and suṣṭa. These latter words are also used as nouns, with the meaning 'a good morning', 'a good day', respectively. If the same were the case with satpā, we might translate satpā as 'for a good to-morrow', 'in order to secure a good hereafter'. But such an explanation does not seem to be very likely.

The ensuing akṣharas cannot be read as bhusati, because the third akṣhara is certainly vi and is, moreover, followed by a fourth letter, which seems to me to be a clear ta, without an i-stroke and without the apparent r-sign, which is always used when t stands for an uncompound intervocalic t. Nor could bhusati be a future of bhū, because we know from the Kharoshthi Dhammapada that a cerebral s was used in such forms; cf. e.g. karishadi A 46. For a similar reason Professor Thomas's bhūsā is unlikely. Bhūsātī seems to be a gerund of a base bhūsa, i.e. a bhūsavīti; cf. Ardhamāgadhi vandītī, avakkamītī, jiṣṭītī, ġhavītī, bhunijavītī, &c. Also bhūsavītī would be a gerund; cf. pramajeti A 23, parivajeti A 8, bāheti B 27, in the Dhammapada manuscript.

1 Cf. Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, § 582.
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We might think of explaining bhushavitum as a gerund of a verb corresponding to Pali bhussavi, he adorns. But we should fail to see why the cerebral s is not used after u. The use of s in forms such as bhikshu does not form a parallel, because there we have before us a living suffix, while we could hardly imagine a bhushana, corresponding to Skr. bhūṣaṇa.

In such circumstances I cannot see any other possibility than to read sauṣṭha abhushavita, and to explain abhushavita as the gerund of a denominative, from uttava, preceded by abhi. The whole would then mean: after having made the festival, i.e., after having performed the (funeral) solemnities, over the illustrious king Moga together with his horse. This explanation is highly hypothetical, the more so because we do not know anything about the royal funeral ceremonies of the Sakas. But I cannot see any other way of analysing the passage in accordance with the phonetical laws of the dialect.

The remaining lines on the back are clear: tuvā cha sanghārāma cha chatudrāvasa sahasa varṣavadite yana parirāha. The shape of tuvā in chatu seems to show that chatu and not chatu is the original. Also the d of drāvasa bears witness to the old r after u. Professor Thomas read dīvāsa for drāvasa, just as in itra, l. 10.

The words tuvā cha sanghārāma cha must be taken together with the preceding śarīra, as in the Patika plate. The stūpa and the monastery were apparently situated inside the simā.

The form varṣavādite for saṃvarāvādīnām is also met with in the Kurram casket.

An inspection of the original shows that the most natural way of continuing is to go on from the last line on the back of the slab to the back of the right lion and to begin from the bottom, where we find the inscriptions marked E, E' and E'', which all evidently belong together.

E. l. 1 runs Khar ṛṣṭo yuravara and is written in large letters, so that we again get the impression that care has been taken to give prominence to the person mentioned in the line. The secondary r-stroke in Kharra is indistinct, but traceable. Below the aksharas yuvā we find, as mentioned above, the word kum̐̃vē, written in smaller letters. Bühler read kum̐̃vē, which he explained as representing Skr. kumudikā, but there is no trace of an e-mātra. I have already stated that I take kum̐̃vē as a designation of Kharaosta, and perhaps as representing Skr. kumudikā.

In E 2 Bhagvānlāl and Bühler read jalamasa kumara, but I agree with Professor Thomas that the first akshara is certainly kha. Khalamasa is evidently an un-Indian name. As remarked by Professor Thomas, the element kha is also found in the name Khalaṁasa, \( ^{1} \) below. Kum̐̃ra denotes a royal prince, different from and younger than the yuvāra.\(^ {1} \) Khalamasa was evidently a brother of Kharaosta. Then follows in E 3 MAJĀ kaniṭha. Bhagvānlāl took maja together with the preceding Kum̐̃ra as Kum̐̃rā-maja, but tu becomes ṭo in the dialect, where it is not kept unchanged. Maja is evidently the name of another brother.

E 4 was read samanadhaktra, i.e. saṃbhushaktra by Bühler, but there cannot be any doubt that Bhagvānlāl was right in reading samanadatra. Professor Thomas suggests that the r-stroke of motra is accidental, \( ^{1} \) in which case we may understand the words saṃbhusha māṭā as indicating that the three sons named were uterine brothers.\(^ {1} \) It seems to me that we must connect samanadatra with the aksharas kva karaṇa incised on the right cheek of the right lion, as done by Bühler. It will be seen that the na of saṃbhushatra is exceptionally long and has a forward bend of the upright. A still more pronounced bend is,

it is true, found in the ni of kaniṭha in E 3. Still I am inclined to think that we have to do with an u-stroke so that we should read m. It is possible that the distinct bend in kaniṭha has been transferred by mistake from l. 4 to l. 3. We shall find some indications later on, which seem to show that the records were originally drafted on the stone in smaller letters, before they were finally engraved. In such circumstances slight mistakes might easily crop in. I therefore read saman[j]motra and connect this with kra to sanaunmotakra. We have seen in pratetre A 10 that an intervocalic single d is written tr, and samanunmotakra can therefore represent a Skr. samanumodaka, ascertaining, i.e. ascertaining to the donation, associated in the grant.

It would be tempting to explain the ensuing karita as a past participle, Skr. kāritāḥ, but we have already seen that there is no single instance of an intervocalic t being kept unmodified. It always becomes tr. We must therefore probably explain karita as a gerund, corresponding to Ardhamāgadhi karīta. Moreover, we cannot overlook the fact that Kharaosta has the nominative termination o, which is missing in Khalamasa and Maja. I therefore take these latter words to be accusatives and explain Kharaosta yuvārāga as the subject of the gerund karīta, translating the record as follows: after the heir apparent Kharaosta had made the prince Khalamasa and Maja, the youngest (brother) ascerting (parties to the donation). I would compare the similar idiom in the Praveśaka of the fourth act of the Svapnavāsavadattā:¹ ayaṃatā iha aachheka īvamā khasanamatiiddhikā paktivā vahānāti bhavāvā, when my husband has come and seen the wreath of flowers, I may be honoured, where we likewise have a nominative as independent subject of a gerund.

After E it would seem natural to go on with inscription M, just below E. It seems, however, as if there has been a desire to draw special attention to the person named in the beginning of M, and that his name has therefore been placed first in large characters on the neck of the right lion, and then, in a shorter form, after E. I therefore go on with inscription B.

B 1 mahakshatravasa is quite clear, tr having the angular r-stroke with a dot in front. There is a cross-stroke on the right side of ksha, which Professor Thomas thinks may indicate duplication. We shall find a similar stroke in M; and it seems possible that these strokes are intended to show that B and M should be read together.

B 2 runs Vajulas putra, which is clearly miswritten for Rajulas putra. The tra has the angular r-stroke and two short strokes in front. They are perhaps intended to indicate that the words written in smaller letters in front of putra should be inserted in this place or after B 3, which runs Sudasa kshatrave, with the same shape of tra as in B 1. There is no case-suffix in putra, and we therefore here have one of those semi-compounds, where only the last word is inflected. The words mahakshatravasa [Ra]julas putra show that there cannot be any question of considering Kharaosta as the son of Rajula.

The words Sudasa kshatrave were taken as absolute locatives by Bühler. We shall see later on, however, that the same words in M evidently give the logical subject of the past participle niyatritra, and I therefore accept Lüders’ explanation² of the forms as instrumentals, not, however, of the plural, but of the singular. Cf. the Grammatical Introduction.

The inscriptions C and D I take to be parenthetical additions. We have seen in E that the yuvārāga Kharaosta has been associated with two younger brothers and has been characterized as Kannā. Sudasa was evidently the second important person connected

---

¹ Ed. Ganapati Sāstri, Trivandrum, 1912, p. 33, l. 2.
² SBAW, 1913, p. 418².
with the pious deeds commemorated in the inscriptions, and also his position and family relations are therefore mentioned. That is done in inscriptions C and D.

C is, as already mentioned, engraved in front of B 2 and 3. It runs (1) Kalui a-(2) varaja. The last akshara is provided with some strokes running backwards from the vertical and forward below the upper limb. They are, perhaps, like the strokes in front of the first akshara, meant to indicate that C is to be inserted after putra. D is engraved below Sudasa in B 3, and should probably be read after B 3.

I therefore read B-E as one context: mahakshatrasaka Varajulastra putra—
Kalui avara—Sudasa kshatravat—Naulado, by the mahakshatrapa Rajula’s son,—he was born after Kalui (or, Kalui is his younger brother)—the kshatrapa Sudasa—the Nauleda. Naulado seems to be an addition of the same kind as KAMUNA, E’.

After these additions the name and title of Sudasa are repeated in M, which is incised below E 4, and runs on into the breast of the right lion. It begins kshatrapa Sudisa, where I take the apparent o-matra in the first akshara to indicate that we have here the direct continuation of B. The i-stroke in Sudisa is curious. The kshatrapa’s name was clearly Sudasa, with a long a. The i is therefore either a mistake or a sign of reference, of the same kind as the apparent o of kshatraye, indicating that B should be inserted in this place.

M 2-3 run ima padhravipraptver, representing Skr. ayam prtihotpradesah or imain prtihotpradesam. As seen by Thomas 1 and Lüders 2 the inscription I, incised on the front of the capital, forms an immediate continuation: I 1-4 vyadhirna kahavaro basapara kahavaro viyaa. For udhirna Bühler read udino and Professor Thomas ahaudhirk (ahadhan). It seems to me that the reading is absolutely certain. For basa Bhagwánlal read usa, and Bühler bussa or busa. After the bu of busaparo another bu has been incised in small size. I cannot explain it otherwise than by assuming that the record was first drafted in small letters on the stone, and then executed in larger size. The akshara bu has then not been cancelled with the rest of the draft and then subsequently engraved through misunderstanding.

For viyaa Bühler and Thomas read viya. It seems to me, however, that the break in the leg of the akshara is too pronounced, and though there is no loop, I consider u as the most probable reading.

I 2-4 are engraved in short lines under the word vyadhirna. The continuation must evidently be looked for below the continuation of I 1. We there find a comparatively large space without any letters, where some portion of the stone seems to have peeled off. Before the vacant space there is a run of exceptionally large size, preceded by viya in characters of the same size as the small bu after bu in busaparo. Professor Thomas suggests the possibility of explaining this viya as an insertion to show that the large run is an error for viya = viya. In my opinion it is a remnant of the first draft, which has not been cancelled and therefore subsequently engraved. I take it to be a doublet of viya in I 4.

Professor Thomas states that there is room for seven or eight aksharas after run. The four last of them I can distinctly read as rasapara, 3 and I am inclined to think that nothing is in reality missing, and that the open space in front of run was originally intended for the aksharas viyaa of I 4 and run, and that, viyaa having been engraved in another place, the result was a blank after run.

After rasapara the text runs on, on the breast of the left lion, with a word which Bühler read [m]ishtena, while Thomas thought that patirdhima is also possible. The

1 Ep. Ind., ix, p. 145.  
2 Bühler restored [janama], which is impossible.
third akṣara is, however, clearly eki. Only the lower curve has been placed so high up that it touches the upper hook.

The continuation follows in the line beginning below rāparaṇa and has always been read without any difficulty: nīsimo karita niyaḷ(r)īḷ(r). These words must contain the termination of the sentence beginning with kṣhatraṇa Sudisa. Karita, with a plain tā at the end, must be explained as in E", as corresponding to Arhamāgdhi karīṭha, and connected with nīsimo, which consequently stands for nissima, as so often in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada. We thus arrive at a sentence: kṣhatraṇa Sudisa imo padhāraṇa-prat(r)ē(r)īḷ(r) . . . nīsimo karita niyaḷ(r)īḷ(r)īḷ(r). It would, of course, be possible to explain kṣhatraṇa Sudisa as a double locative, 'when Sudasa was kṣhatrapa', as done by Bühler. It would, however, be difficult to understand why such a remark should be twice repeated, if it were not intended to state that Sudasa had had something to do with the donation recorded, and this consideration seems to make it necessary to explain the words as instrumentals. We must then translate: 'by the kṣhatrapa Sudasa this piece of land... was handed over, having made it nissima, i.e. lying just outside the limit', or, 'by Sudasa, after having made this piece of land... nissima, it was handed over'. We learn from this that the nissima formed part of the Vihāra ground. The sentence accordingly records a donation of a piece of land to the Vihāra.

The portion intervening between padhāraṇa-prat(r)ē(r)īḷ(r) and nīsimo is the most difficult one on the whole capital. The way to the proper understanding has been shown by Lüders, who explains the passage as a fuller description of imo padhāraṇa-prat(r)ē(r)īḷ(r).

Bühler explained his veyāyini kādhāvara busaṇā kādhāvara veyāa as Skr. veyāyini kādhāvara busaṇā kādhāvara veyāa, the army started in haste; the army (is) intent on wealth: victory!

Thomas objected that kādhāvara does not mean 'army', but 'encampment'; that the meaning 'riches' attached to busa is attested only by Wilson's dictionary; that the reading u in veyāu- is not certain, aniš and even a being possible, and that the change of g to y in veyā is contrary to the tendencies of the language employed in these inscriptions. He mentions the possibility of reading veyāyini kādhāvara, Skr. veyāyayini kādhāvara, but does not think such a reading and explanation promising.

Lüders reads veyāa dinam and sees in dinam the participle dinam, given: kādhāvara, he says, can scarcely be Skr. kādhāvara, which ought to become kādāvara, but probably contains the word kāntha, which means 'town' in the Saka language, but is also known to Pāṇini. Veyāa andBusaṇā he explains as names of localities, and veyā as corresponding to Skr. api cha, taking the final a together with the small veyā before veyā as representing Skr. api cha, and further. He thus arrives at the following translation: by the kṣhatrapa Sudisa this plot of land has been given, (viz.) the excellent place Veyaa and also the excellent place Busapara, and further . . .

So far as I can see there is no objection to explaining kādhāvara as representing Skr. kādhāvara. The Kharoshthi Dhammapada has kānha for Skr. kānhaṇaṃ B 13, and in the Kurram inscription we find sanhkara, Skr. saniskāra, and kānha, Skr. kānha, with k and not bh, though here a small stroke is placed above k to show a slight modification of the sound.

It seems natural to assume that the Saka chiefs, who set up the capital, were encamped before Mathura, where they had evidently gathered in strength, engaged in some warlike expedition. If Moja is, as suggested above, actually referred to in A, he may have been the leader and have been killed, or he may have died, before the expedition started. It is tempting to connect the Saka gathering with the pressure exercised by the Parthians, who, as we shall see in connexion with the Takht-i-Bahi inscription,
had become established in the north-west one year before the date of the Patika plate of the year 78, and who later on also made themselves masters of Taxila. But we cannot arrive at certainty.

The Sakas took the opportunity to make religious donations. Rajula’s chief queen established a relic of the Buddha in a piece of land, which Śudasa, the local kshatrapa, made into a nissima plot for the Order. And this piece of land had been used by the Sakas for their encampments. "Veyāudirna and Busapara were the names of these encampments. Veyāudirna I cannot explain. In some way it may correspond to the later vijayakṣavaṇīhāra. Busapara may mean ‘where the refuse (busi) is the further limit’, or ‘beyond the refuse gatherings’.

I further read viṣānu and follow Lüders in explaining viṣa as Skr. āpi cha, taking u together with vṛvarapareṇa as representing Skr. urvarāpāreṇa, by the place where the cultivated fields (urvarā) are the further limit, or, by the further limit of the cultivated fields. Paličhinna, finally, I identify with Skr. paramīghinna, limited. I thus arrive at the following translation: by the kshatrapa Śudasa this piece of land, the Veyāudirna encampment and also the Busapara encampment, limited by the Uvvarapara, was, after having made it nissima, handed over.

Above the akṣaras udīrṇa and busapa, respectively, there are two short legends in small characters, marked H', H. The former, which is almost illegible in the plate, runs dhamadana, the second, above busapa, guhavihāra. If my explanation of the small characters, which are found here and elsewhere, is right, we must infer that these entries were originally overlooked by the mason and therefore subsequently executed as they stood. It is difficult to say where they should be inserted. They may be intended to characterize Śudasa’s grant as a religious donation to the Guhavihara.

Bühler took this to mean ‘the Guha-monastery’. Dr. Fleet thought of the possibility that Guhavihāra might represent Skr. guhāvihāra, in the cave-vihāra, and Professor Thomas adopts that translation. Dr. Fleet proposed to identify this with the monastery mentioned by Hūan-tsang, who says: ‘To the east of the city, about 5 or 6 li, we come to a mountain saṅghārāma. The hill-sides are pierced to make cells (for the priests). We enter it through a valley, as by gates. This was constructed by the honourable Uṣṇāgupta. There is in it a stūpa containing the nail-parings of the Tathāgata’.

It is of no consequence that Hūan-tsang was told that the establishment went back to the times of Uṣṇāgupta. What he saw was a stūpa, which was said to contain relics, a saṅghārāma, and cells excavated in the hill-side. This is at least a remarkable coincidence.

The continuation of the context is evidently contained in inscriptions K and L, to the left of J 1 and J 2, on the side of the left lion. There are three lines: (1) auyārīṣa, (2) Budhatrevasā, (3) utraena auyimita. The last word was read auyimita by Bühler and auyimisa by Thomas, while Bhagvānīlā had suggested auyimitasa and translated ‘for the merit’ of Buddhadeva, the aḍārya (land) of Udayana Āryamitra’. Bühler translated: ‘on account of the exaltation (udaṇena) of the teacher Buddhadeva, Auyimita’, and Thomas: ‘through the elevation of the aḍārya Buddhadeva, Auyimisa’, at the same time proposing to explain auyimisa as a genitive with aḍāna understood. Finally Lüders explained utraṇena as corresponding to Skr. udakena and thought that some word meaning ‘to give’ might be contained in auyimisa or auyimita, so that there would be the question about the transfer of the donation by means of water, i.e. with libations of water.

I accept Lüders’ explanation and see in auyimita a gerund of aṛ-yam, cf. the frequent

1 JRAS, 1905, p. 156. 2 Julien, Mémoires, i, p. 210.; Beal, Si-yu-Ki, i, p. 181. 3 See plate ix, right corner of section F 2, G, J 3.
compound _pra-yam_, to give, to bestow. With regard to the change of _a_ to _i_ we may compare _ait_ for _ayam_ B 17, _samatāi_ for _samādāya_ B 26 in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada, and as to the sense the term _parindana_.

Sylvain Lévi wanted to identify this Buddhadeva with the Vaibhāṣika ācārya Buddhadeva, who belonged to the generation immediately after Ghoshaka and Vasumitra, who taught in the time of Kanishka and his successor. But the Lion Capital is at least a century older than Kanishka.

It seems natural to continue with inscriptions F, G and J 3, on and below the neck of the left lion:

F. 1 _Buddhīlāsa nakrārāsa (F 2) bhikhusa sarvastivārasa_, where _nakrārāsa_ represents Skr. _nagaraka_, from Nagara, on the Kābul river.

Sylvain Lévi wanted to identify this Budhila with the Fo-t'ī-lo, master of the Sāstras, who composed the treatise Tri-chin-lun (Sānyuktatattvaśāstra ?) for the use of the Mahāsāṅghika school, in a convent of the same, 1400 or 150 li west of the capital of Kashmir, and whose work explained metaphysics, the Prajñā of the Mahāsāṅghikas. This would well agree with what we learn about Budhila below in inscription N, but it is impossible to say anything for certain, so long as we do not know anything about the date of this teacher. At all events, there can hardly be any doubt about the identity of Budhila and Budhat(_r)_eva, the former being a regular short-form of the latter. The name has been repeated so that the ācārya can be further characterized.

G 1 _mahakṣatratrasa Kusulakṣa Patikāsa Maviakāsa_ G 2 _Miyikasā kṣatratrasa puyas_. The _tra_ in _kṣatratrasa_ is here without the additional dot or stroke which we find elsewhere in this word, so that we might think of transliterating _dṛ_. It is, however, probable that we have only to do with an abbreviated writing. The final _sa_ of _Maviakāsa_ is misspelled, and Bühler wrote that the akṣara can only be an abnormal _da_ or _a cha_. I have no doubt, however, that _sa_ is intended, the sloping lower line of the head having been drawn too long and the leg having become reduced to a minimum.

The third _u_ of _Kusulakṣa_ is not certain. It consists of a dot at the bottom and a curious stroke projecting from the upright. It is possible that Bühler and Thomas were right in reading _Kusulasa_. For _Patikāsa_ Thomas read _Padiša_. But _di_ in A 15, I 1, is different.

Kusulua _Patika_ has been identified with Patika, the son of Liaka Kusuluka, who is mentioned in the Taxila copper-plate inscription of the year 78, i.e., as suggested above, 6 b.c., and I see no reason for rejecting this identification. Some _Maviak_ _Miyikasā_ was we know not. The name _Maviak_ has been compared by Professor Thomas with the Scythian name _Mauakes_, _Mvaetes_, and further with Moga, and _Miyikasā_ with names such as Midakhos, i.e., Madhyaka, or Mazdaka, Mazakes, or Pahlavi _meyán_.

The end of the passage recording Śudasa’s grant is evidently J 3: _sarva-stivār_ _ana parigraha_.

The aim of these inscriptions is, as we have seen, to record the establishment of relics by Rajula’s chief queen and the grant of the land where they were established by Śudasa. The space on the bottom of the capital has further been utilized for some additional information connected with the donations, in inscriptions N–Q.

N is incised inside the circle at the bottom, but the first line protrudes over the

---

2. L.c.
3. Cf. JRAS, 1906, p. 213, and Rapson, JRAS, 1894, p. 548, where the name of a kṣatrapa _Mevaku_ is traced on a coin.
whole of the bottom. It runs: *ayariasa Budhila sa nak(r)aruk(r)asa bhikku*. Professor Thomas read *nakarasa*, but the second *kra* is absolutely certain. The termination *sa* of the word *bhikku* follows in L. 2, where we further read: *sarvastival(r)asa pagra*, followed by a blank, which Bhavvânâl Parallel filled up by *har*, while Bühler thought that he could read *sa* in a squeeze in his possession. I agree with Professor Thomas that there are no traces of writing after *gra*, and I follow him in running on with L. 3: *sa mahâsaṅghikasa pra*, and L. 4: *maññivitrave khalulasa*.

Bühler, who read *pahasura* and *paññauvida vakhulalasa*, translated: ‘(in honour) of the teacher Buddhila, a native of Nakara (*Nagara*), a Sarvâstivâda monk, who knows the wisdom (*paññâvidi*) of the famous (*paññâsāman*) Mahâsaṅghikas and is eager to explain it’. He stated that Bhavvânâl Parallel took *vida* as equivalent to *vîda* and translated ‘delightful in the exposition of wisdom and knowledge to the members of the Great Congregation’, and objected against this that the Mahâsaṅghikas were opposed to the Sarvâstivâdins, thinking that ‘perhaps the inscription means to praise Buddhila for his proficiency in the doctrines of the two schools’.

Professor Thomas took *pmaññivitrave* as representing *pmaññâvavilte*, in the knowledge of the nature of proof, and suggested to compare *khalula* with the unexplained *khaṭārā* (Athravaveda XI, ix. 16) and with *khaṭārāk*, a military exercise-ground, or to connect it with the base *khaṭd*; he thus arrived at the translation: an exercise-ground in the knowledge of the nature of proof to the vanguard of the Mahâsaṅghikas.

The reading *pmaññivitrave* shows that the *tra* of *trave* can only represent an uncompounded intervocalic *t*. The termination *tave* is well known as forming infinitives both in Pali and in Ardhamâgadhi. A verbal base *pmaññav* is not likely, but *uvi(r)vave* would be a regular infinitive of the causual *ji̱napayati*, and then *pma* must be explained as Skr. *pmaṇa*, and as the object of *uvi(r)vave*. The word *khalula* I cannot explain. It reminds me of *khaluta*, the name of a Vedic school.

It is evident that N has been added in order to give additional information about Buddhila, and I therefore take *ayariasa Budhilarasa* to be a repetition of *ayariasa Budhilar(r)avasa* K.L. and *Budhilarasa nak(r)araṇasa* F 1.

It seems most natural to go on with inscription O, below the end of N 1. The reading is perfectly certain: *sarvabudhama puṇa dhamaṇa (2) puṇa saṅghasa puṇa*.

Just below O 2 we find R: *Takshalasa (2) Kraminasa*, but this record is evidently supplementary to the record P, on the right side of the base, and I therefore take P to continue O.

The reading of P is beyond doubt: *sarvasa Sak(r)ast(o)jaṇasa puṇaṇa*. The writing *kra* should be noted. Cf. the above remarks about *r*-compounds. Nor can there be much doubt that Bühler was right in translating ‘in honour of the whole Sakastana’. Dr. Fleet!* wanted to explain *saka* as corresponding to Sanskrit *saka* and translated ‘for the worship of the whole of (his, her, or their) own home’, but later on accepted a suggestion by Hultzsch, that *sarvasa* might be the genitive of the name *Sarva*, ‘which is well established both with the dental *s* and with the palatal *t*’, and translated: ‘(gift) of Sarva, in honour of his home’; M. Barth! accepted the explanation of *Sarvasa* and translated ‘of Sava, native of Sakastana; to render homage’. Now the name *Sarva* may, no doubt, occur with a dental *s*, not, however, in dialects where *s* and *ś* are correctly distinguished, as is the case in the north-western vernacular of the Kharoshthi inscriptions. And *stana*, Skr. *sthâna*, can hardly mean ‘home’ in this connexion.

---

1 JRAS. 1904, pp. 703 ff.; 1905, pp. 154 ff., 643 f.  
2 I e., pp. 389 ff. and 247 ff.
The remaining records, moreover, make the impression of being added as a further specialization of Saka(stana), mentioning Saka chiefs, whose names have not been previously recorded.

Q, just below P and continued on the front of the capital, runs: Khāradaśa (a) kṣatrapasā, where it is impossible to decide whether Khāradaśa is the name of the kṣatrapa or of the country over which he held charge.

Then comes, on the opposite side of the base, inscription R, which has already been quoted: Taksilasa (a) Kronsasa. Professor Thomas thinks that we should perhaps read Rakshilasa, but the 'a' seems to be certain. Bühler took Taksilasa to mean ‘a native of Taksilasa’ and read Kōdinasa, Skr. Kauṇḍinya, for Kronsasa, while Professor Thomas thought that Kronsasa might stand for kō‘niṇaśa and represent Skr. kauṇḍinya. In the first place, however, initial 'k' could not well be written 'h', and then it seems extremely unlikely that an Indian name should occur here in the midst of the Saka chiefs. Taksila, finally, can hardly represent Skr. Taksila. Everything points to the conclusion that Taksila is the name of a person, and Kronsina either a secondary name or a designation referring to his place of activity or origin, or to his position.

There remains one record, written from below and running upwards towards inscription J on the front of the capital. It was read khaḷaśama(2)po by Bühler, but Professor Thomas, who distinguished it as 'j', was certainly right in reading Khalaśamato. The word is probably the name of some Saka chief, or perhaps of the navakarmika as in the Patika plate, who wanted to be associated in the merit derived from the pious deeds recorded in the inscription.

In addition to the persons in some way related to Rajula, the mahākṣatrapa of Mathurā, we thus find the names of several chiefs and nobles: the mahākṣatrapa Kusulua Patika, whose dominion was no doubt the Taxila country; the kṣatrapa Mevaki Miyika, who seems to be associated with him and perhaps was kṣatrapa in the Taxila province; the kṣatrapa Khāradaśa, and the persons called Taksila Kronsina and Khalaśamassā.

The family or families connected with Rajula may be arranged according to the following scheme:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Arja} \rightarrow \text{Piśasiri} \\
\text{Abuhola} \rightarrow \text{Kharaposta Kamula, Khalamas, Maja} \\
\text{Hayauna} \rightarrow \text{Ayasi Kamula} \rightarrow \text{Rajula} \\
\text{Hana} \rightarrow \text{Nada Diaka} \\
\text{Suḍasa Natinda, Kalan}
\end{array}
\]

The records on the capital belong to a later time than the Taxila copper-plate of 6 B.C., because Patika, who was then a jātīka, had now become mahākṣatrapa, and they are earlier than the Amohini inscription of A.D. 15, because the kṣatrapa Suḍasa had then become mahākṣatrapa. They may be approximately dated between A.D. 5 and 10.

I now give my reading and translation of the inscriptions, writing the subscript r within parentheses, where it only seems to denote a modified pronunciation of the preceding consonant.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

Text

A


B

(1) Khar(r)oostō yuvaraya (E') Kāmuō (2) Kalamasa kumara (3) Māja kaniṭha (4) saman[1] mot(r)a(E'')k(r)ā karita

D

(1) mahakshatrasasa (2) Va(ra)julasā putra (C) Kalui a(C 2)varajo (3) Śudase kshat[ra]vase (D) Naṭulūdo

M

(1) kshatrave Śuddi(da)se (2) īmo pādhrav(u)prat(r)ēs(r)ō

I

(1) Veṣaūdāna kadhavaro ḫusapa(2)ro kadha(3)varo (4) vi ya u(j)rvapareṇa palichhina (2) nisimo karita niyat(ṛ)it(ṛ)ō (H') dhamaḍana (H) guhavihare

KL

(1) ayārassā (2) Budhātt(ṛ)evasa (3) ut(ṛ)acena ayimīṭa

F

(1) Budhīlasa nak(ṛ)amasa (2) bhikhusa sarvastivat(r)asā

G


J

(3) sarvastivat(r)ana parigrāhe

O

(1) ayārassā Budhīlasa nak(ṛ)arak(ṛ)asa bhikhusa sarvastivat(r)asā pagra(3)na mahasaghana pra(4)ma ṣāvīt(ṛ)ave khalulasā

N

(1) sarvabudhana puyā dhamaśa(2)puyā saṅghaśa puyā

P

(1) sarvasa Sak(ṛ)asta(2)asa puyae

Q

(1) Kharḍasa (2) kshatṛavaya

R

(1) Takṣhīlasa (2) Kronina

J

(1) Khalaśamu(2)ṣo.

Translation

The chief queen of the mahākṣatrapa Rajula, Ayasā Kamūia, the daughter of the yuvārāja Kharoṣṭha, the mother of Nada Diakha, by her, together with her mother Abuhola, her father's mother Piśpasi, her brother Hayuara with his daughter Hana, the harem and the alms-lord chapter, was established in this piece of land, which is just outside the (saṅghārāma) border, the relic of the Lord Śākyamuni, the Buddha—after having
performed the solemnities over the illustrious king Muki and his horse,—and a stūpa and a saṅghārāma, in the acceptance of the order of the four quarters of the Sarvāstivādins.

The yuvāraja Kharaosta, Kamaṇḍa, having made prince Khamamasa (and) Maja, the youngest, assenting parties, by the mahākshatrapa Rajula’s son,—the younger brother of Kalui,—the kshatrapa Śudasa, Nālula, by the kshatrapa Śudasa this piece of land, (viz.) the encampment Veyalūrīna, and also the encampment Busapara, limited by Urvarapara, was granted, after having made it (an appurtenance just) outside the limit—as a religious gift in the cave-monastery,—having given it, with (libations of) water, to the teacher Buddhadeva: to Budhila from Nagara, the Sarvāstivādin monk,—in honour of the mahākshatrapa Kusuluka Patika (and) the kshatrapa Mevaki Miyika,—in trust of the Sarvāstivādins: to the teacher Budhila from Nagara, the Sarvāstivādin monk, a khulula (dialectician?) to teach the foremost Mahāsāṅghikas the truth; as honouring of all the Buddhas, honouring of the Law, honouring of the Order; in honour of the whole Sakastana, of the kshatrapa Khardaa, of Takshila Kronina. Kallālamūna.

XVI. Plate X. 1: Mathurā Elephant Inscription

There is in the Mathurā Museum a small stone, \(1\frac{3}{4}\) in. long and \(8\frac{3}{4}\) in. high. It shows in relief a decorated elephant, trotting towards the right. Above the back of the elephant, in the upper left-hand corner of the stone, is a Kharoshthī inscription, consisting of five aksharas of an average size of \(\frac{1}{2}\) in. — \(\frac{1}{4}\) in.

The stone was found by the honorary curator of the Museum, Pandit Radha Krishna, in a mound at Rawal near Mathurā, and a short notice of the inscription was published in 1927. 1

The characters are too few to allow of a certain dating. Kha has a rather square head and reminds us of the Zeda inscription. Tu reminds us of the Maṅkīla bronze, but the u-loop is added behind, as in the u of the Mathurā Lion Capital inscription 1 r. Dh has almost the same shape as in the Fatehjang record. Sa has its nearest parallels on the Mathurā Lion Capital, and the same is the case with sta.

The reading is perfectly certain and runs: kastakshadhatu. It can only be doubted whether the final akshara should not be read du. Nor can there be any doubt with regard to the interpretation. The words mean ‘the collar-bone (aksba) relic (dhātu) of the Lord (pātri)’.

The meaning of the scene depicted is also clear. We read in the Dipavaṇsa, chapter xv, and Mahāvaṇsa, chapter xviii, how Mahinda wants to leave Ceylon, because there are no relics to be worshipped. The king, however, asks him to remain. He may send for relics to India, and the king promises to build a stūpa over them. Sumana repairs to India, where he receives relics, and thence to Indra’s palace, where the Buddha’s right collar-bone (dakkhiṇakāhaka) is handed over to him. With this he returns to Ceylon, and the relic is placed on the frontal globe (Dipavaṇsa) or the back (Mahāvaṇsa) of the state elephant, while the earth quakes.

We here evidently have a description of the scene depicted in the relief. The legend about the fetching of the collar-bone relic has not hitherto been traced outside of Ceylon. We know, however, that the Āṭṭhakathā, on which the Sinhalese chronicles are based, to a great extent drew on Indian sources. And the Mathurā inscription and sculpture show that such has been the case with the legend about the collar-bone relic.

On the other hand, we cannot state that the legend was localized in Mathurā. The

stone is small and can easily have been brought to the place where it was found from outside, e.g. from the north-west. And, if we bear in mind the fact that Kharoshthi never seems to have found a home in Mathurā, we become inclined to think that such has been the case.

TEXT
Sastakhadhatu

TRANSLATION
The collar-bone relic of the Lord.

XVII. PLATE X. 2: BIMARĀN VASE INSCRIPTION

Bimarān is a small village six to seven miles west-north-west of Jalālābād, which was explored in the years 1834–37 by M. Masson. There was a big stūpa in the centre of the village and smaller stūpas in the immediate neighbourhood.

In one of them, numbered 2 by Masson, a relic-chamber was excavated, which contained a steatite vase inscribed with Kharoshthi letters. Within the vase were found some pearls and beads and a gold casket decorated with reliefs, and together with the vase four copper coins.¹

The coins, which were the only coins found in the stūpa, belong to the Azes coins with the legend maharajasa mahatasa dhramikasa rajatirajasa Ayasa, and they have usually been taken to imply that the vase was deposited in the days of Azes, though they only prove, as pointed out by M. Foucher,² that the reliquary is not older than Azes. The relief figures on the gold casket, representing the Buddha between Indra and Brahmā, on the other hand, are stated by the said scholar to show that the vase is at all events older than the Kanishka casket. A priori there does not seem to be any objection to assigning it to the times of Azes.

A reproduction of the inscriptions, in inverted order, was published by James Prinsep³ and corrected in H. T. Prinsep's republication of the engraving.⁴

Then came H. H. Wilson's publication mentioned above, remarks by J. Bird,⁵ and editions by Cunningham⁶ and Dawson.⁷

A new edition, with excellent plates, was finally contributed by Mr. Pargiter.⁸

The vase, which is now in the British Museum, is inscribed both on the lid and round the body of the vase, but the two inscriptions are, as recognized by Cunningham, practically identical.

The characters are, on the whole, well cut, though Mr. Pargiter is no doubt right, when he states that the scratching tool has slipped in some places and distorted some of them.

They make the impression of being fairly old. We may note the ya, which has an angular top but a bend in the middle of the left leg. Similar forms are found on the Lion Capital and in Kālārā. The sa seems to be a cursive form of the old sa with the leg continued upwards towards the head-curve. The nearest parallels are again found on the Lion Capital. Most characteristic is apparently the anticonsonant r in sarva, which again reminds us of the Lion Capital and seems to be distinctly older than the shape found on the Taxila scroll and apparently also than those of the Takht-i-Bahı and Pārā records.

From the point of view of palaeography there does not seem to be any objection to a dating of the Bimarān vase as about contemporaneous with the Mathūri Lion Capital. And there are also two orthographical features which remind us of the latter. Inter-vocalic t is always written tr, except in mu(m)javada and niyadida, where it has become d, and inter-vocalic g is written gr, where the Capital has br. It is probable, as mentioned in connexion with the Lion Capital, that the sounds intended were fricatives, and I shall transcribe tr(r), gr(r), respectively. Mr. Pargiter reads t, g, respectively.

There are, as already stated, two inscriptions, one round the body of the vase and another one on the lid. They are, however, evidently only two copies of the same record, and it seems probable that the latter has been written after, and probably copied from, the former. The engraver was then aware of the insufficiency of the space available on the lid, and therefore began with the most important part of the record, which could not be missed, adding so much of the remainder as he could. In doing so he seems to have misread the name of the donor's tribe.

I therefore begin with the longer inscription round the vase, which I read as Śivarakshit(r)asa Mu(m)javadapatrasa daṇamukhe niyudide Bhag(r)auṭ(r)a śārīrīkā sarvabuddhā[ṇa] payes.

The apparent anuvāra of Muṇjavada is turned backwards and perhaps only a slip of the engraver's tool. On the lid it is turned the other way and has, accordingly, been taken to represent an anuvāra. Here also the ensuing ra has been misdrawn and made into a na. Mr. Pargiter thinks that the apparent r as a defective na, where the top has been omitted. There is, however, a backward bend of the vertical, so that na is certain. Muṇjavanda might be Muṇjaṅauṇa, but such a name is not known to exist. Muṇjavada or Muṇjavanda would represent Skr. mūjavat or mūjavanta, and be a well-known word. A tribe called Mūjavat is mentioned in the Atharvaveda together with north-western ethnics such as Balihika and Giadārī, and I have little doubt that this word is meant in our record. If the anuvāra after u was actually heard, we have before us the nasalization of a long vowel which is a well-known feature in Indo-Aryan vernaculars. Muṇjavadapatra or Muṇjavadaḥputra would accordingly mean not 'the son of Mūjavat', but 'the Mūjavat scion', 'individual of the Mūjavantas'. Cf. the terms sahaṇa, sahaya used in other inscriptions. I think that this explanation is the right one and infer that the legend on the lid is a mechanical and faulty copy of the main inscription.

The r-stroke in putrasa is defaced. It may have joined the l in a sharper angle than in Śivarakshitura, and I shall write l(pr)a and not l(tr)a.

Daṇamukhe is evidently the nominative and not the locative, for other inscriptions have daṇamukho. The k tends to show that mukho does not stand for mukhya, as suggested by Mr. Pargiter. Moreover, we find in Pāli daṇamukha. The meaning of the word has been discussed by Messrs. Senart, Thomas, Pargiter, and Majumdar.
The last mentioned scholar quotes the Pāli idioms danamukhe datvā, danamukhe suisujitvā, where we still seem to feel an older and fuller meaning ‘under the head of alms’. But I agree with Messrs. Senart, Thomas, and Majumdar that, in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, no difference can be made between dana and danamukha.

For niyadide M. Senart proposes to read niyatilam and M. Pargiter reads niyatide, adding that the ti is provided with the otiose r-stroke. I cannot see any trace of the latter, but I admit that it is possible to read ti.

The form śarirchī was explained by Mr. Pargiter as an instrumental plural, ‘with relics of the Lord’. That explanation is perhaps the right one. There is, however, one objection. We have no a priori right to assume that Śivarakṣita did more than to give the vase. The relics may have been older, and the same may have been the case with the gold casket. It therefore seems possible that śarirchī is a dative, of the same kind as similar forms which have been discussed by Pandit Surendranath Majumdar. The use of the word ni-yat, cf. nir-yat, which often means ‘to restore’, seems to add strength to this explanation. The case may have been similar to what is recorded in the Patka plate, where we hear about relics which had not been properly deposited (apratiṣṭhāvita) and were subsequently enshrined.

We do not know who Śivarakṣita was. We know a person of the same name from the Shahdaur inscription, and the name Śivarakṣita is found on a seal from Taxila, but we have no materials for judging of the identity or non-identity of these persons.

The inscription on the lid is, as already stated, shorter, and omits the final blessing. It looks as if it begins with the word bhag(r)avat(r)a, but I have already tried to explain why such is the case. The execution is less careful than in the main inscription. I have already drawn attention to the writing Muhjaṇapāda for Muh[ā]nava. We may further note the misdrawn bha and da in Bhag(r)avat(r)a and danamuh.

My reading of the main inscription is, accordingly, as follows:

**TEXT**

Śivarakṣita(r)asa Muh[ā]navaḍaputtraṇa daṇamuh be niyādide Bhag(r)avat(r)a śarirchī sarvabuddhaṇa paya.

**TRANSLATION**

Gift of Śivarakṣita, the Muhjavat scion, given in substitution, for the relics of the Lord, in honour of all Buddhas.

The inscription on the lid runs:

**TEXT**

Śivarakṣita(r)asa Muhjaṇapāḍaputrasa daṇamuh be bhag(r)avat(r)a śarirchī.

**TRANSLATION**

Gift of Śivarakṣita, the Muhjavat scion, for the relics of the Lord.

**XVIII. PLATE XI. 1: KALA SANG INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 100 (?)**

Kala Sang is a hillock belonging to the Mahāūsa system in the territory of the Khud Khels of the Yusufzai border. Here a stone bearing a Kharoṣṭhī inscription was found lying on the hill-side near Cherorai. It is now in the Lahore Museum, where it bears the number I. 59.

The stone measures 1 ft. 10 in. x 6½ in., and the inscription covers 1 ft. 4 in., while the size of individual letters is from 1 to 1½ in.

---

1 Sir Asutosh Mukerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, iii, ii, 1925, pp. 31 ff.
The inscription is incomplete, the stone being only a fragment, and the portion containing the beginning of the record has not been found.

The characters are almost of the same kind as in the Mount Banj inscription of the year 101. Cf. the letters ku, kk, p, and y. Ku is perhaps a little more advanced, the top-stroke being continued without a break in the right-hand hook. The shape of l and s is of the same cursive kind as on the Mathurā Lion Capital. Palaeographical considerations on the whole seem to assign the record to about the same time as the Mount Banj epigraph.

The first three aksharas were read yataṇa by M. Senart and yataṇa by Mr. Majumdar. The second cannot be va, because the top-stroke is distinctly bent upwards. Nor can it be la, the leg being too long and too straight. We must read va, and a comparison of the Muchal inscription shows that we must restore sahāyaṇa.

The ensuing Pippalakhaṇa was explained by M. Senart as representing Skr. pippalakṣayā, and it is hardly possible to avoid thinking of pippalā, which occurs both as a common noun and as the name of a person and of a Vedic school. From the same word is formed Pippalāṣa, the name of a school of the Atharvaveda, which we know from the neighbouring Kashmir. One might think of explaining khaṇa as representing Skr. khada and seeing in Pippalakhaṇa a synonym of pippalā, but we are scarcely justified in assuming the dropping of an intervocalic d, provided that the word does not belong to another dialect than the usual one in Kharosthī inscriptions. The only thing which we can say for certain is that Pippalakhaṇa is a nearer characterization of the companions, sahācharas. And it is worthy of notice that similar characterizing additions in other inscriptions are just as difficult to explain. It is impossible to follow Mr. Majumdar in thinking of the name of an individual used in the plural.

The next word was read bhūka by M. Senart, just as in the Mount Banj inscription, while Mr. Majumdar reads khue. The first akṣara is certainly ku, but the second cannot well be e, because the supposed e-stroke is turned downwards. It looks like the ho of the Mathurā Lion Capital, but I have little doubt that we must read o, though the shape is irregular, the bottom of the vertical being bent backwards and the e-stroke being added at an unusual angle. A slight backward bend of the vertical is, however, also noticeable in the Mount Banj and Taxila silver scroll inscriptions. Besides, there can hardly be any doubt that the word in question corresponds to Skr. kūpaḥ, and, to judge from the inscription found at the neighbouring Mount Banj, the nominative of masculine a-bases in the Mahābany country ended in o.

The next word was read dvuka by M. Senart, while Mr. Majumdar read dvau, which he explained as rājuka. The first letter is very different from la in pipala-, which has a straight vertical and a regular curve of the projecting portion. If we abstract from the top-stroke, our akṣara is almost identical with the o of khaṇa, and I therefore accept M. Senart’s reading e. But then we are able to state with confidence that the preceding akṣara is not e, as assumed by Mr. Majumdar.

I also agree with M. Senart in reading the second akṣara as du. Jau has always a sharp angle in old records, and it is not till in the Wardak vase that we find the rounded form which Mr. Majumdar’s reading presupposes.

The third akṣara is peculiar. We have a similar ka in the Shakardarra inscription, but I do not think that it is possible to read so in our record, because ka in kuo is too different.

1 JA, ix. iv, 1894, pp. 51 ff., with plate v, no. 36; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 21.
It seems to me that we have to do with the same akṣara as the last in the word I have read kuo, so that eduo should be read, and this eduo must probably be explained as an adjective qualifying kuo. I have little doubt that M. Senart was right in comparing the word eduka. But unfortunately we do not exactly know what it means. In Markandeya's account to Yudhisthira about the coming deprivation of the Kali yuga we read (Mahān, 110, 65 = 13074) how people are going to worship edukas, abandoning the devatas: edukan pājavyaḥyante vairavatikṣyauti devatāḥ, and two stanzas further on how the earth is going to be marked by edukas and not to be adorned with temples of the gods: edukachykhā prithivi na devagrihyahushita. In the commentary we find edukah explained as asthyakālıkai kudyaṇi, walls marked with bones. This explanation is taken from the lexicographers, who give various explanations containing words such as asḥi, kikasa. Thus Amara II, ii, 4 says that a wall (kudya) is said to be eduka if it is antaryastakikasa, studded with bones, or, with bones inserted into it. In Mahēśvara's commentary this is explained by saying that the bones are applied for the purpose of strengthening the wall, dārkhyaḥathan. The Sabdakalpadruma also gives other explanations: kikasaṁ iva kikasanī yat kudyaṁ chhiṭāveraṁ iti khyatam ity anye, iti Śārasundari. Kikasam asḥi etat kāśṭhadikṣihānamadravyapalakṣhayam, kikasam iva kikasanī, kiliṣkḥāditī Madhu. Eduka is accordingly a wall into which 'bones', i.e. planks, boards, or other hard objects have been inserted.

Sir Aurel Stein describes the old well 11/₂ miles to the east-south-east of Jhanda village in the Māhāt country as follows: 'The masonry lining is of the fashion peculiar to the pre-Muhammadan buildings of Gandhara and Udyana, but remarkably regular, and by far the most finished of its kind I have seen anywhere. It shows a succession of double courses. The upper one consists of roughly square blocks, circ. 7 inches high and varying in length from 8 to 11 inches, with neatly packed columns, formed of small flat stones and circ. 4 inches broad, separating each block from its neighbour in the same course, &c.' So far as I can see, this description shows what is meant with a kupa eduka. It is a well of stones, separated by flat uprights, and I shall tentatively translate 'an intersected well'.

After eduo M. Senart read savahasa, Skr. sarvaajñasya, but stated that an examination of the plate does not quite favour this reading. Mr. Majumdar read Sava ... sa, of the (rajuka) Sava ... The first akṣara has, however, a distinct rounding of the bottom, so that it seems natural to read saṁ. The second seems to be sa, and saṁva may be an unusual abbreviation of saṁvatsare. The third one can perhaps be compared with the first numeral figure of the date in the Lorijān Tangai inscription, preceded by the numeral 1. I am therefore inclined to think that we have to do with a misspelling. The last sign I cannot identify. It may be a sign of the same kind as the unidentified signs after the figures in the Fatehjang and Muchai inscriptions. With every reserve I therefore read saṁva 1 100, in which case our record would be two years earlier than the Mount Banj inscription.

**Text**

[saḥa]ṣyaṇa Pipalakhaṇa kuo eduo sa[m]ya 1(?) 100 (?) . (?)

**Translation**

Of the Pipalakhaa companions, this intersected well. Anno 100 (?)
XIX. PLATE XI. 2 : MOUNT BANJ INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 102

A description of Mount Banj has been published by Sir Aurel Stein, who surveyed the Mahdka range and the adjoining country in the autumn of 1904.

From the culminating height of Mount Banj a spur runs east-south-east and strikes the Indus just above the large Utmanzai village of Khabal. Further to the north there is another spur, almost parallel to it, and running east down to the Indus. Between these spurs lies a valley, 'about two miles broad from crest to crest and drained by the stream of Khabal. In its lower portion this valley is nothing but a deep-cut narrow ravine between precipitous rocky sides rising up from the boulder-filled bed of the stream. But at its head the enclosing slopes are somewhat easier and form a kind of mountain amphitheatre'. Here Sir Aurel found 'an ancient well, 3 feet square, built of large roughly cut slabs with columns of small flat pieces in the interstices. It still is the main source of water supply for the hamlet of Banj.'

This is probably the find-place of a slab bearing a Kharoshthi inscription, which was brought to Sir Harold Deane as found at Mount Banj. Estampages were forwarded to M. Senart, who published the inscription with a plate. A new edition is due to Mr. N. G. Majumdar.

The slab is now in the Lahore Museum, bearing the number 1. 42. It measures 1 ft. 6 in. x 9'1 in., the inscribed portion covering 1 ft. 4 in. x 8 in.

The characters are pre-Kushāpa Kharoshthi, and the size of individual letters varies between 1 in. and 3 in. We may note the kha without any backward bend of the top; the broad angular ya and the distinct, forward prolongation of the leg of sa, which is almost identical with the sa of the Patika record.

The first line of the inscription contains only one word, written in the left corner. It was read dānamukhā by M. Senart and dānamukho by Mr. Majumdar. The third akshara is, however, not quite certain. It looks like the mo of the Patika, Mathurā Lion Capital, Kanhiāra, and Ārā inscriptions. The o vowel-stroke is, however, usually longer. We find exactly analogous forms of the third akṣara of the word dānamukha in the Yākubi and Ghaz Dheri inscriptions. If we consider the varying shapes of the akṣara mu, it will be seen that the u-mātrā usually forms a short stroke added at the left extremity of the letter, as in the Patika plate, and that the right leg rises above the line. In the Kurram casket, where the akṣara is made square, the u-stroke is, however, added to the bottom, and the left leg rises above it. It seems to be the same form which is used in our record and also in the Yākubi and Ghaz Dheri inscriptions, and I therefore accept the reading dānamukhā.

L. 2 begins with ma, surmounted by a small hook above the left top. I cannot explain this hook. One might think that it denotes the long a, but then the a-mātrā after m is marked differently in the Niya documents, where we have certain instances of a mā, viz. by means of a dash below the letter. In the Sui Vihār and Ārā records we find a short stroke crossing the right leg of ma, which does not seem to admit of any explanation. It may be surmised that all these signs are meant to mark the beginning of the record. In the case of our inscription such an inference may be strengthened by

1 ASIFC, 1904-5, pp. 33 ff.
2 JA, IX, iv, pp. 513 ff., with plate v, no. 35.
3 J&FASB, xxv1i, 1922, pp. 65 ff., with plate v; cf. his List, no. 34.
4 See Stein, Serisindia, plate xxiv.
the consideration that l. 1 does not, as usual, begin at the right extremity. The word danamukha is, moreover, never used as the opening word of any other Kharoshthi inscription.

I therefore take the record to begin with l. 2 and the first akshara of that line to be simply ma. Then follows kadaçaputrasa. There are some irregular strokes and dashes on both sides of the upright of the second akshara, but they are too little pronounced to be intended, so that we have not sufficient reason for reading markadaçaputrasa. M. Senart compared markada with Skr. markāsya, markāsya. We might also think of markata, which is used with more than one meaning: a species of grain; an ape; a spider; a kind of fish, and, a Dāitya. At all events the word is evidently a personal designation, but I fail to see why Mr. Majumdar thinks that it sounds like a foreign name.

Then follows Vayira, after which Mr. Majumdar adds sa. There are, however, no traces of any akshara following after ra, which, moreover, stands exactly above the last akshara of l. 3. If makada is the name of an individual person, we should certainly expect another name to individualize his son. But even so it would not be strictly necessary. And makada may be the designation of a locality or association, and putra be used in the same way as in rajasputra, devaputra, &c., to denote a member of an individual group or clan, in which case the Makadaka-son would be a member of the association or clan of the Makadakas.

Vayira must then evidently be connected with the opening of l. 3, which M. Senart left unread, while Mr. Majumdar read bluwa. Only parts of the first akshara remain, viz. a short top-stroke, the upper part of a vertical, and traces of a horizontal projecting towards the left and perhaps crossing the vertical. The thick line to the right, joining the vertical in a curve and continuing downwards, which is seen in the plate, does not belong to the akshara, but is simply the edge of the stone. A careful inspection of the original has made me inclined to accept Mr. Majumdar’s bluwa, though bluwa would also be possible. The bottom of the akshara and the u-mātra have been broken off.

The second akshara cannot be anything else than ra, though the e-stroke is very faint. Vayira and bluwa would correspond to Skr. Vajra, but I do not know of any such designation in Buddhist literature. Sir Aurel Stein has shown that the Mount Banj remains represent the site where the Chinese pilgrims located the incident in the career of the Bodhisattva, when he gave up his body to feed a hungry tigeress. The pilgrims speak about a stone stūpa at this spot and state that the soil as well as the herbs and shrubs show a light reddish colour as if blood-dyed. When people dig the earth, they feel as if pricked by thorns. All, whether sceptics or believers, are moved to feelings of sorrow and pain. We also read about another stūpa to the north, about 200 feet high, which had been built by King Asoka and was adorned with sculptures and of artistic construction, and which at all times shed a divine light. Either of these may have been the Vajra, which may mean a stūpa containing or connected with a vajra, or resembling a vajra in shape or splendour, or built by some person called Vajra or Vajrā.

After [bluwa] follows sansāvatkaraye. It will be seen that the compound tsa is a little irregular, in so far as the upper horizontal protrudes to the right of the vertical, which, in its turn, is continued in a straight line up to the horizontal.

Then follow the numerical symbols 1, 100, 1, i.e. 102, and a word, which M. Senart read bluha and explained as possibly standing for bhuv[ś] ḥa[ṃ]. Mr. Majumdar read bhula, which he took to represent Skr. bhūtaḥ. In his List, however, he accepts my reading, which is kuo, Skr. kāpaḥ. There can be no question about reading the first akshara as bhu, because the top-stroke does not project to the right of the vertical. The
shape differs slightly from that of ka in l. 2, the right-hand hook being more rounded and joining the vertical higher up. We have, however, found more examples of slight irregularities in this record.

We thus arrive at the following text and translation:

TEXT

L. 3  
Makahakaputrasa Vayira-
2 [thu]ye sahvat seriously 1 100 1 1 kuo
1 daanam[u]kho.

TRANSLATION

Of the Makaşaka scion, in the Vajrastupa, in the year 102, (this) well (is) the gift.

XX. PLATE XII. I: THE SO-CALLED TAKHT-I-BĀHĪ INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 103

No. 1. 1 of the Lahore Museum is a stone, measuring 17 in. by 14\(\frac{1}{2}\) in., and bearing a Kharoshthi inscription in six lines. There is some uncertainty about its provenance, Cunningham originally stated \(^1\) that it had been discovered by Dr. Bellew at Shāhbadgarhī, but later on always spoke of it as hailing from Takht-i-Bāhī, and the epigraph has usually been spoken of as the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription.

Both places are situated in the same neighbourhood, Shāhbadgarhī 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) miles east and Takht-i-Bāhī about 8 miles west of Mardān in Yushima.

The editor of Trübner’s Record states that Dr. Bellew had left the stone in Hoti Mardān, ‘in Dr. Johnson’s compound. Several years afterwards, in 1870, he authorized Dr. Leitner to take away anything he might have left at Hoti Mardān. Dr. Leitner, after personal inspection, had the stone carried down to Lahore by bullock-cart, and there had the inscription both lithographed and photographed. The discovery of the stone therefore belongs to Dr. Bellew, that of the inscription to Dr. Leitner.’

A rubbing of the inscription was forwarded by Dr. Leitner to Professor Dowson, who gave a notice of it in Trübner’s Record.\(^2\) Then follows the notice by Cunningham, mentioned above, in Trübner’s Record, June 1873, and a fuller notice by Dowson,\(^3\) who read the date portion, which he again\(^4\) reproduced in a new note two years afterwards. New editions were published by Cunningham,\(^5\) Senart,\(^6\) Boyer,\(^7\) and myself.\(^8\)

Cunningham remarks that ‘as the stone has been used for many years, perhaps for centuries, for the grinding of spices, all the middle part of the inscription has suffered and become indistinct, and some portions have been obliterated altogether’. The reading and interpretation are consequently in some places beset with difficulties.

The inscribed portion covers 15\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. by 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) in., and the size of individual letters varies from \(\frac{1}{2}\) in. to 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. There is apparently a gap after the seventh akshara of l. 1, but nothing has been lost, the gap having been left without any writing on account of the roughness of the stone. There is a similar vacant space in the middle of l. 5.

\(^1\) Trübner’s Record, June 1873, reprinted Ind. Ant., ii, 1873, p. 242.
\(^2\) June 1871, not accessible to me.
\(^3\) JRAS, New Series, vii, 1875, pp. 376 ff., with plate. \(^4\) Ibidem, ix, 1877, pp. 144 ff.
\(^5\) ASI, v, 1875, pp. 58 ff., with plate xvi, no. 3. \(^6\) JA, viii, xv, 1890, pp. 114 ff., with plate.
\(^7\) JA, x, iii, 1904, pp. 457 ff.
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INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

The alphabet is Kharoshthi of a comparatively old type. Kha is without the backward bend of the top and is almost identical with the kha of the Swat vase. Da in shadhadana, l. 4, is similar to the da of the Patika plate, while di is upright as in the Pāja inscription. Ba has the old curvilinear shape with a deep indenture. Pa in maharayasa, l. 1, has the old broad and angular shape, but elsewhere the top is rounded as in somewhat later records, and the left leg is shortened. Sa is like the śa of the Lion Capital, and ńa is usually devoid of the upward prolongation of the leg, as is also commonly the case in the last-mentioned record. In Guduvarasā, l. 1, however, the prolongation is distinct.

L. 1 has never presented any serious difficulty and runs: maharayasa Guduvarasā vāsha 20 4 1 l, where vāsha probably stands for vāshe, though no trace of the e-stroke is now visible. Dowson read the second akshara of the king's name as mū, but a comparison of du in madu, l. 5, and pīdu, l. 6, shows that it is du. Nor can there be any doubt about the identity of the mahārāja Guduvvara. He is certainly identical with the Parthian ruler whom we know from numerous coins, and from Christian legends as the king to whom the apostle Thomas came. On his coins Guduvvara uses different titles, the lowest being maharaja and the highest maharaja rajatiraja or maharaja rajaraja. We have no right to infer that the use of the lower title in our inscription points to an early stage of his reign. On the other hand, there is nothing which militates against such an assumption.

L. 2. The first word was read sāh... by Cunningham and sāhivāsārāsā by Dowson. E. Thomas¹ demurred to Dowson's reading, without, however, suggesting any alternative. Messrs. Senart and Boyer read sāhādāsā, 'of the continuous reckoning'. There cannot, however, be any doubt that Professor Thomas was right¹ in reading sāhābāsārāsā.

The next word is tiśatimāsā, for which M. Senart read tiśahomāsā. The reading is absolutely certain, and also supported by the forms tiśatimās, tiśahomās, in the Pāja and Śkārah Dheri inscriptions. Then follow the numerical symbols 1 100 1 1 l, i.e. 103.

We thus have two different dates after the name of the mahārāja Guduvvara, one in the 26th year (parsha), the other in the 103rd year (sāhābāsā). We have no reason for attaching any importance to the use of different words for 'year', and for assuming that the first date refers to a reckoning where the year begins with the rains. Nor is there anything in the wording of the two dates which points to a difference of the connection existing between the royal name and either of the two dates. What stands there is simply 'of, i.e. during the reign of, the mahārāja Guduvvara, in the year 26, in the one hundred and third---103.—year'. And that can mean that the inscription was drawn up in the 26th year of Guduvvara’s reign or of some unidentified era, and in the 103rd year of another era, which latter is evidently the same as is used in the Shahdaur, Mānehrā, Pachjang, Mount Banj and other old Kharoshthi records. It has been usual to assume that our inscription has been dated in the 26th year of the reign of Guduvvara. The consequence has been that it has become necessary to separate one Kharoshthi inscription, viz. that on the Taxila copper-plate of the year 78, from all the rest and refer its date to a separate era of its own. For if Guduvvara’s 26th year coincided with the year 103 of the other era, his first year would be the year 103—26, i.e. 77, and then the Taxilā plate of the year 78, which is referred to the reign of the Mahārāja Moga, cannot belong to the same era. For we know that Moga was succeeded in Taxila by Guduvvara’s predecessor Azes, and Guduvvara could not, therefore, have been on the throne one year before the date of the Taxila plate, when Moga was still reigning. I have there-

¹ JRAS, New Series, ix, 1877, p. 10 footnote. ² JRAS, 1913, p. 636. 
TAKHT-I-BÂHI INSCRIPTION

fore referring the first date of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription to a Parthian era instituted by Azes, and I still think that this is the correct explanation of our record.

The remaining words of l. 2 are \textit{Vetaksha\textit{a} masasa d\textit{i}vase}, as has always been recognized.

L. 3 ff. were not read by Dowson, and Cunningham only tried to make out some few words. M. Senart gave a transliteration of the greater part of them, and M. Boyer of the whole.

The first word of l. 3 was read \textit{panchame} by the two French scholars, who further took the ensuing sign to be \textit{pa}, which according to M. Senart is the sign for the figure 5.

Mr. Majumdar in his List suggests to read \textit{athama}.

A comparison of the certain instances of \textit{pa} in ll. 4 and 5 makes it almost certain that the first akshara is \textit{pa}. There is no trace of an anusvāra, but there are some strokes at the bottom which may represent an r-stroke. I therefore read \textit{p[r]}\textit{a}. The second letter consists of a vertical bent towards the left at the top, and a stroke projecting to the left lower down, which perhaps crosses the vertical. I have formerly read \textit{tha}, but the bend of the top is too pronounced to be accidental. Nor is \textit{dha} likely, because the vertical does not show the indenture which is visible in the \textit{dha} of l. 4. The nearest approach to our letter is the akshara which I have read \textit{th\textit{u}a} in l. 3 of the Mount Banj inscription. I therefore accept Mr. Majumdar's \textit{th\textit{u}a}. In the third letter the e-matrā seems to be certain. I consequently read \textit{p[r]}\textit{a}th\textit{u}a.

The explanation of the ensuing sign as the figure 5 is hardly possible, the Kharoshthi signs for 5 being a St. Andrew's cross and a single stroke. What we can see is a hook, which may be the beginning of a \textit{pa}, but also a damaged \textit{di}, and a long vertical. I have therefore suggested to read \textit{di i}, cf. \textit{divase athami di i} in the Und inscription.

The next aksharas are badly defaced and cannot be restored with certainty. M. Senart read \ldots \textit{pade} and M. Boyer \textit{ia ishunami samana}.

The first akshara consists of an upright, which is perhaps curving forwards at the top, so that we may think of an \textit{a}. It is provided with two strokes, one running straight out to the right, and the other obliquely from the joining point of the other one. If the former was originally continued to the left of the upright and the latter is due to later grinding, we should have an \textit{a}; if the straight horizontal is a later addition, we must read \textit{e}, and if both are later, we have an \textit{a}. The second akshara may be \textit{ja}, though it is more rounded and has shorter legs than the \textit{ja} of \textit{Vetakha}, l. 2. The right leg is, moreover, rounded forwards at the bottom, but this inward bend seems to be the result of the grinding of later times. Then there are faint traces of a continuation of the right leg in a forward slope, and at the end of this continuation indications of what might be a r-stroke. Finally there is a faint line running in a rounded angle upwards from the left termination of the horizontal. It is therefore possible that the left vertical does not belong to the letter but forms part of the next akshara, in which case we should have to read \textit{bra}.

Then comes a long vertical with a hook projecting to the right from the lower part and traces of a short stroke sloping forward to the left. M. Boyer read \textit{khu}, but there are no traces of the upper curve of \textit{khu}, and the vertical seems to run too high up. I have proposed to restore \textit{di}, but this is just as uncertain. If the preceding short vertical belongs to this akshara and not to the preceding one, we might think of reading \textit{pa} or \textit{pu}. Then comes a short vertical continued upwards in a long curved line. M. Boyer read \textit{na}, and I have suggested to read \textit{ne}. If the lower vertical was originally continued upwards, which seems to be possible, it would be possible to think of \textit{na}.

\footnote{\textit{Acta Orientalia}, iii, pp. 60.}
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

Then we have a small forward hook, which M. Boyer took to be the remains of a mi, but which I follow M. Senart in connecting with the ensuing upright and reading pa. M. Boyer saw a sa in this upright, but the straight top seems to be too distinct. What follows was read de by M. Senart and mana by M. Boyer, who explained samana as representing Skr. śramana. For śramana, however, we could only have śramana or shamaṇa. And besides, what M. Boyer read as mana is evidently kṣhe.

So far as I can see, the only certain thing is that the last word is pakshe, which must be Skr. pakshe or pākshe. With regard to the preceding words we are entirely left to guess. We might think of ita kṣhune (or diye) pakshe, on this paksha-day, or of ebra (or atro) puhāpakshe, at this auspicious paksha, wherewith it would be natural to think of the tradition according to which the 1st Vaiśākha was the birthday of the Buddha. But we shall have to confess that the passage cannot be restored with anything approaching to certainty.

Then follow five aksharas, which M. Boyer read balasamisa, remarking that the e of be may be a flaw in the stone. It seems to me that such must be the case. The final portion is quite clear, and I therefore read balasamisa, which seems to be the genitive of a name, probably corresponding to Skr. Bālavāmin. Professor Thomas' thinks that we ought probably to read mira for misa and compares Mira boyaṇasa l. 4, but the sa is certain.

The last aksharas of l. 3 were read as goyanasa by the two French scholars, and M. Boyer explained goyan as Skr. goyana, a bullock-car, drawing the last akshara sa to l. 4. There cannot, however, be much doubt that Professor Thomas was right in reading boyaṇasa, the same word which occurs at the end of l. 4, where we read miraboyana. This is evidently a name, which M. Boyer has compared with the Iranian Mīhōpōzīr. Boyana in l. 3 must contain the same boyaṇa and be connected with the preceding Balasamisa, so that there cannot be any question of drawing the final sa to the ensuing line. Boyana is evidently an adjective or participle formed with the suffix ana from a base boy, where y has been derived from a voiced sibilant, as shown by the Greek rendering in Mīhōpōzīr. The base is therefore probably the Iranian bang, bān, to save, and boyaṇa has almost the same meaning as Greek oswip, Prākrit tratara, which is common in coin-legends.

The first word of l. 4 was read pa...aa by M. Senart, but M. Boyer was certainly right in reading parīvara, though the t-stroke of the second akshara is almost entirely obliterated and there is an apparent stroke protruding from the middle of the vertical. The latter is evidently not part of the akshara.

Parīvara must be Skr. parīvāra, and I take the meaning of the word to be 'enclosure, enclosed hall, chapter, chapel'.

The next word was read yadha..na by M. Senart and śadādāna by M. Boyer. So far as I can see the remains of the first akshara consist of a curve, which is different from the more square sa, but looks like the curve of sa, and faint traces of a vertical below. I therefore read shadādāna, which is exactly the form we should expect for Skr. śraddhādāna or śrīdādāna. M. Boyer was no doubt right in comparing Pāli sādhāneya, Skr. śraddhādeya, a gift of faith, a pious gift. The dha shows an apparent hook to the right, which does not seem to form part of the original akshara. The upward bend of the bottom of da is probably only a continuation of the bottom-stroke, but might be an anusvāra.

Of the letters following after -dāna M. Senart only read the two first, and those as sapta. M. Boyer read sapayasavatāna, which he explained as Skr. sapraftāsuvatāna

JRAS, 1913, p. 636².
and took together with the last words of the line, *miraboyanasa*, translating the whole as ‘together with his children (praja) Suwadanā and Miraboyana’. He thinks that the curious letter before mira contains na and da, the latter having been added above, after the rest had been written, when there was no more space left in the line.

The first letter is certainly sa, but the second has a distinct u-loop at the bottom, so that we must evidently read pu. The third no doubt looks like the ya of puyae, ll. 5, 6, but there are distinct traces of an upright rising from the left-hand termination and of a bottom-stroke. I therefore read tra. Then comes a letter which does not seem to be sa, but rather looks like ve. There is, however, an indenture in the middle of the upright, and the apparent e-stroke seems to run down below the upper horizontal. I therefore feel justified in reading dhi, though the indenture in dha of shadadana is much more pronounced. Then there are traces which point to a ta and a very distinct ra, which, however, runs into an akshara of peculiar shape, which had evidently been omitted, when the line was engraved, and was then inserted, in distorted form, after the mistake had been detected. I do not think that there can be much doubt that sa is intended, the less so because a similar sa is found at the end of the Zeda inscription. I therefore read saputradhilarasa.

L. 5. The first three letters were read ejkshuna by M. Boyer, while M. Senart only read the first and the third ones. The base of the second akshara is certainly jha. Then we have a curve across the leg, and I do not think that there can be any doubt that it is the ante-consonantic r, which has this shape in the Patika, the Lion Capital, and other old inscriptions, while the left termination usually joins the preceding akshara in a loop in later records. Below this curve there is a loop, which looks like the usual u-loop, and the most likely reading is, a priori, erjhuṇa. I have formerly thought it possible that the curve and the loop belong together, representing an intermediate stage between the old curve and the later curve with loop, so that we should read erjhuṇa, but erjhuṇa seems to be the correct reading.

The word is evidently un-Indian. Jk is a rare sign in Kharoshthi, and when it occurs, it seems to represent the voiced s, which is usually transliterated as s. If we assume that the word sounded erṣuṇa, we become tempted to identify it with the word alyṣaṇai, later eṣṭaṇai, i.e. aḷaṇai, eṣṭaṇai, which is used in the old Saka language of the Khotan country in order to render Skr. kumāra. For we know that the Saka language used r for l throughout, only substituting l before certain sibilants as a later development. Saka alyṣaṇai therefore presupposes an older aḷaṇa, aḷaṇaka, while the later form eṣṭaṇai shows that the initial vowel tended towards an e. If erjhuṇa is the actual reading, the development of ṛ to u is parallel to the change of ṛ to u in kṣuṇa, for which we find kṣaṇa in Saka documents.

It seems to me that we have good reason for assuming that erjhuṇa is actually the Saka word, and consequently that we have to do with a prince of Saka extraction.

His name may be looked for in the aksharas following after erjhuṇa. M. Senart read them as kapa, and M. Boyer, who admitted that the first akshara looks like ka, suggested to read [bhau]pa. The ka is beyond doubt, the pa, on the other hand, seems to show faint traces of a curve crossing the pa and a prolongation of the vertical below the curve, so that I have proposed to read kaphṣu, comparing this with the varying forms Kasa, Kappha, Kapha, Kauf, Kap, and Kaph occurring on the coin-legends of Kujula Kadphises. The traces of a subscript sha are, however, so faint that I think that we must read kapa, the same form which the Chinese rendered as kia, i.e. in the pronunciation of the Tang period kiau.

I have pointed out in the Historical Introduction that I cannot see any objection
to assuming that Kujula Kadphises, whose coins show him to have succeeded the Guduvhara dynasty in Taxila, can have been mentioned as a prince in our inscription, which can very well belong to one of the very first years of Guduvhara and to a period when the Parthian dominion had not been pushed westward so far as Taxila or even as the Indus.

After Kapapa follows a wide gap, which has never carried any writing, having been left open on account of the roughness of the stone, and then is, which should be connected with Kapapa.

The last words of the inscription are perfectly clear, viz. puyae madu in l. 5 and pidu puyae in l. 6. We may note the cursive shape of the ya in puyae, which almost looks like a, and the curious flourish after the final e. It looks like the flourish above the left top of the initial ma of the Mount Banj inscription, having only been turned the other way. I explain it in a similar way as in that record, where I took it to indicate the beginning of the inscription. Here it is evidently meant to mark the end. The final e itself is defaced, the head and the e-stroke being almost invisible.

We thus have a record dated during the reign of the Parthian ruler, the maharaja Guduvhara, during the twenty-sixth year of an era which I take to commemorate the establishment of the dominion of the Parthians under Guduvhara’s predecessor Azes, and further in the 103rd year of another era, which I identify with the old Saka era of the Shahdaur, Mānseshā, Fatehjang, Patika, Mount Banj inscriptions, &c. It is further dated on the 1st of Vaiśākha, and according to Dr. van Wijk’s calculation this date corresponds to the 10th March, A.D. 19.

At this time the Parthians were settled in part of the old Saka empire, notably in the country about Takhti-Bahā and Shāhbazgarhi, which probably belonged to what the Chinese called Ki-pin. The era introduced by the Sakas, however, still remained in use, and a secon of one of the Saka tribes, the erjhuṇa Kapapa, was a person of some consequence. Erjhuṇa Kapapa may, or may not, simply mean ‘the Kapā prince’, as suggested by M. Lévi, and the prince may or may not have acquired the position of hi-hou of Kuei-shuang. At all events it seems to me that we have to do with the same person who later on conquered the remaining hi-hous and then started on his career of conquest, which first led to victory over An-si, i.e. the Parthian empire of the Guduvhara dynasty, and subsequently to the Kushāṇa empire.

My reading and translation of the record are, therefore, as follows:

**TEXT**

1 maharayasa Guduvharasa vash[a*] 20 4 1 1
2 sa[si]a[tsaro t]a sa[tiame sa 1 0 0 1 1 1] Vaiśakhasa masasa divase
3 [praṭham[a]] 1 atr(a [iśa ?] puṇa(diṇe, kaiṇe k[aksha ?]paksha] B[alasa]misa [Bo]yaṇasa
5 erjhuṇa Kapasa puyae madu
6 pidu puyae[e].

**TRANSLATION**

(During the reign) of the mahārāja Guduvhara, in the 26th year, in the one-hundred-and-third, 103rd, year, on the first, 1st, day of the month Vaiśākha, at this auspicious paksha (this) chapel (is) the religious gift of Balasami (Balasvāmin?) the Saviour, together with his son and daughter, in honour of Mira the Saviour (and) of Prince Kapapa, in honour of mother and father.

---

1 JA, cciii, 1923, p. 52.
XXI-XXII. Plate XII. 2-5: OTHER TAKHT-I-BĀHI INSCRIPTIONS

No. 1160 of the Peshāwar Museum is a damaged Buddha figure hailing from Takht-i-Bāhi.

On the back Dr. Vogel discovered an inscription in Kharoṣṭhī, which he reads as Horashada. This name, which appears to be Iranian, may be that of the sculptor or donor of the statue.¹

The four akharas read as Horashada are, on an average, 1 in. high. The reading of the two first is far from being certain. The first may be ḫa or ḥo, a, i, or ē, and the second may be ra or na or kha. I shall, however, not try to improve on Professor Vogel's reading. The word is at all events the genitive of the name of a person.

That this person was the donor, and not the sculptor, is evident from the traces of a second line, which are visible in the impressions. We see a distinct da, traces of a na, of a mu, and, apparently, also of a kha or ḥe, so that we can, with great confidence, restore danamukhe.

TEXT

L. 1 [Horalshadasa
2 da[namukhe].

TRANSLATION
Gift of Horashada.

No. 444 of the Peshāwar Museum is a fragment of black pottery, apparently part of a large jar, which was probably intended to hold grain. On the outer face are inscribed seven Kharoṣṭhī letters, each about 1⁄2 in. in height. They have been read by Professor Vogel² as saṃghe chadudise ka . . ., and there cannot be the slightest doubt about the correctness of this reading. The last akshara ka may have been the beginning of the name of the donor of the jar, or, more probably, of the name of the sect to which the monastery belonged, as in the Taxila and Bedādi ladle inscriptions, where we have saṃghe chadudise . . . Kaśāvīya (respectively Kaśyāvīya). Similar fragments of inscribed jars have been found at Patala Dheri and Sahr-i-Bahlol.

TEXT

saṃghe chadudise Ka . . .

TRANSLATION
in the Saṅgha of the four quarters of . . .

XXIII. Plate XIII. 1: PĀJĀ INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 111

Pājā is the name of a ridge and a village between Jamālgarhī and Takht-i-Bāhi in Yusufzai. About a quarter mile from the village a stone, measuring 6 ft. 5 in. by 1 ft. 4 in. and bearing a Kharoṣṭhī inscription in two lines, has come to light, which Sir Harold Deane presented to the Lahore Museum, where it has been entered as I. 47.

¹ Cf. Hargreaves, ASIFC, 1916-17, p. 3; Majumdar, List, Addenda (iv).
² See Hargreaves, ASIFC, 1916-17, p. 3; ASIAR, 1910-11, p. 34; Majumdar, List, no. 67.
The inscription has been edited by Mr. R. D. Banerji, and commented on by Lüders, Konow, and Majumdar. The inscribed surface covers 4 ft. by 1 ft., and the size of individual letters varies from $3\frac{1}{2}$ in. to $1\frac{1}{2}$ in.

Mr. Banerji describes the characters as belonging to the Kusāṇa type, but also draws attention to the archaic shape of sa, which usually has the angular head and the prolongation of the leg which are characteristic of the older group. And there cannot be any doubt that the palaeography of the record points to the Saka period. We may note the downward prolongation of the lower curve of cha, the angular ya, the upward prolongation of the leg of sa, and, on the other hand, the loop-shape of the pre-consonantal r in sarva. The latter form also occurs in the Taxila silver-scroll of the year 135, and, on the whole, the characters can be described as intermediate between those of the Patika plate of the year 78 and that record.

L. 1 begins with the word samvatāśaraye. Messrs. Banerji and Majumdar read the third letter as tsa, evidently because the prolongation of the left leg of ts gives the left-hand part of the akshara a distinct similarity with sa. But then there would not be any ta, and the right-hand part of the letter would be unexplained. In our akshara it is bent forward at the bottom and almost joins the middle of the front leg.

Then follows ekadasa-lakṣāṁyaye 100 10. There is a blunted bar across da, but it only represents an unevenness in the stone. Mr. Banerji explains ekadasa-lakṣāmpaye as ‘an Anapbhrā̇ma of ekadāśadhikā-lakṣāmpaye’. The ensuing numeral symbols show that the word means ‘11th’, but the regular numeral for ‘11’ would be ekadāśata, and it is evident that a sā has been omitted by mistake, so that we should read ekadāśasa-lakṣāmpaye. The form lakṣāmpaye, and not lakṣāmpaye, has already been met with in the Takht-i-Bahi record and is the only one which is found in Kharoshthi inscriptions. It seems to be due to the analogy of ordinals formed from numerals ending in -ādi.

The remaining portion of l. 1 is quite clear: śravanasa mañasa disa panchadasa 10 4 1, only the da of panchadasa is slightly irregular and blurred. It will be seen that va has been left out in disa, which stands for dīvase.

L. 2 opens with a word which I follow Professor Lüders in reading Ānanda-patrenā. The first akshara looks like vr in the estampage, and there are some blurred lines to the right. An inspection of the original has, however, convinced me that it is a. The second might be read as kha, but the bottom seems indeed to be the anusvāra-curve. The apparent cross-bar of da is due only to the roughness of the stone. Ānanda-patrenā may mean ‘the son of Ananda’, but putra can also mean a member of some group or association, and Ānanda-patrenā, ‘a follower of Ananda’, or the like. The name of the person in question, Saṅghamitrawa, being evidently a monastic name, the latter explanation seems to me to be the more likely one. For Saṅghamitrenā, the word following after Ānanda-patrenā, Mr. Banerji read Saṅgahamitrenā, but the gha is perfectly clear.

Then follows kua karite, and not katite as read by Mr. Banerji. The leg of va is always straight and that of ta sloping in this record. Kua karite represents Skr. kāpah karitah.

The final portion of the record does not admit of any doubt. We have mata-pitā pañya sarvasatāṇya hidasuhae. The r of tvā and the v of tvā, which were not read by Mr. Banerji, are quite certain. The form mata-pitā for mata-pitā or mata-pitā is curious and may have been influenced by the ensuing pānya.

---

1 *Ind. Ant.*, xxxvii, 1908, pp. 46, 64 ff., with plate II. a.
3 *SBAW*, 1916, p. 806.
4 *J&FASB*, xviii, 1922, p. 65; *cf. List*, no. 46.
According to Dr. van Wijk's calculations the date corresponds to the 23rd June A.D. 27.

**TEXT**

L. 1 saṁvatسا bay ekad[a]sa[sa*]śimaye i 100 10 1 śravaṇasa masasa d[va*]ṣe pani-
ch[da]ṣe 10 4 1
2 Ānandaputraṇa Saṁghamitreṇa kue karite matapatite puyac sarvasāvāna
hidasaḥae.

**TRANSLATION**

In the one-hundred-and-eleventh—III.—year, on the fifteenth—15.—day of the
month Śravaṇa (this) well was caused to be made by Saṁghamitra, the Ānandaputra
(or, the son of Ananda), in honour of (his) mother and father, for the welfare and
happiness of all beings.

**XXIV. PLATE XIII. 2: KĀLDAARRA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 113**

No. I. 77 of the Lahore Museum is a stone, measuring 27 in. by 9 in., and bearing
a Kharoshṭhi inscription in three lines. It was found by Colonel L. A. Waddell in the
Kālādaṛa Nadī near Dargai, to the south of the Malakand Pass in Swāt and presented to
the Lahore Museum by Sir Harold Deane.

The inscription was discussed and edited by Bühler, and new editions were
published by M. Senart and Mr. Banerji.

The characters, which vary between 1 in. and 2½ in. in height, are of about the same
date as those of the Mount Banj inscription. We may note the forward slope of the leg
of ta, the broad angular ya, the short, but distinct upward continuation of the leg of sa
and the shape of anticonsontant r, without the later loop, in saravas, l. 2. A peculiarity
of this record is the pronounced backward curve of the top of ta and ya. I cannot
understand how Mr. Banerji can arrive at the conclusion that our inscription is certainly
later than the Mānikeśa record of the eighteenth year of the Kanishka era and refer it
to the year A.D. 191.

The reading is perfectly certain, and has been correctly given by M. Senart as Daita
putraṇa Thaitoreṇa pukaranit karavia sarvasāvana puyac vasha i 100 10 11 1 śravaṇasa
20. Bühler misread the ninth akshara of l. 1 as no instead of do, and read vasha for
vasha and śravaṇa s[wa*]da for śravaṇasa 20 in l. 3.

The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a tank (pukaranit) by
a person bearing the name of Thaitoreṇa, i.e. as explained by M. Senart, Theodoros.
According to Dr. van Wijk's calculations the date corresponds to the 5th July A.D. 29.

The donor bears a Greek name, but in a corrupt form. In a correct shape the same
name occurs in the inscription on the Swāt vase, where we read about the meridark
Thaitoreṇa, with u as often elsewhere used for the short Greek a. It is possible that the
Thaitoreṇa of the Kālādaṛa inscription was a descendant of the meridark, whose inscription
may be about one hundred years older, since both records have been found in Swāt.
But it is nothing more than a possibility.

---

1 Majumdar's List, no. 22.
2 *Academy*, 1896, no. 1247, p. 266, no. 1252, p. 368.
6 Vincent Smith, *JRAS*, 1903, p. 41, states that it contains a reference to a Kushāṇa king.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

Thaidora is characterized as Datiaputra, and M. Senart translated this as 'son of Dati', comparing the Persian name Datis. But there is no instance of a genitive in -a from a masculine i-base in the dialect of Kharoshti inscriptions. We must evidently explain Datia as a base and not as a case of Dati. It may represent datika, dattika, or dantika, and be a name, an ethnic, or an occupational designation. We have no means for arriving at certainty, and I shall therefore translate 'the Datia scion'.

Pukarani for Skr. pushkarani occurs as pukarini in the Paṭhāyar inscription, with the same absence of aspiration in k, i.e. kh, but without the secondary substitution of a for the penultimate i.

The form vaska probably stands for Vaske, just as in the Takht-i-Bahi inscription.

The tank is dedicated sarvasapaya puyae, which Buhler translated as 'for the worship of all snakes'. This translation has been copied by M. Senart and Mr. Banerji and adopted by M. Foucher and Professor Vogel. I think, however, that most scholars will agree with Professors Thomas and Lübker that sapaya represents not Skr. sarpanam, but sattva vām. As remarked by Lübker, the dropping of anteconsonantal r in sarpa would be extraordinary, and, on the other hand, the change of Skr. tv to p, i.e. pp, is found in ekacaparasaik for ekachautariṅkte in the Ard inscription. That record seems to present the very word sarvasapaya, in the sentence sarvasapaya that jātishwara [his] yae, where we can hardly think of sarpa, because such a devout care for the welfare of snakes in their various rebirths would not be immediately intelligible. Also in the Taxila silver scroll it would be possible to read sapaya in the passage sarvabuddhaṇa puyae pracharaṣṭreṣvara arahata[a] na puyae sarvasaṇa[ḥ] puyae mātapuruṣa puyae mitramahānati-salokita[a] sa puyae, where the position of sarvaṇa, i.e. sarvasapaya or sarvasatvaṇa between Buddhhas, Pratyekabuddhas and Arhats on one side, and parents, friends, ministers, and relatives on the other, does not make it appropriate to think of snakes. On the other hand, blessings on all beings (sarvasatvaṇa) are found in the Pājā, Sui Vihār, Hidda, Kanishka casket and Wardak inscriptions, and are so common in Buddhist records that I cannot feel any doubt about the explanation of our record.

TEXT

L. 1 Datiaputra Thaidorena puk-
2 raçi karavita sarvasapaha puyae
3 vash[e] 10 00 10 11 śravanaṇa 20.

TRANSLATION

By Thaidora, the Datiaputra, (this) tank was caused to be made in honour of all beings, in the 113. year, on the 20. of Śravāṇa.

XXV. PLATE XIII. 3: MĀRGUZ INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 117 (?)

Mārguz is a village in the Swābī tahsil of the Peshāwar District. Near the village is a mound, about two miles from the Indus, where a fragment of a marble slab, measuring 14 in. by 10 in., and bearing some Kharoshthi letters, has been found. It is now in the possession of a Muhammadan goldsmith of Mārguz, Jehangir by name.

5 Cf. Wasi-ud-Din, ASI, 1911-14, p. 4; Marshall, ASIAR, 1913-14, P. i, p. 29; Majumdar, List, no. 41.
MÄRGUZ AND PANJTAR INSCRIPTIONS

The slab contains parts of two lines of well executed Kharoshthi letters, measuring from 1 in. to 3 in. The characters are almost identical with those of the Pajja inscription of the year 111.

L. 1 opens with four numerical figures and traces of a fifth. The four which can be read with certainty are: the lower portion of 4 and three strokes, i.e. 4 1 1 1, seven. Before the damaged 4 only part of a bottom-stroke is left. It reminds me of the lower part of the figure 10, as seen in the Pajja inscription. If it had been the figure 20, we should have expected the bottom to go further down. The only alternative seems to be that the figure before 4 was 100. I therefore restore the date as 1 1 1 1 1 1 1, i.e. 117, though 107 is also possible. The corresponding Christian dates would, according to Dr. van Wijk's calculations, be A.D. 33-34 or 23-24, respectively.

Then follows kuo sahaya, and we can safely follow the lead of the Muchai and Kala Sang inscriptions and restore sahayarana, though sahayana is also possible.

L. 2 opens with an akshara which is so like the da of hidasahe in 1. 2 of the Pajja inscription, and which is, moreover, placed high up towards the top of the line as in that epigraph, that there can be no doubt about its nature. Then follows raana. To judge from the Muchai inscription: vashe etasitima 20 20 20 20 20 sahayarana kuo vashtisuga, we seem to be justified in inferring that daraana is the end of a word characterizing the sahayaras, whose well is mentioned. But then it is probable that ya was the last akshara of l. 1, and that the second contained at the utmost three or four aksharas before da. L. 1 can accordingly not have contained many letters before the numeral figures, and we can, with some confidence, restore the beginning as vashe (or sahe) 1 1 1 1 1 1.

We thus arrive at the following restoration:

**TEXT**

L. 1 [vashe 1 100*][to] 4 1 1 1 kuo sahaya-
2 [raana . . . .] daraana.

**TRANSLATION**

(In the year 117), the well of the ... dara companions.

XXVI. PLATE XIII. 4: PANJTAR INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 122

Panjtair is situated below the Mahaban range in 74° 31' E. and 34° 14' N. This place has given its name to an inscribed stone, which, according to Dr. Fleet, "seems to have been actually found at a place named Salimpur, near Panjtair". Cunningham brought it from the banks of the Indus in 1848, and deposited it, together with the Und inscription, in the Lahore residency, where it had, however, already disappeared before 1853. The inscription was published by Cunningham. The first line was reproduced and discussed by Professor Dowson and quoted by Mr. E. Thomas.

Mr. Vincent Smith twice referred to the inscription and its date, and further remarks.

1 JASB, xxiii, 1854, p. 705, with plate no. 4, xxvii, 1863, pp. 141, 145, 150; ASI, v, 1875, pp. 61 ff, and a new plate, XVI, no. 4.
2 JRAS, xx, 1869, pp. 233 and 265 ff, with plate x, fig. 3.
4 JASB, lxii, i, 1893, p. 85; JRAS, 1903, p. 41.
are due to M. Senart, Professor Bühler, Mr. R. D. Banerji, Dr. Fleet, Baron A. von Stael Holstein, myself, and Mr. Majumdar.

The inscription consisted of three lines, but we have no means for judging about the size of the stone and of the aksharas. Nor can we attempt to offer remarks on the palaeography of the record, because the reproductions are evidently made from eye-copies. We may note that the cha seems to show the downward continuation of the lower part, which we know from old inscriptions; that the ya is broad and angular, and that the sa of gushanasa, l. 1, in Cunningham's older plate shows a distinct lengthening of the leg above the jointure with the head.

The first line can be read with absolute certainty and seems to be complete, if we abstract from the last akshara, which has become damaged because the edge of the stone had evidently been broken off. Dr. Fleet's discussion of this line makes it unnecessary to mention previous attempts at transliteration and translation. It runs sah 1 100 20 11 Sravana masasa di pradhane 1 maharayasa gushanasa raj[mi]. Dr. Fleet read prathame for pradham, and it is possible that the reproductions are wrong. We cannot, however, do more than to transliterate what they actually give, and the dh is perfectly certain. The date, the first Sravana 122, must be referred to the old Saka era and has been calculated by Dr. van Wijk to correspond to the 7th of June A.D. 38.

The word Gushanasa was explained by Stael Holstein as Gushana sa, i.e. shah, king, of the Gushas (Kushas), but Dr. Fleet was certainly right in stating that 'Gushana cannot be accepted as anything but the genitive singular of Gushana, in apposition with the genitive singular maharaya and dependent on the locative rajani'. Gushanasa, i.e. Gushana, is another rendering of the adjective Khushana or Kushana, which is formed from the simplex kusha by adding the suffix ana. The form gushana also occurs in the Manikita inscription. The various forms with g, k, dh, Greek ɛ and ɣ of this name, show that the initial cannot have been a familiar Indian sound. Most probably it was a guttural fricative.

The identity of the maharaya Gushana has been discussed in the Historical Introduction, where I have given my reasons for identifying him with Kujula Kadphises, of whom we know from Chinese sources that he assumed the title 'king of Kuei-shang' after having conquered the other hi-hous. That title corresponds to our Gushana maharaya. I have stated above, in my edition of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription, that we have reasons for assuming that Kujula Kadphises is mentioned as urjuna Kapo in that record. When it was executed, in the year 103, he was simply a prince, perhaps not even a hi-hou. In the year 122 the victory over the other hi-hous had been effected, and we may infer from the find-place of our inscription that the Parthians had been ousted in the country to the west of the Indus.

The Chinese annals mention the invasion of An-si as following on the consolidation of the Kushana power and evidently as preceding the conquest of Kao-fu, i.e. the territory where the Greek ruler Hermæus tried to hold his own against the Parthians. The Panjatar inscription evidently belongs to the period after the invasion of An-si, but we cannot say whether Kao-fu had yet been reduced. And we have no reason for supposing that the Kushana conquest had been pushed beyond the Indus, or as far east as Taxila.
The remaining portion of the inscription cannot be restored and explained in a satisfactory way, because we do not know in how far we can rely on the reproductions.

The beginning of l. 2 was read as spesain ase by Cunningham, but the second akshara is certainly su and not sain. The first may be sā, though the position of the supposed e-stroke is irregular. If we compare the eleventh akshara of the same line, we see that it is evidently ka in Cunningham's second plate, while the older one has the same akshara as that under discussion, only with a more regular place of the e-stroke. We might therefore think of reading kasausa or kasausa. Or the dash to the right might be not the e-stroke, but the upper part of vha and have to be connected with the curve below, so that we should read vhasasa. We can do no more than to mention the various possibilities. The form must be the genitive of a noun denoting some locality, probably the old name of Salimpur or Panjtūr.

The next two aksharas were read as prati by Cunningham, but the second is evidently cha. Then follows the e-stroke of a letter, which seems to have been much damaged, and the lower parts of three verticals. A comparison of prachā delo in the Patika plate leads me to read delo, and [Ka]sasa prachā delo must mean 'the eastern region of Kajusa'.

After this Cunningham read mo Ika. His first plate, however, has a clear e-stroke above the third akshara, so that we must probably read moike. I take this to be an un-Indian name, and the form to be the instrumental singular, of the same kind as the forms kshatravā Śūvāsa in the Lion Capital inscriptions.

The next word, which Cunningham read antumujāputra, is evidently Urumuṣujāputre and probably contains the name of Molka's father or means 'the Urumuka scion'... The rest of the line was read as katra videsa vathala khatra dome by Cunningham, but must almost certainly be read as karavide śivathale tatra, and only the two aksharas which follow admit of doubt. The first looks like de, especially in Cunningham's second plate, but may also be misread for cha, and the second seems to be me, though it is broader and has a shorter e-stroke than in pradhame, l. 1. If we compare the context of the Patika plate, where atra [de*]de follows after the naming of the locality, we become inclined to think that Cunningham's copy has been misdrawn, and that the last akshara was be. I prefer, however, to suggest cha me.

The words karavide śivathale seem to represent Skr. karaṣṭha (or -te) śivasthatāna (or -te). In view of the almost certain nominative delo it seems difficult to explain the forms as nominatives. In the Yakubi inscription, however, we in the same way find danamukṣhe but jinakumaro. We must therefore state that in that part of the country male a-bases seem to have formed their nominative in o and neuter bases in e.

What a śivathala is, I cannot say. The word may mean 'a Śiva sanctuary' or simply 'an auspicious ground', and the latter meaning is probably the more likely one.

The beginning of l. 3 was read by Cunningham as danamitra raka 1 1. I have suggested to read daṇa mīla tanka 1 1, comparing the word tanka, which is used to translate kārṣṭapaṇa in the Khotan-Saka version of the Aparmitāyusūtra. But a gift of two kārṣṭapānas would hardly have been considered sufficiently important to be recorded in an inscription. With every reserve I would suggest to read daṇamī tar[u]-ka 1 1, supposing two trees to have been planted by the person who made the śivathala.

Then follows pañkarenve, where Cunningham read -na, evidently considering the apparent e-stroke over the last akshara as accidental, and continued the line as follows: vaha makkha śivathala bama. The bottom of the whole line has evidently been mutilated, and it seems to me that we are justified in reading pañkareṇeva amalā śivathala rama.
INSRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

... ma. I take amata tivathala to be an accusative, probably of the plural. The last word cannot be restored, but we may perhaps think of some form of the base ram.

With great reserve I therefore read and translate as follows:

TEXT

L. 1 saih 100 20 1 Šravaṇaṇa masasa di praḍhame 1 mahārasaṇa Gushaṇaṇa raja[mi]

2 [Ka?]-suasa pracha [deṣa] Moike Urumujapatre karavide śivathale tatra [cha] me

3 daṇami tar[u]ka 1 1 p[u]ṇaṁkareṇeva amata śivathala rama ... ma.

TRANSLATION

Anno 122, on the first—1.—day of the month Śravaṇa, in the reign of the Gushaṇa Great King, the eastern region of [Ka?] Suṣa was made an auspicious ground by Moika, the Urumujya sect. And there in my gift (are) two trees. Through this meritorious deed ... immortal places of bliss.

XXVII. PLATE XIV: TAXILA SILVER SCROLL INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 136

During his excavations in Taxila in the spring of 1914 Sir John Marshall unearthed a silver scroll bearing a Kharoshṭhe inscription. It was found in one of the chambers to the west of the Dharmaṇaṭī stūpa of the Chir Mound. He describes the find as follows: 'In the room G', near the back wall opposite the entrance which faces the main stūpa and a foot below the floor, I found a deposit consisting of a steatite vessel with a silver vase inside, and in the vase an inscribed scroll and a small gold casket containing some minute bone relics. A heavy stone placed over the deposit had, unfortunately, been crushed down by the fall of the roof, and had broken both the steatite vessel and the silver vase, but had left the gold casket uninjured and chipped only a few fragments from the edge of the scroll, nearly all of which I was, fortunately, able to recover by carefully sifting and washing the earth in the vicinity. The cleaning and transcription of the record has been a matter of exceptional difficulty, as the scroll, which is only 6½ in. long by 1½ in. wide and of very thin metal, had been rolled up tightly, face inwards, in order that it might be enclosed in the silver vase; moreover, the metal of which it is composed is silver alloyed with a small percentage of copper, which had formed an efflorescence on the surface of the extremely brittle band, with the result that I could neither unroll it without breaking it nor subject it to the usual chemical treatment. By the use of strong acid, however, applied with a zinc pencil, I was able to remove the copper efflorescence and expose, one by one, the punctured dots of the lettering on the back of the scroll, and then, having transcribed these with the aid of a mirror, to break off a section of the scroll and so continue the process of cleaning and transcription. In this way I succeeded in making a complete copy of the record from the back of the scroll, while the letters were yet intact. Afterwards, I cleaned in like manner and copied the face of each of the broken sections, and was gratified to find that my second transcript was in accurate agreement with the first.'

The inscription, which is now No. Ch. G. 5 of the Taxila Museum, has been edited by Sir John,¹ M. Boyer,² and myself.³ Valuable contributions to the reading and inter-

prestidation have been made by Messrs. Thomas, Fleet, Bhandarkar, Woolner, Ramaprasad Chanda, Harit Krishna Deb, Rapson, and Lüders. It is no. 72 of Mr. Majumdar's List.

The discussion has chiefly borne on the questions about the date and the ruler mentioned in the record. With regard to the date, we must bear in mind the fact that, according to Sir John, the chapel in question is built in a small dipter type of masonry which came into vogue in Taxila about the middle of the first century A.D., and lasted for about a hundred years.

The inscription consists of five lines, and the letters are drawn by means of dots punched into the plate, and not in continuous lines. The execution is good and the shape of individual letters is fairly constant.

The type of the characters is younger than in the Patika plate and older than in the Dewai inscription. We may note the cursive cha, where the top runs into the lower part without the downward prolongation of the latter; the slight rounding of the angle of ja; the forward slope of the leg of ta; the deep indenture of ha; the angular shape of ja; the backward slope of the leg of sa, with the distinct prolongation above the jointure, and the loop-shape of anticonsonant r.

With regard to phonology we may note that intervocalic j becomes y in puyas, l. 4 and 5, but is retained in maharaja, rajatiraja, l. 3; that y is used both for r and for n; that intervocalic t becomes d in prad, l. 1, but is retained as t elsewhere, and that t also becomes d in the enclitic de after aya[om*]. l. 5.

There are some few mistakes in the writing. Thus we find prachaga for prachaga, l. 4; basatiwa for bodhistata, l. 3; arahana for arahata, l. 4; salohina for salohiina, l. 5; Takshaite for Takshasila, l. 3; and sarvasana for sarvasatwana or sarvasapan, l. 4.

L. 1 opens with the date: sa 1 100 20 to 4 1 ayasa a sha dasa masasa divas 10 4 1, which has given rise to much discussion.

Sir John explained ayasa as the genitive of the name Aya, Azes, and thought that it was added in order to characterize the year as belonging to an era founded by Azes, and this view has been endorsed by Professor Rapson and Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda.

Sir John draws attention to the fact that other dated inscriptions of the same period open with the titles and name of the ruler, expressed in the genitive case, followed by the date, and it is, of course, well known that in their case . . . the era in which they are dated is unspecified. In the two Taxila records, on the contrary, the opening formula presents a significant difference. Here, the year of the era in which they are dated comes first, then the name of the king, and, lastly, the month and the day. He thinks that this difference in the arrangement points to the conclusion that the construction of the context is different, and he lays stress on the fact that we have not 'a single Kharoshthi inscription of this age phrased in the same way as the Taxila inscriptions and dated in an unspecified era'.

Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda seems to attach considerable importance to this argument. It should, however, be borne in mind that the number of dated Kharoshthi inscriptions, especially of such which give the name of a ruler, is limited, and a glance at the list in the introductory remarks about the eras will show that there is no fixed rule in the arrangement of the dates. Moreover, we cannot overlook the evidence of the Kharoshthi

---

5 JRAS, 1920, pp. 319 ff.  6 JRAS, 1922, pp. 37 ff.
7 The Cambridge History of India, i, pp. 581 ff.  8 Deutsche Literaturzeitschrift, 1924, p. 1865.
inscriptions from Eastern Turkestan, which are evidently framed after the same pattern, and where the rule is to give first the year, then the name of the ruler in the genitive, then the month and the day, exactly as in the Taxila records.  

Mr. Chanda seems to have found support with Mr. Akshay Kumar Maitra, who maintains that 'if ayasa is not a proper name, then, on the analogy of the Wardak Vase inscription of the year 51, the year 136 should be treated as a year of the Kushan era of Kanishka. The Wardak Vase inscription opens with the date "In the year 51, on the day 15 (of the first half?) of the month of Artemisios"; then follows an account of the deposit of the relic, followed by benediction on King Hoveshka. Similarly, in the Taxila inscription of the year 136 the date and the account of the deposit of the relic is followed by benediction on an unnamed Kushan (Khushana) King. The only new element in this latter record is the word ayasa between the mention of the year and the month. If ayasa is explained away as an adjective qualifying Ashaśaša, we have to recognize the year 136 as a year of the Kushan era'.

It seems hardly possible to infer more from the parallelism between the Taxila and Wardak records than that a Kushana was ruling at the time of the former and another Kushana, Huvishka at that of the latter.

Against Sir John Marshall's interpretation it has been urged that ayasa is hardly the name of a ruler, because we have no example of the use of the mere name without any title or further designation.

Professor Rapson meets this objection by drawing attention to the fact 'that the inscription belongs to a people that knew not Azes. His family had been deposed and deprived of all royal attributes. The throne of Takshašaša had passed from the Šakas and Pahlavas to the Kushana. Azes could scarcely have been furnished with his wanted title, "Great King of Kings", in this inscription, without prejudice to the house actually ruling'.

If we admit the possibility of this explanation, it will still be difficult to understand why we have no traces of such a habit of speaking about Azes-years in other inscriptions. For the idiom could not be intelligible unless it were commonly used.

It has further been maintained, especially by Dr. Fleet, that Sir John's explanation of the dates of the two Taxila records leads to the unlikely result that down to the date of the Patika plate two eras, one instituted by Moga and the other by Azes, were used simultaneously, because the two eras evidently overlap. This argument does not, however, seem to be of great weight, because in such circumstances it would be quite natural to distinguish between the two reckonings by additions such as ayasa.

The chief objection against the explanation of ayasa as the name of a ruler is that it is the invariable practice in old inscriptions that the name of a ruler added to the date in the genitive can only denote a ruling prince then actually in power. This objection is, so far as I can see, decisive. If ayasa actually meant 'of Azes', Azes must have been still ruling in the year 136, and he must have been ruling simultaneously with the maharaja rajatiraja devaputra Khushana mentioned in l. 3. And that is of course excluded.

The word ayasa must accordingly be explained in a different way, and various suggestions have been made. Lüders thought of the possibility that aya sa might stand for ayan sakhvatāro, this is the year, and be comparable with the words ita dīvase following after the month and the day. But such an idiom is entirely unexampled. Moreover, the year is always, where we can control the grammar, mentioned in the locative, and we should expect the same to be the case also in the repetition, just as in ita dīvase. And, finally, the abbreviation sa has never been met with outside the stereotype formula at the beginning of the date.

1 Cf. the list in my paper in the Acta Orientalia, ii, pp. 113 ff.
TAXILA SILVER SCROLL

It seems to be necessary to explain ayasa as an adjective qualifying the ensuing ashadasa. It might represent Skr. aryasa and characterize the month as Aryan in contradistinction to the Macedonian months mentioned in other records. But this explanation is hardly likely, because in an inscription in Indian language it would be perfectly intelligible if a Macedonian month were designated as such, but less so in the case of an Indian month, unless the use of the Macedonian names were the rule. And an examination of dated Kharoshthi inscriptions shows that it was quite the other way.

Then it has been suggested, by Professor Thomas, to explain ayasa as a genitive formed from the base of the pronoun ayam, this. An expression such as ‘of this Ashadha’, would be intelligible in the very month in which it was used, in case there were, in that particular year, two months Ashadha. But it would be perfectly unintelligible later on. The same consideration makes it impossible to accept another suggestion, of Dr. Fleet, that aya is the actual reading and stands for Skr. etasya, by which explanation we have the additional difficulty that intervocalic t does not disappear in the dialect.

A third suggestion, by Dr. Fleet, was to correct ayasa to vyasa and explain this as corresponding to Skr. dvitiyasya, Sindhi bhīya or bhīj, Lahndi bhīya, Kasmirī bhīya, another. But then, in the first place, we should have to reckon with the disappearance of an intervocalic t, and, in the second, the initial b of the modern forms is not derived from an old v, but from dv, which becomes b through the intermediate stage db and not through v. And, finally, we have ayasa and not vyasa.

The only explanation which does not necessitate any change or the assumption of some phonetical irregularity and which gives a clear and satisfactory sense is to explain ayasa as corresponding to Skr. adhyāya. For Skr. adya we should expect either adiya or ajya, and the latter might become āja, āya. Cf. doublets such as bharia, bharya, bhaya, Skr. bharyā.

If the explanation of ayasa as representing Skr. adhyāya is accepted, the explanation cannot well be, as suggested by M. Boyer, that the month Ashadha was the first one in the year, which would, accordingly, have been ashadhādi. Nobody would easily think of dating a letter on the fifteenth of the initial January, or, in India, of the initial Kārttika. The meaning must be, as stated by Professor Bhandarkar, that there were, in that particular year, two months Ashadha.

We know from the Jyotishas that in the ancient Indian calendar an Ashadha was intercalated every five years. But then the occasional use of Macedonian months and the through reckoning of the days of the month show that the calendar was influenced by Macedonian notions. In other words, we have before us an early stage of that fusion of Indian and Greek astronomy and calendars which later on found its expression in the Siddhāntas.

As pointed out in the Introduction, our record is the only one within the older series of Kharoshthi inscriptions which contains such an additional detail. If the methods of the Siddhāntas are applied, Dr. van Wijk finds that only two years between A.D. 50 and 80 suit the case, viz. A.D. 52 and A.D. 71. If we can refer the era of the silver scroll to the same era as that of the older Taxilla inscription of Patika, there can only be the question of the former, and we may, as a working hypothesis, fix the date as corresponding to the 17th May A.D. 52.

After the date follows, as already mentioned, isā dīvala and then [prati]stavita bhogavata dhatu[c]. The head of se in divasa is damaged, and of the ensuing prati only

1 Cf. Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen, § 30c.
2 The case is of course different with Skr. adyāna, which becomes ugyāna in Pali and c.g. in the Shābhāṣṭarī version of the Adoka edicta.
3 Acta Orientalia, iii, pp. 79 ff.
the bottom remains. The existing traces show that ḍi, and not ṭi, is almost absolutely certain. The final ṭ of dhatu is also defaced, but beyond doubt.

The three last aksharas of l. 1, which Sir John originally read as ḍhurasa, are certainly, as seen by Professor Thomas, urasa, and they must be taken together with the two first aksharas of l. 2, kena, as one word urasakaṇa. Professor Thomas took this to mean ‘of Uraša’ and as giving ‘the nationality (which, in fact, usually comes first), and not the name, of the donor’. M. Boyer is also of the same opinion, but I cannot accept it.

In the first place I do not know of any Kharoshṭhi inscription giving, in this way, the nationality of the donor before the name. And then the Bedadi laddle inscription shows that Uraša was sounded with a palatal ṅ in Uraša, i.e. Hazāra itself. I therefore take Urasaka to be the name of the donor, bearing in mind that the element saka, strength, vigour, is not uncommon in Iranian names.

The next akshara is damaged and uncertain. Sir John originally read ḍhi and subsequently ṭo, comparing the first akshara of l. 5, which is certainly ṭo. Professor Thomas suggested to read in or viṅ, and M. Boyer accepted the former but drew attention to the fact that the supposed ī-stroke is sloping and not straight as in īṅ, l. 1. The facsimile plate is illegible, and an examination of the original did not give better results. Our only guide is, therefore, the copy which Sir John made before the scroll was unrolled.

Here there is a certain resemblance with the ṭo of l. 5. The latter, however, shows a straight vertical, while our akshara resembles an ṅ with a curved bottom and an oblique cross-bar. An almost identical akshara occurs in the Dhararajikā inscription 3, where the reading īṅ seems to be certain. The following letter is still more sloping than ṭo, so that we might think of da, But ṭa is probably to be read.

Then follows vratiṣṭupaṇa, and the whole word is accordingly intriṣṭupaṇa. This has usually been considered to be a slip for -putrena and to contain the name of the donor’s father, which name, Intriṣṭu or Intriṣṭri, has been compared by Professor Thomas with Vindaphara, Undopheres, Gondopheres, Gudawhara, &c., and explained as a new variant of this name. But there are difficulties. I formerly thought of explaining Intriṣṭuva as the genitive of a name Intriṣṭri. But we have no example in Kharoshṭhi inscriptions of genitives in ia from old ī or ī-bases. Intriṣṭuṇa can, of course, mean ‘the son of Intriṣṭuva’. But then the scroll has -putrena and not putrena, and, in the same way, the Āra inscription gives Daśakṣharaṇa Poshapūraṇa. We are, therefore, hardly justified incorrecting the text, but must explain Intriṣṭuṇa and Poshapūraṇa as genitives of the plural, dependent on the preceding name. And then putra does not seem to mean ‘son’, but to have the wider sense of ‘scion’, ‘individual member of a larger group’. Poshapūra may mean belonging to Poshapura”, i.e. Peshawar, and Poshapūraṇa ‘a Peshawari boy’. If this explanation is right, Intriṣṭuva may be the designation of a locality, or else of a family. We may compare the Mānikiāla bronze casket inscription Kavaliṣṭrāparasa G(r)andvṛyaṇaṣṭrāparasa, of the Kaiśikiṣṭrāparasa, the son of the G(r)anvṛyaṇaṣṭrāparasa, where we apparently have the same vṛya as in our record. I therefore translate ‘of the Intriṣṭuva boys’ and abstain from further attempts at explaining Intriṣṭuva.1

The next word bahalena I follow Sir John in identifying with Skr. bāhikena, a man from Balkh. In this connexion it may be of interest to note that Bāhlīkas are mentioned in connexion with Takshaśālī by Varāhamihira, Bṛhatatsabhīta x. 7. The treatment of intervocalic ṭ in this word is in favour of considering it as an Indian word and not as

1 If Letauva should, after all, prove to be the correct reading, the name might, as suggested by Dr. Morgenstern, belong to an Iranian dialect where initial ḍ became t, as in modern Pashto and Munjānī. Lota would then be the well-known dāta, corresponding to Skr. dharma.
a foreign name. In prachaga, i.e. prachega, l. 4, intervocalic k has, in a similar way, been modified, while it is left unchanged in the foreign name Urasakeya, l. 1. Moreover, the ensuing remark about the domicile of the donor would be more in its place after the word mentioning his place of origin, than according to the other explanation, where that word comes first, then the personal name, and after that the remark about the domicile.

The latter runs: Noachae nagare vastaçoya, where the use of the cerebral u both as an initial and between vowels may point to a weakening of the difference between u and i, just as in the usual Sauraseñi of Indian dramas. The town Noacha or Noachaa cannot be localized. We do not even know whether it should be looked for in the neighbourhood of Taxila or elsewhere, e.g. in Balkh.

The last three aksharas must be read together with r, the two first letters of l. 3, as dharmarāja.

The word dharamaratī has been explained to mean 'at the Dharmarājikā stūpa', Dharmarājikā being thought to have been the designation of the main stūpa of the Chir Mound. Dharmarājikā was stated to mean a stūpa by Stanislav Julien, and Professor Vogel states that, more particularly, it denotes a stūpa erected by Āsoka, the Dharmarāja. He refers us to M. Foucher, who quotes the Divyāvadāna, where we read (p. 379): Āsoka nama . . . dharmaraj. . . chataratītim dharmarajikāsahasrasam pratishṭhāpayisvayati, Āsoka, the Dharmarāja, will establish eighty-four thousand dharmarājikās. M. Boyer aptly objects that we learn from the same text that Āsoka received the designation Dharmarāja because he was supposed to have erected dharmarājikās. We must therefore explain the word dharmarājikā otherwise, and since we know that Āsoka's stūpas were considered to have been erected over relics of the Buddha, the real Dharmarāja, it is probable that dharmarājikā really denotes a stūpa erected over such relics.

The form dharmaratī cannot belong to an o-base dharmarātī, Skr. dharmarājikā. M. Boyer is inclined to consider it as the oblique case of dharmaratī, Skr. dharmarājī, which might be a short form of dharmarājikā. In one of the Dharmarājikā inscriptions, however, we read Taksha[la]mi dhamaratī, so that dharmaratī is evidently the locative of an adjective dharmaratī, Skr. dharmarājikā, connected with a dharmarājikā, the dharmarājikā compound.

The ensuing word Takshaśī is evidently miswritten for Takshaśīla, and Sir John took it to be the locative of the name Takshaśīla. The Dharmarājikā inscription mentioned above, with its Taksha[la]mi dhamaratī, however, makes me inclined to explain Takshaśīla[la] as the locative of an adjective Takshaśīla, corresponding to Skr. Takshaśīla, belonging to Takshaśīla.

Then follows tānusva boisatvagahāmi, where si in boisi is miswritten for dhi. The va of tānusva seems to be certain.

The word tānusva was taken to be the locative of Tānusvā, the name of some locality, by Sir John. M. Boyer explained it as Skr. tānusvya, at the sacrifice of the body, and referred us to the Jātaka about the Bodhisattva's sacrifice of his own body, thinking that

---

1. Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales, par Hiouslyang, i, p. 417.
2. ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 223.
5. Cf. Jātakamāla, ed. Kern, p. 5: sitaṁ tānus vaı tivasarjya, and, with regard to the formation of the word, dehatvya.
the bodhiṣṭattva griha was erected to commemorate this Jātaka. My own old explanation was that Takṣavā was the name of the foundress of the chapel.

Since the appearance of the Kurram casket inscription and the Niya inscriptions, however, we know that tankuva, tanuwa, a word meaning ‘own’, ‘belonging to’, cf. e.g. the Niya document 235, where we have edasra tanuwa, belonging to him. It is evidently the same word or a variant which has become the common genitive suffix tanki in Old Gujarāti, tanu and wa in Modern Gujarāti, tano in Marwāri. We can only be in some doubt whether we should take it together with the preceding Takshaśila[la] as meaning ‘belonging to Takshaśila’ I have, however, already stated that other reasons make it probable that Takshaśila[la] is an adjective, and an idiom Takshaśilae tanuva, belonging to Takshaśila, is in itself not likely. In the Kurram inscription tanuwa means ‘own’, and must be referred to the person who establishes a relic of the Buddha, and the same explanation must evidently be applied to our passage.

Then follows mahaśa jataśarjasa devaputraśa Khushanasa avadakshinae. I have stated in the Historical Introduction that I think it necessary to identify this ruler with Kujula Kadphises, and it seems probable that the inscription was executed not very long after Kujula Kadphises had been established in power in Taxila. Otherwise we should have had some reason for expecting the ruler’s name to have been mentioned in connexion with the date. Even though the record is a private one, it is evident that Urasaka was closely connected with the Kushāṇa ruler.

L. 4 does not present any difficulty: sarvabuddhabhāṣa sūrya pravāha[sa]vahāṣa puyā avahā[sa]vahāṣa puyā sarvaśa[sa]vahāṣa puyā sarvaśa[sa]vahāṣa puyā sarvaśa[sa]vahāṣa puyā sarvaśa[sa]vahāṣa puyā. It will be seen that there are several slips, which can all, however, be corrected with certainty. The first akṣarās of l. 5, which must be read together with l. 4, are also absolutely clear in the original, and the missing syllable can be restored from one of the Dharmarajika inscriptions, where we read salokhīṇa. M. Boyer thought that salokhina might be the genitive plural from saloḥiṇa, formed from saloha, loha instead of lokita occurring in lokaḥiṇa, a certain disease, enumerated in the Mahāvyutpatti 284, 23 between sasūla and apamātra, and usually translated ‘a boil or abscess filled with blood’. The existence of such a word lokita is, however, very uncertain, and the analogy of the Dharmarajika inscription renders the restoration salokhīṇa or, perhaps, salok śiṇa, absolutely certain, especially in view of the many slips exactly in this passage.

Then follows atvano avadakshinae nivāṇaḥ hūri, where there has only been some doubt about the compound letter which I read tva, but which has formerly been read sometimes tvā and sometimes tva, according to the different correspondence in Sanskrit, and about the va of nivāṇa, which Professor Thomas substituted for Sir John’s vāṇa. There is a slight bend at the termination of the horizontal of va, but the reading seems to be absolutely certain.

Then follows a damaged letter, which can, however, clearly be made out as a, though there is a slight bend of the bottom. After a comes a break, followed by an akṣara which is certainly de. M. Boyer proposed to restore agade, Skr. agraśa, and I accepted that restoration in my edition of the record, though we should expect final aḥ to become o in the Taxila dialect. An examination of the original shows that the missing portion of the plate cannot have contained the akṣara ga. There is an oblique stroke at the left edge of the break, which is so like the left leg of ya that there can be little doubt that we should read ya. We thus arrive at ayade, which can hardly be anything else than Skr. ayam te. Ayā must then be connected with the last word of the inscription samaparichage, which we must follow M. Boyer in explaining as Skr. sannyāsparityagah. The reading ayā makes it impossible to correct the text to ya me parichage.
TAXILA SILVER SCROLL AND PESHÄWAR MUSEUM, NO. 20

It is of interest to see that the last sentence speaks of the donor in the second person. It therefore evidently contains a blessing given as a kind of endorsement by some dignitary, probably by some leading Buddhist connected with the stūpa or the chapel.

After the text the plate shows the symbol ꦖ, which is known from the coins of Kujula Kadphises, Wima Kadphises, and Zeionises. I have stated in the Historical Introduction that I do not think that we are allowed to draw any chronological conclusions from its occurrence. Somewhat similar symbols are also found on coins of Guduvahara, and its occurrence in our inscription may have some connexion with the extension of Kushāna power to Taxila.

**TEXT**

L. 1 Sa 1 100 20 10 4 1 1 ayasa ashaḍasa masasa divase 10 4 1 iṣa diva[se pradi] stavita bhagavato dhatu[o] Ura[sa]-

2 kena [Ihi]tavhriaputraṇa Bahaliena Noachae āgare vastavena Tenā ime pradi-stavita bhagavato dhatuo dhamara-

3 te Takshaśila[*e] tanuvae bos[di]satvagahami maharajasa rajātirajasa devaputra Khusaṇa arogadakṣhipae

4 sarva[bus][d]haṇa puyae prach[e]gabuddhaṇa puyae arahā[ta*]ṣya pu[ya]e sarvasa[na] puyae matapitu puyae mitramachāṇatīsae-

5 lohi[ta*]ṣya [pu]yaev atvano arogadakṣhipae Nivāṇae hout a[ya] de samaparichago.

**TRANSLATION**

Anno 136, on the 15th day of the first month Ashāḍha, on this day were established relics of the Lord by Ursaka, of the Irrtavhria boys, the Bactrian, the resident of the town of Noacha. By him these relics of the Lord were established in his own bodhisattva chapel, in the Dharmanājīkā compound of Takshaśila, for the bestowal of health on the Great King, the King of Kings, the Son of Heaven, the Khushāṇa, in honour of all Buddhas, in honour of the Pratyekabuddhas, in honour of the Arhats, in honour of all beings, in honour of mother and father, in honour of friends, ministers, kinsmen, and blood-relations, for the bestowal of health upon himself.

May this thy right munificence lead to Nirvāṇa.

**XXVIII. PLATE XV. 1: PESHÄWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 168**

Inscription no. 20 of the Peshāwar Museum is found on a stone, measuring 15 in. by 8 in. by 7 in., which was presented to the Museum by Sir Aurel Stein on the 4th July, 1916.1 Sir Aurel had received it from Sir Harold Deane, who had no information about its provenance.

The inscribed portion covers 11 in. x 4 in., and the size of individual letters varies from 1 in. to 1¼ in. Below the inscription is a svasti̊ka.

The characters are intermediate between the older and the Kushāṇa varieties, and the forms of individual letters are not quite uniform. Kṣa in l. 2 has the shape which we already find in the Kāla Sang inscription, where the top-line and the side-limb form one continuous curve. In l. 3 the side-limb is likewise a curve, but placed slightly lower than the top-line. The top of kha is long and curved to the right, almost as in the Shakardarā inscription. The bottom is curved to the right in kha, and to the left in kha, l. 3. The cka of l. 1 has a very cursive shape, with an almost straight top and a curve at the bottom, which looks almost like an anusvāra, and is perhaps wrongly transferred from the preceding letter. If the third akṣara of l. 2 is cḥi, we there have

---

1 Cf. V. Natesa Aiyar, ASIFC, 1916-17, pp. 5 and 27; Majumdar, List, no. 54.
of the Old Sakha Era

a distinct upper curve and a straight termination of the lower part. The letter de in l. 3 has an exceptional shape, consisting of a sloping line with an e-stroke protruding above the bottom. It is probably misdrawn. Ya has the broadened top which we already find in Kādarra. The shape of sa is inconsistent, looking like a ra in māsa, l. 1, having the same rounded head as in the Kāla Sang record in divase, l. 1, and being provided with the forward protrusion of the leg which we know from the Patika and Mount Banj records in l. 2.

L. 1 is comparatively clear: sath 11002020204[4]Jēhama sa divase panchadas[e]. There are some dots after the last figure of the date, but they do not seem to form part of an additional figure, which could only have been 1. I take them to indicate the end of the date, in a similar way as in the Fatehjang inscription, and I find a confirmation of this explanation in the fact that a comparatively long interval separates the figures denoting the year from the remaining part of the record.

The cha of panchadas looks like chāi, and it is possible that the anusvāra has been written by mistake, because the preceding akshara was provided with an anusvāra hook. A similar cha is, however, found in l. 6 of the Āra inscription, where we must read cha and not chāi.

The e of se is not certain. It is not found on the top of the letter, as usual, but the bottom is connected with the bottom of the preceding da, and the projection of the right vertical may be meant to represent an e, in a similar way as in de, l. 3.

L. 2. The first akshara is evidently khu, and the second can only be da, though it differs from the other da's, which have a peculiar rectilinear shape.

Then follow two aksharas, of which the first seems to consist of an angle, opening towards the right and resting on a sloping leg, from the middle of which a horizontal protrudes towards the next akshara. The second looks like a, but the apparent e-stroke stands much higher than in the certain e of khu, l. 3. Moreover, the akshara is followed by an unmistakable mu, so that we evidently have to do with a locative singular in -amī. It therefore seems necessary to read the fourth akshara as a and take the apparent e-stroke as belonging to the preceding letter. Now it will be seen that it can be traced upwards to the termination of the figure standing above in l. 1, and that there are faint traces of a line crossing it and running into the upper leg of the angle of the third akshara. We thus arrive at the result that the third akshara consists of an upper curve over an angular leg, provided with an e-stroke, i.e. we must read cha and consider the apparent projection from the leg as accidental. And an examination of the original has confirmed me in this view.

The first word of l. 2 is, therefore, Khudachami, and there cannot, I think, be any doubt that we have to do with the same word which occurs in l. 6 of the Mānikial inscription, where we must evidently read Ṛeṣaśaṇa Khudachami, together with Ṛeṣaśaṇa the Khudachian. Khudachia is accordingly an adjective formed from the name of a locality, and it is to be regretted that we do not know the full-place of our record, so that we cannot identify it. The name of the place was perhaps Khudacha; cf. the local name Nāchaka occurring in the Taxila silver scroll.

The next word might be sahaya; cf. the na of the Āra inscription. We shall see later on, however, that the cerebral u is used in words such as dānapuṣa, khaya-vide, and the fourth akshara is, moreover, almost identical with the ra of viharami, l. 3. I therefore think that we must read sahaya. This sahaya is either a slip instead of sahayaṇa, or else it must be connected with the ensuing word into a com-

1 Mr. Majumdar reads ga, assuming the letter to be misdrawn or incomplete.
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pound. In all other Kharoshthi records where sahyas or sahayaras are mentioned these words are used in the genitive plural.¹

The next word was read Travâsakuruṇa by Mr. Majumdar, who translated ‘gift of Agasahaya, the father-in-law of Trapa’. But śakura could not represent a Skr. śakura, because an uncompound śa cannot, in the north-western dialect, become śka, and the fourth letter is certainly ku and not shu. The fifth can be ra, but it will be seen that the projecting limb is much shorter than in ra of vihariṇi, l. 3, and the reading is not quite certain. It would be possible to read Travâsakuruṇa, and to compare the word Sakuna which occurs as the name of a people side by side with Gândhâra in the Mahâbhârata vii. 802. But it would be rather extraordinary to find a dental and a cerebral y side by side in this way. I therefore read Travâsakuruṇa and refrain from any attempt at explaining this name, which is just as unintelligible as the remaining names of associations of sahâyas or sahacharas.

The next word seems to be rather daṇḍamukhe than daṇḍamukhe. If the anusvāra was actually sounded, it must be explained as an anticipation of the ensuing nasal.

The remaining portion does not present any difficulty. According to Dr. van Wijk’s calculations the date corresponds to the 24th April, a. d. 84.

TEXT

1 Saṁ 100 20 20 20 4 4 . Jētramâse divase pachadâ[č]e
2 Khuda[ch]jami sahyara Travâsakuruṇa daṇḍhu-
3 khe kua khaṇavide vihariṇi.

TRANSLATION

Anno 168, in the month Jyaistha, on the fifteenth day, (this) well was caused to be dug as the gift of the Travâsakura companions in the Khudâcha vihâra.

XXIX. PLATE XV. 2: KHALATSE INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 187 (?)

Khalatse is a village in Ladakh, 52 miles below Leh on the trade route. There are several inscriptions near the place, which have been discovered and partly utilized by Dr. A. H. Francke, and among them are a few Kharoshthi records.²

A photograph of the most important one was sent to Professor Rapson, who wrote to Dr. Francke in a letter of the 23rd September, 1910, that he could read the word maharajas, followed by a name beginning with a and ending with the genitive termination sa, and, above the name, a date, which he—with some doubt as to whether three strokes at the end are part of the date or not—read as 187.

It has proved impossible to get new and better reproductions, and my edition is, therefore, based on the photograph utilized by Professor Rapson and the imperfect plate published by Dr. Francke after a hand-copy.

In such circumstances it is not possible to judge with certainty about the palaeography of the record. The square shape of ka and the angular head of sa, with a distinct bend of the lower vertical forwards and upwards, remind us so strongly of the Patitka and Mount Banj records, that the epigraph makes the impression of being old. In the same neighbourhood was found a Brāhmi inscription, which Professor Vogel ³

¹ Cf. Fatchiang Vadhitrana sahayana, Muchai sakayaraṇa kue Vashilugaya, Mârguz sakayam . . . . . daraya, Kala Sang . . . . yaraya Pipalakahaya.
³ Francke, ZDMG, 61, p. 592.
referred to the Maurya period, about 200 B.C. There cannot be any question of assigning such an early date to our inscription, and we must reckon with the possibility that the Kharoshthi letters retained their old shape in Khelatse longer than elsewhere.

There are two lines, and above the beginning of I. 2 and to the right of I. 1 there is a rough drawing, which seems to represent a standing warrior or king.

The first line was read by Professor Rapson as *saim I100 20 20 20 20 4 I I I*. He rightly remarks that it is doubtful whether the last three strokes, which are clearly visible in the photograph but absent in Dr. Francke’s hand-copy, are part of the date or not. In the former case, we have the year 187, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk, to A.D. 103-4, in the latter it is three years earlier.

The first word of I. 2 is, as stated by Professor Rapson, *maharajas*. We may note the long right-hand bar of *ma*, which has its parallels in the Takhti-Bahi and Mount Banj inscriptions, and the backward bend of the vertical of *ja*, which reminds us of the Zeda and Ará inscriptions and the possible *ji* of Jaulia 12.

The first letter of the ensuing name does not seem to be *a*, as assumed by Professor Rapson. There is a distinct loop at the bottom, and I think that *u* is to be read. Then comes an akshara which is clearly *vi*, though the *i*-stroke only just projects a little below the horizontal. The next letter is again a distinct *ma*, almost running into the following akshara, which is an unmistakable *ka*. The photograph shows a curved line running downwards from the point where *ma* touches the angle of *ka* and apparently continuing the left bar of *ma*. A comparison of the hand-copy, however, seems to show that there is a flaw in the stone at this point.

Then comes the most difficult akshara of the whole inscription. It consists of a *va*, with a short sloping cross-bar, and with a horizontal running to the left from the bottom and crossed by a broken line, vertical below and bent back towards the vertical of *va* above the point of crossing. At the left-hand termination of the lower horizontal there is another line, running in a curve up towards the ensuing akshara and bent backwards in a sharp angle at the lower termination, below the horizontal. The lower portion of the akshara is similar to the curious St. Andrew’s cross attached to the lower vertical of *phi* in the coin legends of Wima Kadphises. The chief difference is that it does not cross the vertical, but is placed to the left of it. The curve at the left termination might be an *i*-mátrá, or the short cross-bar of *va* might be meant to mark an *i*. At all events it seems to me that the only possibility is to read *othi*. Then follows *sasa*, and the whole name accordingly is *Uvimakauhisasa*.

I have no doubt that we here have before us another orthograph of the name of Kadphises II. The initial letter of his name in the coin legends is, as mentioned in the Historical Introduction, apparently *erí*, where the *r*-stroke seems to indicate a modification of the sound of *r* in this word. The same modification is evidently indicated in our record by prefixing *u*. It should be borne in mind that we do not know the etymology of the name. It is no doubt Iranian, and the Greek legend *OOHMO* seems to be in thorough agreement with our *Uvima*. With regard to *Kothisa*, the dental *sa*, as compared with the *sa* of the Kharoshthi coin legends, may be compared with the *s* of the Greek *Kadhýrns*. Instead of *othi* we might, of course, read *thô*, in the same way as is usually done in the coin legend, which, according to the usual arrangement of Kharoshthi compounds, might also be read *Kaphhísa*, instead of *Kathphísa*. I prefer, however, to read *Kothisa*, which form may also be reflected in the Chinese *Kao-chên*, i.e. in the Tang period *Kâu-chên*.

As pointed out in the Historical Introduction, our inscription furnishes the proof that the historical Šaka era was not instituted by Kanishka, provided that it couples the
name of Wima Kadphises with the year 187 or 184. For we know that Wima Kadphises preceeded Kanishka, and it is even probable that he was separated from him by an interval. And it is impossible to push the beginning of the old Saka era so far back that the year 187 or 184 can fall earlier than A.D. 78.

It also shows that the maharaja raja raja devaputra Khushaya of the Taxila scroll, which is dated fifty years earlier, cannot well be Wima Kadphises, because it is hardly conceivable that he, who succeeded an octogenarian father, should have ruled for fifty years.

On the other hand, our inscription does not militate against my ascription of the institution of the historical Šaka era to Wima Kadphises, because that reckoning was instituted in commemoration of the overthrow of the national Indian dynasty, which had ousted the Sakas in Malava, and there was no reason for introducing it in those provinces where the old Saka supremacy was still in force and the old Saka era had not been abolished.

I thus arrive at the following reading and interpretation.

TEXT

L. 1 Sañj 1 100 20 20 20 4 [1 1 1]
L. 2 maharajasa Uvima Kavthisa.

TRANSLATION

Anno 187 (or 184), (during the reign) of the Great King Uvima Kavthisa.

There are also other Kharoshthi inscriptions at Khatlatse, and Dr. Francke has reproduced eye-copies of four short ones, with Professor Vogel’s tentative readings. No. 2 he read sakhavasa, no. 4 sasukhasa or sasalasa, while no. 5 and 6 only consist of one akshara each, viz. sa.

It is useless to discuss the reading and interpretation as long as no better materials are available. I shall only draw attention to the fact that no. 4, where the palatal s is certain, shows that the Khatlatse dialect cannot have been essentially different from the usual language of Kharoshthi inscriptions.

XXX. PLATE XVI: TAXILA SILVER VASE INSCRIPTION. YEAR 191

During his excavations at Sirkap in the winter 1926-7 Sir John Marshall found a silver vase of duck shape, 7 in. high, and bearing a Kharoshthi inscription round the neck.

The inscribed portion is 4 1/2 in. long, and the size of individual letters varies from 1/8 in. to 1/4 in. In the middle, below the handle of the vase, there is a damaged portion where about six aksharas seem to have disappeared. In other respects the inscription is in an excellent state of preservation.

The letters consist of dots punched into the surface. We may note the compound khs, which also occurs on the Patika plate; the cha, which reminds us of the Patika plate and the silver scroll, and the sa, where the upwards continuation of the leg is shorter than in the Patika plate and most closely resembles that of the sa of the silver scroll.

1 ZDMG, 61, p. 593, with plate II, no. 2, 4, 5, 6.
The inscription begins below the mouth with a distinct ka. There is not enough space in front of this ka for restoring [saniṣṭhāra]i[e]. Ka is evidently the first akṣara of the record, and it is perhaps an abbreviation, e.g. of ka[le].

Then follow the numeral figures 1 + 100 + 20 + 20 + 20 + 10 + 1, i.e. the record is dated in the year 191, evidently of the old Saka era, and corresponding, according to the system adopted in this volume, to A.D. 107–108.

Then follows maharaja, though there are some apparent dots between ra and ja, making the ja look almost like mi.

After ja comes a damaged passage, with room for about six akṣaras, which cannot be read with certainty.

The first letter seems to be bhra, of the same shape as in the Patika plate. Then follow two akṣaras of which I cannot see anything, further traces of what looks like ni, two absolutely defaced akṣaras, and an almost certain sa.

The remaining portion of the record is absolutely certain, viz. putrasya Jihonikasa Chukhsasa kṣhtrapasa.

Jihonika is evidently identical with the kṣhtrapāya Zeionises, whose Kharoṣṭhī coin legends run Manigulaśa kṣhtrapasa putrasya kṣhtrapasa Jihonikasa. Zeionises has been described as ruler of Pushkalavatī.¹ Our inscription shows that his province was that formerly held by Liaka Kusuluka and Patika, viz. Cukhsa, the modern Chakkha, of which Taxila was evidently the capital.

The coin-legends lead me to restore the damaged portion as maharajabhra[Ma]-Ma[Ma]gulaśa putrasya. If this restoration is accepted, we learn that Zeionises’ father, Manigula, was the brother of the maharaja, i.e. apparently of some dignitary of higher rank than that of a kṣhtrapāya. Who this maharaja was, we cannot tell with certainty. A comparison of the Khaltas inscription of the year 187 makes me inclined to think of Wima Kadhphises. Now if Zeionises was the son of Wima Kadhphises’ brother, he might consider himself as heir apparent to the imperial power, if Wima Kadhphises had no male issue. For there are, as mentioned in the Historical Introduction, indications to show that the order of succession among the Sakas sometimes passed from a ruler to his brother, and further to the brother’s son. And since the name of the maharaja is not given, it is possible that he had died at the time when our inscription was issued. In that case Zeionises would already be a candidate to the imperial throne. We have not, however, any indication in other sources to the effect that there was any Saka emperor between Wima Kadhphises and Kanishka. And if Zeionises claimed the position, it may be surmisled that he did not meet with success. There was apparently, after Wima Kadhphises’ demise, a disintegration of Kushāna power, similar to what seems to have taken place after the death of Moga. And it was only after the Indian Kushānas had joined hands with their cousins in Turkestan that the empire rose to new, and this time, much increased power.

TEXT

Ka 1 100 20 20 20 10 1 maharaja[bhra]īa Ma*[Ma][gula]*sa putrasya Jihonikasa Chukhsasa kṣhtrapasa.

TRANSLATION

Year 191 (during the reign) of Jihonika, the kṣhtrapāya of Chukhsa, the son of Manigula, the brother of the Great King.

¹ Rapson, The Cambridge History of India, i, p. 582.
TAXILA GOLD PLATE

UNDATED TAXILA INSCRIPTIONS

Taxila was an important centre of learning, and especially of Buddhist civilization during a long period. It is therefore not to be wondered at that several inscriptions have been found in the ruins, belonging to different times. The oldest one belongs to the period when Greek rulers still held sway in the Panjab and has been dealt with together with the oldest Kharoshthi records. The youngest ones seem to take us down to the fifth century of our era, and might be dealt with in connexion with the records dated in the Kanishka era. It seems, however, as if Taxila lost its political importance with the advent of the Kanishka dynasty, and it is therefore preferable to deal with the undated Taxila records in connexion with the inscriptions dated in the older Saka era.

XXXI. PLATE XVII. i: TAXILA GOLD PLATE INSCRIPTION

Of the Taxila ruins the ancient city of Sirkap, on the western spur of the Hathial Hill, seems to be the second in point of age. According to Sir John Marshall it appears to have been in occupation during the Saka, Pahlava, and Kushana periods, down to the reign of Wima Kadphises.

Outside the northern wall of the Sirkap city was a suburb, now known as Babarkhana, and here, to the east, is a group of remains, which Cunningham called the Gangu group. In one mound, numbered 32 by Cunningham, the villager Nur discovered some relics, which were described by Messrs. G. D. Westropp, Rajendralala Mitra, F. F. Pearse, and Cunningham. To quote Cunningham, 'these relics consisted of a circular stone box, about 1 ft. in diameter and 3 in. in depth, beautifully turned and polished, and covered by a slab of sandstone, inside which there was a small hollow crystal figure of a hamsa or goose, containing a thin gold plate 2 1/4 in. long and nearly 1 in. broad, inscribed with Ariano-Pali characters. The letters have been punched on the plate from the back, so that they appear in relief on the upper side'.

Cunningham further states that 'the circular stone box and the crystal goose are now in the British Museum, but the inscription is not with them'.

The inscription accordingly seems to have been lost, and our knowledge about it is derived from Rajendralala's reproduction, which has evidently been taken over by Cunningham, who does not appear himself to have seen the plate. It was read by Rajendralala Mitra, E. C. Bayley, Cunningham, and F. W. Thomas, and it is no. 71 in Mr. Majumdar's List.

To judge from the reproduction, Rajendralala Mitra seems to have been fully justified in stating that the letters were in an excellent state of preservation. The more it is to be regretted that the reproduction is not, as he himself admits, quite reliable. It is stated to have been prepared from a sealing-wax impression, and it is probable that what we possess is an eye-copy of this impression. It follows from what I have said above that Cunningham's plate has no independent value, being copied from Rajendralala's.

1 ASIAR, 1912-13, p. 23.
2 Proceedings ASB, 1865, p. 443.
3 JASB, xxxi, 1862, pp. 175 ff., with plate, fig. 11.
4 Proceedings ASB, 1865, pp. 111 ff.
5 l.c., with plate 11X, no. 5.
6 l.c., with plate 11X, no. 5.
7 l.c., with plate 11X, no. 5.
8 ibidem, pp. 174 ff.
9 l.c.
10 JRAS, 1916, pp. 383 ff., with a reproduction of Rajendralala's and Cunningham's plates and of the goose and the box.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

These facts must be borne in mind, when we use the plate, which has been reproduced from Professor Thomas's paper. We must reckon with the possibility of mistakes.

A peculiar feature in this record is the round dot which marks the lower termination of most letters. It is evidently due to the engraver's tool.

The characters on the whole seem to confirm Sir John Marshall's dating of the site. They are, roughly, intermediate between those of the Patika and Takht-i-Bahi inscriptions. Ta and da are not always easy to distinguish. Where ta is certain, it has the distinct forward slope which we find in the Patika plate, and the unmistakable de of l 3 has the forward bend of the bottom which we know from that record. Ya is broad and angular, and we may note the backward slope of the o-stroke in yo, l 2, which has its parallels in the Dhammapada manuscript. La has almost no bend of the projecting upper limb, as is also the case with some of the la's of the Mathura capital. Sa is strictly angular, as in the Patika plate. The upward prolongation of the bar of sa is usually clear, and it is straight as in the Muchai, Paja, and Marguz inscriptions.

The inscription consists of three lines, and it can be restored with some approach at certainty.

L. 1. The first word is certainly Sirae. Cunningham saw in this a reference to some relic of the head-bone (sirandhatu) of the Buddha, while Professor Thomas was of opinion that 'Sirae is clearly the name of the place or district, now Sir Kap, in which the stupa was. It is not necessary to suppose that the name Sir Kap contains any etymological survival of Sirae—the common view is otherwise—nor would it be reasonable to regard the form as = (Taksha)sila. It is no doubt a local name'.

This explanation is ingenious. It seems to me, however, that we must necessarily look for the name of the donor in the first word, which is evidently to be taken together with the ensuing participle prethaweitye. I therefore take Sirae to be the genitive of a female name Sirae. If it is not a clerical mistake for Sirae, we may perhaps think of the Khotani-Saka word Sirae, which is used to render Skr. Sirae.

The next word is almost certainly bhagavato, though -do is no doubt possible. Then comes what looks like dhatu. The apparent o is, however, different from the o of bhagavato. It is slightly curved, and the bottom of la is devoid of the usual dot. I therefore feel convinced that the plate actually had a complete u-loop and read dhaatu.

The ensuing word was read prevaitye by Bayley and prethaweitye by Cunningham. The former adds that the sealing-wax impressions have ve, but that the e is not visible in the plate. We have no right to reject this statement. The second akshara can, of course, only be tha. Professor Thomas says: 'Although this word might find a Sanskrit equivalent in presthapatya, "dearest offspring", no one would seriously doubt that it is really an erroneously inscribed pratihavayati (stamped from the back), and we shall recall the errors which have been shown in Sir J. H. Marshall's silver scroll inscription from the same city. It would seem that work done in metals, or at least in the precious metals, was less reliable textually than that slowly wrought in stone'.

We must, I think, be very wary in assuming an error in the text. What Mr. Bayley had before himself in the wax impression was evidently prethaweitye, and we must try to explain this form as it is. The initial preth has been explained by Professor Thomas as standing for prath and derived from prath by dissimulation. It will be seen in the Grammatical Introduction that intervocalic t is regularly preserved as t or d in Kharoshthi inscriptions and as d in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada. The occasional writing tr, which is the rule in the Lion Capital inscriptions, may point to a fricative pronunciation, at least in some cases. And it is conceivable that such a fricative was some-

1 JRAS, 1926, p. 507.
times weakly sounded, so that it might be left unmarked. I have mentioned in the Grammatical Introduction that we occasionally find forms such as asvati, Skr. abhāti, pahas, Skr. pratisi in the Dhammapada manuscript, and that we have another example of e for ati in the very word prati in the form prethavide, Skr. pratishthāpitaḥ, in the late Jamālgārhi inscription of the year 339, where Professor Thomas's explanation would also hold good. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to correct our pre to prati, though the form is suspect in such an old record. Prethavetiye is, in other respects, a possible form. The anusvāra is very commonly left unmarked in Kharoshṭhī records, and we are fully justified in explaining our word as standing for prethaventiye, the oblique form of the female participle prethaventi, Skr. pratishthāpayanti. And, in my opinion, this is the only explanation which is admissible. We must translate: of Śīra, who establishes a relic of the Lord, and, so far as I can see, the form prethavetiye definitely shows that Śīra is the name of the donor.

The last word of l. 1 is evidently madu. The angular shape of the last akṣara makes madu unlikely.

L. 2. The reading is perfectly certain, if we abstract from the uncertainty regarding ta and do. Professor Thomas reads hasisa pitu hasase loodasasi aiyoha, and continues with l. 3 dekajā ti. He takes hasasa to be a mistake for hasasa and translates: In Śīra, A[r]d[a]iyoha, sister of Looda, daughter (deka) of a hānsi mother and a hānsa father, deposits relics of the Bhagavat.

He reminds us of the fact 'that the hānsa is white, so that it is an apt type of a spotless character... Secondly the hānasa pair is famed in poetry for its affectionate union... Thirdly, since the hānasa is a migrant, which after a season takes its departure to Lake Mānasa... it is a fully chosen synonym for friends departed to a better world. And, lastly, in the language of the Upaniṣads... the word hānisa is a common synonym for the embodied soul, jīva'.

I agree with Professor Thomas in seeing in hānasa a veiled reference to the departed soul, but I do not think it possible to explain hasisa as the genitive of hānasi, which would be hasi[ri]ye on the analogy of pethavetiye. Nor do I think it likely that the genitives māt and pīru can depend on the distant dekajā, and I know of no instance in Kharoshṭhī inscriptions where ti, Skr. iti, is added at the end of a record.

With regard to the reading, I accept Professor Thomas's pīru, though pīru is also possible, but I think that we must read ta and not do after loo.

In explaining the record we must, I think, bear in mind the fact that the gold plate was actually deposited in a hānasa. Whether the plate was itself considered as a dātū or there was another relic besides, we do not know. But at all events the deposit was made in the crystal hānasa.

Now we have the two words hasisa and hasase, which evidently mean the crystal hānasa itself. None of them is a regular form of the word hānasa, but both have been copied from the wax impression, and a strong presumption is raised in our minds that the original, be it the wax impression or the engraver's draft, had precisely one and the same form in both cases. And that can hardly have been anything else than hasisa. Hasises would be a regular locative of hasa, the locative termination as being well known from the Mānsehāra and Shāhābgārhi versions of the Aśoka edict and from the Kharoshṭhī Dhammapada, where it is often written asa and has been wrongly explained as the genitive suffix.

We thus arrive at the conclusion that Śīra deposited the relic in the hānasa of her mother and father, i.e., the crystal hānasa was to her a symbol of the souls of her departed parents, and the relics were deposited for the benefit of the parents. The idiomatic
to about the same thing as more common expressions such as *matu puyae pitu puyae*. The use of the symbolic *hamsa*, however, leads us to think more directly of a magic purpose.

With regard to the remaining portion of the inscription, I have already given Professor Thomas's reading, which I accept, only substituting *ta* for his *da* after *lō* 2. He suggests to explain *Lōda* as a distorted Leontes and *Ariyoka* as representing Antioche, while he takes *sasi* to stand for Skr. *svasa*, sister.

If my explanation of *lō* 1 is accepted, we cannot look for the names of the donors in *lō* 2–3. And *a priori* we should certainly expect to find some additional remark connected with the dedication of the relics. And such is, I think, actually the case.

I take *lō* to correspond to Skr. *lokaḥ* and *tasa* to be the usual genitive of the demonstrative pronoun. In *siasi* I see the well-known optative of the base *as*, to be, corresponding to Skr. *syaṭ* and to *siasi* in the Māneśhā inscription of the year 68.

As *dehajati* of *lō* 3 regularly corresponds to Skr. *dehajati*, corporeal birth, *yoha* alone remains unexplained. *Yo* can be the nominative masculine or neuter of the relative pronoun, Skr. *yah* or *yad*, cf. *yo cha me bhaya* and *yo atra anitara* on the Wardak Vase. I identify it with Skr. *yad*, used as a conjunction in the sense of 'when'. But then *ha* must be the particle *ha*, which is frequently used with relatives in the old language.

It will be seen that the last sentence contains an imprecation in connexion with the relic. The explanation of the words *lō* *tasa* is not quite certain. *Lōka* may mean 'wide space', in which case the purport would be that wide space might fall to the share of the *hamsa*, i.e. the soul, when it comes to a new birth. It seems to me, however, that it is more probable that *tasa* should be referred to *dhatu*, and that the meaning is: might it (sc. the *hamsa*) be its place (i.e. the receptacle of the *dhatu*), when a new birth takes place. It should be remembered that *dhatu* means both 'relic' and 'element'. To wish that the soul of a departed may become the receptacle of a Buddha*dhātu* in the next existence is, therefore, equivalent to wishing that the departed one may, in his next birth, become a Buddha.

It is of interest to note that the final sentence of the record makes the impression of being metrical, especially if *siasi* is read as bisyllabic. We have 7 + 6 or twice seven syllabic instances: *-x-o-o-o-o* (or *-x-o-o-o*). It will be seen that both halves have the same rhythmical exit, and that there is, moreover, a distinct rhyme. Whether the sentence should be considered as metrical or as rhythmical prose, it certainly seems to be intended to be a magical incantation. We have already found a semi-incantation at the end of the Taxila silver scroll, where *nīvañca hotu aya de samaparicchago* would give a similar rhythm, if *aya de* were omitted: *--x-o-x-o--x--.* Such instances are calculated to throw light on the prevailing notions about the occult power of written formulas.

**TEXT**

1. *Sīrae bhagavato dhāt[u] prēṭha[ve]tiye matu *
2. *hasisa (hasasi) pitu hasase(s)ī* Lōo *tasa siasi yo ha *
3. *dehajati.*

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift) of *Sīra*, depositing a relic of the Lord in the *hamsa* of her mother, the *hamsa* of her father. Might it become its place when a corporeal birth comes.

---

1 I here give the complete readings of the first editors, Rajendralala: *Sirae bhagavato bodhavo prajna rātiyamanta haisaṇaṇaśa hasaśilā śa śasi atyoha viharati*; Bayley: *Sirae bhagavato bodhavo (or ye) pravasaviśaye matuha mīsā pītuka sasā lośa śasi atyo kha dehaṇaṇa*; Cunningham: *Sirae bhagavato dhāt pravasaviśaye Matuha-mīsā Pītuka sasā Loora-sasā Atiyō hahahat.*
XXXII. PLATE XVII. 2: TAXILA VASE INSCRIPTION

Cunningham states that the villagers of Shāhpur, to the west of the Chir Tope of Taxila, had found an inscribed vase in the mound numbered i3, to the west of the village. He could not trace the vase when he was informed of the find, but he supposed it to be identical with a vase which he found in the Peshawar Museum and which is now, without any number, in the Lahore Museum, and we have no reason for seriously doubting the correctness of this identification.

The inscription has been edited by Messrs. Dowson, Cunningham, and Lüders, and it is no. 90 in Mr. Majumdar’s List. It is incised round the body of the vase and is in an excellent state of preservation. The size of individual letters varies from \( \frac{1}{8} \) in. to \( \frac{1}{3} \) in.

The characters are Kharoshthi of a fairly ancient type. The top of \( \text{kha} \) is not bent down; \( \text{cha} \) is devoid of the downward prolongation of the lower curve, and the upward prolongation of the leg of \( \text{s} \) is straight and less pronounced than in the Patika plate, two peculiarities which point to a slightly later date than that record, with which the palaeography agrees in most respects. The form Takhasila\( \text{s}\) agrees with that inscription as against the later silver scroll.

Reading and interpretation have been settled by Professor Lüders, who has also shown that we have no reason for thinking that the record is metrical, as suggested by Professor Thomas.

TEXT

Sihileṇa Siharakshitaṇa cha-bhāraṇehi Takhaśila\( \text{e} \) ayān thuvo pratithavito savabudhaṇa puyæ.

TRANSLATION

By Sihila and Siharakshita, the brothers, this stūpa was established in honour of all Buddhas, in Takhaśila.

XXXIII. PLATE XVII. 3: TAXILA COPPER LADLE INSCRIPTION

The Taxila Museum contains some copper ladles, two of which contain an identical Kharoshthi inscription round the bowl. They were found during Sir John Marshall’s excavations in 1920-1, 1923-4, and 1926-7 at Mahal, close to Sirkap.

I edit the record from casts prepared for the Corpus under Sir John’s directions. The inscription has a length of \( 6\frac{1}{8} \) in., and the letters are from \( \frac{1}{8} \) in. to \( \frac{3}{8} \) in. high.

The characters consist of punched dots and are of about the same age as those of the Taxila vase; cf. \( \text{kha} \) without the downward bend; \( \text{cha} \), which reminds us of the silver scroll; the forward slope of \( \text{ts} \), and the straight prolongation of the leg of \( \text{s} \).

We may note the form of the name Takhaśila, which is also found in the silver scroll.

---

1. ASI, ii, pp. 144 ff.
2. JRAS, xx, 1883, p. 241, with plate iii, fig. 2.
3. JASB, xxi, 1883, pp. 151 and 174, with note by Dowson, p. 428; ASI, ii, 1871, p. 125, with plate lix, fig. 3.
and the Dharmārījakā inscriptions, while the Patika plate and the vase have Takśila, and the ḫp for old ść in Iśparaka, Skr. Iśvaraka, for which Sir Joht reads ḫukṣuṃ.

The reading and interpretation are perfectly certain. The ladles were the gift of a certain Iśvaraka to the congregation of the four quarters and the property of the Kāśyapīyas in the North-ārāma (Uttarārāma), which was evidently situated to the north of Sirkap. The Kāśyapīyas were a branch of the Sthavīravāda school and were also reckoned to the Sarvāstivādins and considered to observe the Dhutāṅgas more rigidly than other sects.1

TEXT

Iśparakasa daṇḍamukho saṃgho chaṭudīśe Uttararame Takṣashilaie Kaśaśaśaṃa parigra[hī]e.

TRANSLATION

Gift of Iśvaraka to the congregation of the four quarters in the Uttarārāma of Takshaśila, in the acceptance of the Kāśyapīyas.

XXXIV. PLATE XVII. 4: BEDADI COPPER LADLE INSCRIPTION

In my edition of the Shahdaur inscription I have drawn attention to some indications which may point to a certain connexion between Taxila and the ancient Uraśā country. They are strengthened by a find which comes from the small village of Bedadi, on the Siran River, some twelve miles by road to the north-north-west of Mānschā, which shows that the Kāśyapīyas had a settlement there, which may have had some connexion with the Uttarārāma of Taxila.

According to Sir Aurel Stein 2 the site seems to be of considerable antiquity. Among the coins found there, there are numerous specimens of the coinage of Azes and the Hindu Shahīs of Kābul, a fine silver coin of Augustus, several Soter Megas coins, and also coins of the early Kushānas.

About 1920, Mr. T. B. Copeland, Deputy Commissioner of the Hazāra District, bought an inscribed copper ladle from a local villager, who stated that he had found it at Bedadi. In 1922 he brought the ladle to England, where it was examined by Professor F. W. Thomas. The ladle has since been presented by Mr. Copeland to the Peshawar Museum.

In 1924 photographs of the ladle were sent to Mr. Majumdar, who published the inscription with a plate.3 He states that the ladle is 9 inches in length and weighs 277 oz. The bowl is 14 inches high and has a diameter of 19 inches. The inscription runs round the bowl and the letters consist of punched dots.

The characters seem to be earlier than Kanishka. We may note the angular ka, the cursive cha, the somewhat square ya, the angular ta, the absence of the upward prolongation of the leg of sa and the loop-shape of anteconsonantal r. The nearest parallels to several of these forms are found in the Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168, where the ka is, however, more cursive:

Mr. Majumdar begins with the letters just to the left of the handle, where we read saṃgho chaṭudīśe śa, with some dots punched between di and śa. It seems as if the engraver has made a mistake and begun to punch the dots of the akṣara n following after śa, omitting śa, and that he has afterwards cancelled these dots. We shall find a similar cancelling later on.

---

2 ASI, 1904-5, p. 18.
3 JASBS, xix, 1923, pp. 345 ff., with plate 14.
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It is not easy to decide where we should begin. Usually, however, where the name of the donor is mentioned, it comes first. It would also seem to be the natural thing to hold the handle in the left hand, when beginning to read the legend. I would therefore start with the words to the right of the handle, where we have Sanīgharakhshi(dasa da)na. The last aksharas are uncertain. The da of -dasa seems probable, though Mr. Majumdar reads ta. Between -dasa and na there is room for two letters, and what can be seen in the photograph looks more like na than da. The reading is, consequently, conjectural.

Then follow the words sanīgha chadudīse and further Uraśaraje, i.e. Skr. Uraśarajya, in the Uraśā Kingdom. We have already seen, in connexion with the Shahdaur inscription, that early rulers in Hazāra used the title rājan, and our record points to a similar state of things at a somewhat later period. The form Uraśa is of interest, as showing that the name was pronounced with a palatal $t$ in the country itself.

Then comes what looks like acharyanena, but I have little doubt that the apparent ne is only a cancelled na.

The next word is clearly Kashyavīyana, which Mr. Majumdar rightly identifies with the Kaśviyaṇa of the Taxila ladle. The writing shya for $t$, i.e. $t$, is of interest and finds its explanation in the fact that thereby regularly became $t$ in the dialect; cf. the frequent manuṣya, Skr. manuṣeya in the Kharoshṭhi Dhammapada.

TEXT
Sanīgharakhshi[dasa da]na sanīgha chadudīse Uraśaraje acharya(ne)na Kashyavīyana.

TRANSLATION.
Gift of Sanīgharakhshita to the congregation of the four quarters, in the Uraśā kingdom, of the Kaśyapīya teachers.

XXXV. PLATE XVII. 5: DHARMARAJIKĀ INSCRIPTIONS

During his excavations at Taxila in 1913 and 1914, Sir John Marshall explored the great Chir Tope, the so-called Dharmarajikā, and several minor buildings surrounding it.

To the south-west of the great stūpa was a structure, apparently a chapel, constructed in the large diaper masonry which, according to Sir John, came into use about the close of the first century A.D.

Six fragmentary inscriptions were recovered on objects found in this place and published by Sir John.1

The characters are later than those of the silver scroll, but apparently older than Kanishka. $Ta$ has the forward slope and $dha$ the deep indenture of older records; $mu$ has not been turned on the side, but differs from the oldest forms in lengthening the left upright; $sa$ occasionally has traces of the upward continuation of the leg; $rya$ has a comparatively late form, with a square $ya$ and a double-loop for the anticonsonant $r$.

I retain Sir John’s numbering of the records.

No. 1

This inscription is inscribed on the side of a lamp and consists of two lines, 13 in. and 2½ in. long respectively, with letters $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to $\frac{1}{4}$ in. high.

---

1 ASIAR, 1912-13, pp. 17 ff., and plate xiv; Majumdar, List, nos. 73-5.
The first word is Takshaśila, which is evidently a slip instead of Takshaśastra, the locative of Takshaśila, Skr. Takshaśilaka, belonging to Takshaśila.\footnote{Sir John, who originally read the last two aksharas as ago, accepted my reading, when we examined the original together in 1925.}

The next word was read dhamaratā by Sir John, and this reading is probably right. There are traces of a cross-bar through the right bar of ma, so that we might think of reading rma as in Jaulī, but the traces are not sufficiently certain. The e-stroke of the final akshara is placed quite at the bottom, and I could not see it in the original. It is therefore possible that we should read a and assume that a mi has stood in the broken space between this and the following letter, so that we should have to read dhamaratāmi. But then we should have to assume that the i-stroke of mi was unusually short. I therefore read dhamaratā.

The ensuing akshara was read dhrā by Sir John. It seems to me, however, that the apparent traces of a r-stroke, which protrude a little above the bottom, run on towards the preceding letter and simply represent an unevenness in the stone. I therefore read dhrā. The second letter must have stood above the broken edge and must have been ma. If the ensuing downward curve of the edge follows the outline of a dha and the short stroke to the left of the break is the bottom of a so, we might restore Dhamadasa, Skr. Dharmadasa. Of the next akshara we have the lower portion of a vertical and traces of an i-stroke running obliquely down from the edge, so that we may think of bhi. Then follow a curve which reminds us of ksha and a vertical which may have had a loop at the bottom. It is therefore possible to read ksha. The next letter consists of a vertical, with an e-stroke at the bottom and the beginning of a curve at the top. With every reserve I therefore restore the whole as Dhamadasabhikshuno, though the usual genitive of bhikshu in Kharoshthi inscriptions is bhikshusa.

Then comes a 'broken akshara which looks like the lower part of an e, and afterwards a vertical with traces of a curve above, so that ska is possible. I accordingly read esa.

The last word of l. 1 is saputrasa.

Then follows l. 2, danamukhe. The bottom of the last akshara is damaged, and there may have been an a-mātrā as well, as in the Jaulī inscription 2. We should certainly expect danamukhe in a Taxila record, but the e-stroke is too pronounced to be accidental.

**TEXT**

L. 1 Takshaśilaami dhamaraś Dhamadasabhikshuno esa saputrasa
2 danamukhe(o).

**TRANSLATION**

In the Dharmarājikā compound of Takshaśila this is the gift of the friar Dharmadasa.

**NO. 2**

This inscription is found on two fragments of a frieze, and beginning and end are missing. The length of the record is 18 in., and the size of individual letters varies between \(\frac{1}{2}\) in. and \(\frac{3}{4}\) in.

The first akshara of which traces remain cannot be made out. It seems to have been provided with an u-mātrā and may have been du. In that case we might think of restoring madupidae, comparing madupidae of the Pājā inscription and assuming that du had been influenced by the preceding du of madu. But I prefer to leave the letter untranslated.
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The remaining portion of the inscription is clear, but I cannot explain the final word hoḍreṇaṇa, after which there are traces of another akshara, apparently with an o-mātrā.

TEXT

... e puyae at[va]psa śatimitrasaloḍhidaṇa arogadakṣiṇae Hoḍreṇaṇa o ... 

TRANSLATION

in honour of ... for the bestowal of health on his relatives, friends and blood-relations, ... of the Hoḍreṇas.

No. 3

This incomplete record, found on a small fragmentary stone, is 5½ in. long, with letters 

\[ \frac{1}{3} \] in. to \[ \frac{3}{4} \] in. high.

The first word is mitrae, apparently the genitive of a female name ending in -mitrā. Then follows indra, for which Sir John read inda. The r-stroke is, I think, certain. The next two aksharas are quite defaced, but the first may have been s. After the break we seem to have sa, and I think it possible that we have to read Indrasena. Then follows bha and an akshara which Sir John read rya. The top is, however, damaged, and the top-line seems to slope downwards. If it were continued to the left and bent downwards still more, we should have rya. With every reserve I therefore restore bharyae.

TEXT

... mitrae Indra[senas]a bharya[ye].

TRANSLATION

Of ... mitra, the wife of Indrasena.

No. 4

Another incomplete inscription found on a fragmentary frieze, 3½ in. long, with letters 

\[ \frac{1}{2} \] in. to 1 in. high.

Sir John read ... o (?)senasa jība. The first aksharas are much defaced, and i is hardly possible to restore them with certainty. A comparison of No. 3, however, makes me inclined to read Indrasena. Then follows an akshara which is quite defaced. It seems to be provided with an w-loop, and the existing traces may point to ku. The next akshara can hardly be ji, because there is a distinct stroke joining the lower part of the vertical at an angle. We must evidently read fi. The letter fa is extremely rare in Kharoshṭhī inscriptions and has only been traced in the Sui Vihār record in the word kuṭiṇhini. Intervocalic t probably became dh in the dialect, and its retention in Sui Vihār seems to be due to the marked Sanskritization of that record. The same has probably been the case in our inscription. The last akshara is damaged, but evidently b. The top-stroke may be part of an i-mātrā, and the upward termination of ba may have stood exactly in the break. There is a blurred line in front of the vertical, but, as it is absent in Sir John's plate, it is probably accidental. I therefore read bi and restore kuṭiṇhīna, cf. Pāli kuṭiṇhī. The persons mentioned are evidently the same as in inscription 3.

TEXT

[Indra]senasa [kuṭiṇhīna*]...

TRANSLATION

of the wife of Indrasena.

No. 5 and 6

These only consist of single letters and are evidently, as stated by Sir John, only masons' marks, ba and bha, respectively.
XXXVI. PLATE XVIII: JAU LIĀ INSCRIPTIONS

The Buddhist remains near the village of Jauliā were excavated in the years 1916–18.¹

They comprise a monastery, one great and several small stupas, arranged in different courts. The older parts of the walls of the monastery and the lower courses of another wall show the large coarse diaper masonry, which, according to Sir John, came into fashion during the second century A.D. Elsewhere we find the semi-ashlar masonry, which was in use from the third until the fifth century.

The monuments were richly decorated with reliefs and sculptures in stucco, of a relatively late date, about the fifth century according to Sir John. And some of them were provided with Kharoshṭhī inscriptions.²

On the north side of the stupa, in one of the bays on the eastern side of the ascending stairs was found a seated Buddha, and on the pedestal below an ex-voto inscription, No. 1.

In a small stupa, numbered A 15, to the east of the main stupa, 'the plinth is faced throughout with large diaper masonry ... and it is likely that this is one of the earliest among the small stupas, although it was no doubt refaced and redecorated at a later date'. The plinth is decorated with a series of figures of the Buddha, and under six of them are found Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, viz. No. 2 on the east face; No. 3 on the west face; No. 4 and 5 on the south face; No. 6 and 7 on the north face.

Finally, there is a small stupa, numbered D 5, to the south-west of the main stupa, where the decoration is sadly damaged, but where some of the images are provided with inscriptions: 8, on the east face; 9 and 10, on the south face, and 11 and 12 on the west face. 'The plinth appears to have undergone renovation, and some of the images may be later than the background to which they have been applied.'

Sir John Marshall draws attention to the interest which these inscriptions possess for the history of Kharoshṭhī. They show that that alphabet was still occasionally used in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. The inscriptions and the plaster reliefs of A 15 and D 5 are stated to be so fresh that there cannot be any 'doubt that they had not long been executed when they were buried from view, and, inasmuch as the latter event cannot be placed earlier than the second half of the fifth century A.D., it follows that the earliest date to which we can assign the inscriptions is about the beginning of the same century'.

Sir John is of opinion that 'at that time Kharoshṭhī was still the ordinary script of the townspeople of Taxila, just as Prākrit was their ordinary vernacular, and it need not surprise us that the common speech and the common script were employed in donative records intended to be read and understood by all and sundry who might see them'.

It is perhaps unsafe to infer too much from the occurrence of Kharoshṭhī votive inscriptions in the beginning of the fifth century. The find of a Sanskrit manuscript in Brāhmi script in the Jauliā ruins shows that the monks had, by that time, taken up the study of Sanskrit and were conversant with the Brāhmi alphabet. From the history of the Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā we can draw the conclusion that this development had already set in in the second century.³

² Published by Sir John, MASI, no. 7, pp. 6 ff., with plate XI; cf. Majumdar, List, nos. 77–89.
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On the other hand, the aim of the votive inscriptions was not, perhaps, that they should be read and understood, but to ensure religious merit through the mystic power of the aksharas. Only very few of those who saw the images were able to read the inscriptions.

We might therefore think it possible that such ex-voto inscriptions might have been written in Kharoshthi even after that alphabet had ceased to be the common one in Taxila, in imitation of older inscriptions of the same kind, which would easily lead people to think that Kharoshthi was more efficacious than Brahmi in such inscriptions, which were more or less some kind of charms, and which would be still more considered as such, if Kharoshthi had ceased to be the usual script. It is even conceivable that some of the inscriptions are copies of older ones, executed when the old images and decorations were restored or repaired.

An examination of the palaeography of the Jautilā records makes me inclined towards the last-mentioned explanation. There is a striking lack of uniformity in the letters, and old and new forms occur side by side, though the general impression is that the records are late.

E has the e-stroke at the bottom of the vertical in 7, just as in one of the Dharmarajika records.

Kṣa has the square shape in 11 and 12, but is rounded in 5.

Kha has a peculiar angular shape, which reminds us of the Zeda and Mañikiala inscriptions, and still later records such as the Patū Rérā and Jamāgarāhī pedestals. We may note, in this connexion, the curious combination of an e- and an o-stroke in dhanamukha, 2.

Kha has a peculiar pointed shape of the upper curve in bhikshusa, inscription 4, side by side with the regular shape in Budharaksha data. The u-mātra of bhikshusa is a complete loop in 7; in 2 it consists of an upward bend towards the left, in 4 of a bend towards the right, and in 5 it looks like an o-stroke.

Ya has an irregular shape, with a backwards bend of the vertical, in 12, if the reading is correct.

Na and nu are used promiscuously; thus dana in 2, 4, 5, dana in 7, 8, 10, 12.

Ta has usually the same shape as in the silver scroll. Note that the o-mātra is regularly placed in to in 11, 12, 13, but consists of a horizontal stroke parallel to the upper horizontal in 9.

The e-stroke of de in inscription 2 has a peculiar place above the upper curvature.

The shape of mu shows great variety. We have a square, standing, form in 2 and 12, a vertical with a curve in 7; a mu raised on the end in 5, and a sloping one in 10.

Sa has the upward prolongation of the leg in 3, 7, and once in 2, while it is absent in 2, 4, 5.

Hu in 7 is quite abnormal, the u-mātra being simply a continuation of the lower termination back towards the upright.

The compound rm looks almost like shu in 6; in 5 it reminds us of thn; in 1 we have an ordinary ma with a sloping curve across the right bar.

From this great inconsistency it seems natural to infer that Kharoshthi only survived in reminiscences, and that the individual writers tried their best in order to imitate old forms.

No. 1

Incomplete, 8½ in. long, with letters 1 in. to 2 in. high, read Dhammanadisa Budhamitra by Sir John and Dhamaratva Budhamitra [sa*] by Mr. Majumdar. I read the second akshara as rma. It is slightly different from the initial akshara of the
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

Sui Vihār and Ārā records, where the cross-bar, which evidently only marks the beginning of the record, is straight, while in our letter it is a curve. We may compare the rma of 5 and 6.

Also the third akshara is peculiar, because the backward curve is little pronounced. I think, however, that na is more likely than ra, because ra is more angular in other Jauli inscriptions; because a similar na is perhaps found in 7, and because Dharma- 
anandin actually occurs in Buddhist literature. Dharmanādi, i.e. Dharmanandin, rejoicing in the Dharma, was probably an honorific title.

The final tsa is damaged, but certain, and we can, with great probability, restore the remaining portion of the record.

TEXT

Dharmanādisa Budhāmitra[sa bhikṣhusa danamukho*].

TRANSLATION

Gift of the friar Budhāmitra Dharmanandin.

Inscriptions 2–7 have been found in the stūpa numbered A 15.

No. 2

Consists of three parts, 4 1/4 in., 3 1/2 in., and 4 1/2 in. respectively, with letters 1 1/2 in. to 2 1/4 in., 2 in. to 1 1/2 in., and 3 in. to 1 1/2 in. high, respectively. Mr. Majumdar separates it into two records, nos. 78 and 79, but an inspection of the original shows that the three statues enclosed by the inscription are the donation of one and the same donor.

The reading is perfectly certain. We may note the unusual position of the ē-mātrā in Budhādevasa, the incomplete u-loop of kṣu in bhikṣusas, and the apparent ē-stroke in addition to the e-mātrā in danamukho.

TEXT

Saghamitrāsa Budhādevasa bhikṣu[sa danamukhe(o].

TRANSLATION

Gift of the friar Budhādeva Saghamitra (the friend of the order).

No. 3

2 1/4 in. long, with letters 1/2 in. to 3/4 in. high. Only one word.

TEXT

Shagamāmitrasa.

TRANSLATION

(Gift of) Śramaṇāmitra.

No. 4

1 3/4 in. long, with letters 1 in. to 2 1/4 in. high. The first word is Budhārakshita[sa], though Budhārakshita[sa] is possible. Then follows an open space, where nothing has ever been written, and bhikṣusa, with a misspelled kṣu, and, finally, danamukho, where, however, the na is defaced and the mu so indistinct that its shape cannot be made out.

TEXT

Budhārakshita[da] bhikṣusa da[namukhe(o.

TRANSLATION

Gift of the friar Budhārakshita.
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No. 5
15 \frac{1}{2} in. long, with letters \( \frac{3}{4} \) in. to 1 \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. high. Sir John read the first word as Dhanamitra, but the second akshara is evidently \( \text{rma} \). Then follows bhikshusa, with an irregular \( u \)-mātrā consisting only of a projecting bar, and a damaged \( s \); [\text{na}garaka[sa]], and danamukho, with a \( da \), which looks like a \( na \).

TEXT

TRANSLATION
Gift of Dharmamitra, the friar from Nagara.

No. 6
16 in. long, with letters 1 \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. to 2 in. high. Sir John read the first word as Dhanusha \ldots, but again the second letter is evidently \( \text{rma} \). Of the third only the top of a vertical, surmounted by a horizontal, remains. It may have been a \( bha \) or a \( bhu \). The next letter must have stood in the ensuing break, where there is only room for a short akshara. Then follows the lower part of a vertical, which we can confidently restore as \( s \). The whole may have been Dharmabhutisa.

Then come the ends of two verticals, which must represent the bottom of a \( bhi \); an almost complete \( kho \), an open space, where nothing seems to have been written; traces of a \( sa \); a break with room enough for three letters, of which the second seems to have ended in a long upright, and, finally, part of a \( kho \). We may restore the whole as follows:

TEXT
Dharma[bhutisa*] [bhi]kshusa [danamu*]kho.

TRANSLATION
Gift of the friar Dharmabhuti.

No. 7
14 \frac{1}{2} in. long, with letters 1 in. to 2 in. high. The first word was read as Rahulasa by Sir John, and this reading is probably right, though the \( u \) of \( hu \) is quite irregular, consisting of a bar from the bottom of \( ha \) up to the vertical. It should be borne in mind that the name Rāhula figures in lists of old Sarvāstivāda teachers and would be quite likely also in later times.

Then follows vanacasa, which Sir John translates ‘of Vanaya’. Mr. Majumdar translates ‘of Vanāyu’, which, he says, has been identified with Bānu or with Arabia. If I am right in assuming that the Jauliā records are partly copies of older inscriptions, we may, however, reckon with the possibility of a clerical mistake. If we, further, bear in mind the fact that the Sarvāstivādins had a Vinaya of their own, and that the front leaf of a Tibetan manuscript of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, examined by Csoma Körösi, has a picture representing the Buddha with Śariputra and Rahula on his two sides,\(^1\) we become inclined to think that vanacasa has been misread for venātasa, the \( c \) of \( ve \) having been overlooked and the \( i \) misread as \( e \). Venāta corresponds to Skr. vaṇṇayika, and Pāli vaṇṇiyika, which is explained by Kachchāyana\(^2\) to mean ‘versed in the Vinaya’.

---


\(^2\) Ed. Senart, p. 391 (p. 189 of the reprint).
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

There are, so far as I can see, some distinct indications that our record is a copy of an older one. In the first place, the sa everywhere shows the prolongation of the lower vertical up towards the top, which is characteristic of old Kharoshthi. Then we have the cerebral ṇ in the last word of the inscription, daṇamukho, which also has a mu of the shape which we find in the Tirath inscription.

The remaining portion of the record is beyond doubt.

**TEXT**


**TRANSLATION**

Gift of Rāhula, the friar versed in the Vinaya.

The remaining inscriptions are found in the stūpa numbered D 5.

**No. 8**

10½ in. long, with letters 1 in. to 1¼ in. high. Much damaged. The first visible traces consist of a vertical, which may be part of a mi; followed by a curve, which may have been the lower part of a ta. Then comes a defaced portion, with sufficient room for three or four aksharas, the last of which has left some traces of an upper curve and a vertical, so that it is possible to read kṣa. Then comes the lower portion of a letter, which may have been sa; daṇa; a defaced spot sufficient for one akshara, and, finally, kha. I tentatively restore the legend as follows:

**TEXT**


**TRANSLATION**

Gift of the friar Dharmamitra.

**No. 9**

10 in. long, with letters 1½ in. to 2 in. high. The first akshara has disappeared and the two following ones are damaged, but can be made out to be tavo, so that we can restore Kaśavo, Skr. Kāśyapakaḥ. Then comes tathagato, with the e-stroke of the final akshara placed irregularly as a horizontal projection from the middle of the leg.

What follows was read as sa... sa by Sir John, and it is hardly possible to improve on this reading. The first akshara seems to be s. Of the second a vertical remains. The apparent projection to the right seems to represent damage to the plaster coating. Then come traces which may represent ka, bha, or pa, and further a distinct ha, followed by sa and apparently ṇa. I cannot make anything out of this state of things.

**TEXT**

[Kaśavo tathagato s... hasa sa...]

**TRANSLATION**

Kāśyapa the Tathāgata...

**No. 10**

Fragment, 6 in. long, with letters ¾ in. to 1½ in. high. There are traces of four aksharas, which may perhaps be tava sa da, and two distinct letters, viz. nu. We may perhaps restore as follows:

**TEXT**

[Kaśavasa daṇamu[kho].]

**TRANSLATION**

Gift of Kāśyapa.
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In that case Kāśyapa must be the name of the donor, and it is possible that his designations preceded in the broken portion at the beginning.

No. 11

7 in. long, with letters 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. to 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. high. Perfectly legible.

TEXT
Kāśavo tathāgato.

TRANSLATION
Kāśyapa, the Tathāgata.

No. 12

14 in. long, with letters 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. to 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. high. The beginning is quite clear: "Sakamu tathāgato, which evidently stands for "Sakamūni tathāgato." The omission of the akṣara ni perhaps points to the inscription being a copy of an older record. Sir John read the remaining portion as "jinnās daṅga[mukho], translating the whole as 'Śakyamuni Tathāgata, lord of Jinas—a pious gift'. I have some doubts about this reading. The top of the first akṣara looks like the top of cha or cha, but it may be a distorted ji. The second looks more like ra than na. Besides, the dental na would make some difficulty in face of the distinct na which follows. The third letter is certainly t, but the fourth is much shorter than the sā of Sakamu and is more likely to be ya. The fifth seems to be to and not da. The sixth is certainly na. The seventh has a hook protruding from a vertical and bears no similarity to the mu of Sakamūni. The existing traces point to ku, pa, or bha. The last letter, finally, consist of a vertical with remnants of the anteconsonant r-loop at the bottom and may be ro. We might think of reading "chīrae yatana prájñā, Skr. "chīrāya yatana prájñā", or Jīvae Yatanabharya ..., but I do not venture to deviate from Sir John.

TEXT
Sakamu[ni*] tathāgato ji(?){na(?)}eṣa(? da(?)mukho(?).

TRANSLATION
Śakyamuni, the Tathāgata, lord of Jinas, a gift.

No. 13

Received as copied in the same stūpa D 5; not previously noticed. Only a fragment, 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. long, with letters 1 in. to 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. high. The record is so damaged that I refrain from any attempt at reading it.

No. 14

Received as hailing from Jaulīā and as unidentified. Bears the number d. No. 1564. One letter and part of a second one: to ṣa (or, ya).

XXXVII. PLATES XIX, XX: MINOR TAXILA INSCRIPTIONS

The excavations at Sirkap, which yielded the silver vase containing the Zeionises inscription of the year 191, have also brought to light several other antiquities bearing Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, which can conveniently be dealt with in this place.

1-2. Incribed silver cups

Sk. 4081/24, excavated in the year 1926-7, are two silver cups, 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. in diameter, apparently meant for keeping grain or flowers. Each of them contains a Kharoshṭhī legend, giving the name of the donor.
There is no difference in the letters of the two copies. They consist of dots punched into the surface, and the bottom of the aksharas is bent and twisted in various ways. In the case of sa the result is a letter which reminds us of sva. This letter only occurs in the genitive termination asa, so that it is possible to think of sva. We shall see, however, below in No. 3 that the same sign there occurs for an initial s, where sva is out of the question. It therefore seems more probable that we have before us a modified, perhaps a voiced s. I shall write s(\text{y})a.

There is no upward continuation of the leg of sa. Nevertheless there cannot be much doubt that the inscriptions are about contemporaneous with the Jihokika record.

The reading is absolutely certain: Theutaras(\text{y})a Thavaraputras(\text{y})a, of Theutara, the son of Thavara.

There can hardly be any doubt that Theutara is the Greek name Theodoros, which we have found in the form Thaedora on the Swat vase and as Thaidora in the Kaldarra inscription. The writing \(\textit{t}\) for \(\textit{d}\) probably finds its explanation in the usual voicing of intervocalic \(\textit{t}\), and \(\textit{a}\), i.e. \(\textit{a}\) for Greek omega, does not present any difficulty.

Thavara can hardly be a Greek name, but may represent Skr. s\textit{th}avara.

**TEXT**

Theutaras(\text{y})a Thavaraputras(\text{y})a.

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift) of Theodorus, the son of Thavara.

3: Inscribed silver plate with three legs

Sk. 4081, 20, found in the year 1926–7, is a rectangular silver plate, 8½ in. by 6 in., with three legs, probably intended for offerings.

The back contains a short Kharoshthi inscription, with letters consisting of punched dots. The characters are of the same kind as in Nos. 1 and 2, and the sa has the terminating loop which seems to represent a subscript \(\textit{y}\), so that we should perhaps read sva. The same sign is, however, also used as an initial, and I shall transliterate s(\text{y})a. It should be noted that there is, in this record, a distinct upwards prolongation of the lower part of sa.

The first word is Munjukritas(\text{y})a, of Munjukrita. I do not know any such name. In No. 4 we shall find it again, in the form Minjukrita, which shows that the first vowel was probably difficult to render, i.e. the name is probably un-Indian. The last part, kritas, is perhaps the Greek kritas in names such as Demokritos.

Then follows sava 20 dra 1. There can hardly be any doubt that sava and dra are abbreviations of sateta, drakhma, Greek σατήρα, δραχμή, respectively, and that the value of the silver plate is here given.

It is of interest that the Greek word satera has here, as in Turkestan, been borrowed in the form sateta. Professor Thomas has quoted some examples of its use in the Kharoshthi Documents from Niya, and in one of them, no. 43, the word is written \(s(\text{r})\)atera, i.e. with the modified \(s\), which perhaps denotes a voiced pronunciation. This coincidence adds some probability to the explanation suggested above that sava stands for a voiced \(s\), though it is difficult to understand how the \(s\) of sateta could become voiced.

**TEXT**

Munjukritas(\text{y})a s(\text{y})a 20 satera 1.

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift) of Munjukrita, 20 staters, 1 drakhm.

---
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4. Inscribed circular silver plate

No. 4081/21, found in the year 1926–7, is a circular silver plate, $8\frac{1}{4}$ in. in diameter, with the centre raised and ending in a knot. The plate was probably intended to hold offerings.

On the outside is a Kharoshthi inscription, with letters punched in dots into the silver. It is of the same kind as in No. 3 above, but the lower part of sa here ends in a bend and not in a loop, wherefore we can only read sa. The reading is perfectly clear. The form Minhujriti has already been mentioned. Instead of the dva for drakhm of No. 3 we here find dha, but it would be unsafe to base any conclusions on this writing.

TEXT

Minhujritasa sa 20 to dha 2.

TRANSLATION

(Gift) of Minhujrita, 30 staters, 2 drakhms.

5. Inscribed silver sieve

Sk. 4081/19, found in the year 1926–7, is a round conical silver sieve, 8 in. in upper diameter, with two handles. The upper border is of solid silver, the sieve itself is made of plaited silver wire. On the outside, just below the rim, runs a Kharoshthi legend, with letters consisting of punched dots.

The aksharas are of the same kind as in the above inscriptions. The sa of the termination asa can be read as sya and has the upwards continuation of the leg.

The reading is not subject to doubt. It runs Gomanadaputras(y)a Jhamdanamas(y)a, where it can only be questioned whether the last na should not be read as nam. I cannot identify these names; the initial jha of the second one points to the conclusion that they are not Indian.

TEXT

Gomanadaputras(y)a Jhamdanamas(y)a.

TRANSLATION

(Gift) of Jhamdanama, the son of Gomanada.

6. Inscribed volute bracket

No. 1457, excavated in the year 1926–7, is a volute bracket representing a kneeling figure, with folded hands, $5\frac{1}{2}$ in. high, with a base, 2$\frac{3}{4}$ in. long, which runs backwards from the bottom of the sculpture.

The back bears a Kharoshthi inscription, and letters are also found on the top of the base, running backwards from the bottom of the sculpture, and on the proper right side of the base, where they run upwards.

The aksharas are stiff, but evidently of the same age as in the records dealt with above. The leg of sa has a distinct upwards prolongation. The dental n is used as an initial, while n is written between vowels.

The arrangement of the legend is peculiar. On the back we read, beginning from above pitu puyae, then after a short interval, savatratenma niyatiyo vihare maia, where the ya of niyatiyo and the re of vihare are slightly mutilated. On the top of the base we find devadato, followed by some blurred marks which do not seem to be parts of letters. The legend on the right side of the base is savatrateya ni, i.e. it is identical with part of the inscription on the back.
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It is evident that we must read the legend on the back as Savatrataṇa niyatito vihare matapitū puyae, and the repetition of the aksharas savatrataṇa ni on the base seems to be meant as an indication that the record begins with Savatrataṇa and not with piti puyae.

With regard to the remaining word Devadato, we may doubt whether it is the name of some person, different from the donor, e.g. of the navakarmika, or a designation of the sculpture. If the kneeling figure is a Nāga, we might think of the name Devadatta applied to a Nāga in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

TEXT
Savatrataṇa niyatito vihare matapitū puyae Devadato.

TRANSLATION
Presented by Sarvatṛata in the vihāra, in honour of (his) mother and father, Devadatta.

PLATE XX contains reproductions of some seals and dies, and of older epigraphical fragments found at Taxila.

1. Inscribed gold ring
Sk. 194/8 is a plain gold finger-ring, 6 in. in diameter, with flattened bezel, engraved with Nandipada symbol and a Kharoshthi legend, which Sir John Marshall¹ read as Sadvalasa (?). To judge from photographs and a cast the first two aksharas are much defaced. The second seems to me to be dha. With great reserve I therefore read:

TEXT
Sadvalasa.

TRANSLATION
Of Sadvala.

2. Inscribed gold hoop finger-ring
Sk. 194/10 is a gold hoop finger-ring, 7 in. in diameter, with oval bezel enclosing silver inlay and containing a legend in two lines,² one in Brāhmaṇī, the other in Kharoshthī.

TEXT
Mahāyaśaputra Manavaśa.

TRANSLATION
Of Manava, the son of Mahāyaśa.

3. Inscribed copper ring
A finger-ring of copper, 3 in. in diameter, engraved with a sleeping lion and a Kharoshthī inscription, has been described by Sir John Marshall,³ who read the inscription as Mahajanaputra Dhaladapriyasa. The accompanying plate seems to me to show:

TEXT
Mahajanaputra Jhanapriyasa.

TRANSLATION
Of Dhyānapriya, the son of Mahādhyāna.

4. Rectangular copper seal
Sk. 1556 of 1925 is a rectangular copper seal, ½ in. x ¾ in., showing a humped bull, above which there is a Kharoshthī legend, which seems to run Yavalatrasa or Yavaletrasa.

TEXT
Yaval(ale)trasa.

TRANSLATION
Of Yavalatra (or, Yavaletra).

¹ ASIAR, 1912-13, p. 27 and plate XXI b 6.
³ ASIAR, 1923-4, p. 66, plate XXVII, 3.
5. Circular copper seal

Sk. 1 of 1921 is a circular copper seal, \(\frac{1}{4}\) in. in diameter, showing a standing figure and a Kharoshthi legend which I cannot read with certainty. In front of the figure it seems possible to read Yolamonalatra...sa, and behind Budhatalrata. With the utmost reserve I read:

**Text**

Yolamonalatra[putra]sa Budhatalrata.

**Translation**

Of Buddhalatra, the son of Yola Moanalatra.

6. Oval copper seal

Sk. 1416 of 1925 is an oval copper seal, \(\frac{3}{4}\) in. \(\times\) \(\frac{3}{4}\) in., showing a standing figure and a Kharoshthi legend, which has suffered much from corrosion. Behind the figure it seems possible to read Matajhol[na]putrasa and in front...jhanasa, but the reading is extremely uncertain.

**Text**

Matajha[na]putrasa...jhanasa.

**Translation**

Of...dhyāna, the son of Matadhyāna.

7. Another oval copper seal

Sk. 1301 of 1913–14 is another oval copper seal, \(\frac{1}{8}\) in. \(\times\) \(\frac{1}{8}\) in., with a legend, which seems to be denipasa, though the first akshara might be ja.

**Text**

Denipasa.

**Translation**

Of Denipa.

8. Square copper seal with Brahman

Sk. 3889 of 1926–7 is a square copper seal, \(\frac{7}{16}\) in. \(\times\) \(\frac{7}{16}\) in., showing a Brahman sitting in a hut before an altar, with a Kharoshthi legend in front.

**Text**

Bramadatasa.

**Translation**

Of Brahmadatta.

9. Square copper seal with Nandipada

Sk. 4263 of 1926–7 is a square copper seal, \(\frac{3}{8}\) in. \(\times\) \(\frac{3}{8}\) in., showing a Nandipada and above a Kharoshthi legend.

**Text**

Arajhamdasa.

**Translation**

Of Arajhanda.

10. Terra-cotta seal

Sk. 132 of 1926–7 is a round terra-cotta seal, 1 in. in diameter, with a Kharoshthi legend in two lines.

**Text**

L. 1 atavihare Mu-
    2 drasatasat

**Translation**

Of Mudrasata, in his own Vihāra.
11. Copper seal with figure of Śiva

A round copper seal, measuring 1.35 x 1.35 in., with two rings on the back, was found at Sirkap in the year 1914–15. It shows the figure of Śiva with trident in left hand and club in right. In the right field a Nandipada and a Kharoshthi legend in letters which strongly remind us of the Shahdaul inscription B of Śivaraksita. In the left field the same legend in Brāhmi.1

TEXT
Śivaraksitasa.

TRANSLATION
Of Śivaraksita.

12. Bronze seal with Herakles

An oval bronze seal, measuring 0.7 x 0.6 in., and acquired in the same year, shows Herakles trampling down a bull-shaped dragon. The Kharoshthi legend was read by Sir John Marshall as Tīḍusa Viśhunītara (7). The first akshara is, however, so far as I can see, ba. Baḍu corresponds to Skr. baṭu, a Brahman boy. The second syllable of the second word seems to me to be an unmistakable īpa. I therefore read:

TEXT
Baḍusa Viśpamitasa.

TRANSLATION
Of the young Brahman Viśvamitra.

13. Inscribed stone matrix

An inscribed stone matrix was found in the year 1919–20.8 In the right corner there is a distinct Kharoshthī ga, and in the centre, within an irregular circle, four aksharas which I would read as Gayalasa, of Gayala. There are two dots, under ya and la respectively, which I cannot explain.

14. Inscribed pillar

To the south-west of Sirkap, in a ravine close to the right bank of the Tamrā Nāla and near the village of Dhibiā, Cunningham found the remains of a large monolith, called chura by the villagers, lying in five pieces. One of the pieces bore traces of a Kharoshthi inscription.4 To judge from Cunningham’s plate there were remnants of two lines. The first was read by Cunningham as seracha, and, if his plate is reliable, it must be fairly ancient, the shape of sa and cha being of about the same kind as in the Patika plate. In the second line we seem to have sakha and some blurred letters. The sa is, however, different from the sa of the first line, and may be misread for ta, in which case we might think of restoring Tukhalasū.

15. Jandial pillar

Another pillar was dug out by Cunningham in a mound to the north of Jandial, where Sir John Marshall later on laid bare a stūpa of two periods, built in the Scytho-Parthian epoch and rebuilt probably in the third century of our era.5 This pillar was marked with a letter which Cunningham took to be a numerical figure. To judge from the reproduction, it may be a da.

---

3 ASIAR, 1919–20, p. 20, plate VIII, 1.
4 Cunningham, ASI, ii, p. 126 and plate LIX, fig. 5.
5 A Guide to Taxila, p. 94.
6 Cunningham, l.c., p. 135, and plate LIX, fig. 6.
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Last silver roll

Cunningham mentions still another inscription from the same neighbourhood, which he had not himself seen. He says: ‘Mr. Delmerick has since made a discovery in this immediate neighbourhood: “To the west of Seri-ki-Pind, about a gunshot from the village, at a spot called Thapī, about 8 feet below the surface,” was found a stone box, holding a wooden box, which held a silver box, inside which was a gold box, containing some small pearls, bits of gold, &c. The stone box was found in a square compartment, near which in a mass of earth was found a small roll of very thin silver, scarcely one inch in breadth and very friable, containing an inscription in Arian letters.’ This silver scroll has apparently disappeared and there is no probability of its being ever recovered. For the remaining antiquities mentioned by Mr. Delmerick were evidently not taken care of, and some of them, viz. ‘a small silver casket lenticular in shape, containing a smaller one of the same pattern in gold, and in the latter a small fragment of bone’, seem to have been actually recovered by Sir John Marshall in the spoil earth at the side of the stūpa.2

XXXVIII. PLATE XX. 16: SEAL INSCRIPTION OF ŚIVASENA

The name of a kshatrapa Śivasena occurs in the legend of a copper seal ring, which was found by Mr. Bayley in the Panjāb and described by Cunningham,4 but which has since disappeared.

Cunningham read the seal legend as Śivasena kshatrapa Atri naraṁ Pathanavare, Śivasena, of the race of Atri, satrap of Pothowar, and saw in Pathanavara the old name of Pothowar, which is part of the Rāwalpiṇḍi district.

Professor Dowson gave a new reading; viz. Śivasena kshatrapa Atridara paṭana are . . . , Śivasena kshatrapa, city of Atridara.

To judge from the plates Śivasena kshatrapa are certain, as is also the ensuing a. The next akṣara, however, looks like vṛ, and the following one is perhaps sa. Avrisra may, of course, be misread for avhisra. Now if we bear in mind that intervocalic bh becomes vh or v in several cases in the Kharoshṭhī Dhammapada, and that vṛ is used in the coin legends of Wima Kadphises for an aspirated or strongly labialized v, it is perhaps possible to see in avrisra or avhisra the well-known Abhisāra, which has been identified by Sir Aurel Stein8 with the hills between the Jhelam and the Chenāb and some time comprised also Hazāra.

The remaining portion of the legend seems to be pathaṇaare, followed by some unidentified symbols, though neither the na nor the a appear to have been quite certain. It is perhaps possible to explain patha as corresponding to Skr. prastha and paare as representing nagare, though the dropping of an intervocalic g is unparalleled, and the absence of reliable reproductions makes it necessary to consider every explanation as little more than a guess.

TEXT
Śivasena kshatrapa Avr[sa]rapathamaare.

TRANSLATION
Śivasena, the kshatrapa in the town of Abhisāraprastha.

1 I. C., p. 135, footnote.
2 See A Guide to Taxila, p. 95.
3 JASB, xxiii, 1854, p. 698, and plate XXXV, no. 23.
4 JRAS, xx, 1865, p. 249, and plate IV, fig. 6.
XXXIX. Plate XV. 3: DEWAI INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 200

Dewai is a small fort in the territory of the Nawab of Amb, on the eastern slope of Mahaban, with some ancient remains, which were visited by Sir Aurel Stein in November 1904. One of the inscribed stones collected by Sir Harold Deane was stated to have been found at Dewai. It is now Nr. I. 44 of the Lahore Museum. It is very rough, but has, on one side, a smoothened surface, 9 in. by 5 in., with three lines of Kharoshthi letters, varying in size between ½ in. and 2 in.

A photograph of the stone was sent by Sir Harold to M. Senart, who published the inscription with a plate. The characters are irregular and inconsistent, and it is evident that the engraver has been in possession of little skill. The distinct prolongation of the lower part of sa in the initial sam, the second sa of masasa and the se of divase seems to show that the letters of his draft belonged to a period intermediate between the Taxila silver scroll and Kanishka.

The reading of the date is quite certain: sam 1 1 100 Veśakhasa masasa divase athame 4 4, i.e. the 8th Vaiśākha 200, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk, to the 24th March, A.D. 116.

We may note the great diversity in the shape of the sa, and, on the whole, the careless execution of the aksharas. The first sa is fairly regular, with the projection of the leg which we know from old records, but the anusvāra curve runs into the head of va below. The sa of Vesakahasa and the first sa of masasa look like va, while the second sa of masasa is provided with a sloping projection from the almost straight line formed by the lower bar of the head and the leg. A similar form is found in divase, where the top-stroke is continued in the e-mātrā. The ve of Vesakahasa looks almost like the sa of the same word. The tha of athame is continued in a flourish, which runs into the line below, and the me looks almost like a Brāhmī ma.

After the date M. Senart read isme khamasa, which he explained as corresponding to Skr. asmin kshaya. The second akshara, however, does not seem to be isme, but itra. The only unusual feature is the backward curve of the bottom of t, below the r-stroke. A similar curve has sometimes, it is true, been transliterated as m in the compound tma, but there the curve is narrower and turned upwards at the termination. Moreover, the reading tma is, as indicated in connexion with the Taxila silver scroll, certainly wrong and should be replaced by tva. I therefore read itra, cf. itra in the Mānikiśā inscription. The next word is certainly khapasa, and this is evidently the same locative which we find in asi loki parasas y, Skr. asmin lokhe parasmin cha, A56, Cm 30; navarvaha, Skr. narmrupa, B 38, in the Kharoshti Dhammapada, where we find the same change of asi to asa. Khaṇa instead of the more usual kshuna should be compared with Takkṣaka side by side with Takkṣaśāla.

After kṣapasa comes an akshara which is almost invisible in M. Senart’s plate, but which is evidently da. It must be drawn to l. 3.

L. 3. The next word was read as nagachhatra, or, in my transliteration, nagachhatra, by M. Senart, who compared Bühler’s reading samanachhatra in the Mathurā Lion.

1 Cf. ASIFC, 1904-5, p. 32.
2 JA, ix, iv, 1894, pp. 510 ff., and plate v, no. 34; cf. Banerji, Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 46, 68; Majumdar, List, no. 9.
3 JRAS, 1894, p. 536.
Capital inscription E, which Bühler thought may perhaps be justified by the use of the term chhatrī, which in Rajputana and Gujarat is frequently used to denote the cenotaphs of princes and monks, over which an umbrella-like dome is erected. Chhatrī, however, has an old chh, which is never written ksha in Kharoshthi inscriptions.

Nor do I think that M. Senart’s reading can be accepted. The second akshara is, so far as I can see, a mu, of the same shape as in A 3 of the Mathurā Lion Capital, where it is likewise raised above the line. The left bar of an ordinary ma has been added, so that the akshara looks almost like mo. We may compare the mu of the Mount Banj inscription. The raised position makes, I think, the reading mu certain.

The next akshara seems to be ho. It might be kha, but the o-stroke stands too low down and the backward curve and continuation of the bottom is too pronounced to be accidental, and the kha of ll. 1 and 2 is too different. I therefore read the whole word as danamahā.

The next akshara was read tāra by M. Senart, but it seems to me that we must read to, though we have not the same backward curve as in tāra, l. 2, and though there is a projection of the lower limb above the o-stroke. To read to seems unlikely in face of the other sa’s.

What follows after to was taken to be a da by M. Senart, but I have already stated that I think it belongs to the tha of l. 2. A comparison of the difficult passage following after rajam in l. 2 of the Zeda inscription shows that such must be the case. There we have an akshara resembling what I have read as to, followed by a distinct ya, with a hook attached to the right limb. In the same way we have, after the to and M. Senart’s da, a ya, with a long line at the bottom. The same word is evidently contained in both records, and we must infer that nothing intervenes between to and ya. The Zeda inscription also shows that the akshara after to cannot be sa, as read by M. Senart, but must be ya. The meaning of the horizontal crossing the right bar of this ya must evidently be the same as that of the hook attached to the corresponding ya of the Zeda inscription, which, in its turn, is so like the anusvāra of sam, the first akshara of the inscription, that it seems necessary to read the letter as yam.

The ensuing letter was left untransliterated by M. Senart. Its shape is irregular, but it bears resemblance to the da of divasa above, and as the corresponding letter in the Zeda inscription is certainly da, I read it as da. We thus get at a word toyada or toyandha, which is only known from these two inscriptions. It seems to be formed in the same way as dhananjaya, and to mean ‘water-giver’. In the Zeda inscription the toyandha is mentioned in connexion with a well, and it seems likely that it denotes some contrivance or place for drawing or serving water. But we cannot say what is exactly meant.

The next letter was also left untransliterated by M. Senart. It consist of a long vertical, with a sloping top-line and a semicircle attached to its middle. The semicircle reminds us of the back-limb of bha in the Wardak Vase inscription, and it is perhaps possible to read bha. The next two letters were read trasa by M. Senart, but it also seems possible to read drasa, and, with every reserve, I read the whole as bhadrāsa.

After this word M. Senart read ima. It will be seen, however, that the bottom of the first letter is curved backwards and that the i-stroke has not the same slope as in i of l. 2. I therefore think that we must read hi. Moreover, there are traces of a damaged letter after mu, which I take to have been sa. I therefore read himasa and see in this the genitive of a name which may be compared with the name Himmaṇa, Rājatarāṇī VI. 213 ff.
The reading and interpretation of the record are, as it will be seen, partly uncertain, in consequence of the careless execution.

**TEXT**

1. sa[th] 1 1 100 Veṣākhasa masasa di-
2. vase aṭhame 4 4 itra kaṇasa [da]-

**TRANSLATION**

Anno 200, on the eighth, 8., day of the month Vaṣākha, at this instant a water-giver is the gift of the worthy Hima.

**XL. PLATE XXI. I: LORIYĀN TANGAI PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 318**

The ruined stūpa of Loriyān Tangai is situated in the valley (tangai) of Loriyān, or, according to M. Foucher,¹ perhaps Ralyan, near the northern opening of the Shahkot pass into Lower Śwāt, to the south-east of the Aladand fortress and near the village Piyalāna. It was excavated in the spring of 1896 by Mr. A. E. Caddy, and the result was a collection of Gandhāra sculptures, most of which are now to be found in the Calcutta Museum.

According to M. Foucher,² the period of the stūpa is late, perhaps the second century A.D.

Among the sculptures is a statue, No. 4901 of the Calcutta Museum, which has been illustrated and described by Professor Vogel.³ It is much injured, the head, the left foot, and the two hands being broken off. The pedestal shows, in the centre, a seated Bodhisattva, with two male devotes to the left and two female ones to the right.

Beneath this relief is a raised border, and below a plain surface containing a Kharoshthi inscription in two lines, which has been noticed or edited by Messrs. Hoernle,⁴ Senart,⁵ Vogel,⁶ Banerji,⁷ and Majumdar.⁸

The length of the two lines is 16 in. and 8½ in., respectively, and the size of individual letters varies between ½ in. and 1½ in.

The characters are evidently late. We may note the short vertical terminating the horizontals in ṇha, va and ra, and the square ya with the left limb projecting above the top-line, which we know from the Arā inscription.

The date is quite clear, viz. sa 1 1 1 100 10 4 4 Prokhavadasa di 20 4 4 1, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk’s calculations, to the 27th August A.D. 234.

Then follows Buddhagoshasa danamukhe, where only the final akṣhara, the last of 1. 1, is damaged.

L. 2 opens with Saghurumasa, which name Professor Vogel has rightly explained

---

⁰ JA, ix, xiii, 1899, p. 528.
¹ L’art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhāra, ii, p. 490¹.
² ASIAR, 1903–4, p. 251, plate LXIX b.
³ A. Caddy, *Report to the Government of Bengal* (Chakdara, the 13th May, and Mansahera, the 18th July, 1896), pp. 10 f.
⁴ JA, ix, xiii, 1899, pp. 526 ff., with plate.
⁵ ASIPU, 1903–4, pp. 50, 53; 1904–5, pp. 20 f.; ASIAR, 1903–4, pp. 251 ff., and plate LXX, no. 5.
⁶ Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 40.
⁷ J&PASB, xviii, 1922, pp. 63 f., and plate iv; List, no. 33.
as corresponding to Skr. Saṅghavarma, taking Saṅghavarma to be a second donor in addition to Buddhaghosha.

The last word was read as sadarabhatika, 'together with his wife and brother', by M. Senart, and as sadarastara by Professor Vogel and Mr. Majumdar, the latter adding the translation 'together with his wife Iśvari'.

Now we shall see that the same word recurs in other Loriyān Tangai inscriptions, in connexion with other names, and we should have to infer that the name Iśvari must have been very common, if Mr. Majumdar's translation were right.

Moreover, we have no examples of the mentioning of two donors in this way, and, further, it would not be good grammar to draw the concluding word to the last name only.

A priori we should expect the last word of the record to indicate some relationship between the two persons mentioned. We may compare, e.g., the Brāhmī inscriptions nos. 29, 40, 918, and 925 of Lüders' List: aryya-OGhaya tishya gauyaya aryya-Pālasya varadhahara vāchakasya aryya-Dattasya tishya vāchako aryya-Sīha, the preacher Arya-Simha, the pupil of the preacher Arya-Datta, (who was) the companion (sādhamchara) of the gauṇī Arya-Pāla, (who was) the pupil of Arya-Ogha; daññu bhikkhussya Buddhadasassya Saṅghamitrasadavihāriya, gift of the monk Buddhadasa, the companion of Saṅghamitra; bhikkhussya Pushyavuddhissya saddhavesvāriya bhikkhussya Balasya, of the friar Bala, the companion of the friar Pushyaviddhi.

These inscriptions give us the clue to the correct reading and interpretation of this and other Loriyān Tangai records.

The third akṣara, after sada- is, so far as I can see, whether ra nor re, but ui, and the fourth is, as already stated, clearly the same ya as is found in the Árā inscription. We must, therefore, read sadaviyarisa, and it is evident that this means the same thing as sādhamchara and sādhavesvāri in the Brāhmī inscriptions quoted above, one of which had the same d for dh as our record. We may compare the sādhamchara of the Divyāvadāna and Pāli saddhavesvāri, which show how familiar this word was with ancient Buddhists. We have already seen that we must reckon with a rather advanced stage of development in the Loriyān Tangai dialect, where Saṅghavarman becomes Saṅghoruma, and the substitution of y for ā in sadaviyari cannot make difficulties. It is, however, possible that the word represents Skr. *sādhamavesvāri.

The meaning remains the same.

TEXT

L. 1 Sā 1 1 1 100 10 4 1 4 4 Prothavadasa di 10 4 1 1 1 Budhaghoshasa dañāmu[kke] 1
2 Saghorumasa sadaviyarisa.

TRANSLATION

Anno 318, the 27. d. of Praushṭapada, gift of Buddhaghosha, the companion of Saṅghavarma.

XLI. PLATE XXI. 2: LORIYĀN TANGAI INSCRIPTION, No. 4860

No. 4860 of the Calcutta Museum, entered in the books on the 20th January, 1898, as brought from Loriyān Tangai by Mr. Caddy, is a statue, representing the Buddha sitting cross-legged, in the dhyānamudrā, on a lotus fruit.

Below the folds of the garment is a Kharoshthi inscription in two lines, 5 in. and 3½ in. long respectively, which has not formerly been noticed.

The akṣaras, which are of the same kind as in other Loriyān Tangai inscriptions, vary in size from ½ in. to 1½ in., and are badly drawn and executed with little
care and understanding. We may note the late shape of *bu*, which reminds us of the Jauliai records, the quite exceptional *mu*, and the ancient *sa*, with a distinct prolongation of the lower limb. There cannot be any doubt that the style is very debased.

The first letter is clearly *bn*, and the next *dho*. The top-stroke is very faint, but the alignment of the akshara shows that it cannot be *ro*. The third is *ru*, with a defective *u*-loop, and the fourth and fifth *māsa*. We must, consequently, read *Budhorumasa*, a form of the same kind as *Saghoruma* in the preceding inscription.

The next word is clearly *dadhamukhi*, though the writing is rather irregular. The *da* and the *pa* have been connected by bending the vertical of *pa* backwards; the *mu* has an exceptional shape, and the *e*-stroke of *khe* is almost invisible.

The second line presents so many curious forms that the reading can only be conjectural.

The first akshara may be *kham* and the second *da*. The third reminds us of the second *ba* of the Loriyan Tangai inscription No. 4871. But there we have a horizontal top-bar continued in a small curve forwards instead of a vertical. Here we have a letter looking like an *a*, with a broad curve attached to the termination. If we compare the writing of *da sa* in l. 1, we become inclined to think of a cursive *vānu*. *Khandavaṇa* might be compared with the name *Khandāgiri* and be considered as the name of the place where the stūpa is situated. Then follows an akshara which might be *ru*, or rather *tu*. The *u*-curve seems to be of the same kind as in *ru*, l. 1. The next akshara is apparently *ba*, of an older shape than in l. 1, and then follows what is almost certainly *ga*. The last letter, finally, might be *mi*. *Tubhagami* might be a contamination of *stubhagami* and *thubhagami* and represent a Skr. *stūpaka*. With the utmost reserve I therefore read as follows:

**Text**

L. 1 Bu[dh]orumasa da[damukhi]

2 Khaṇḍa[vaṇatu]baga[mi].

**Translation**

Gift of Buddhavarma, in the Khaṇḍavana stūpa.

**XLII. Plate XXI. 3: LORIYĀN TANGAI INSCRIPTION, No. 4871**

No. 4871 of the Calcutta Museum, entered in the books on the 20th January, 1898, is a statue from Loriyan Tangai, which has been illustrated and described by Professor Vogel as probably belonging to a comparatively late date. It represents the Buddha, seated cross-legged on an ornamental stool.

The sculpture is provided with a Kharoshthi inscription in two lines, 4½ in. and 5 in. long, incised on the cloth hanging down from the Buddha's seat and following the folds of the drapery. The size of individual letters varies from ½ in. to 1 in. The middle portion of the second line is defaced.

The inscription was read by Professor Vogel as *Budhamitrāsa Budharakshidasa sadareṣariṣa daṇamukhe*.

The first akshara stands alone between two folds, and is of the same kind as in No. 4860. The second *bu* has its top turned into a forward curve, probably on account of the rounding of the stone. The *khi* is irregular and looks almost like a *di*.

---

2 ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 253, with plate LXVIII a.
3 l.c., pp. 245, no. 9, 453, with plate LXX, no. 8; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 32.
Loriyán Tangai Inscriptions

L. 2. The first three aksharas are clearly sasa, though the third might be dva. The fourth consists of a sloping angle and can hardly be anything else than ya. The fifth is a damaged ri, and it is separated from the ensuing sa by an interval. We thus have sadayarisa, which may be a slip for sadavirisa or a synonym, Skr. *sardhamcharin. The two last aksharas are damaged, but certainly mukhe.

Text

L. 1 Budhamitrāsa [Buddhakshita-
2 sa sadayarisa danamukhe].

Translation

Gift of Buddhakshita, the companion of Buddhakshita.

XLIII. Plate XXI. 4: Loriyán Tangai Inscription, No. 4995

No. 4995 of the Calcutta Museum, entered in the Museum register on the 21st January, 1898, is a headless statue from Loriyán Tangai, representing a Bodhisattva, sitting in European fashion on a stool. The right leg has been drawn up; the left foot and the sandal of the right one are placed on a footstool shaped like a lotus-fruit.

The footstool bears a Kharoshți inscription, which is much damaged, because the bottom of the stone is broken. It has been edited by Professor Vogel, with plates illustrating the image and the inscription.¹

The inscription consists of one line, with some aksharas added above the last letters, and is about 7 in. long, the size of individual letters varying from $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to $\frac{3}{4}$ in. The bottom of most aksharas is damaged, and the reading is, on the whole, beset with difficulties. The characters are of the same late type as in other Loriyán Tangai records. We may note the shape of mn, the position of the e-stroke above the head of kha, and the pa-like ya.

Professor Vogel read the two first words as Amohakasa danamukhe and left the remaining portion untransliterated.

The first akshara is almost certainly a. The second may be me, though the e-stroke is placed at the right extremity of the upper curve and seems to project a little above the curve. This projection is, however, perhaps not intended. On the other hand, our akshara is strikingly like the kha of Buddhakshita in no. 4871, and as the bottom is broken off, the vertical has evidently been longer. I therefore think it probable that we should read ksha or ksha. The third letter can be i or hi. The bottom is broken, so that we cannot see whether it was curved back or not. The i-stroke is certain. Then follows the top of an a. The apparent i-stroke is nothing else than the broken edge of the stone. The ensuing sa is certain. With every reserve I therefore read aksa or aksha, taking aksha, akshia to be a name, Skr. akshayika or akshayam.

The next word is danamukhe, with a dental n.

The next letter is evidently the upper portion of a sa, and what follows looks like the dha of the Jaulia inscriptions. Then comes a letter which might be thu or rna. It seems possible to read the two next aksharas as rata, and the whole may be sadharama-
rata, Skr. sadharmarata, rejoicing in the true law.

Then comes an akshara which looks like sa, and further a continuation of the left upright in a broad curve, so that the whole looks like sam, written together somewhat like dana in no. 4860. A long vertical is then drawn parallel to the left bar, perhaps as

¹ ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 254, and plates LXVIII c and LXX, fig. 7; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 30.
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correction in order to separate ły and ma. The next akshara may be na. Then comes a vertical, with an indenture towards the top, followed by a sa, raised above the line, and a da. Above the last aksharas we can distinguish a ja, a ri at a somewhat higher level, and a sa. With great reserve I therefore read šamanasa sadayarisa and restore the whole as follows:

TEXT

TRANSLATION
Gift of Akshayika, the companion of the Śramaṇa Saddharmarata.

XLIV. PLATE XXI. 5: LORIYĀN TANGAI INSCRIPTION, No. 5095

No. 5095 of the Calcutta Museum, entered in the register on the 25th January, 1898, is a fragmentary bas-relief from Loriyān Tangai, representing a preaching Buddha sitting cross-legged on a full-blown lotus.

Below is a Kharoshṭhī inscription, 7 ¾ in. long, with letters ¾ in. to ⅜ in. high, which has been edited by Professor Vogel.

With regard to the characters we may again note the position of the e-stroke in (daṇamukhe).

The first words are certainly, as read by Professor Vogel, Sihamitrasa daṇamukhe, though the e-stroke of Si is very indistinct.

The third word he reads as Sāhilasa, Skr. Sāhilakasya, and this reading is perhaps the most likely one. In the photograph, however, there are faint traces of an e-stroke across the first akshara, and I am inclined to read si; cf. the name Sihila in the Taxila Vase inscription. The bottom stroke of hi is almost invisible, but certain. There is a very distinct line running obliquely into the front-limb of la, and it seems necessary to read hi. Sihīlā may be compared with Akṣhāla of no. 4995.

Then follow sa, da, and, so far as I can see, vi, for which Dr. Vogel read re. I restore sadaviyarisa.

TEXT
Sihamitrasa daṇamukhe S[i]hil[a]sa sadaviyarisa.

TRANSLATION
Gift of Sīhāmitra, the companion of Sīhilīka.

XLV. PLATE XXII. 1: JAMĀLGARHI INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 359

According to Cunningham,3 Jamālgarhi is a village to the south of the Pājā ridge, which separates Līṅkhor from Sādām, just at the point where the Gadar Rūd breaks through the hills. It is nearly equidistant from Mārdān, Takhti-Bāhi, and Shāhbāzgarhī. From the first it bears nearly due north eight miles; from the second it bears east-north-east; and from the last it is nearly north-west. It is situated in 34° 20' N. and 72° 4' E.

During the excavations carried on by the Archaeological Department in the winter 1920-1 an inscribed stone was found in removing the debris in court 7. Estampages were sent to the Director General, at whose request Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni

---

1 ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 253 f., with plates lxviii b and lxx, fig. 6; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 31.
2 ASI, v. 1875, p. 46.
prepared a preliminary transcript, which was published by Mr. Hargreaves with some remarks contributed by Professor Thomas.

Mr. Hargreaves describes the stone as a rough block of greenish mica schist, measuring 21 in. x 10 in. x 3 in. The inscribed portion is 20 in. x 3 in. and is smoothly dressed. The stone is broken at both ends and the back is irregular. Mr. Hargreaves thinks that it was one of the courses of a wall, as both ends and the back were not originally carefully dressed. From the general appearance he infers that the missing portion cannot have been great.

The stone is now in the Peshawar Museum as Inscription no. 23.

The inscription consists of two lines, separated by a deep line over the whole surface, and the average height of the aksharas is 1 in. They are deeply cut and regular in shape, and can, on the whole, be read without any difficulty. There is, however, a damaged portion towards the end of l. 1, and in a few places the engraving has caused the stone to peel off outside the outlines of the letters.

The execution of the characters seems to be very careful, and they have a very ornamental look. On the other hand, there are almost no characteristic features, which enable us to draw chronological conclusions. We may note the la of l. 2, with the curve at the top of the vertical, which has its nearest parallels in Ashoka’s inscriptions. The general impression left by the inscription is that it has been drawn up by a calligrapher and not by a person who was in the habit of using the alphabet for practical purposes. Moreover, we are sometimes reminded of the Jaulia inscriptions, where we find something of the same ornamentalism and very similar forms of individual letters; cf. ka, ga, ta, da, dka, na, ra, and sa.

L. 1 opens with the date, and it is not likely that anything is missing. The first akshara is sam, where the anusvara is marked by a slight forward bend of the vertical. Then follow the figures 1 1 1 100 20 20 10 4 4 1, i.e. 359, where the second 20 is written so near the ensuing 10 that it has evidently been added subsequently. It also stands so near the preceding 20 that it cannot well have been written before the 10 had been incised. The engraver evidently first wrote 339, and then noticed that he had made a mistake and added the second 20. It is less likely that he has wanted to correct 339 to 349, because the 10 was evidently there in his draft.

Then follows a word which Mr. Daya Ram suggested to read as iśpailasa or ikailasa, but which Professor Thomas was no doubt right in reading as aśpailasa, Skr. aśvayujah. It will be seen that the stone has peeled off in several places, so that it looks as if there were a horizontal across the head of the initial a, an h-loop below i, and only traces of the loop of n. Then follows padhanamahini, with anticipation of the ensuing nasal in the second and third syllables; cf. danañjñukhe in the Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168.

The date is, accordingly, the first Aśvayuj 359, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk’s calculations, to the 24th August A.D. 275.

Then follows shavaena, i.e. Skr. śravakena, and Padaena, where the stone has peeled off, so that the head of e looks as if it were broken above, and, on the other hand, joined the curve of na, which is, in its turn, damaged, the result being an akshara looking like ksha. Moreover, the peeling off has brought about the appearance of a big loop at the bottom of na. There cannot, however, be any doubt about the reading Padaena, which word gives the name of the śravaka. We may compare names such as Pota, Potayo, which occur in later inscriptions.

2 Cf. e.g. Ep. Ind., v, p. 68; viii, p. 10; xi, p. 316; xiii, pp. 2, 10.
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After Podena the peeling off is more extensive than elsewhere, and the lines visible are rather confused. Mr. Majumdar reads su, which he connects with the ensuing letters, haichi, to sahachi, Skr. sahīdāth, with his friends. The plate will show that the stone is damaged in this place, in addition to the peeling off consequent of the engraving. Even the deep line separating ll. 1 and 2 has disappeared, and also the aksharas in ll. 2 below are damaged. It therefore seems to me that the big loop below the missing akshara is of the same kind as the apparent loop below the preceding na, and I read sahachi, Skr. sahāyāth or sahāyēbhyaḥ, the same word as is used in the Fatehjang and Peshāwar Museum inscriptions, though saha chi, together with these, is also possible.

Then follow pida and a damaged akshara which cannot be anything else than phu. We shall see below that only two aksharas seem to be missing in ll. 2. If we assume that not more has been lost in ll. 1 neither, we become inclined to restore pīdāpurēhi.

ll. 2. The first akshara is damaged. The existing traces are more in favour of u than of o. Then comes dīlikehi, with peelings off producing the appearance of a continuous line from the right end of the i-stroke of hi and to the upright of a. Udiśikā is evidently the designation of the companions, sahīyas, mentioned in ll. 1, who apparently comprise a family, and it is just as inexplicable as other designations of such associations (sahīyas, sahācharas) in other inscriptions.¹

The next four letters were read as ivernūṇa by Mr. Daya Ram, while Mr. Majumdar seems to read ivernā, which he translates 'a jewel, i.e. an image of the Buddha'. I follow him in thinking that the marks in front of ra, which Mr. Daya Ram took to be an u-loop, are simply due to the peeling off of the stone. The last akshara, on the other hand, is certainly īe. If we compare rajubhāmi of the Hidra and tawakāhāmi ranidānmu of the Kurram inscription, it seems probable that rahe is Prakrit rahe, Skr. rahe, in the forest, grove.

The preceding iever is more difficult. We might think of explaining i as corresponding to Skr. cha² and ve to vai. If we compare the shortening of the left limb of sa in se of the first line of the Pāṇā inscription, which hails from the same neighbourhood, we shall, however, become inclined to think that iever is misdrawn for ieste.

Then follows prēhanīde, which evidently corresponds to Skr. pṛkhapīṭaḥ. We have already found pī for prati in the Taxila gold plate.

The next word was read dhahanīkhe by Mr. Daya Ram, who tentatively explained it as corresponding to Skr. dhānmaṇḍikā. I think, however, that Professor Thomas was right in reading dhanaūṭe, Skr. dhānamukta. There is a short stroke to the right of mu, but it is evidently due to the peeling off of the stone. In atke for yunukha we may note the regular t for tt, old θ, while an uncompound intervocalic t becomes d in Podena, pīda, prēhanīde.

Of the next word, which cannot have contained more than two aksharas, only the first one is partly preserved. It seems to be o. If we compare what follows with the fifth akshara of the line, we shall find so much similarity that I feel justified in restoring ke, explaining oke as corresponding to Skr. okā, Pāli okā, a homestead, an asylum.

The remaining aksharas are perfectly clear, parīvṛhate sarvasa, and as the traces of a letter visible after sa seem to be the angular back-limb of a pha, we can restore the last word as sarvasapana.

It is accordingly possible to restore the whole record with great probability as follows:

¹ We may perhaps compare forms of the name Udyāna such as those mentioned by Professor Thomas, JRAS, 1906, p. 461.
² Cf. ja in the Mathurā Lion Capital and Wardak Vase inscriptions, ji in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada A' 6, B 34; t, ibidem, B 17, 36.
JAMĀLGARHI STONE AND PEDESTAL INSCRIPTIONS

TEXT

L. 1 sait 1 1 1 100 20 20 10 4 1 Aṣpā[ū]sa paṇḍharmāṇi shavaena Pod[ena sa]ṛhaei pida[pu]trehā[:]

TRANSLATION

Anno 359, on the first of Aśvaryuj, an asylum connected with religion was established in this grove by the śrāvaka Potaka, with (or, for) the Uddilaka companions, father and sons, in the acceptance of all beings.

XLVI. PLATE XXII. 2: JAMĀLGARHI PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

In the year 1907-8 Dr. Spooner obtained a fragment of a small sculpture from a peasant at Jamālgarhi, who stated that it had been found in a neighbouring field. On his visit to the site in January 1912 Sir Aurel Stein purchased another fragment from a cultivator, probably the very person who brought the first one.

The two pieces fit together and form the pedestal of a standing statue, of which only the feet are left. It is now in the Peshāwar Museum, No. 501.

Below the statue is a defaced figure, seated cross-legged on a throne, between Corinthian pilasters, and with two attendants on each side, and further down is a Kharoshṭhi inscription in two lines, the lower, longer, one 11 in., the upper 10 in. long. The characters are from % in. to 1 in. high.

The characters are on the whole well drawn, but the ga of l. 2 is misshaped and looks like ti, with a small vertical in the top angle, which has its parallel in the ga of the upper line of the Shahr-i-Nāpursān pedestal inscription. They are evidently late. Kha reminds us of the Arā and Jaulīā inscriptions, tha of the Arā and Dewāi records, ya of the Wardak Vase, and sa of the Jamālgarhi inscription of the year 359, and, in the word vasetha, of the Peshāwar Museum inscription of the year 168.

L. 1. The first letter is hopelessly defaced. The existing traces may be interpreted as pointing to a or ain. The second seems to be ba, and the third is e. We may perhaps restore ambae and see in this the genitive of ambā. There are some indistinct traces of letters in the space above, and it is possible that it contained the name of a person in the genitive, in which case we should have to translate ‘by the mother of . . .’. Or else Ambā may be the name of a woman.

Then follows a sa, with a small vertical above the head, which might be an e-stroke. If we compare the unmistakable se which follows, however, and the sixth akṣara from the end, where we have a similar vertical, we become inclined to consider the apparent vertical as accidental and to read sa. The next akṣaras are clearly vasethabhariae, and we must, accordingly, read savasethabhariae, which can hardly mean anything else than ‘together with Vaseṭha’s (Vāsishṭha’s) wife’. It is accordingly tempting to restore Vasethasa ambae savasethabhariae, of the mother of Vāsishṭha together with Vāsishṭha’s wife.

The next words are dayamukhe sa[rvasa]tu[ṇa] puyae, where the na of dama has an

1 Cf. ASIFC, 1907-8, p. 3.
2 Ibidem, 1911-12, p. v; ASIAR, 1911-12, Pt. I, pp. 23 ff.
3 Majumdar, List, no. 20.
4 It is hardly possible to read savasethabhatiar, together with her brother (khaṭriksa) Vāsishṭha, if we compare the difference in shape between tva, l. 1, and no.l. 2.
unusual bend of the vertical, rva is damaged, and the ensuing sa has disappeared in the break between the two pieces of which the pedestal consists.

Then follows a sa with a curve to the right, which might be explained as a subscript pa, assuming svu to have become spa in the same way as svu becomes spa. It seems, however, more probable that the curved hook is the sign of length which we find, in this form, in the Sanskrit verses contained in one of the Kharoshthi documents found by Sir Aurel Stein in Eastern Turkestan, and I therefore read sā, and take this together with the ensuing aksharas, miṣa, to represent Skr. svāmikasya, of the master, wherewith it is difficult to say whether the 'master' is the husband or the ruler or principal.

The next akshara seems to be cha, but the head is damaged. Then follows an incomplete a, which is to be connected with the letters written above in the upper line, which are evidently meant to be rogadakshīṇī; though the ga is misdrawn and looks like ti, with a small vertical in the angle of the head, as mentioned above. It is possible that the draft has had gha, as in the Taxila meridarkh plate, which helps us to restore the whole as aragadakshīṇīāe.

Text

L. 1 [ān]bhæ saVasephabharīa daṇamukhe sa[rvRa]sa*]tvana puyaṃ sāṃiṣa [cha a-
2 ro[ga]dakṣīṇī[ae*].

Translation

Gift of the mother (or, Ambā), together with the wife of Vāsishṭha, in honour of all beings and for the benefit of health for the Master.

XLVII. Plate XXII. 3: JAMĀLGAṚHI IMAGE HALO INSCRIPTION

On the halo of a statue from Jamālgaṛhi, which seems at the present day to have disappeared, Cunningham found a short Kharoshthi inscription, which he read as saṃphā daṇamukha. M. Senart suggested to read the first word as sapta, and Professor Vogel read sapta; while Mr. Majumdar seems to read sapta, but translates 'fruitful'.

If any reliance can be placed in Cunningham's plate, we can only read saphta, or, perhaps, supta. And the analogy of all records containing the word daṇamukha shows that it must be the genitive of a name, denoting the donor. Sapta or Supha might correspond to Greek Σόφη.

Text

Sapta daṇamukha.

Translation

Gift of Saphā.

XLVIII. Plate XXII. 4: JAMĀLGAṚHI PILASTER BASE INSCRIPTION

Cunningham also found at Jamālgaṛhi part of a pilaster base, bearing a Kharoshthi inscription. A new reading was given by Professor Vogel.

The fragment was deposited in the Calcutta Museum, but has been lost sight of.

I now edit the inscription from a photograph.

1 Cf. Stein, Serindia, plate xxiv.
2 ASI, v, 1875, pp. 49, 63 f., and plate xvi, 8.
3 ASIPU, 1903–4, p. 53; ASIAR, 1903–4, pp. 248 f.
4 I. c., p. 63, and plate xvi, 7.
5 List, no. 16.
6 II. es. pp. 52 and 54, and p. 248; Majumdar, no. 15.
7 Bloch, List of Negatives, Indian Museum, no. 997.
JAMALGARHI AND LAHORE MUSEUM INSCRIPTIONS

It consists of two lines, the first of which is incomplete. The characters seem to be of the same kind as the Hashtnagar inscription.

The first word was restored by Professor Vogel as Buddhavarumasa, Skr. Buddhavarmanah. Cunningham read Buddhava masa. A Buddhavarna is mentioned in a Mathurā Brāhmi inscription of the year 51.1

After Buddhavarumasa we have a distinct che, which may perhaps be restored into chetiye, Skr. chatiye. After this we should expect some such word as daṇamukhe.

L. 2 was read by Professor Vogel as [eka] thunja, Skr. ekā sthāna, one pillar. We may compare the gift of Chaitya pillars (chātikākha) registered in two Amaravati inscriptions.2

TEXT

L. 1 Buddhavarumasa che[tiye daṇamukhe*]
   2 [eka] thunja.

TRANSLATION

(Gift) of Buddhavarna (in the) chai(tya), one pillar.

XLIX. PLATE XXII. 5: LAHORE MUSEUM HALO INSCRIPTION

The Buddhavaruma inscription bears great similarity to a fragmentary record found on a broken Buddha image of unknown provenance, which is now No. 257 of the Lahore Museum.3

The inscription is found on the broken halo behind the head. It is only a fragment, $\frac{3}{4}$ in. long, and the characters are $\frac{3}{2}$ in. to $\frac{5}{4}$ in. high.

It has been published by Professor Vogel,4 whose reading and restoration are Bosavarumasa da[ṇamukhe*]. The name Bosavaruma, with its dental s, does not look Indian. Professor Lüders has suggested to me that bōsa may be the Chinese p'u-sa, a Bodhisattva, and it is tempting to accept this explanation. At the time when our inscription was drawn up Chinese p'u-sa was certainly pronounced 'with a b and an o'. The pronunciation in the T'ang period was, according to Karlgren No. 1167, b'u'o-sa.5

TEXT

Bosavarumasa da[ṇamukhe*].

TRANSLATION

Gift of Bosavarman.

L. PLATE XXII. 6: LAHORE PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

There is also another fragmentary inscription, of unknown origin, which seems to agree with the Jamālgarhi records in palaeography. It is found on a pedestal, No. 679 of the Lahore Museum, showing the feet of a Bodhisattva, with a relief below.6

On the border below the relief are two Kharoshthi letters, $\frac{2}{4}$ in. high, after which the surface of the stone is destroyed over a distance of $2\frac{1}{4}$ in., so that not more than ten aksharas can have been lost.

The record has been edited by Professor Vogel,6 who read the aksharas as sanhe

---

1 Lüders, List, no. 52.
2 Lüders, List, no. 1210, 1229.
3 Lüders, List, no. 1210, 1229.
4 Vogel, ASIAR, 1903-4, pl. LXVI. 3.
5 ASIPI, 1903-4, pp. 50, 53, and l.c., pp. 244, no. 3, p. 249, and plate LXX. 3; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 27.
6 Burgess, Journal of Indian Art and Industry, viii, no. 63, pl. XIII, 4; Vogel, ASIAR, 1903-4, pl. LXVI. 4.
7 ASIPI, 1903-4, p. 50; l.c., p. 249 and pl. LXX. 3; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 29.
and took this as the beginning of the donor's name in the genitive, after which the word *dayamukhe* has probably followed. The first akshara is like the initial *sam* of the Jaimalgarhi inscription of the year 359, but the reading *su* seems to be preferable.

**TEXT**

Suhe...

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift of) Suhe...

**LI. PLATE XXII. 7: JAMĀLGARHĪ LAMP INSCRIPTION**

A fragment of a stone lamp was unearthed during the excavations at Jaimalgarhi in February, 1912, and is now in the Peshawar Museum, as No. 01874. It is 3 3/4 in. long and 2 3/4 in. high, and is inscribed with six complete and one fragmentary Kharoshthi letters, varying in size from 1/8 in. to 1 1/2 in. The inscription was read by Mr. Hargreaves as *samijjatuvama[ma]*.

The letters are deeply cut, but partly badly drawn. The third can, as it stands, hardly be *ji*, or *je*, unless we assume that it has been turned the wrong way. It may be a damaged *e*. The fifth is too short to be *bu*, and I should prefer to read *tu*. If we read *samiedatuvam*, it is perhaps likely that *sam* is the last part of the locative of a word ending in *sa*, and that *edatuvam* should be restored as *edatuvami*, where *tu* might be of the same kind as in No. XLI, so that the meaning might be 'in the stūpa of Aida', or 'in the ram stūpa'. It would also be possible to consider the short stroke at the bottom of *da* as remnants of an *u*-mātrā and to compare *edu* with *eduka*, which we have thought to find in the Kala Sang inscription. But we cannot well read *du* in face of the distinct *u*-loop of the ensuing akshara. As a mere guess I therefore arrive at the following reading and interpretation:

**TEXT**

... *sa* edatuvam[*]*.

**TRANSLATION**

... *sa*, in the Aida-stūpa.

**LIII. PLATE XXII. 8: JAMĀLGARHĪ PAVEMENT STONE INSCRIPTION**

During a visit to Jaimalgarhi in the beginning of 1912 Sir Aurel Stein discovered a Kharoshthi inscription of eleven characters, each about 2 3/4 inches long, incised into one of the slabs of slaty stone which form the pavement round the main stūpa excavated under General Cunningham's order in 1873. The inscription shows plainly characters of the Kushāna period. Its chronological interest is evident; for placed as it was and scratched into a stone of no great hardness it could not have retained its legibility if it had lain exposed for a long series of years. It seems therefore probable that the period when the Stūpa court was finally abandoned is not separated by a very great interval from the time when these characters were scratched in, perhaps by some pious visitor.

The stone is now in the Peshawar Museum, as No. 01873. According to Mr. Majumdar it contains a number of holes, which were intended, as Mr. Hargreaves rightly suggests, to hold offerings of coins, a custom that continues even to the present day. A

---

1 ASIFC, 1920-1, pp. 6, 27, no. 228; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 18.

2 Cf. ASIFC, 1911-12, p. v; ASIAR, 1911-12, P. 1, pp. 12, 23 f.; Majumdar, List, no. 19.
pavement slab, with a copper coin of Vāsudeva in one of its holes, has actually been found at Jamālgarhī.

The heads of the first aksharas are missing, and the reading is, consequently, uncertain.

Of the first only an u-mātra remains. I feel, however, confident that it was bu. Of the second we see the lower part of a vertical, with an evident bend at about the level of the top of the u-mātra of [š]u, wherefore we must almost certainly read dhā. Then comes a somewhat longer vertical, which I take to represent ra, and afterwards traces, which Sir Aurel took to represent two letters, but which I feel convinced belong together and must be read as kṣhi. It looks as if the engraver has misunderstood his draft and separated the right limb from the rest.

The ensuing akshara is certainly da, and then comes what looks like the head of a sa, followed by an e. The state of things met with in the case of kṣhi, leads me to think that the engraver has again misunderstood his draft and separated the sa into two aksharas, taking the head as a separate letter. In that case we should have to assume that the sa was provided with the projection of the leg which we find in old inscriptions and in later ones where we have some reason for suspecting that the writers were more influenced by traditional patterns than by daily practice.

I therefore read the beginning as [B]u[dharakshi]da[sa].

Then comes a distinct ta, followed by an akshara which seems to be a badly drawn na and a very long ma. The unusual length of the right termination of the last akshara leads me to think that the engraver had before him nu and not na, and to restore the whole as tanam[š]khe, where the writing ta for da can be explained by the confusion between ta and da occasioned by the voicing of intervocalic t.

I find some confirmation of my reading in a Jamālgarhī inscription mentioned by Mr. Majumdar, which has evidently been lost sight of. Mr. Majumdar could not trace it in the Museum, but he saw impressions which seem to have given the reading Budharakshitasa bhikshusā danamukha.

I therefore read as follows:

TEXT

TRANSLATION
Gift of Buddharakshita.

LIII. PLATE XXII. 10: HASHTNAGAR PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 384

Hashtnagar, i.e. the eight towns, is a modern name given to eight small villages on the left bank of the Swāt river, above its confluence with the Kābul river, on the site of the ancient town Pushkalāvati, the Peukelaotis of Greek writers. The modern names of the villages, from south to north, are Prāng, Chārsadda, Rājar, Utmanzai, Tarangzai, Umarzai, Sherpao, and Tangai.

The history of the site has been summed up by Messrs. Marshall and Vogel in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1902–3, pp. 141 ff. It was conquered by Alexander, who established a Macedonian garrison there. Hūan-tsang states that two of its stūpas were built by Aśoka, and Fa-hien narrates that Aśoka’s son Dharmavivaradhana ruled in the place where the Buddha had made a gift of his

1 List, No. 17.
eyes, i.e. at Pushkalavati. At a later date, and probably under Kaniṣhka, the capital was transferred to Peshāwar, and Pushkalavati lost its political position. Buddhist religion and art, however, continued to flourish, perhaps down to the sixth century, when Mihirakula, the ruler of the White Huns, destroyed the stūpas of Gandhāra. When Huān-tsang visited the place between A.D. 629 and 645 the monuments were ruined.

The history of Hashtnagar consequently extends far down into the period of Kaniṣhka and his successors. The era instituted by him does not, however, seem to have been regularly used there, any more than in Loriyān Tangai and Jamālgarhi.

At the village of Rājar a road runs eastwards to Khānnai, and on the north side of this road, about half a mile from Rājar, lies a mound known as the Pālāṭu Dheri, which was excavated by Marshall and Vogel in April 1903. They found remnants of a Buddhist monument, which had evidently met with a violent end. About what time this happened may be surmised from the coins found in the courtyard which belong to the late Kusāṇa period. The date of its erection is more difficult to determine, but some hint may be obtained from the fact that the sculptures found here are of superior style, and presumably earlier than those from the adjacent stūpa, while such evidence as there is goes to show that the latter is to be referred to the reign of Zelōnises.

A bānya of Rājar named Ratan had formerly used the mound as a quarry, in order to obtain stones for a dhārmāla, and found a statue of the Buddha, which the Hindūs of Rājar readily recognized as an image of Kālikā Devī, and as such it is still worshipped in the dhārmāla.

It is without arms, and the old head is missing and has been replaced by another. Professors Vogel 1 and Foucher, however, agree in praising the good style of the garment, and the latter states that it must be older than the Buddhas of Kaniṣhka, and draws attention to the fact mentioned by Marshall and Vogel that a Kadphises coin has been found in situ under the base by Ratan, who himself brought it to Marshall and Vogel. The coin, however, can at the utmost prove that the statue is not older than Kadphises.

About 1883 the statue was seen by Mr. L. White King, I.C.S., who was permitted by the villagers to saw off the pedestal, which he found contained a Kharoshṭhi inscription, and this pedestal, which is commonly spoken of as the Hashtnagar pedestal, has been frequently described and illustrated.

The date of the pedestal has been discussed, without reference to the statue, by several scholars. Mr. V. A. Smith 2 thought that its style assigns it to a late date, say the third or fourth century A.D.; Colonel Waddell 3 speaks of its style as fairly good, and M. Foucher 4 thinks that the Corinthian pilasters with panels and the introduction of the donor prevent us from dating it before our era, while the still reasonable disproportion between the Bodhisattva and the two attendants, the individual character of the long haired Brahma and the turbaned Indra, the naturalness of the gestures and the pliable drapery are as many features anterior to the style of Kaniṣhka.

It will be seen that the best authorities are inclined to assign a high age not only

---

1 ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 258, with plate lxix a.  
2 L'art gréco-bouddhique, ii, pp. 490 f., with plate 478.  
3 L.c., p. 548.  
4 ASIAR, 1902-3, p. 151.  
5 Cf. V. A. Smith, JASB, lvi, Pt. i, 1889, pp. 144 ff., with pl. x; Ind. Ant., xviii, 1889, p. 257, with facsimile; J. Burgess, Journal of Indian Art, vii, no. 62, 1898, p. 38, with pl. v, fig. 3, cf. no. 69, 1900, p. 89; Foucher, l.c., pp. 88, 493, fig. 479.  
6 JRAS, 1903, pp. 14, 42.  
7 JRAS, 1913, p. 949.  
8 L.c., p. 552.
HASHTNAGAR PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

to the statue, but also to the pedestal. But then it should be remembered that the sculptures excavated at this site are, as mentioned above, said to be, on the whole, of particularly good style. If the high date assigned to the best Gandhāra art is right, we must, therefore, reckon with the possibility that the artistic tradition in this particular place remained strongly hellenistic and pure down to a comparatively late period. The isolated position of the place may have, in this respect, exercised an influence as in the case of the retention of the old Saka era even after the accession of the Kanishka dynasty.

The inscription is engraved on a band underneath the relief and does not contain anything beside the date. A portion of 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches is, however, broken away on the left side of the pedestal, and, if the writing was continued to the left to the same length as to the right, there may have been about four aksharas after the date.

The date was first read for Mr. King by Sir A. Cunningham \(^1\) as sān 274 embrasāsama masasa ni pañchhami 5, where embrasāsma was explained as representing Greek ἐμμεροςμᾶς, intercalated. M. Senart \(^2\) saw that the last figures of the date were 38 and the month Prothavada, and Bühler \(^3\) had simultaneously and independently arrived at similar results, reading the name of the month as Postavadasa. Vincent Smith \(^4\) compared the readings of these two scholars, and adopted Cunningham's view that the era was the Śaka era, and Bühler remarked \(^5\) that the paleography of the record does not furnish us with sufficient facts for dating it at a great distance from the inscriptions of Kanishka and Huviso. Finally M. Senart \(^6\) read the year as 384, and his reading was, with a slight modification (pañchami for pañchane) adopted by Professor Vogel \(^7\) and Mr. Pargiter.\(^8\)

There cannot be any doubt about the reading; the execution of individual letters being throughout excellent. The only thing to be remarked is that the anuvāra hook is everywhere to be found in the field below the raised band where the inscription is incised. On the other hand, it is hardly possible to base conclusions on the paleography. The cha has the later, cursive, shape, and may be compared with the forms found in the Āra and Wardak records, and sa is of a similar kind. We may note the form pañchami for pañchane, which is evidently influenced by the preceding divasānī.

After the date there are traces of an akshara, but it is impossible to say which. We should expect the name of the donor in the genitive, followed by dāna or dānamukhe.

The only difficulty connected with the record is the question about the era, which has been discussed in the Introduction, where the various views propounded by other scholars have been mentioned and reasons have been given for referring the date to the old Śaka era. According to Dr. van Wijk's calculations it then corresponds to the 7th June, A. D. 300.

TEXT

Sān 1 1 1 100 20 20 20 20 20 4 Prothavadasa masasa divasammi pañchhami 4 1.

TRANSLATION

Anno 384, on the fifth, 5., day of the month Prausṭhāpada.

---

\(^1\) See V. A. Smith, JASB, LVIII, i, 1889, pp. 144 ff.; Ind. Ant., xviii, 1889, pp. 257 ff.

\(^2\) JA, viii, xv, 1889, pp. 124 f.

\(^3\) Ausziger der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, xxxiii, pp. 64 ff.; Ind. Ant., xx, 1891, p. 394.

\(^4\) JASB, lxi, i, 1892, pp. 54 f.; Ind. Ant., xxi, 1894, pp. 156 f.

\(^5\) JASB, lxii, i, 1893, p. 85.

\(^6\) Ind. Ant., xxv, 1896, pp. 311 ff.; cf. Academy, 1895, no. 1252, p. 368.

\(^7\) JA, ix, iii, 1899, pp. 23 ff.

\(^8\) ASIPU, 1903-4, p. 53; ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 250 ff.

\(^9\) Ep. Ind., xlii, p. 32, with plate. Cf. also Rapson, JRAS, 1906, p. 389; Bergny, ibidem, p. 414; Smith, ibidem, 1903, p. 424; Banerji, Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 40; Majumdar, List, no. 12.
LIV. PLATE XXII. 9: PÂLÂTÛ DHERÎ PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

During their excavations at Pâlâtû Dherî in April 1903, Marshall and Vogel found a pedestal of a standing Buddha, which is now No. 626 of the Peshâwar Museum. Of the statue only the feet remain. On the front is a disfigured relief and below a Kharaoshthi inscription, 2 inches long, with seven letters, each, on an average, 1/3 in. high. The first akshara is damaged, only the lower part of a vertical remaining.

The inscription was read by the discoverers as [Ga]dasa danamukhe, with reference to an intaglio said to contain the name Guda, which, as I have stated in the Introduction, plays a role in the legend of St. Thomas and Gondophernes.

I agree with Mr. Majumdar in not being able to read the first letter as ga. What is left is only part of a vertical and, perhaps, traces of an i, or, perhaps, e-mâtrâ, so that we might think of ti, bi, ri or vi. If the traces of an i-stroke are accidental, ga is a possible reading, but ksha, mi, vha and several other possibilities are just as likely.

The second akshara is more like fa than da. We might think of the name Tita found by M. Boyer in a Kharaoshthi legend from Miran in Chinese Turkestan.

It is, however, impossible to do more than to transliterate what can be made out with some degree of certainty.

Text
.. tasa danamukhe.

Translation
Gift of .. ta.

LV. PLATE XXIII. 1-3: PÂLÂTÛ DHERÎ JARS INSCRIPTIONS

The excavation of the Pâlâtû Dherî mound also brought to light some more inscriptions, written in a thin wash on the walls of some jars, which were found in a row from north to south in the south-eastern portion of the mound, each covered with a flat stone.

The characters were almost effaced when the jars were found, so that their form could only be traced after moisture had been applied. They are now practically invisible, and we have to rely on eye-copies made at the time of discovery, from which the accompanying plate has been prepared.

There are three inscribed jars, distinguished as A, B, C, respectively. The inscriptions run in one line horizontally round the body of the vessels, the distance from the spring of the neck being 3 in. to 3 1/2 in. in A, 3 in. to 4 1/2 in. in B, and 1 in. in C.

The discoverers have made an attempt at reading the inscriptions in the second of the publications quoted in the footnote, where some remarks contributed by Messrs. Senart, Boyer, and Lüders have been added. The last mentioned scholar made a further contribution to the reading and interpretation of the records in the same Annual Report for 1903-4. Jar B has now the number 414, and C 415 in the Peshâwar Museum, while A does not bear any number.

A

Inscription A consists of two fragments, each 9 inches long and consisting of ten aksharas, of an average size of 1 1/2 in. I refrain from making any remarks on palaeographical features. The general impression is that all these records are late.

1 ASIPU, 1903-4, p. 54; ASIAR, 1902-3, p. 167, with fig. 16; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 7.
2 JA, x, xvii, pp. 413 ff.
4 pp. 289 ff.; cf. Majumdar, List, nos. 4-6.
M. Senart read what he considered to be the first half as saṅgh(e) chadudīṣe
shama...da. The e of saṅgh(e) is absolutely invisible, and the second word is almost
certainly, as stated by Professor Lüders, chadudīṣī, though the continuation of the vowel-
stroke below the horizontal may be due to a slip of the brush. The di of chadudīṣī has
become so effaced that it looks like e in the eye-copy before me.

I also follow Lüders in reading the next word as shamanana, Skr. śramayanām.
It should be noted that only the dental n is used in this record.

The other half was read by M. Boyer as...ga amaṭa eh danamukha, this jar (Skr.
amatra) is a gift. Professor Lüders reads...rigasa Ksharasa (or Morasa), and restores
...rigasa as parigasa, supposing the name of the special sect which received the gift to
have been given in the lost word preceding [pa]rigaḥa.

So far as I can see, Lüders’ reading and explanation are evidently right. I have
only some doubt about the reading of the word preceding danamukha, which seems more
like gadaasa than ksharasa. A name Gada is well known both from the Krishna legend,
and, as already mentioned, from the Christian tradition about St. Thomas.

With regard to the particular sect mentioned in the lost word or words preceding
[pa]rigaḥa we can apparently infer from inscription B that it was that of the Kāśyapīyas.

We thus arrive at the following reading:

TEXT


TRANSLATION

To the Order of the four quarters, in the acceptance of the... śramaṇas, the gift
of Gadaka (?)

B

The remaining portion of inscription B is 18 inches long, and the average size of the
aksharas is 1 inch. Messrs. Lüders and Senart read it as saṅgh(e) chadudīṣe shamanana-
[na], and the former remarked that the tu of chadudīṣe is very faint and that the form
appearing in the tracing does not bear resemblance to any known Kharoshṭhi letter, but
that it is probably tu or du. The akshara has now disappeared almost entirely, but seems
to be du. Also the last akshara of shamanana is slightly different from the preceding
one, but must evidently be read as na.

Then follows an akshara, which may be ba or ya, and then apparently ha. The
next letter looks like a fa or da. In the eye-copy before me it has the vertical curved
towards the right, while it is turned the other way in the plate published in the Report
of the Archaeological Survey, where it is, moreover, separated from the preceding one by
a longer interval than in the copy before me. If the head was continued to the right of
the vertical, we might think of reading shu. The ensuing letter might be mi, but the
curve is quite different from ma in shamanana, and I think it possible that ti may have
stood on the jar. Then follow traces of an a, followed by the remains of two verticals,
which may have belonged to a ka, and a distinct na. As a possibility I may mention
the reading bhakṣhutakana, Skr. bahuṣrutaḥkāṇām. According to Tārānātha the
Sarvāstivādins reckoned the Bahuṣnutiyas, who are elsewhere mentioned as belonging
to the Mahāsāṃghikas, as one of their own sub-schools, as was also the case with the
Kāśyapīyas.

The next word seems to be Kavasvīyāna, where, however, the šaṅa ends in a curve,
which may perhaps be the subscript ůa. We have already found the writing kaskyaviyana for kastaviyana on the Bedadi copper ladle and seen that it finds its explanation in the fact that sḥi became ṣṭ.

The remaining akshara may be ůa, i.e. Skr. cha, or part of a pa.

The inscription may accordingly be restored as follows:

**TEXT**


**TRANSLATION**

To the order of the four quarters in the acceptance of the Bahuṣrutiyaka and Kaṣyapiya śramaṇas.

C

The lettering is fainter than in the case of A and B and could only be copied with great difficulty. The length of that portion which could be traced was 6 inches, and the average size of the letters ¾ inch.

The inscription was read by M. Boyer as Yasuvaḍa samadāṇadimitrasa, gift of Yasavat with his mother, relatives, and friends. I do not know of any such name as Yasavat. It cannot represent Skr. Yasvat, because ś never becomes s in the dialect. Moreover, the first akshara seems to be the head of a sṛ, and the first word is perhaps shavaasa. Skr. śrāvakasya. The next akshara can hardly be anything else than sṛ, and if the following one is ma, it is perhaps possible to read Dhamasa. Then comes the stroke which M. Boyer took to be a damaged ॐ, a clear ṝ, and an akshara which may be mi, but also a damaged ga. The last two letters are apparently remnants of saṅgha.

With every reserve I therefore read:

**TEXT**

shavaasa Dhamasa [i̯a]ji[ga]saṅgha.

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift) of the śrāvaka Dharma to the congregation of his relatives.

LVI. PLATE XXIII. 4: SAHR-I-BAHLOL POTSHERDS

A similar legend has already been met with in some fragments found at Takhti-Bahi, and Professor Lüders has shown ¹ that an inscription which Cunningham ² found incised on a piece of black pottery at Sahri-Bahlol and which he read as Magho cha, is to be read as saṅgha cha, i.e. saṅgha chaṭudīte.

During his excavations at Sahri-Bahlol in the year 1909-10 Dr. Spooner found a considerable number of pottery fragments with Kharoshthi inscriptions in ink, and on some of them he read the word parigrahe.³ Sir Aurel Stein ⁴ found other fragments of the same kind, one of them bearing not less than 18 aksharas.

No materials are available from which I can form any opinion about the contents. It may be surmised that it has run saṅgha chaṭudīte acharyana Kaśtiyana parigrahe.

---

¹ ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 291.
² ASI, v, 1875, pp. 44, 63, plate xvi, 6.
LVII. Plate XXIII. 5: GHAZ DHERI PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

Ghaz Dheri is a mound opposite Palaṭu Dheri, to the south of the road leading to Khānnai. During their excavations there in 1903, Messrs. Marshall and Vogel found a fragmentary Bodhisattva statue, with traces of a Kharoshṭhi inscription on the pedestal.¹

The pedestal is reported to have been deposited in the Peshawar Museum, where it cannot, however, be traced. Marshall and Vogel say: ‘The proper right part of the legend is entirely destroyed. On the left side the lettering can be traced for a distance of 8 inches, but here also several characters are missing or injured. This part, containing the first half of the inscription, probably contained 16 aksharas, the distance between the letters, as well as their average height being about \(\frac{1}{2}\) in. We read it—\(kha(?)\) lavīśae \(kṣa(?)\) tra(?) \(pā(?)\) sva(?)—\(da(?)\) \(dha(?)\) \(sa(?)\). It will be seen that the greater part of the reading is doubtful. The only aksharas which may be said to be certain are \(la\) \(vi\) \(sa\) \(e\) in the beginning and \(sa\) at the end. Before \(la\) there is room for not more than three letters, but as the initial letter probably stood at some distance from the edge we may assume that there were only two. Of these the second can still be traced and approaches most the sign for \(kha\). If we insert \(pu\) for the missing initial, we shall read \(Pukhalavīśae\) (Skr. \(Pūkhalavīśaya\), “in the district of Pukhala”. The next word is perhaps the gerundive of \(\.\.\.\) \(khaṭrāpa\), “kṣatrap”, and for the third word we naturally expect a proper name.’

So far as I can see \(vīśae\) cannot represent Skr. \(vīṣaya\), because the \(shu\) never becomes \(śa\), unless it is followed by \(y\) in the compound \(sṅya\). Moreover, the word after \(\.\.\.\) \(tavīśae\) seems to be \(danamukhe\). The raised \(mu\) is, so far as I can see, certain. But then the word ending in \(tavīśae\) can only be the genitive of the name of a female donor.

The next word certainly ended in \(sa\), and a comparison of the Shahr-i-Nāpursān pedestal inscription makes me inclined to supply \(aroğadaksīṇae\) after this word.

TEXT

\[\ldots \text{la} \text{viśae} \text{[danamukhe]} \ldots \ldots \text{sa} \text{[aroğadaksīṇae*]}\]

TRANSLATION

Gift of \(\.\.\.\) lavīṣā, (for the bestowal of health on) \(\.\.\.\)

LVIII. Plate XXIII. 6: SHAHR-I-NĀPURSĀN PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

No. 1194 of the Lahore Museum is a Bodhisattva pedestal, excavated in 1882 by Lieutenant M. Martin at Shahr-i-Nāpursān, between Rājar and Utmanzai in Hashtnagar. Of the statue only the feet are left, but on the pedestal is pictured a Bodhisattva with two standing figures on each side, and below is a Kharoshṭhi inscription, which has been published by Professors Bühler² and Vogel.³

The inscription consists of two lines, a long one, and a short one above the termination of the former. The longer is \(14\frac{1}{2}\) in. and the shorter \(2\) in. long, and the average size of letters is \(1\) in. in the former and \(\frac{3}{4}\) in. in the latter.

Bühler drew attention to the cursive forms of such letters as \(da\), \(bu\), \(mu\), which

---

¹ ASIPE, 1903-4, p. 50; ASIAR, 1902-3, p. 176 and figure 231; 1903-4, p. 245, no. 34; Majumdar, List, no. 8.
² Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philologisch-Historische Classe, xxiii, 1896, pp. 64 ff., with plate; Ind. Ant., xxv, 1896, pp. 311 ff.
³ ASIPE, 1903-4, p. 55; ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 249 ff., and plates LXVII. 1, LXX. 4; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 11.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD SAKA ERA

reminded him of the Zeda, Sui Vihār, Mañjikāla, and Wardak Vase inscriptions, and assigned the record to the Kanishka-Vasudeva period. Similar forms are also found in Jauliā.

Bühler and Vogel began the reading at the right corner, where we have arga, followed by remnants of a da and a gap sufficient for three or four letters.

There cannot, however, be much doubt that the inscription begins after the gap, with Saṅghamitrāsah. The last akshara of the name was read as sa by Bühler, while Vogel thinks that it may stand for sya, though it looks like sam. The compound sva, which we know from Sui Vihār, is, however, different and ends in a distinct loop. Moreover, the ensuing word shamanasa has, as remarked by Vogel, the regular termination sa, and there can be little doubt that our sam is a slip for sa.

The ya of shamanasa is damaged. The remaining letters of the line are absolutely certain: danamukhe Budhorumasa. The form Budhoruma for Budhavarma has already been met with in Loriyān Tangai.

As on the Jamālgarhi pedestal the continuation follows in an upper line, where we read arogada[kshīnæ*], which can be restored as arogadakshīnae. We may note the short upright above the head of ga, which we have already found on the Jamālgarhi pedestal.

It has the appearance as if the engraver has not been able to complete the last word, for want of space, and that he has therefore written it once more before the first word of the inscription, where the last three aksharas have subsequently peeled off.

TEXT

L. 1 (arogada[kshīnæ*]) Saṅghamitrāsah shamanasa da[na]mukhe Budhorumasa

2 arogadakshīnae*.

TRANSLATION

Gift of the śramaṇa Saṅghamitra, for the bestowal of health on Budhavarma.

LIX. PLATE XXIII. 7: MIR ZIYĀRAT CLAY SHERD

One of the mounds in the Shahri-Nāparsān group is now called Mir Ziyarat, where a broken sherd of coarse black clay, hand-polished and with some Kharoshṭhī letters scratched on it, was excavated by Messrs. Marshall and Vogel.\(^1\)

The letters seem to be mere scrawls, and they are not arranged in a line. In the proper left corner, at an angle towards the upper end of the sherd, is a letter which may be da or ba. Then follows an akshara which seems to be na or mu, and further, pointing upwards towards the edge, a ye, and, finally, at a somewhat higher level, a vi.

LX. PLATE XXIII. 8: SKĀRAH DHERĪ IMAGE INSCRIPTION

OF THE YEAR 399

Skāraḥ Dherī, or the Charcoal Mound, is situated in 34° 16' N. and 71° 47' E., near the village of Spinvari, eight miles north of Chārsadda. It is the find-place of an inscribed Hārīti statue, which is now no. 1625 of the Lahore Museum.\(^2\)

According to M. Foucher, the style of the image and its execution betray a late date.

The inscription consists of two lines, 16 in. and 13 in. long respectively, the height of individual letters varying from \(\frac{3}{8}\) in. to \(\frac{1}{4}\) in. It bears a date.

---

\(^1\) See ASIAR, 1902-3, pp. 154 ff., and fig. 10, p. 157.

\(^2\) See Vogel, ASIPTU, 1900-1, para. 39; 1901-2, para. 16.
SKĀRAH DHERI IMAGE INSCRIPTION

The date portion was first read by Dr. Stratton,1 whose reading was reproduced by Professor Vogel.2 A reading of the whole record was subsequently given by M. Boyer.3

A new reading of the date was proposed by Dr. Fleet,4 and accepted by Mr. Kennedy5 and myself,6 while M. Boyer, according to M. Foucher,7 Mr. Banerji,8 and Mr. Majumdar9 stick to the old reading, and Professor Thomas10 leaves the question open. A new reading of the record was finally given by myself.11

The inscription is cut vertically to the proper left of the image, and is very rough. The characters seem to be late. We may note the cursive cha, where the head is connected with the lower part in a large loop; de, which reminds us of the Sui Vihār inscription; the broad sa, which has its nearest parallels in the Wardak inscription; and the sa, which sometimes strongly reminds us of Jaunpur.

L. 1. The first word was read vasāra by Dr. Stratton, and varsha by M. Boyer. The long line which crosses the lower part of sa seems to be continued through the ensuing akṣara and can hardly be a r. Besides the regular dialect form of varsha is evidently vasāra; cf. the Takhti-Bahā and Kaldarā inscriptions. I cannot see any trace of an e-stroke, but vashe is evidently intended.

Dr. Stratton held the next word to be either ekunatsisātimas or ekunavatisātimas, and M. Boyer is positive that the former is the correct reading. Dr. Fleet, on the other hand, read ekunachadutīsātimas. M. Majumdar objects against this reading that chadūsītimas can only mean 'the 104th'. But in Sanskrit we have chatukṣutā, 400, and similarly chatūsī in Prākrit. Such numerals were ambiguous, but there is no ambiguity when ekunā precedes.

There is not, therefore, any a priori reason for rejecting Dr. Fleet's reading, which seems to be the only possible one.

The u-mātra of ku is rather indistinct, but I think it is probable. Ekaṇa would represent Skr. ekāṇa. The letter following after sa is peculiar, but cannot be va or ti. I follow Dr. Fleet in taking it to be a cursive cha. The ensuing akṣara is absolutely certain and cannot be anything else than du. Ti, which follows after the ensuing sa, is quite different.

Then comes ashadāsa masasa, where we may note the sa of ashadāsa, in which the head has become separated from the lower vertical.

After masasa comes a cross, which Dr. Stratton took to be the numeral 4, but which M. Boyer rightly read as di.

The ensuing akṣara, which was left untranslated by Dr. Stratton, was taken by M. Boyer to be the figure 10. It seems to me, however, that it is an unmistakable sa.

The last four letters of I. 1 were read as bodhavera by Dr. Stratton, while M. Boyer read Khuṭa12, supposing Khuṭo to be the name of the donor and some such word as haritimurti to have followed.

So far as I can see the first akṣara is certainly sa, with an unusually high top-stroke, which evidently contains the e-mātra. I therefore take it to the preceding

---

1 JAOS, xxiv, 1923, pp. 1 ff.
2 ASIIPU, 1903-4, p. 53.
3 BEFEO, iv, 1904, pp. 660 ff.; cf. Vogel, ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 254 ff., with plates lxix e (the image) and lxx, 9 (the inscription).
4 JRAS, 1907, pp. 184 ff.; 1913, pp. 985 ff.
5 JRAS, 1912, p. 686 ff.
6 Ep. Ind., iv, p. 136; Acta Orientalia, iii, p. 70.
7 L'ari grécou-bouddhique du Gandhara, ii, p. 573.
8 List, no. 63.
9 JRAS, 1913, p. 1034 ff.
10 Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, v, pp. 129 ff.
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diva and read divase. But then the remaining signs can only be numerical figures, and the first one does indeed look more like a 20 than anything else. The two last ones are peculiar, but as nothing seems to have been written to the left of them, and nothing can, accordingly, be supplied, I take them to be the figures 11, i.e. 2.

The date is then the 22. Ashādha 399, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk's calculations, to the 10th May, A.D. 315.

L. 2. M. Boyer read sagabha dana samayeta dasamya m[shu]ra tanayeshu and translated the whole, supplying haritimuti at the end of l. 1, as follows: 'The gift of Khuto (a statue of Hāriti) together with a niche (garbhā). May she heal on children the small-pox, which is difficult to heal'. He thought that maphura might be derived from māṣha, which according to lexicographers can signify a cutaneous eruption resembling beans, and denote some eruptive disease, which attacks children, presumably small-pox. He compared the word māṣari, which is stated by lexicographers to mean small-pox.

This ingenious reading has been accepted by M. Foucher and Mr. Majumdar.

The two first aksharas are certainly saka. The bottom is, however, damaged, and we should be justified in reading svarga. The third one can hardly be bha, because there is no top-stroke. It seems to be a regular pa. Then comes a short vertical bent towards the right both at the top and the bottom, which is almost identical with the de of the Sui Vihāra inscription. I therefore think that we must read sagapade or svargapade, and, in either case, take the word to represent Skr. svargapade, in the heavenly place, in heaven; cf. Pāli saggapadām.

The next akshara might be na, but everywhere else the dental n is replaced by the cerebral one, and I therefore read da, which I take together with the ensuing tama as daśama, Skr. daśamam.

Then comes, so far as I can see, a distinct bha, followed by a letter, which looks more like a ra than a ta, and a distinct du. I therefore read the beginning of l. 2 as s[va]rapade daśama bhuradu, may she carry the tenth in, or to, heaven.

It should be borne in mind that the sculpture represents Hāriti carrying a child. In other representations she bears one babe in her arms, and three, five, or eight children are playing about, and in the legend she has 500 sons, the youngest one being Pāgalā, her favourite.1 It is possible that our sculpture bears witness to another version, according to which the number of her babes was ten. Or there may be a reference to a child of the donor, which may have been carried away by small-pox.

I accept M. Boyer's reading tamama for the next three aksharas, but I take the bar crossing the right limb of the first ma to be s. The ensuing letter, which M. Boyer read shu, is quite different from shu in l. 1. The stroke which seems to run downwards through the top is probably an unintended continuation of the da standing above in l. 1. Lower down there is a cross-bar, and what M. Boyer took to be an n seems to me to be an r-loop. I therefore read vrha. The next letter does not look like ra, because the upper vertical is missing. It might be va, but it is still more like the e of line 1; only the e-stroke has run into the unintended continuation of the cross-bar of the preceding akshara. I therefore read viṃmaraṣṭhas, and follow a suggestion made by Mr. Helmer Smith, to explain arthaṣ as corresponding to Skr. arthasāye, I request.2

2 It would be possible to read larmaraṣṭhas or larmaraṣṭhas, for the purpose of protection, taking the apparent [r]mama as one akshara, mma, but such a reading does not seem to be likely.
SKĀRAH ĐHERI AND PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTIONS

For the last word I accept the reading tāyayeshu, though the e of ye and the u of shu are uncertain.

My reading and interpretation are, accordingly, as follows:

Text

L. 1  vash[e*] ek[am] cha dupātamae ashadasa masasa divase 20 i 1

Translation

In the four-hundredth year less one (i.e. 399), on the 22. day of the month Āśādha. In heaven may she carry the tenth. I ask for protection of the children.

Mr. Helmer Smith agrees with me in thinking that l. 2 is probably metrical, and thinks it possible that we have before us a primitive dohā: \(\sim - \sim - \sim (6+4+3)\), \(\sim - \sim - \sim (6+4+3)\), instead of the usual 6+4+3, 6+4+1. If we are right, this is the earliest known example of such a metre, and the inscription may prove of importance for the history of Indian metrics.

LXI. PLATE XXIII. 9: PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION, No. 1

No dated inscriptions have been found in the Khudu Khel country, to the west of Mahābān, and we do not know whether the old Saka era remained in use there also after the accession of Kanishka, or was replaced by the reckoning introduced by him. A priori we should be inclined to think that the state of things was the same as in Hashtnagar. I therefore deal with the records found there in this connexion.

No. 1 of the Peshāwar Museum is the upper left-hand corner of a slab, 8½ in. high, which has been brought by Colonel Pipon from the Khudu Khel country. The exact find-place is not recorded.

The fragment contains the termination of two lines of Kharoṣṭhī letters, written in a cursive hand and sloping downwards. The size of individual akṣharas varies between \(\frac{1}{2}\) in. and 2 in.\(^1\)

The characters remind us of the Wardak Vase, the Dhammapada manuscript, and the Niya documents, especially the final akṣhara of l. 1, which looks exactly like the sign which Professor Rapson transliterates as an underlined ṣa in the Niya documents and which also occurs in l. 1 of the Wardak inscription.

L. 1 contains six akṣharas, the first of which is defaced. It is perhaps vi. The second is almost certainly ka, and the third ra, or rather rāṇa, with the same irrational anusvāra as in ṣa viharā in the last line of the Wardak inscription. The next akṣhara looks like the noa of the Sui Vihār and Māṇikīā Śālā inscriptions, but might also be teṇa. Then follows ma, with faint traces of an i-mātrā, and the cursive sa mentioned above. The backward bend of the vertical looks like an r-stroke, and I therefore transliterate a(r)a, as in the Mathura Lion Capital inscription, assuming that the sign denotes a modification of the sound, perhaps towards a voiced r. The whole word, therefore, seems to be [va]hara(ṇ) ṣa[ma][r]a, corresponding to Skr. viharasvāmināḥ.

L. 2 likewise consists of six akṣharas, and again the first one is defaced, but may be vi. Also the second is damaged, but may be te. Then follows an a with a curious curve attached to the top and traces of an e-stroke. I take it to be an e corrected to an a. Or the engraver may have worked from a rough ink draft and subsequently have found traces

\(^1\) Cf. Majumdar, List, no. 49.
of the draft remaining after he had finished, wherefore he also incised the old outline. The next akshara is ya, and I therefore read [a]ya, Skr. ayam. The ensuing akshara may be khu, with an irregular angular u to the right of the vertical. If the second akshara is to, however, we may also read tu, and as the last letter is certainly bo, I read tūbo and take this to be a contamination of stūbo and thūbo; cf. the inscriptions Lorigyan Tangal, No. 4860, and on the Jamālgāri lamp.

With every reserve I therefore read:

**TEXT**

1. [viḥara(m)s][vam[i]s(r)a


**TRANSLATION**

of the master of the Vihāra . . . this stūpa was established.

---

**LXII. PLATE XXIII. 10: PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION, No. 4**

No. 4 of the Peshāwar Museum is a wedge-shaped fragment, 9 in. x 11 in., which has been brought from the Khud Khel country by Colonel Pipon. It contains remnants of two lines in Kharoshthī writing, with letters 4 in. to 1½ in. high.

The characters have no characteristic features, but make the impression of being comparatively late. We may note the shape of da, which reminds us of the Jamālgāri inscription of the year 359.

L. 1. The first of the remaining letters is much defaced, but may be ri. The second is va or, rather, ram. I therefore restore sariram. Then follows pratiḥavedi, with two blurred strokes protruding from the point where the hook of pra joins the vertical, so that it would be possible to read pre. These strokes are, however, almost certainly due to the peeling off of the stone.

Then comes gu, followed by a letter which I cannot identify with certainty. It may be the same akshara which has been read as vhra in the Taxila silver scroll, with the same rounding of the top as in the Dhammapada manuscript. The long upright prevents us from reading ke. I therefore tentatively read gavhra and think it possible that bha has been omitted before gu, so that we have to supply bhagavhra, which may stand for bhag(r)avha, with uh for v, as we shall also find in the Māṇikiāla and Nowshera inscriptions. The word would then probably represent Skr. bhagavatāk.

L. 2 is much defaced all through. The first akshara may be da and the second ya. The third resembles the letter which I read mu in murodasa in the Zeda inscription; the fourth seems to be kha, and the fifth may be cha. With every reserve I would therefore read:

**TEXT**

1. [sa][ri][va]mi pratiḥavedi [bha][gavhra[to]

2. [daṇam][ku]ka[cha]

**TRANSLATION**

establishes a relic of Bhagavat . . . and the gift . . .

---

1 Above, pp. 108 and 116.

2 Majumdar, List, no. 52.
LXIII. PLATE XXIV. 1: NAUGRAM INSCRIPTION

Naugram is a village in the Khudu Khel country, situated in 34° 14' N. and 72° 29' E. In September 1902 Mr. G. O. Roos Keppel found a stone, 1 ft. 10 in. long and 3½ in. broad, and bearing an incomplete and partly defaced Kharosthi inscription, in an old building near the village. The stone is now no. 1. 154 of the Lahore Museum.

The characters, which vary in size between 1 in. and 1½ in., remind us of the Dharanarajika inscriptions; cf. especially the ja. The akshara e has a curious forward curve of the vertical, which may be compared with the flourish in the last letter of the Takht-i-Bahi record.

The beginning of the record is missing. The first akshara which is preserved seems to be la, the second may be kha, or ba. There are apparently traces of a vertical joining the sloping leg near the broken edge, but they are perhaps due to the peeling off of the stone. I tentatively read kha. Then follows lae, and the first word is consequently [takhlae], which must be the genitive of a female noun or name, which may be complete or incomplete.

The next word is clear, being arogadakshinae, whereafter six aksharas have become so much defaced that I cannot make them out. It seems possible to read vraddhhaya, Skr. vridddhahhaya, but the reading is too uncertain. After two more defaced letters we have la, followed by a raised vertical, which is placed so near the hook of la that it can scarcely be anything else than the i-matra. The last two letters are yana, and liyana is perhaps the genitive plural of a noun derived from the name or noun occurring in the beginning of the line.

TEXT

[Takhlae arogadakshinae [vraddhhaya ?]. . . liyana.

TRANSLATION

For the bestowal of health on Takhalā (?) . . . of the . . . liyas.

LXIV. PLATE XXIV. 3: PESHAWAR INSCRIPTION ON WRITING-BOARD

No. 347 of the Peshawar Museum is a sculpture showing the Bodhisattva seated with a writing-board in his lap. The sculpture belongs to the Pixon collection, and it is therefore probable that it hails from the Khudu Khel country.

On the writing-board are some Kharosthi letters, which have been tentatively read by Mr. Majumdar as paranghita.

The letters vary in size from ½ in. to ¾ in., and seem to be fairly well preserved. Their shape is, however, partly peculiar, and I am not able to read the record with certainty.

The first akshara looks like a defective sah. The greater portion of the head is missing, and there is a short vertical in front of the anusvara-curve. A similar mutilated sah, without this vertical, is found as the first akshara of a Lahore inscription, representing the Bodhisattva in school.

The second letter looks like the compound ḫa of the Sui Vihār record. Only the front vertical of the subscribed ḫa is missing. Then comes re, and the first three aksharas might accordingly be sanittare. Now we find in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada that Skr.

1 See Vogel, ASIAR, 1903-4, p. 250; Majumdar, List, no. 44.
3 List, no. 56.
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Thus sanstara, Skr. sanstara, A.6. I think therefore that we are justified in explaining the three first aksharas of our record as corresponding to Skr. sanstara, in the world of phenomena.

Then comes an akshara which looks like ita, with a sloping line across the head. Though the line slopes the wrong way, I think it possible to read it.

The next akshara seems to be at, with the e-stroke protruding from the upper curve of the letter and running into the i of it. Then comes a fairly clear va, and, finally, apparently a broad ma.

If this reading is correct, we should have: sanstare iti devama, and this reminds us of the passage in the Lalitavistara, where the Bodhisattva shows his superiority in writing and other arts: manushyokete "tha cha devatokai gandharvoloke py asurendraloke vyavanti ke'hit liti sarvatoke i latrai sa praavagati sahdisattvah, in the world of gods and in the world of gods, in the Gandharva world also, in the world of the Aśura chiefs, as many writings as there are in the whole world, with them this pure being is thoroughly conversant.

If our inscription contains the same idea, we must assume that it is an abbreviation for diva and that the scene illustrated belongs to the Śilpasāhāndarśanaparivarta and not to the Lipiśāhāndarśanaparivarta.

TEXT
sanstare iti devama...

TRANSLATION
in the world (whichever) writings (of) gods and men (there are).

LXV. PLATE XXIV. 2: LAHORE INSCRIPTION ON WRITING-BOARD

No. 206 of the Lahore Museum, of unknown provenance, represents the Bodhisattva standing in front of the teacher Viśvāmira, who holds a writing-board on which some Kharoshthi letters are visible. They have been read by M. Boyer as saparana ita, i.e. saparana hita, Skr. svaparānāni hitam. This has been explained as a reference to the Bodhisattva's words in the Lipiśāhāndarśanaparivarta of the Lalitavistara, which deals with his first visit to school. When he was examined in the alphabet, he recited an appropriate stanza connected with each letter. When the short a was spoken, he uttered the words about the impermanence of the Sāṁskāras: a(nityasarvasaṁskārasābdaṇaḥ). After having heard the long a, he recited the words about one's own welfare and that of others: a(maparāhitasabdaḥ), &c.

M. Foucher thought that we must supply hi, as suggested by M. Boyer, under the teacher's right hand, and ala, hidden by the left hand. He consequently read [ata]a parama [hi]ta, and explained the inscription as a reference to the school scene narrated in the Lalitavistara. He is aware of the fact that we should expect the legend to bear reference to the very first words of the Bodhisattva at the rehearsal of the alphabet, which the Lalitavistara gives as anityah sarvasaṁskārasabdaḥ, and thinks that the sculptor has had in his mind the Pākrit aṭṭa, which begins with a short a. We should accordingly have to assume that the tradition about the events during the Bodhisattva's visit to school

1 Ed. Lefmann, p. 146.
2 BEFEO, iv, 1904, pp. 618 ff.; cf. Vogel, ASI, 1903-4, p. 50; ASIAR, 1903-4, pp. 245 ff., and plate LXVI, no. 1; Majumdar, List, no. 28.
3 Ed. Lefmann, pp. 125 ff.
4 L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhāra, i, pp. 323 ff.
LAHORE WRITING-BOARD AND YÂKUBI IMAGE

has been recast in the Lalitavistara. The अत्मपराक्षितासुदाह was, in the old tale, connected with the first letter of the alphabet, the short a. To the author of the Lalitavistara, on the other hand, the word for 'self' was अत्म, with a long a, and the अत्मपराक्षितासुदाह must, accordingly, be transferred from the first to the second letter of the alphabet. M. Foucher sees, in this state of affairs, a proof of the relative independence of the monuments with reference to the texts.

An examination of the plate, which is reproduced from a cast, will show some features which were invisible in the plates from which M. Boyer read the inscription. The first akshara cannot be स, but is a mutilated सन्, where the head must be imagined under the Bodhisattva's left hand. In the second a horizontal protrudes from the upper part of the vertical of the apparent पा, i.e. we have the same modified form of कम which occurs in the words सन्मकरा and दुःख्यानुद्धा of the Kurram casket inscription.

We must therefore evidently read सन्मकरायण, Skr. सन्मकरायणम. Now there is sufficient room for two or three aksharas under the teacher's right hand, and then follows a letter which seems to be ता. We may accordingly restore the whole as सन्मकरायण अनिचात, or, dharmata, i.e. there is a thorough agreement between the sculpture and the Lalitavistara, a result which is of some interest for our understanding of the art of Gandhāra.

The scene depicted is not, then, the same as in no. lxiv, where the Bodhisattva and not the teacher holds the writing-board.

TEXT

[s]anmk'arüna [anica]ta.

TRANSLATION

(the impermanence) of the Samskāras.

I add some records which may belong to the period after the introduction of the Kanishka era, but where we have no indications to show that they hail from districts where it replaced the old Saka reckoning.

LXVI. PLATE XXIV. 4: YÂKUBI IMAGE INSCRIPTION

No. 280 of the Peshawar Museum is a sculpture, presented by Mr. Wilson-Johnston, I.C.S., as found in a nallah near Yâkubī in the Swābi Tahsil of the Peshawar District. According to M. Foucher 1 the sculpture represents the miracle of Srāvasti, through which the Buddha triumphed over his rivals, the six chiefs of sects.

Dr. Spooner 2 thought that this identification was very doubtful and stated that it is not supported by the inscription found on the sculpture.

The latter is incised on the band below the sculpture and has been published by Dr. Spooner, 3 with remarks by Mr. Venkayya and Professor Vogel. It is 13½ in. long, and the average size of letters is ¾ in.

The right-hand portion of the sculpture has been broken away, with the result that about six aksharas are missing at the beginning. Also the left-hand corner is damaged, with the consequent disappearance of about three letters. Above this defaced portion some letters, originally apparently three, have been incised in an upper line. Two of them are still visible.

---

3. I.e., cf. Majumdar, List, no. 94.
The characters point to a comparatively late date. *Ka* reminds us of the Peshāwar Museum inscription of the year 168; *kha* of Zeda and Ārā; *cha* of Māṇikiāla; *fa* and *sa* of Wardāk.

The missing beginning must have contained the name of the donor in the genitive. The first word which is preserved is *danamukhe*, where *mu* has the same form as in the Ghaz Ḍheri inscription.

The next word was read as *Sadhabamitrasha* by Dr. Spooner, who took this to be the name of the donor in the genitive. But the termination *asya* cannot become *asha* in the dialect. The first letter is certainly *sa*, but the second seems to be *cha*, of the same shape as in the Māṇikiāla inscription, the upper horizontal apparently protruding in a slight curve to the right of the vertical. The third is absolutely different from the *ka* in the following *jinakumaro*, and the top-line protrudes on both sides of the vertical. I therefore read *bha* or, perhaps, *bhra*. Then follows *mi* and an akshara, which I agree with Dr. Spooner in reading as *ta*. I cannot see any trace of a *r* -stroke below, but I take the line which slopes backwards at the top to be an *e*-mātrā; cf. the *e* of *danamukhe*.

There are some traces of a forward curve at the bottom, which might be taken for an *u*-loop, but they seem to be due to a mistake of the engraver. The next akshara is almost certainly *sha*, and I think that the *u*-loop has originally stood at the bottom of this *sha*. I therefore read *sahabhamitash[ā]*, Skr. *sātyabhramitashu*, among those who had become confounded through the truth, and see in this word a reference to the tīrthyas whom the Buddha confounded through his miracles and preaching at Śrāvastī.

The next word is *jinakumaro*. Here as in the Panjārā inscription masculine *a*-bases seem to form their nominative in *o*, while *e* is the termination of neuter *a*-bases. *Jinakumaro* can hardly mean 'Royal Buddha', as suggested by Dr. Spooner, or 'pious monk', as translated by Mr. Venkayya, but means 'the young *jina*', and the term finds its explanation in Buddhist tradition, according to which the Buddha was a younger teacher than the tīrthyas whom he confounded, one of whom, Sañjaya, had been the teacher of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, before they joined the Buddha. The miracle seems to be placed by tradition in the interval between the sixth and seventh rainy seasons after the Bodhi, i.e. the Buddha was about 40 years old.

After *jinakumaro* comes *hidagama* or, rather, *hidagrama*. Professor Vogel read *hidagama* and explained this as Skr. *hitakama*, but the word is devoid of a case suffix and must evidently be connected with what follows. Dr. Spooner explained *hida* as corresponding to Skr. *iha* as in Aśoka's edicts, but no such form is found in later Kharoshthi inscriptions. Moreover, we never find such indefinite terms as 'in this village'. I therefore think that *Hida* is the name of a village.

The next akshara is *va*. Dr. Spooner states that it may be *va*, but I agree with him in thinking that an examination of the original makes the reading *va* almost certain. He suggests to supply *sinah* *va* and to go on with the upper line, which he reads *rada*. Or else, he thinks, 'the stone was injured either before the inscription was begun . . . or while it was inscribed; for it seems easy to read the existing letters as one word, *sparada* an epithet of the Buddha'. He thus arrives at the following translation: 'this royal Buddha [to be] a source of blessing for this village . . . or, for the people of this village'.

The last aksharas of the line cannot be restored. The existing traces are not absolutely against reading *stavena*, and *Hidagramavastavena* would mean 'by the resident of the Hida village'.
YĀKUBI AND PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTIONS

In the upper line there has evidently been three letters, the first of which seems to have been ra. The second seems to be identical with the letter which I read cha in sacha, but shows traces of an i-stroke. The third looks like the akshara which I read te in bhamitesh[u], but seems to be provided with an o-stroke. I therefore read rachito. It is possible, but perhaps not likely, that the name of the artist was contained in an upper line above the beginning of the record.

I thus arrive at the following reading and interpretation:

TEXT


2 rachito.

TRANSLATION

Gift (of . . .), the young Jina among those who were confounded through truth, executed by the resident of Hida village . . .

LXVII. PLATE XXIV. 5: PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION, No. 3

No. 3 of the Peshāwar Museum is a fragment of a building stone, belonging to the Deane collection. On one side is a rough drawing of a hand, and on the face above two letters, evidently masons’ marks, placed obliquely against each other and measuring 1 in. and 2 in. respectively.1 One of them is mi, the other probably me, though it might be sha.

LXVIII. PLATE XXIV. 7: PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION, No. 5

No. 5 of the Peshāwar Museum is a small stone of unknown provenance, measuring 9 in. by 6½ in., and belonging to the Deane collection.

It bears a fragmentary Kharoshṭhī inscription of seven aksharas,² varying in size from ½ in. to 1½ in.

The characters are similar to those of the Arā inscription. Note especially ka, de, and ya. The left-hand vertical of ya is, however, exceptionally long. The ma of me has been placed almost on end.

The reading does not present any difficulty.

TEXT

karavide Metrey[e]na*.

TRANSLATION

Caused to be made by Maitreya.

LXIX. PLATE XXIV. 6: PESHĀWAR MUSEUM INSCRIPTION, No. 7

No. 7 of the Peshāwar Museum is another fragment, belonging to the same collection, with a few letters, ¾ in. to 1½ in. high, in two lines.

L. 1 traces of an unidentifiable letter followed by dayi.

L. 2 traces of what may be dha, and then a.

¹ See Majumdar, List, no. 50.
² Majumdar, List, no. 53.
LXX. PLATE XXIV. 8: PESHWAR SCULPTURE, No. 1938

No. 1938 of the Peshawar Museum is a sculpture representing two wrestlers. In the upper right-hand corner is a short Kharoshthi legend, consisting of four aksharas, 6 to 1 inch high. The type of the characters points to the later Kushana period.

The reading is perfectly certain, viz. Minamidra, of Minamidra, and probably gives the name of the donor. Minamidra is the Greek Menandros and represents an older form of the name than Pali Milinda.1

The chief importance of the inscription rests with the fact that it furnishes a new instance of the use of Greek names in North-western India at a comparatively late date.

LXXI. PLATE XXIV. 9: NOWSHERA PEDESTAL INSCRIPTION

On the pedestal of a sculpture in the Officers' Mess of the then 82nd Panjab Infantry regiment the chaplain, Rev. J. E. H. Williams, discovered a Kharoshthi inscription.2 The regiment has since been removed to Buner, as the 74th Panjab Regiment.

The inscription is 5 inches long and consists of twelve aksharas, 1/2 in. to 1/4 in. high. The characters remind us of the Kala Sang and Shakardara stones and the Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168 (ka), of the Kharoshthi Dhammapada (dha), and of the Ara and Hashtnagar inscriptions (sa).

The first akshara is evidently dhi, of the same shape as is often found in the Dhammapada manuscript; the second is the same letter which I have read as vha in the Peshawar Museum inscription, No. 4; the third is the same ku which occurs in the records mentioned above, and the fourth and fifth are ra and sa. Dhivharasa may correspond to Skr. Dipankarasa and be the name of the donor or of the Buddha pictured in the sculpture. We may compare dhiyavaha for divasa in a Kharoshthi document from Turkestan.3

Then follow ta and a curious letter which seems to be khti; two aksharas which I read as dren, and three letters which seem to be karide. The curious takhtidra must, accordingly, be the name of the sculptor or of the donor.

Reading and explanation are, throughout, uncertain.

TEXT

Dhivkarasa Takhtidrena karide.

TRANSLATION

Of Dipankara, made by Takhtidra.

1 Cf. Pelliot, JA, xi, iv, 1914, pp. 380 f., 384 f.; Lüders, Kalpanāmanḍitikā, p. 34.
2 Cf. Wasi-ud-Din, ASIFC, 1912-13, p. iii; Marshall,ASIAR, 1912-13, P. I, P. 33; Majumdar, List no. 45.
C. INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE KANISHKA ERA

The Kanishka era is used in inscriptions found over a wide area, from Sārnāth in the east and to Khawat in the west, from Jalalābād and Manikāla in the north, and to Bahāwalpur in the south. Only one certain instance of its use has, on the other hand, been found to the north of the Kābul River. I here bring together those records which are dated in this era, and some other ones which have been found in such localities where we have every reason for thinking that it was used during the rule of the Kanishka dynasty.

LXXII. PLATE XXV. I: KANISHKA CASKET INSCRIPTIONS

Shāh-ji-ki Dhéri was the name of two large mounds outside the Ganj gate of Peshawar city, where Cunningham and Foucher had located the big Kanishka stūpa mentioned by Chinese pilgrims. This location has been proved to be correct through Dr. Spooner's excavations in the years 1908 and 1909.¹

He found extensive remains of a large stūpa, and within it a rude relic chamber, containing a relic casket, composed of an alloy, in which copper predominates and which seems to have been originally gilded. The main body of the casket, which is cylindrical, measures 5 in. in diameter, with a height of 4 in. On this body fitted a deep lid, supporting three figures in the round, giving a total height of 7¾ in. The three figures represent the Buddha, Brahmā, and Indra. The upper surface of the lid has a decoration consisting of the incised petals of a full-blown lotus. The lip which fits on to the top of the casket proper shows a highly ornamented band of geese or swans in low relief. The main body of the casket is decorated with a series of three seated Buddha figures, supported by a long undulating garland upheld by little Erotes, with larger worshipping figures at intervals, which device terminates at a larger group of figures, representing King Kanishka standing between the Sun and the Moon, the Miro and Mao of Kanishka's coins.²

The casket carries some lines of Kharoshṭhi writing, punched into the metal in a series of faint dots. They occur on the upper surface of the lid, between the flying geese on the lower edge of the lid and in the level spaces above and below the figures decorating the main body of the casket.

The inscriptions have been edited by Dr. Spooner,³ whose readings can now be checked by means of the excellent photographs supplied by Mr. Hargreaves. The letters are, generally speaking, well executed. There is frequently a short bottom-stroke projecting to the left, as in the Kurram casket inscription. Intervocalic g is, if we abstract from the evidently foreign name Agisala, always provided with an r-stroke, added in a sharp angle, i.e. it was probably a fricative. The role of the cerebral

² Cf. the Illustrations ASIAR, 1908-9, pl. XII, XIII; Foucher, L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhāra, ii, pl. vi.
³ ASIAR, 1908-9, pp. 51 ff.; 1909-10, pp. 135 ff., with plates I and II; cf. Majumdar List, no. 60.
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and dental n's seems to be inverted, the former being used as an initial, the latter between vowels. The letter ya has a broad head, almost as in some of the yā's of the Wardak vase. We may also note the compounds rya and rva.

Dr. Spooner distinguishes four different records.

I

The first is incised on the upper surface of the lid, beginning behind the figure of the Buddha and running across the petals of the lotus with which the surface is decorated. The reading is perfectly clear: acharyama[nu] sarvasativatima[na] pratigraha. As already noted, I take the dental ma to denote the cerebral. Dr. Spooner took the bottom-stroke of sarvasativata to indicate the anusvāra, but exactly the same stroke is found in the preceding va, where there cannot be any question of reading samī. In his last paper he also read parigraha, but pratigraha is perfectly certain. It should be noted that the r-stroke of grāha is different from where gr seems to indicate a fricative g.

II

A second inscription is found on the lower edge of the lid, between the figures of the flying geese. It is much defaced, and Dr. Spooner, who originally thought that he could see three connected aksharas, ka, na, shka, did not venture to maintain even this hypothetical reading. With the help of Mr. Hargreaves's photographs it now seems possible to read at least parts of the record.

It evidently begins below the Buddha figure, to the left of the goose below the beginning of the upper legend, and the first akshara is samī, so that it is clear that we have to do with a date. Unfortunately the ensuing passage is badly corroded, but it seems possible to read the signs following after samī as t ma, i.e. the casket is dated in the first year of the Kanishka era.

After the corroded space following samī comes a goose, and then an interval where nothing can be seen, another goose, and, in the ensuing interval, an indistinct akshara, which seems to be se, followed by kani, where the dental n perhaps denotes the cerebral nasal. I think that we can restore the text as samī t maharāja Kani[the]skasa. After the two aksharas which I restore as shkasas there is room for one or perhaps two letters. What can be seen is a vertical, which is evidently an i-stroke and which seems to be crossed by a horizontal. The whole might be vi or ti, but I do not venture to attempt a restoration. Then comes another goose: three fairly distinct letters ma, na, and gra; another goose; a ra or re, a defaced letter, which seems to be dha, another akshara, which I cannot make out, a gra, a rya, and a ka. With great reserve I therefore restore i ma rahar[ra] dha ... graryaka and take nagvar[ra] to stand for nag[ra]var[ra], i.e. nagare with a fricative g, and ... graryaka to be an adjective formed from a compound ending in agara. We might think of dhānāgara or dharmāgara, but it is hardly possible to arrive at certainty.

III

A third line is found on the main body of the casket, between the heads of the figures of the principal frieze. It runs deyadharmo sarvasatvam[am] (na) hidasukhartham[am] bhavatu. Dr. Spooner read deyadharmo, but the e-stroke is certain.

IV

A fourth line is incised between the feet of the figures in the main frieze. Dr. Spooner read dasa Aghala navakarmi (K)anishkasa vihare Mahasenasa sangharam,
explaining dāsa as Skr. dāsa, a slave, and Agiśala as representing the Greek name Agesilaos.

There is an interval between the two first aksharas da and sa, and some dots are visible below the ornamental streamers which depend from the frieze, but they are not part of the writing. The g of Agiśala is devoid of the otiose stroke and provided with a forward projection of the bottom of the vertical, which has not come out in the photograph. The n of navakarmi is the usual cerebral n. I have already remarked that the significance of the two n-signs seems to be inverted in these inscriptions. The ensuing a I draw to this word and read navakarmia, i.e. navakarmia. There can, however, be some doubt whether it is not possible to read na-vakarmia.

The ensuing akshara is certainly e, i.e. probably me, and not ni, and it is clear that we must supply Ka before it. The intention has evidently been to arrange the word Kayeshkasa so that two aksharas stood on either side of the king's figure. It is possible that the letter me was engraved before the remaining aksharas in order to ensure this, and that the result was that the engraver had not enough room for entering Ka. But it is also possible that we have to do with a mere carelessness.

It seems probable that the whole forms one continuous record, beginning with II, which contained the date, and ending with I. The mention of the navakarmika may be due to Agiśala himself; cf. the Patika and Mānikiśala inscriptions. The passage containing his name seems to interrupt the context and may be considered as a parenthetical addition. As remarked by M. Foucher, the casket was not destined for public exhibition. It was to be deposited in the relic chamber and had only for a moment to pass through the hands of a king who was little qualified to judge about its merits. If M. Foucher is right in thinking that Agiśala had been paid for a gold casket and substituted a gilded one of bronze, he may have had the more reason for attempting to acquire merit by having his name associated with the gift.

**Text**

L. 1 sam [ma]haraja*sa Kani(ni)[skhasa*]. imaṇa(na)g(e)(r)ar[e] [dha]. . g(t)aryaka
2 deyadharme sarvasatvam[na]n[am] hidasuhrtha[ni] bhavatu
3 dasa Agiśala na(na)vakarmia [Ka*]ne(ne)shkasa vihare Mahasena(na)sa sam-
gharam
4 acharyana(na) sarvastivatina(na) pratigrahe.

**Translation**

In the year 1 of (the mahārāja) Kanishka, in the town ima, connected with the... mansion, this religious gift—may it be for the welfare and happiness of all beings,—the slave Agiśala was the architect,—in Kanishka's Vihāra, in Mahāsena's Sāṃghārāma, in the acceptance of the Sarvāstivādin teacher.

### LXXIII. PLATE XXV. 2: SHĀH-JI-KI ḌHERI INSCRIBED BRICKS

Among the debris on the western edge of the western projection of the main stupa at Shāh-ji-ki Ďheri were several fragments of inscribed bricks. They are now in the Peshawar Museum, as nos. 484-93.

No. 484, four letters, on an average 2 in. high: *Buddhasena.*

---

1 I.e., p. 542.
2 Cf. ASIFC, 1908-9, p. 21; ASIAR, 1908-9, pp. 55 f., with fig. 4; Majumdar, List, no. 59. T
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No. 485, three letters, averaging 1½ in. in height, read as divasa by Dr. Spooner. The third akshara is, however, plainly ra and not sa.

No. 486, three aksharas and traces of a fourth, 1¼ in. to 2 in. high. The first is uncertain, but may be va, and the ensuing ones are nasa.

No. 487, one incomplete me, 1 in. high, evidently the end of a word.

No. 488, one letter, ma, 1 in. high, but placed obliquely, so that it is evidently only a mason's mark.

No. 489, the lower part of two verticals.

No. 490, the upper portions of three aksharas, perhaps ayad . .

No. 491, the greater portion of a great mi.

No. 492, three letters, 1 in. to 1¼ in. high, marami, or, perhaps, malami.

No. 493, one letter, 1½ in. high, ďi.

LXXIV. PLATE XXVI. 1: SUI VIHĀR COPPER-PLATE INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 11

Sui Vihār is the name of a ruined stūpa about 16 miles south-west of Bahāwalpur, at 31° 34’ E. and 29° 18’ N., where a copper-plate, bearing a Kharos̱ṭhī inscription, was found in 1806 by Rev. G. Yeates.

The stūpa has been described and illustrated by Major Stubbs1 as a tower, about 45 ft. high, but 6 or 8 ft. were stated to have fallen down shortly before his visit. Half the exterior height is made up of a mound; and about 20 ft. above the place where the tower rises from the mound, there are the remains of a large square chamber, about 8 ft. square, its sides facing the cardinal points. Above the floor of this, the walls rise at present about 11 ft. high. In the centre of the floor there is a square hole of 16 in., opening into a shaft of the same size down to the top of the mound. This shaft is quite exposed from about 3 ft. of the floor down to the top of the mound, by the falling away of half the tower, whenever that occurred. The tower is built of very large sun-dried bricks, 17” x 13” x 3½”. But in this chamber was formerly a flooring of burnt bricks of the same size as the sun-dried ones, laid in lime cement with the copper-plate bedded in the middle, while round the plate on the four sides, walls of the same kind of brick and mortar were raised, about 2 ft. high, forming a sort of chamber with the copper-plate at the bottom. In this the coins, mixed with some pieces of iron, a few beads, fragments of ornaments, all mixed up with ashes and earth, were found. The men charged with the clearing out of this, unfortunately pulled the whole of the masonry down.

The plate is 30 in. square, with rounded corners, and the inscription is incised in four lines, along three of the sides and a quarter of the fourth side. It was forwarded, by Major Stubbs to Sir E. C. Bayley and afterwards presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, where it is now preserved.

The inscription has been published by Messrs. Dowson,2 Bayley,3 Hoernle,4 Bhagvanlal Indrají,5 and N. G. Majumdar,6 and the letters of the inscription, from Hoernle's plate, were made use of for cols. x-xii of Plate i in Bühlcr’s Palaeography.

---

1 JASB, xxxix, i, 1870, pp. 65 ff., with plate II.
2 JRAS, N.S., iv, 1869, pp. 477 ff., with plate 4, copied by Major Stubbs, ibidem, vol. v, 1870, p. 196.
3 JASB, xxxix, i, 1870, p. 65, with plate.
4 Ind. Ant., x, 1881, pp. 324 ff., with plates; cf. PASB, 1881, p. 139.
5 Ind. Ant., xi, 1882, pp. 128 ff.
6 Sir Asstbha Mookerji Silver Jubilee Volumes, iii, i, 1922, pp. 459 ff., with plates; cf. also R. D. Banerji, Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 47, 55; JRAS, 1920, pp. 203, 205; Konow, Ep. Ind., xiv, p. 136; Majumdar, List, no. 64.
The characters are Kharoshṭhī of a cursive type, and they originally consisted of punctured dots, and were subsequently engraved in full, though some portions still show traces of the old dots. The size of individual letters varies from $\frac{3}{4}$ in. to 1 in. The preservation is generally good, but a few letters are partially obliterated by the effects of occlusion. Most of them occur in the third line, which is, on the whole, executed with less care than the other ones.

There is an evident effort to separate the spoken words or word-groups by means of small intervals, just as is the case in the oldest Indian manuscript, which is of about the same date as our inscription. The language is a Sanskritized Prākrit.

With regard to the shape of the letters, we may note the frequent use of a short bottom-stroke, protruding towards the left. In consequence of the manner in which the inscription has been executed, the length of this bottom-stroke varies. Dr. Hoernle thought that it was sometimes intended to mark a long vowel. There does not, however, seem to be any valid reason for assuming that such was the case. In a few cases this stroke has become a curve, which looks like an anusvāra; cf. se in ṭivasa, l. 1; ni in viharasvāminī, l. 3. In such cases I shall transliterate (ṁ). A genuine anusvāra occurs in several places: thus, saṃvardhāre, l. 1; yathāṁ, l. 2, &c.

With regard to individual letters, we may note the a with a subscript ya in the beginning of l. 2; the rare cerebral ta in kusināini, l. 3; the de of devaputraśya, l. 1; the line across the right side of the initial ma; the irregular shape of the compounds tka in saṃvardhāre, l. 1, and rma in dharmaṃkāthya, l. 2, and the curious sva in viharasvāminī(ṁ), l. 3.

L. 1. The cross-bar of the initial ma was taken by Dr. Hoernle to denote the long a. It seems more likely that it marks the beginning of the inscription, as the similar bar over the left termination of ma in the Mount Banj, and the identical cross-bar at the beginning of the Arā inscription. The reading does not present much difficulty: mahabarajaya rajatrajasya devoputraśya Kan[?]'kṣaya saṃvardhāre ekadase sam 10 1 Dattisvārya masāya di vas(ṁ) a ṣhavīse di 10 4 4. The compound tka in saṃvardhāre is slightly misdrawn and looks like ekha, and was read as such by Professor Franke. Mr. Majumdar suggests to read ekhha, but the shape of ekh is quite different. The apparent anusvāra in Dattisvārya and divas(ṁ) has already been mentioned. The sva of masāya looks like sam and does not seem to have been properly executed. The termination of the genitive of masculine vowel bases is throughout sva, no doubt under the influence of Sanskrit.

L. 2. The only real difficulty is the first word, which was read atre by Bayley, antra by Dowson, atra by Bhagvānīlā, ayatra by Hoernle and Majumdar, and utra by Bühler and Johansson. As already mentioned, the first letter is evidently an ordinary a with a ya-hook, and so far as I can see, there are two possibilities. Either āya is meant to signify ē or a sound approaching ē, or else āya is, as Professor Lüders has proposed, a shortened writing instead of āya. This latter explanation is the most likely one, because we should not expect ātra in such a Sanskritized record, and because ayatra is supported by Prākrit forms such as āmīni, ayanī, which show that the element āya was felt as a pronominal base, from which ayatra might be formed just as tatra from the base ta.

2 Pāli und Sanskrit, p. 97.
3 ZDMG, 45, p. 133.
5 Cf. Fischel, Grammatik des Prākrit-Sprachen, § 429.
The whole line then runs: \textit{ajatra diwas bhikskasya Nagadatasya dhakaramjyathisyay acharya-Damatrata\textit{a}stishtisyay acharya-Bhawe(\textit{e})prashisyasyay yathir\textit{a}ropyaya\textit{ta}\textit{ka} Damanae.} The compound \textit{rma} in \textit{dharmanjyathi} has usually been read as \textit{kha}, and the bottom-stroke of the preceding \textit{dha} has been taken to be an anusvāra. The reading is, however, absolutely certain. The only difference between our akshara and the \textit{rma} of the Jaulā inscription No. 6 is that the \textit{r} curve has been continued backwards and cursively connected with the top of \textit{ma}. The \textit{e} of \textit{Bhawe} is, according to Dr. Hoernle, only a flaw in the plate. The same scholar took the bottom-stroke of \textit{ta} in \textit{aropyaya\textit{ta}} to be an \textit{o}-stroke. We have, however, exactly the same shape of \textit{ta} in \textit{hita}, l. 4. There is a short horizontal below the \textit{ma} of \textit{Damanae}. It cannot well signify the anusvāra, which we find in \textit{imani}, l. 3, as a distinct hook. We might think of reading \textit{ma}, though we find a different akshara \textit{ma}, with a curved vertical below, in plate xxiv of Sir Aurel Stein’s \textit{Serindia}, in a Sanskrit verse where the reading is, consequently, absolutely certain. It is, finally, possible that the horizontal is meant for the subscript \textit{r}, which is used in the termination \textit{amri} in the Wardak Vase inscription, where the sound intended is evidently an aspirated \textit{m}. In that case we should have to transliterate \textit{Damhane}. I prefer, however, to write \textit{Da[mhu]e}, leaving the question about the significance of the stroke open.

With regard to the construction of the line it seems necessary to explain \textit{aropyaya\textit{ta}} as the genitive of the present participle and to take \textit{Nagadatasya aropyaya\textit{ta}} as a double genitive.

The staff, \textit{yathi}, which is mentioned, was evidently put up in the shaft just below the place where the copper-plate was found, as surmised by Dr. Hoernle, who goes on to say: ‘The word (\textit{yathi}), in the modern form \textit{ith}, is applied to monumental pillars, like the well-known stone pillars of Allahābād, Delhi, Banārās, and other places, but that can hardly be the meaning of the word here. The word is also applied to a monk’s staff. This, at first sight, would seem to be a much more likely meaning. The \textit{aropyaya} “setting up” or “assuming” of a staff might be a ceremony indicating the assumption of a high clerical office (as in the case of the Bishop’s staff or crook). Or “putting up (= putting aside) the staff” might be a euphemism for “death”; the monk having died, his \textit{yathi} may have been enshrined by the two pious ladies’. Mr. Majumdar, who reads \textit{aropyalā} for \textit{aropyaya\textit{ta}}, refers us to the Andhau inscriptions\(^1\) of the Śaka year 52, i.e. of about the same date, where the raising of staffs (\textit{lakṣṭi utkāpita}) by two persons is mentioned, and where the ‘staffs’ are evidently the long slabs of stone on which the inscriptions have been incised and which have been explained as memorial stones. He thinks that we have a reference to a relic-pillar of Nāgadatta, i.e. a pillar containing the corporeal relics of Nāgadatta, referring us to the Kārle inscription, No. 9,\(^2\) where we read about a pillar (\textit{ṭhāktra}) with relics (\textit{sasāriva}), and where ‘there is a hole or receptacle cut for the purpose of holding the relic mentioned in the inscription in the centre of a lotus carved on the front of the pillar just where the inscription ends’.

So far as I can see, the \textit{yathi} was raised by Nāgadatta himself and was not a memorial raised over him. Why it was put up, I am not able to say, but it may have been in order to support the chamber above, which was evidently meant as a relic chamber.

L. 3. The first words are clear, viz. \textit{vihārasakmi\textit{i}(vi) upasi\textit{ka} Balana\textit{nī}}. Only the \textit{ba} of \textit{Balana\textit{nī}} is damaged. The next word was read in different ways, till Bühler\(^3\) read it as \textit{kunubhi}. The first akshara is damaged. Dr. Hoernle stated that

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., xvi, pp. 19 ff.
\(^2\) Ep. Ind., vii, p. 55; Lüders, List, no. 1095.
\(^3\) \textit{Indische Palaeographie}, p. 28.
the outlines of ka are quite distinct on the plate and that he could recognize traces of a dotted line across the letter, wherefore he read kā. The latter are absolutely invisible to me, and the reading kā seems to be certain. Nor can there be much doubt that the next akṣara is a cerebral ṅī. The upper hook is clearly visible. So far as I can see, the curve of the vertical is not an MBED loop, but rather the anusvāra, and the sloping crossbar does not seem to be the short bar to the right of the vertical, which we find in the Aśoka inscriptions and the Dharmarājikā record. That bar never crosses the vertical, and its slope is downwards from the left to the right, and, besides, it is sometimes missing. I therefore think that the cross-bar is the i-stroke and read kuṭīṁbīṇi, cf. the Dharmarājikā inscription.

The ensuing words are again clear: Bala[jaya mata cha ānāi yathipraśṭhānām. Only the final anusvāra is somewhat indistinct.

The following syllables were read as apano cha by Bhagvānalā and as kapajām cha by Hoernle and Majumdar. Professor Lüders has, however, pointed out to me that the first akṣara is clearly Ṉī, the third probably ā, and the fourth certainly ānāi. He proposes to read śhapāṭhānaṁ, corresponding to Skr. śhāpaśvīva, and to translate ‘setting aside’, ‘besides’. This explanation seems to me to be evidently right.

The next word is anu-parivaram, which cannot well mean ‘accompanied by the (whole) household’, as translated by Mr. Majumdar, but must be the object of the ensuing verb. Dr. Hoernle translated ‘and the customary accessories’. It seems to me, however, that anu-parivara must have a similar meaning as I have assigned to parivara in the Takht-i-Bahi and Mathura Lion Capital inscriptions and refer to the chamber raised round the relics, after the yathā had been put up. Or else anu may be explained as an adverb, ‘subsequently’, and parivara may mean ‘enclosure’.

The next word was read as dadarim by Dowson, while Hoernle read dadārim, which he explained as a miswriting instead of dadārimī. Dowson’s reading is undoubtedly correct, and Professor Lüders compares the termination riṣu with Pali re.

The remaining portion of the inscription does not present any difficulty.

The record is dated on the 28th Daisios of the year 11 of the Kanishka era, i.e., according to Dr. van Wijk, the 7th June, A.D. 139.

**Text**

1 maharajāsya raṭatirajāsya devapatraṣaṇa Kaṇṭiṣhakṣaya saṁva[ṭ]šare ekadaśe saṁ \( ^{10} \text{Dasi(m)kasya masasy[a] dvase(m) aṭhaviśe di} \) 10 4 4

2 [aya]ra divase bhikṣusya Nagadatasya dharmāni kathisyā acharya-Damatratayā śiṣhyasya acharya-Bhaye(ya)-prāṣṭhāyā yathāṁ aropayata iha Da[m]a[ne]

3 viharasvamii(m) upasika [Baḷ]ānām[i] [kuṭīṁbīṇi Bala]jaya mata cha ānāi yathipraśṭhānām ṭha[p]a[ṇ]i chaṁ anu parivaram dadarim śa[rvasa]tavanām

4 hitasukhiya bhavatu.

**Translation**

(during the reign) of the Mahārāja Rajatirāja Devaputra Kanishka, in the eleventh year, anno 11, on the eighteenth day, d. 18, of the month Daisios, on this day, when the friar Nagadatta, the preacher of the law, the disciple of the teacher Damatrāta, the disciple’s disciple of the teacher Bhava, raised the staff here in Damana, the mistress of the Vihāra, the lay votary Balānandī, and her mother, the matron, the wife of Bala (or, Bala[jaya]), in addition to this foundation of the staff, subsequently give the enclosure. May it be conducive to welfare and happiness for all beings.
LXXV. Plate XXVI. 2: ZEDA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR

Zeda is a village near Und, situated in 34° 3' N. and 72° 32' E. Here I. Loewenthal noticed 'an unshapen piece of rock lying at the entrance of the village', on which there was an inscription in Kharoshthi characters.1

The stone, which is now in the Lahore Museum, as No. I. 2, is, according to Cunningham, a rough block of quartz, 4 feet long and 1 foot broad. The inscription has been edited by Cunningham,2 Senart,3 Boyer,4 and Konow,5 and some remarks on the dating and interpretation have been published by E. Thomas,6 Bühler,7 Banerji,8 Lüders,9 and Majumdar.10

The stone is very rough, and damaged in some places, with the result that the reading is beset with considerable difficulty.

The inscription consists of three lines and covers a space two feet long and about 8 inches broad. The size of individual letters varies from almost 4 in. in the beginning to 1 in. to 1½ in. towards the end. M. Senart thought that ll. 1 and 2 are perhaps incomplete.

The characters are Kharoshthi of a similar kind as in the Sui Vihār plate, but there is comparatively great variation in the shape of individual letters. The u-matrā is e.g. rounded in kshumam, l. 1, but angular is kue, l. 2; the kha of khade, l. 2, has the same shape as in Jaulil, but is more rounded in dvanumaka, l. 2; eha has the cursive shape which we already find on the Lion Capital; eva in kshatrapasa, l. 3, has a shape which reminds us of A 1 of the Lion Capital, but is regular in Sakhaputra, l. 3; e has the same shape as in Sui Vihār; yā has the same angular shape as in Sui Vihār; the compound shka shows the verticals of both letters as one continuous line, but I see no reason for following Mr. Majumdar, who reads shpa; sa has several different forms, as will be seen from the plate. Two aksharas, viz. ja in pujana, l. 2, and the final sa have been twisted in order to avoid their running into the letters standing above them.

L. 1, which contains the date, does not present any difficulty: sam 10 i ashadasa masasa di 20 utaraphagune ite kshumam. M. Senart read the day as 10, but M. Boyer is certainly right in reading 20. The e of ev in utaraphagune is written above the top as a vertical. The coupling of the date with a nakshatra has enabled Dr. van Wijk to calculate it as corresponding to the 19th June, A.D. 139.11

L. 2. The first aksharas were read as chanain uspa by Cunningham, as bhanaun uka by M. Senart, as bhanaun uspha by M. Boyer, as khane kue by Professor Lüders, and as khade kue by myself. A comparison of the de of the Zeda and Ārā records will show that the second letter is certainly de. Khade kue corresponds to Skr. khātaḥ kūpaḥ.

The next word was read as kharada by Cunningham, .. chasa by M. Senart, mu .. chasa by M. Boyer, veda or ṛvādasa by Professor Lüders, and āvādasa by Mr. Majumdar. The first akshara is evidently mu. It is placed high up, protruding above the line, and a long flaw in the stone runs into the u-curve, giving the whole the appearance of a sa. The photograph reproduced in the plate, however, clearly

---

1 Cf. his remarks JASB, xxxii, 1863, p. 5.
2 ASI, v, 1875, pp. 57 f., with plate xvi, 5.
3 JA, x, iii, 1904, pp. 455 ff.
5 JRAS, N.S., ix, 1877, p. 91.
6 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 45, 72.
7 JRAS, 1894, p. 535.
8 SBAW, 1912, p. 826.
shows that the akshara is *mu*. The next letter is almost certainly *ro*. The stone has peeled off in consequence of the engraving of the *o*-stroke, but the latter is clearly visible on the stone. *Muroda* can hardly be anything else than the Saka word *murunda*, master, lord, i.e. it stands for *murunida*.

The next word was read as *mardakasa* by Cunningham, and as *mardoqasa* by Messrs. Boyer and Luders. The head of the second letter, however, clearly shows the forward bend which distinguishes *jha* from *da*. *Marjhaka* seems to be an older form of the Khotan Saka word *maltyski*, i.e. *maltak*, which is used in the Maitreyasamiti to render the *grihapati*, the sixth ratna of a chakravartin, who is characterized by the divine eye, through which he discerns hidden treasures and secures them for his master. This designation is probably meant to characterize the ruler in question as rich in treasure, a characterization which is sometimes used about the Roman emperor. The title *marjhaka* is here given to Kanishka. We know that the Roman power in Asia was waning during the rule of Hadrianus (A.D. 117-138), when the Parthians occupied Mesopotamia. Kanishka is further reported to have defeated the Parthians, and it is conceivable that the assumption of the title *marjhaka* is connected with some such events.

Then follows *Kanishkasa rajani*. I have already stated that I cannot accept Mr. Majumdar’s reading *Kanishhapa*. A compound *shpa* does not seem to be ever used in Kharoshthi.

The ensuing passage is the most difficult part of the whole record. Cunningham read *dharya dadhakasa Idamukhastrope u de asa...*, M. Senart... *dahabai da*[na]-mukha... *[pe adha]a*[daadasa] [ta[tha]...*, and M. Boyer *[to]yadadahai danamukha sapeadhia saasatashe sati vudhe.

The first word is evidently the same as we have found in the Dewi inscription. I accept M. Boyer’s *ta*, though I do not feel quite confident about the reading. The next letter is certainly *ya*, but the right leg is bent and continued in a curve, so that we must apparently read *yan*. Then follows *da*, and *toyanada* may mean ‘a water-giver’, i.e. some appliance for drawing water from the well or some place for serving it to visitors, as suggested above in connexion with the Dewi inscription.

The ensuing akshara seems to me to be a distinct *cha*. There is an apparent cross-bar running into the next letter. The photograph, however, shows that it does not belong to the letter. Then comes *bhui* and not *bhu*. *Bhui* I have explained as corresponding to Skr. *bhyah*, and *toyanada cha bhui* as a parenthetical sentence, meaning ‘and moreover a water-giver’, to be connected with the preceding *khadha kme*.

The next word is certainly *danamukha*, which probably stands for *dañamukhe*.

The ensuing akshara, which was read *stra* by Cunningham and *sa* by M. Boyer, seems to me to be a distinct *hi*, and in the following I accept the reading *peadhia*, suggested by Messrs. Senart and Boyer. The impressions show several bars and lines in *pea*, but an inspection of the original has convinced me that they are due to the roughness of the stone. The ensuing *di* seems to be certain. The following *a* seems in the plate to rest on a line bent downwards at both ends. In the original I can only see a hook to the left, of the same kind as we find in the Māṇikiāla inscription.

It seems necessary to see in *Hippodiass* the name of the donor, and it is tempting to compare Greek names such as Hippoios, Hippias.


The ensuing akshara seems to be sa, though the bottom is damaged. What follows has not come out well in M. Senart’s plate. The first letter seems to be rasa and the second sī, but the stone has peeled off so that the outlines are indistinct. Then comes a certain us, a letter which can be da (cf. di of l. 1), ta or even sa; a distinct ti; a va, where I cannot see the u-mātrā read by M. Boyer; an akshara which may be dha or dh, and a letter which looks like the initial sa of l. 3, but which may be se. I therefore think it possible to read sarvastivadatradhāsa, for the increase of the Sarvāstivādā, or sarvastivasadadhasa, the elder in the settlement of the Sarvāstīs.

Then comes a distinct pu, followed by some strokes which Messrs. Senart and Boyer read as tra. To me they seem too short to be part of an akshara, and I take them to represent damage to the stone caused by the engraving of the u-loop of kṣṇa in l. 1. On the other side of this u-loop stands an akshara, which has been bent forward in order to avoid its running into the u-loop. M. Boyer took it to be ba, but it seems to me that it must be fa. Then comes an akshara which M. Senart read as na, M. Boyer as uṇa, but which seems to me to be u, with the same downward curve of the e-stroke as in some of the e-signs of the Mājūkāla inscription. I therefore read pūjaya, Skr. pūjaya. If the lines read as tra by the French scholars really represent tra, we might think of reading pūrajaya.

The last aksharas of l. 2 are certainly lika, as read by M. Senart, and they must be taken together with the first akshara of l. 3, which cannot, therefore, be anything else than sa.

The next word was read as kṣaharasa by M. Senart and as kṣahaspasa by M. Boyer. The second akshara is, however, evidently the same which occurs in maha-

kṣāra[tra]pasa in A. 1 of the Mathūrā Lion Capital. Only the small vertical above the head is placed more to the right. I therefore write [tra], assuming the sign to denote a modification of tra, perhaps with a fricative t. The next akshara can hardly be anything else than pa, though the head is damaged.

The kṣātra[pa] Liaka must be different from the kṣātra[pa] of Chukha. Liaka Kusuuka, but may have been a descendant of his and have held sway in Chukha, which must then have included Zeda.

The ensuing portion was read by M. Senart as: pa...a, da, ta dana, and by M. Boyer thupa dhola uvaṃita dana. So far as I can see, the first akshara is a, the third ku or kn, the fourth and fifth certainly cha and a. I therefore read upakachas and explain this as the dative of upakachas, i.e. upakachas, with the same meaning as Skr. upakara; cf. Pārkrit kachha. The next words I cannot read otherwise than as mada[n] kata dana, though the u-loop of madu is indistinct. The ka of kata seems to be quite certain.

The next three aksharas were read as anuga by M. Boyer, who thought that the backward curve at the bottom of ga is due to damage of the stone, but such does not seem to be the case, wherefore I read gra. M. Boyer read the remaining portion of the record as punavardhase Saghahitrasa dana, gift of Sāghaimitra, in order to increase his merit. What he read as pu, however, seems to me to be he, and ya could hardly represent Skr. yya. The na seems to be certain, though there is a wedge-like peeling off above the head. I, accordingly, read anugrahaṇa.

In my edition of the record I accepted M. Boyer’s vardhase. On the stone, however, I could not see the r-hook, and the supposed riha looked more like da. It may, however, be a misshaped dha. The third letter may be se, but also a sa of the same kind as the last akshara of the inscription. The first has, finally, a distinct curve at the bottom, which may be part of an u-mātrā. Vedhase or vadhase might be Pali vadhassa, vaddhassa, of the old, of the learned.
LXVI. PLATE XXVII. I: MĀṆIKIĀLA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 18

Māṇikīāla is a village and group of ruins in the Rawalpindi District, situated in 33° 27' N. and 73° 17' E., midway between Hassan Abdul and Jhelum. The remains consist of a great stūpa, south of the modern village, which was excavated by General Ventura in 1830, and fourteen smaller buildings of the same kind, fifteen monasteries, and many isolated massive stone walls.

One of the smaller stūpas was excavated by General Court in 1834.1 He found, at ten feet from the level of the ground, a cell in the form of a parallelogram, with the four sides corresponding with the four cardinal points, and covered by a massive stone, which proved to contain a Kharosthī inscription on the lower side. In the cell was found a copper urn, enclosing a silver urn, which again enclosed a gold urn, within which were found some coins, two precious stones, and four pearls.

Prinsep contributed a note on the interpretation of the inscription,2 and was apparently engaged on a study of the record shortly before his final departure from India. It was published by his brother, H. T. Prinsep.3

A new plate was published in E. Thomas's edition of Prinsep's Essays,4 with a transcript of the inscription.

Prinsep had read the name of the king as Kaneshka and the year as CXX, which he took to mean 120. Cunningham4 read the king's name as Maharaja Kanishka of the Kushan tribe5 and the year as 446, and stated that the inscription mentions the erection of a stūpa by the Satrap Gandaphuka. Further editions have been published by

---

2 I. c. p. 563.
3 I. c. p. 563.
4 Note on the historical results deducible from recent discoveries in Afghanistan. London, 1844, with plate 'Arian inscription from Māṇikīāla Tope'. Not accessible to me.
5 I. e., plate IX, opp. p. 145.
6 Bhilsa Tope, p. 149.
7 JASB, xxiii, 1854, pp. 703 ff.; with plate XXXV, fig. 26, opp. p. 668.
Dowson,1 Cunningham,2 Senart,3 Lüders,4 and Pargiter,5 and some contributions to the interpretation by Banerji,6 Fleet,7 Staël-Holstein,8 Konow,9 and Majumdar.10

The stone itself was sent by General Court to Paris, where it was deposited in the Cabinet of Medals in the Bibliothèque Nationale. It has since then been transferred to the Louvre. The stone is liable to peel off, and it has not been deemed advisable to have the stam- pages prepared, wherefore the new plate has been prepared from photographs, which the authorities of the Louvre have courteously placed at the disposal of the India Office.

The stone is 35 in. long and 16½ in. high, and the inscription consists of seven lines written parallel to the long sides of the stone; three lines written transversely at the left side, with the heads of the letters turned towards the central inscription, and continued along the upper edge, with the heads turned towards the heads of the uppermost line of the central portion; and, finally, of two lines, written transversely in front of the beginning of the central inscription. The size of individual letters varies from 1½ to 2 in.

The characters are boldly cut, but not well designed, and there is some difference in the shape of individual letters. Thus Lüders has recognized that the e-stroke of e sometimes takes the shape of a curved hook, of the same kind as the e-mātra in (puja) in the Zedā inscription, so that the akṣara has sometimes been read as iṣa. Dr. Hoernle and Dr. Fleet had anticipated this discovery in two instances, but not drawn the consequences of the reading. Some letters are provided with a bottom hook, which has sometimes being taken to be the anusvāra curve; cf. the sa of Kāyēkkasa, the sa of Kāṭiyasa a curve. The akṣara iṣa has different shapes in il. 1 and 5. Ya has a broadened head. The curve of iṣa is separated into two curves, one on each side of the vertical. Sa occurs in various forms and is sometimes provided with a short continuation of the vertical towards the head.

Such features only show that the draftsman was not very skilled, and they are found all over the inscription. There is, so far as I can see, no reason for Mr. Pargiter's suggestion that there are three different handwritings on the stone.

Lüders has seen that l. 2 of the central portion is the beginning of the record. It then runs on till l. 7 and continues in il. 1–3 on the left side. The last line there is continued in the inverted line on the top, and, further, in the top line. The two lines on the right side have been added subsequently, having been omitted through oversight when the bulk of the inscription was written. That seems at all events to be the case with the lower one. We shall see below that the case is perhaps different with the upper line. I shall number the lines in accordance with this arrangement, which only differs from that of Professor Lüders with regard to the inverted line at the top, which he took to follow after the uppermost line of the central portion.

L. 1–2, the second and third of the central portion, have been correctly read and interpreted by Professor Lüders as sam to 4 4 evra purva maharajas s Kāyēkkasa Gushavāsakaśanvaradhaka Lala. The e of evra and purva were formerly read as spha, and Mr. Pargiter read the two words as kṣhātra puruspa, but it is hardly necessary to discuss these readings after Professor Lüders' statement of the facts. There are two verticals below evra, one on each side, which do not seem to form part of

1 JRAS, xx, 1863, pp. 250 ff., with plate ix.
2 ASI, ii, 1871, pp. 161 ff., with plate LXXIII.
4 JRAS, 1914, pp. 641 ff.
5 JRAS, 1914, pp. 373 ff., 1003 ff.
6 SBAW, 1916, pp. 795, 798.
7 JA, ix, viii, 1896, pp. 1 ff., with plates.
8 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 46 ff.
9 JRAS, 1914, pp. 757, 759.
10 J&PASB, xviii, 1922, p. 67; List, no. 36.
the letter. I have already mentioned the hook at the bottom of some of the letters. In the sa of Kaṇeshkasa it has never been taken to have any significance. The ensuing gusṣaṇa was read ṣuṣaṇa or gusṣaṇa by Baron Staël-Holstein, who explained the form as the genitive plural of gusṣa, corresponding to kusana, i.e., kusana on the coin legends of Kanishka and his successors, and Mr. Pargiter read gusṣaṇa, but I agree with Dr. Fleet that the turn to the left at the bottom of the vertical stroke of (sa) is nothing but a slight exaggeration of the slope to the left with which the Kharoshthi y often ends, and is quite in agreement with the general sloping character of the writing of this record. The case is evidently not different where this turn has become a hook as in (Kaṇeshkasa, (gu)ṣaṇ(a), (va)ṣa, and I cannot accept Mr. Pargiter’s reading vaṣaṃ.

The words etra purva cannot well refer to the year, saṃ 18, but must indicate the day (tihi). It is perhaps probable that the two verticals below the e of eṭra are meant to indicate that something is missing, and I follow Professor Lüders in assuming that the second line on the right side of the stone should be inserted after saṃ to 4 ṣ. This line has been read as Kaṭṭiyasa māsa divavase 20 by Messrs. Senart and Lüders. M. Senart took māsa to be a clerical mistake for māsasa, while Professor Lüders explained it as a contraction of mākasa. Mr. Pargiter read maṇa, which may be a mistake for māsasa; or it may be the nearest way or writing māṇgha, the Iranian genitive of maṇ, a month; or the word may (as Dr. Fleet suggests) be mājha, read with the following divavase.

So far as I can see the reading maṇaḥ is certain. The only question is whether the slight backward turn of the vertical, which is quite distinct in the original, should not be read as an e. At all events maṇaḥ is no doubt intended. Now ṣh is often written to denote a voiced s in Kharoshthi documents from Central Asia, and we have found the same to be the case in maṇjha in the Zêda inscription. Maṇaḥ therefore means māṣa, where we find a voiced pronunciation of intervocalic s of the same kind as e.g. in dajha, Skr. dás in Kharoshthi documents from Niya, so that maṇaḥ represents Skr. māṣa, in the month. Instead of ṣh we find ṣṣ in this very word in the box-lict, the Hidaka and the Wardak inscriptions, where ṣṣ may likewise be meant to denote the voiced s, in which case we should become inclined to think that the Brahmī compound ye in Khotan Saka and in some Western Kshatrapa records has been coined in imitation of this ṣṣ.

The date is accordingly the 20th Kārttika of the year 18, i.e., according to Dr. van Wijk, the 6th October, A.D. 45.

Professor Lüders, followed by Mr. Pargiter, thought that the words maṇharacca Kaṇeshkasa cannot, standing as they do after eṭra purva, be taken together with the date. An exactly corresponding arrangement is, however, found in a document from Eastern Turkestan, where we read saṃvatasse 10 masya ṣa dhiṣajha to 4 ṣṣ y(a) kathunam Khotana maṇharacca rayāṭiraya Hinaḥkaya Avij(y)īdasinikasay.1 I cannot, therefore, accept Dr. Fleet’s opinion that our inscription bears witness to a later revival of the line of Kanishka.

The word gusṣaṇaṭamavardhaka cannot be connected with Kaṇeshkasa but must be taken together with the following name Lāla. Lāla was, accordingly, a scion of the Kusana race.

L. 3. The first two akṣaras were read ṭaḍaḥ by M. Senart and ṭoṣa by Mr. Pargiter. Professor Lüders saw that they are ṭaḍaḥ, i.e., ṭaṇḍaḥ, and must be connected with the ensuing akṣaras to ṭadaṇyagha, Skr. ṭaṇḍaṇyakāh. There is, it is true, a line protruding from the lower part of ṭa, but it seems to be a flaw in the stone.

Then follows, as already read by Dowson, Vedasiva kshatrapa. It is true, as

pointed out by Lüders, that the second akṣara looks like the e of etsa purve, but it is still more like the ets of older records, and the exceptional shape of e in some words of our record, where it looks like ets, does not justify us in reading every akṣara of a similar shape as e no more than in reading the usual e otherwise than e.

Vesṭā or Vesṭā, as the word is written in l. 6, is evidently a name. We may compare Prīṣast(e) in the Lion Capital and Viśvāsika, Viṣvāsika in some Brahmi inscriptions from Mathurā,† which may be a title.

I. 4. The first word was correctly read by M. Senart as horamurta, or rather horamurto, and it has been explained by Professor Lüders as a Scythian word with the same meaning as Skr. daunātī. We find it in the form horamurudaga in the Brahmi inscriptions from Mathurā containing the name Viṣvāsika, and the word uruvā in the Zeda inscription favours this latter form. Horamurta is therefore either a slightly different word or else an unsuccessful attempt at writing the foreign word. The ensuing words, sa laṣa apamga vihary horamurto, have been explained by Professor Lüders as a parenthetical sentence: he is his alms-lord in his own monastery, and this explanation is evidently right. M. Senart took apamga to represent Skr. apamagā, in (the Vihāra of) the small Naga, and Mr. Pargiter thought of Skr. apāyakā, in the market-place. I am convinced that Lüders was right in agreeing with Dowson who saw in apamga an old form of the modern apna, own. It cannot be objected that alman occurs as alman in the Taxila silver scroll and alman in the Arā inscription. The latter record shows that tva can become pat in the dialect, cf. ekapamara, Skr. ekapamarā, and, besides, Māṇikāla is not far removed from the Sauraseni country, where alman becomes apna. Our inscription therefore is the oldest known instance of the use of the word which has become Hindi apna, as a possessive pronoun.

Then follows an akṣara which Messrs. Senart and Pargiter read a, but which Lüders is certainly right in reading as e. The e-stroke is attached to the lower part of the vertical and then bends down and runs into the ve in the line below. Mr. Pargiter read the next three akṣaras as avamga and thus arrived at his avamga, Skr. avamagama, through ringing. There cannot, however, be any doubt that Messrs. Senart and Lüders were right in reading tva nava, and Lüders has rightly explained nava as corresponding to Skr. nava.

Then follows, as already Dowson saw, Baṅgava Buddhā,† which must evidently be connected with the ensuing word, which was read as tucena by M. Senart, tucena by Professor Lüders, and tucena by Mr. Pargiter. The first akṣara cannot, so far as I can see, be anything else than jhu. The bottom is curved, but not enough to allow us to read jhu or jhun. A word jvama is not known to me, but it must be derived from the base which occurs in Pāli jhampata, which is used inter alia about the emanation of the Buddha’s body. It must accordingly mean something produced by burning and is evidently a synonym with ṣārīra, dhātu, used in other records. With this explanation also the word ngya becomes intelligible.

I. 6 fr[†]tistateyati saha tucena Vepstasena Khud[da]khi[etc.] The e of pra is not certain, but probable. The u of tucena seems to be certain, that of Khudakhi to be probable. The word tucena was explained by M. Senart as Skr. tucaqata, with a triad.

† Cf. R. D. Bandopādhyāya, J&FASB, v, 1907, pp. 242 f.
† SBAW, 1913, pp. 420 ff. Mr. Pargiter takes it to be a compound of the Greek ἐμα, an hour, and mabhara, corrupted to marta.
† M. Senart took horamurtasatasa as one word, Skr. horamurtisasatasa, an incantation image of Ahura, and Mr. Pargiter as Skr. horamurtisasatasa, attached to horas, i.e. mura, horas.
† Mr. Pargiter reads bhun va simha.
while Mr. Pargiter took *teua* to be equivalent with Skr. *teu*. The last word was read *Khudachi* by M. Senart, *Khujacchena* by Professor Lüders, and *khudene* by Mr. Pargiter. The second akshara is evidently the same as the *du* in *dadanayago*, and the apparent *e*-stroke is probably a flaw in the stone. We have already found the word *Khudachi* in the Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168, where it is evidently derived from the name of a locality. Here it must be taken to characterize Veṣpaśa, apparently as hailing from Khudacha, or Khudachi.

We must then turn to the first line on the left side, where I accept Lüders’ reading *Buriteña cha viharakaraṇaṃaṇa*. The last word has been explained by Lüders; it corresponds to Skr. *viharakārakārapaṇaṇa*. M. Senart suggested to read *viharaspāroṣaṇa* and to see in this a synonym of *viharavāmin*, and Mr. Pargiter saw in *karavahaṇa* the Iranian *karapan*, *karafan*, ‘the name applied to teachers and priests hostile to the Zoroastrian religion’.

L. 8, the second of the left-hand portion, begins *sahneva cha parivareṇa sadha*. *Sahneva* is evidently a mistake for *savana* or *savaṇa*.

It will be seen that we actually have a ‘triad’: Veṣpaśa of Khudacha, Burita, the Vihāra architect, and the whole *parivāra*, i.e. probably as in the Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions, the *horakaparivāra*, the chapter of donators. We understand the use of the term *teua*, which would be less appropriate if only three persons were mentioned, Veṣpaśa, Khudacha, and Burita, as has usually been assumed.

Then follows as read by Lüders *etena kuśalamulena budhike cha shavacchi cha*. For *shavacchi* M. Senart read *spavasap̄ha*, Mr. Pargiter *spautahaka*, and Mr. Majumdar *aṭha-kahi*. *Shavacchi* has been explained by Professor Lüders: it corresponds to Skr. *trāvākāṭa*.

I then take the inverted line at the top. Here M. Senart read *sauka sada bhavatu*, Mr. Pargiter *sahasasa bhavatu*, and Dowson and Lüders *sachhasaṃa bhavatu*. I agree with Mr. Majumdar that the second akshara can only be *ma*, and I take the hook below *ma* to be the anusvāra. The next word seems to be *sauka*, which also occurs in the corresponding passage of the Wardak inscription.

As l. 11 I then take the uppermost line of the central portion: *bhraitara Svara-bhūkṣa agrapaḍāṣaṇa*. The only doubt is about the *di* of the last word, which may be *ti*.

The last line of the record is the first line of the right-end inscription. Messrs. Senart and Pargiter read *Saukha-buddhilenā savakarmigeṇa*, but there cannot be much doubt that Lüders was right in reading *saukha Buddhilenā navakarmigeṇa*. Only I think that the bottom-line in *sa(dha)* is not the anusvāra, but the otiase line which is often met with in old records and in coin-legends. I therefore read *sada*.

It is a curious coincidence that the name of the *navakarmika* has been subsequently added here as in the Patika plate. This addition is probably due to the *navakarmika* himself.

**TEXT**

1. *Saṁ 10 4 (Kartiyaya majh[e] divase 20) e[tra] purvæ maharajasa Kāne-
2. shkasa Gushapavaśaśaśaśvardhaka Lala
3. daṇanayago Veṣpaśa kṣhtrapasa
4. horamur[c] sa tasa apanage vihare
5. horamurfo etra ṇaṇa bhagava Buddhaj[a]va
7. Buriteña cha viharakara[va]haṇa
8. sa(m)veṇa cha parivareṇa sadha etena ku-
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10. samārah sada bhavatu
12. sadha Budhilehā navakarmgeṇa.

TRANSLATION

Anno 18, on the 20th day in the month of Karttika, on this first (tithi) during the reign of the mahārāja Kanēshka, the general Lāla, the scion of the Gūḍhaṇa race, the donation master of the kṣhatriya Veśpasi—he is his donation master in his own Vihāra—establishes several relics of the Lord Buddha, together with a triad: Veśpasi the Khud rhakian, Burita the Vihāra architect, and with the whole chapter. Through this root of bliss, together with the Buddhas and Śravakas, may it for ever be for the principal share of (my) brother Svarābudhī. (He was also associated) with Burīta, the repairing architect.

LXXVII. PLATE XXVII. 2: MĀNIKIĀLA BRONZE CASSETTE INSCRIPTION

During the excavation of the great stūpa at Mānikāla in 1830, General Ventura found a small chamber, one foot in breadth and depth, covered by a great stone slab. It contained a box, enclosing a cylindrical bronze casket, on the lid of which a Kharoṣṭhī inscription was discovered, with letters consisting of dots punched into the surface. The casket contained a gold cylindrical box, 4 inches long by 1½ inch in diameter, filled with a thick brown liquid mixed with a multitude of fragments of what Mr. Ventura supposed to be broken amber. Within the box were, further, a gold coin of Huvishka, a pāṭha gold coin, and a plain disc of silver, inscribed with Kharoṣṭhī letters.

The bronze casket inscription was published by Cunningham,2 Dowson,3 and Pargiter,4 and it has been mentioned and commented on by Messrs. Senart,5 Konow,6 and Majumdar.7

The casket, which is now in the British Museum, is 5½ in. high and 3½ in. in diameter, with a pinnacle, 3½ inches high, on the lid.

The inscription runs round the lid, the last word being incised below the preceding one, with the result that the last akṣara crosses a double line running along the rim.

The first word is Kavitiaksatrapasa. Cunningham read svatiṣṭhi and later svatiṣṭva, E. Thomas and Dowson Kavitiṣṭa, Senart Svaratissa, and Pargiter Kavitiṣṭa or Kavitiṣa, but the reading Kavitiṣṭa is certain. It can hardly be anything else than Skr. Kāpiṣṭa, of Kapiśa. The use of the name of a country to denote the ruler is well known in India.

The ensuing two akṣaras are certainly grava, where gr probably denotes a modified, presumably fricative g. G(a)ava may be an Iranian noun formed from the base kava and meaning 'killing', 'fight'.

The next letters were read phaka by Cunningham, phkaka by Dowson, and kpoṣaka,

2. JASB, XIV, i, 1845, p. 432; XXIII, 1854, p. 699, with plate XXXVI, fig. 24; ASI, II, 1873, pp. 160 f., with plate LXIII, no. 1.
3. JRAS, xx, 1862, pp. 244 ff, with plate IV, fig. 4.
5. JA, viii, xv, 1890, p. 134; IX, vii, 1896, pp. 31 f.
7. List, no. 37.
i.e. kṣuaka, by Pargiter. The first akshara consists of a vha, with a rounded bar across the long upright, and an angular addition at the bottom. The cross-bar is similar to the ante-consonantic r of rmas in the Kanishka casket, Kurram and Jauli inscriptions, and the subscribed hook seems to be ya. I therefore read ṛukhya, or perhaps rather uhryaka, which would be an Iranian adjective formed from the base pri.

The remaining aksharas are unmistakable. The final o of datamukho has not come out in the photograph, but is plainly visible in Mr. Pargiter’s plate.

**TEXT**

Kaviśakshatrapasa G(r)anavhryakakshatrapaputrasa datamukho.

**TRANSLATION**

Gift of the Kapiśa kshatrapa, the son of the kshatrapa G(r)anavhryaka.

**LXXVIII. PLATE XXVII. 3: MAŅIKIĀLA SILVER DISK INSCRIPTION**

The silver disk mentioned above is likewise in the British Museum. It is 0.9 in. in diameter and carries an inscription in two lines, which has been illustrated and edited by the same scholars as the bronze casket inscription.¹

The reading given by Mr. Pargiter, Gomaṇasa karavakasa, is quite certain, though the last ka of the latter word is distorted. Karavaka is the same word which we have found in the form karavkaa on the Māniṅikāla stone.

**TEXT**

L. 1 Gomaṇasa  
2 karavakasa.

**TRANSLATION**

(Gift) of Gomana, the architect.

**LXXIX. PLATE XXVII. 4: BOX-LID INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 18**

Among the antiquities sent home by Mr. Masson from Afghanistan was a brass casket, which came too late to be included in the Ariana Antiqua. We do not know where it was found or what has become of it.

The lid contained a Kharoshṭhi inscription, with a date, which was discussed by Cunningham.² A reproduction was published by E. Thomas ³ and again by Dowson,⁴ with remarks on the reading and interpretation of the record.

The plate gives the impression that the inscription was incised in two lines. Professor Dowson’s remarks make it, however, clear that such was not the case, for he informs us of the fact that, after the date, which ends in the apparent l. 2, there is a small blank, and then the inscription goes on with the apparent beginning of l. 1.

Nor can there be any doubt that Dowson was right in making the inscription begin with the eighth akshara from the end of what looks like l. 1. We there read, as seen by Dowson, sam to 4 4, i.e., the year is the same as on the Māniṅikāla stone.

After the year Cunningham suggested to read māsa attamiśiyasa vṛkhi 1. Dowson did not accept this, but could only propose another reading for the last aksharas, which he took to be stekhi 10. He was certainly right in his correction, but in other respects Cunningham’s reading was not far off the mark.

¹ Cf. Majumdar, List, no. 38.
² JASB, xxxi, 1892, p. 363.
³ In James Prinsep, Essays on Indian Antiquities, i, p. 161, with plate ix, fig. 3.
⁴ JRAS, xx, 1893, pp. 232, 254 f., with plate IX, fig. 3; cf. Majumdar, List, Addenda (i).
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The first letter looks like *mu*, but has evidently been a *mu* with a long right-hand stroke, of the same kind as in the Kalatse inscription. The second seems to be *ye*, with an incomplete *y*-loop and the *e*-stroke apparently joining the head. The form *masye* has already been mentioned in connexion with *majh[e]* in the Manikiala inscription and seems to correspond to Skr. *mäsa*, with a voiced *s*.

Then follow a misdrawn *a*, where the head has become square; a *rtha* of the same kind as in the Wardak inscription, which has been distorted so as to look like a *rta*; further, in the apparent l. 2, three aksharas which I follow Cunningham in reading as *misiya*, though they are badly misdrawn. *Arthamisiya* seems to be the genitive or locative of *Arthamiti*, Greek Artemisios.

The ensuing letters must evidently be read as *saste[hi] to*, though the *i* of *sastehi* cannot be seen in the plate. *Sastehi* is the instrumental plural of *sasta*, and is used with the meaning ‘day’ in the Hidda and Wardak inscriptions and in some Kharoshthi documents from Central Asia. It is not an Indian word, but seems to be identical with Khotan Saka *sasta*, the past participle of the base *sád*, to shine, to appear, which is used about the sun. It seems to be used in the same way as the Iranian base *sak*, which is used about the passing of time. *Sastehi* to accordingly means ‘when to had appeared’, and the inscription is dated on the 10th Artemisia of the year 18, i.e. according to Dr. van Wijk’s calculations, on the 20th April, A.D. 146.

Then follows the inscription proper, which Dowson read as *Hasharesya ga*(or go or go) or ga delt or *výma[na na] sarir parishkathii (or parishpâtti).

I take the first words to be misread for *isa* (or *ile*) *kshunamrãti*, with the same *mri* for a modified, probably aspirated, *mi*, which we shall find in the Wardak inscription.

Then follows *Gola*, the akshara which I read as *ma* in *masye*, and an akshara which seems to be long enough to contain two letters, a *na* and a *sa*. The reproduction is evidently quite unreliable, and I suppose that the original had *Gotamaśamanasa* or *Gotamashamanasa* or *Gotamanunisa*.

* The next word is clearly *sário*, and the last I take to be *paristavida*, though it looks more like *parishthavida*.

With every reserve I therefore read as follows:

**TEXT**

Sane 10 4.4 *masye Arthamisiya saste[hi] to í[f]e[k] kshunamrãti* Gotamaśamanasa *sário paristavida.*

**TRANSLATION**

Anno 18, in the month Artemisia, when 10 (days) had appeared, at this term the Sramaṇa Gotama’s relic was enshrined.

LXX. PLATES XXVIII, XXIX: KURRAM CASKET INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 20

This inscription is incised on the four sides of a copper stūpa, with harmikā and umbrellas, belonging to Arbab Muhammed Abas Khan, younger brother of the Nawâb of Landi, near Peshawar, to whom it was presented when his father was Tâhsildâr in Kurram. We do not know where it has originally been found.

There is a hole at the right-hand corner where the third line of the inscription begins. In other respects the casket is fairly well preserved.

The inscription, which runs round the square base of the stūpa, was brought to the notice of the late Pandit V. Natesa Aiyar in 1917 by Khan Sahib Mian Wasi Uddin, and published by him, with corrections by Professor Thomas.

When I was in Peshāvar in February, 1925, the owner kindly lent me the original, and I was even allowed to take it to Taxilla, where I was able to go through my transcript with Sir John Marshall, who accepted my readings and allowed me to publish a paper on the record. The accompanying plate has been prepared from photographs supplied by Mr. Hargreaves.

The edition in the Epigraphia appeared after my paper had been finished, and I shall therefore only draw attention to such cases where I differ from Professor Thomas, whose readings are everywhere to be preferred to those of the Pandit.

The letters consist of small dots punched into the copper and are distributed over four lines on the first and last sides and three on the others. I shall mark the four sides as A, B, C, D, respectively. The arrangement of the inscription is that the individual lines are continued through all four faces. After the end of line 3 on face D, the text runs on in line 4 on the same face and is finished in line 4 of A. I here differ from my predecessors, who took A 4 to precede D 4.

The characters are Kharoshthi of a similar kind as in the Kanishka casket inscription and other records of the same period. We may note the frequent use of a bottom-stroke, the rounded da, the peculiar mu, and the broad ya.

Intervocalic ga is written gva, and the same sign is occasionally used for old k; cf. bhagravatasa, sogra. What is meant is evidently a voiced guttural fricative. In prachagra, Skr. pratiyaya; vugrava, Skr. upayasa, gr is written for old j. We have an exact parallel in the Kharoshthi manuscript of the Dhammapada, where we find e.g. raka, Skr. rāga; urako, Skr. urago; udakavaya, Skr. udhayayaya; dhoreka, Skr. dhauraya. Here k is written, in a similar way as kr on the Mathurā Lion Capital, but the sound intehed is certainly the same in all these cases. I shall write g(r), in the same way we apparently have dva for intervocalic da.

There are also other peculiarities which remind us of the manuscript. Thus r s becomes sh in phasha, Skr. sparśa, D 2; sh becomes k in kandha, Skr. skandha, D 3; samkara, Skr. samśkāra, B 2. The ka in such words differs, it is true, from the usual ka, in so far as the vertical is prolonged above the head, so that the sound must have become modified. We have found a similar sign in the Lahore Museum inscription on the Buddha's writing-board, which contains references to events dealt with in Buddhist literature. In the Dhammapada we find kauhāya, Skr. skandhānam, but saṅkara, Skr. saṃskāra. I shall write k. In A 3 we find lasha for Skr. trishna, with a curve above the sha. The Dhammapada has lasha. I shall again write lasha. In this case the Dhammapada manuscript comes to our assistance. It frequently uses this same curve above letters which we must assume to have been aspirated; thus above n in ganu, Skr. gandha, C 3; ana, Skr. anāha, C 4; hana, Skr. skandha, B 13. There can be no doubt that an aspirated n is intended. Similarly we find the curve above ja in jāna, Skr. dhyāna, ajayado, Skr. adhyāyasah, B 16; prātijāti, Skr. prabhudhyante, A 5, &c. The curve is, however, sometimes omitted; cf. jayadu, A 3; prātijāti A 4, &c. Such writings seem to bear witness to a weakening of the aspiration.

Another peculiarity, which I cannot explain, is the apparent substitution of s for sy

---

1 Cf. ASIAR, 1917-18, pp. 31 ff.; ASIFC, 1917-18, p. 2; Majumdar, List, no. 26.
2 Ep. Ind., xviii, p. 16 ff., with reproductions of the stūpa and of a photograph and an eye-copy of the inscription.
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in dormanasta, Skr. daurmanasya, C 3. It seems as if we have before us a barbaric daurmama.

All these peculiarities, with the exception of the writing gr for intervocalic g, are found outside the proper record and in a passage which is described as a saying of the Lord, and which is, in fact, the well-known pratityasamutpatha formula. The passage looks like a quotation, and seems to have been taken from a canonical text. Now we know from the Kharoshthi Dhammadpada that there existed canonical texts in a somewhat standardized form of the vernacular used in Kharoshthi inscriptions. Our record, and apparently also the writing-board epigraph mentioned above, show that the Dhammadpada was not the only work of this kind.

We cannot say to which sect this Prakrit canon belonged. Our inscription mentions the Sarvastivadins, and it seems natural to infer that the Sarvastivadins had a Prakrit canon in the north-western language of, say Taxila, before Sanskrit was introduced, probably in connexion with Kanishka's Council.

I now turn to the inscription itself.

A 1. The beginning is damaged, but can be made out to be Sānu 20 maṣasa. It has been subsequently changed to Sānu 20 t maṣa, but the figure t and the ma which has been engraved over the old sa have not been executed in the usual way, as punched dots, but engraved in deep-cut lines. It therefore seems probable that the correction has been made at a later time, when the beginning had become so much damaged as to be almost illegible.

Then follows Aavadunakaśa di 20 iś[a] khaunānmi. Aavadunakaśa is the Greek Aēduos, and according to Dr. van Wijck's calculations, the 20th Audunacios of the year 20 corresponds to the 2 January, a.d. 148.

B 1 was read by Professor Thomas as Tītra-Varmyasaputrasa navakaṁmisa saṅgha. So far as I can see, however, the first akshara can only be śv and the second is identical with the āra of C D 2. It is possible that the engraver's draft had śvatra, cf. the Skr. metronymic śvāitreya, but we can only read śvātra. I connect this śvātra with the ensuing varma, and read Śvātra varma Yaśaputra.

The ensuing akshara is not sa but ta, and we must read tānuakaṁmī or, perhaps, tānuakaṁmī, cf. tānuvā, own, in the Taxila silver scroll.

The next word was invisible in the plates which Professor Thomas had at his disposal, but is clearly rataṁkamī, Skr. aranyya, a word which we have already met with in the Jamālaṛat inscription of the year 359.

C 1 opens with a hole, with room enough for four letters, followed by an almost complete rata and a ni. There are traces left of the first akshara, which seems to have been ma. I therefore think that we may restore navatārakamī. The next words were read as acharyam araśvāstivārana by Professor Thomas, whose plates did not show the last two aksharas of the line, pari.

D 1. The first aksharas are defaced but clearly visible in the original, being grahaṁ. Then follows thukhasaṁ bhag(ā)pavatasa Śākyamunissa.

A 2. śarīra pradīpaveti yattha uta bhag(ā)pavada. Professor Thomas read yatha and utaṁ, but I feel confident that my reading is correct.

B 2–D 3 do not call for any remark after what has been said about the peculiar signs used in this part of the record. Professor Thomas read koyas for kora, and doma- navaṁṣaṁsanaṁsvaṁjñāvati for dormanastāvagrasa evam asa, because his materials were too defective to make it possible to see the actual reading.

Then we must go on with D 4, as already stated, where the only doubtful akshara
is the last one, which seems to me to be clearly to and not de. L. 4 forms the continuation of the inscription proper, which was interrupted by the quotation.

The concluding line, A 4, was illegible in Professor Thomas's plate, but is quite certain. The name Mahipattia was not known from other sources.

**Text**


L. 2 (A), ōra pradīp̐hāveda yatha uta bhag(r)avada (B) avijaprachag(ra) sañkāra(r̓a) sañkāra(r̓a) viṇāna (C) [viṇ]anaprachag(ra) namaruva namaruvaprachag(r̓a) shad(r̓a)[ya][D][çana] shad(r̓a)ayadanaprachag(ra) phasha p[h̓]a[ra]m estas pra[ca]pañca rāja

L. 3 (A), vedana vedanaprachag(ra) tasha tash[pa]prachag(r̓a) uvdana (B) uvdanaprachag(r̓a) bhava bhavaprahag(r̓a) pada jadipra[ca]g(r̓a) (C) jaramara[nar]a[sog(r̓a)]-paridevadukhahomanastāivag(r̓a)asa (D) [eva]m asa kevalasa dukhaṅkanidhasa samu[ḍ]ae bhavadi

L. 4 (D), sarvasatvāna puyae aya cha pratichasamupate (A) likhida Mahipatiṃa sarvasatvāna puyae.

**Translation**

Anno 20, on the 20. d. of the month Avadunaka, at this instant Śvedavarma, the son of Yaśa, establishes a relic of the Lord Śakyamuni in his own grove, in the new Viśāra, in the acceptance of the Sarvastivāda teachers, in a stūpa. As it has been said by the Lord: in interconnection with delusion the saṃskāras, with the saṃskāras consciousness, with consciousness name and form, with name and form the six organs, with the six organs touch, with touch sensation, with sensation thirst, with thirst grasping, with grasping life, with life birth, with birth decay, death, grief, lamentation, suffering, dejection, despair. Thus is the origin of this whole aggregate of suffering—for the honouring of all beings. And this pratiyāsāmutpāda has been written down by Mahipatī for the honouring of all beings.

**LXXXI. Plate XXXI. 1: Peshāwar Museum Inscription, No. 21**

Inscription No. 21 of the Peshāwar Museum is found on a stone measuring 16 in. x 9 in. x 6 in., which was presented to the Museum by Sir Aurel Stein on the 4th July, 1916.¹ We have no information as to the place where it has been found. Sir Aurel has kindly let me know that it was presented to him by Sir Harold Deane.

The inscribed portion measures twelve inches by five, and the average size of letters is 1 in.

There are altogether four lines of writing; of the first one, however, only a few akṣaras remain.

The characters are roughly drawn and remind us of the Zeda and Aṛā inscriptions; cf. the forms of ḫa, ṛ, and ṃ, and note the compound ṭṛ in l. 4.

L. 1. Only some fragments of the writing remain. We have a complete ma, the lower portion of a ḫa, traces of two akṣaras with long verticals, and the greater part of a ṃ. The first word must, accordingly, have been mahārajasu.

Then there are remnants of a letter which seems to be ṭa, and further what looks

¹ Cf. V. Natesa Aiyar, ASIPC, 1916-17, pp. 6, 27; Majumdar, List, no. 55.
like the u-mātra of an akshara. It would be possible to read the name as Vajhushkasa, but the existing traces are too faint to allow us to judge.

The remainder of the first line is hopeless, and the difficulty is increased through the apparent distribution over two lines. If the two or three blurred groups of strokes which seem to stand in the lower line are flaws in the stone of the same kind as what we can observe below l. 4, it would be possible to read the end of the line as 20 4 jethasa, though the apparent 4 is a straight and not a sloping cross. We might then tentatively restore the whole line as maharajas Vajhushkasa sanātatre 20 4 Jethasa. But the only certain word is maharajas.

L. 2 begins with masasa followed by an akshara which looks like the di of the Ara inscription, though it might also be ti. Then there is an open space, with room for one or two numerical figures, which cannot be made out.

The remaining portion of the record can be read without much difficulty. L. 2 runs on ise kṣhunānini khaṇāvīde [kupe]. There seems to be an akshara standing below the ya of khaṇāvīde, but it is evidently only a flaw in the stone. The last word of the line might be kupe, but I think that kupe is more likely.

L. 3. The beginning is quite clear, viz. Vasaṇaseya Īdraudevatuyena, where the dra or Idra might also be read as tra. The last word of the line was read as Khaṇāviseya by Mr. Majumdar, but I have little doubt that we must read brahmavatya or, rather, brahmavata, for there seems to be a curve below the ma, of the same kind as in the Dhammapada manuscript.

L. 4. The first akshara looks more like o than sta, and the apparent continuation of the o-stroke to the right of the vertical seems to represent a peeling off of the stone. The second is bha, and I take the strokes running upwards toward the su of l. 3 and backwards from the bottom to be flaws in the stone. Then comes ra, surmounted by a sloping line, which may also represent an unevenness in the stone itself.

The next word is clearly vastamvcat, and then follows dānasya avāptīr astu, where the only doubtful point is whether we should take the backward bottom-stroke of su in dānasya as a mutilated yu-loop or read sa.

The last sentence is accordingly Sanskrit, dānasya avāptīr astu, may there be obtainment (of the meritorious results) of the donation. This is the only known case where we find Sanskrit in Indian Kharoshthi inscriptions. We know from the documents found by Sir Aurel Stein in Central Asia, which can be roughly dated in the second half of the second century A.D.,1 that Kharoshthi was then occasionally used for writing Sanskrit, and our inscription shows that such was also the case in north-western India, apparently in the second half of the second century.

The introduction of Sanskrit was no doubt subsequent to the Kanishka Council, and we know that Sanskrit became later on the church language of the Sarvāstivādins. The use of Sanskrit in our record may be due to a belief in the greater efficacy of Sanskrit in such blessings, which are more or less of the nature of charms. Or the explanation may be found in the fact that the donor was a Brahman.

At all events the sentence is, through the use of Sanskrit, separated from the bulk of the record, and adds strength to my explanation of the final sentence in the Taxila silver scroll, gīvayaḥ hato yāya de samaparigho, as standing outside the context.

The writing dānasya[y]a for dānasya further shows that no difference was heard

---

1 Konow, Acta Orientalia, ii, pp. 115 ff.
2 Cf. e.g. Boyer, Rapson, Senart, JA, xi, xiii, 1918, pp. 319 ff.
between a dental and a cerebral n. In the Sanskrit texts from Central Asia mentioned above, we similarly find manushya, vartamana, dhanani, &c.

**Text**

1. maha[raja]sa...
2. masasa di... ise kshuna[mi] khanavide [kuve]

**Translation**

Of the Mahārāja... on the... day of the month..., at this term this well was caused to be dug by the Brahman Vasudeva, the son of Indrādeva, a resident of Obhara. May there be obtaining of (the meritorious results of) the gift.

**LXXXII. PLATE XXX. 2: HIDDA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 28**

The small village of Hidda is situated on a line of conglomerate elevations, about five miles to the south of Jαləlabad. It was there that the Chinese pilgrims found the stūpa said to contain the Lord’s ushnisha. The site was examined by Masson, who in one of the stūpas found a jar, with a Kharoshthi inscription, ‘written with a pen, but very carelessly’.

Some of Masson’s papers have been deposited in the India Office, and among them Professor Thomas found some other copies of the Hiddu inscription, with an attempt at a transliteration, and from a comparison of these materials he published a new reading of the record, with reproductions of the old plate and of Masson’s copy. The plate now published in the Corpus is simply a recast reproduction of Professor Thomas’s plates, in the arrangement which he has established.

The inscription contains two lines of Kharoshthi letters. Though the hand-copies from which the plates are reproduced are rather faulty, it has proved possible for Professor Thomas to read the whole record.

The first word is samhātārāc, but the first letter looks like se- or seh. The next seems to be anhaviniṣṭaḥi, as read by Professor Thomas. We should expect anhaviniṣṭe or anhaviniṣami, or else samhātavṛti for samhātārāc.

Then follow the numerical figures 10 4 4 and evidently Masc. Professor Thomas reads mase and corrects to masa. The next words are Ape[or] plae[sa] stehi dasahi, for which Professor Thomas reads Ape[or] plae[sa] stehi dasahi. The only question is, I think, whether we must not read stehi, for there is evidently a vertical rising from the crossing, as sometimes in the Kharoshthi documents from Central Asia, where it has been customary, in such cases, to transliterate sth.

Then comes the figure 10, and further isa, or ile as read by Professor Thomas, kshuna[mi] pratistapita svāra. The two copies read pharistapita and [phara]-ja-stapita, respectively, and it is, as already stated, uncertain whether we should read sta or sta.

---


2. JRAS, 1915, pp. 91 ff., with plates.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE KANISHKA ERA

The next word was read rajavāntimi by Professor Thomas. The two copies read [ja]tama[or pa]mi and rajatamāmi, respectively. Also other copies in the India Office have a ra after the ra of sarīra. I have little doubt that we must read either rajarakpa[mi] or simply rama[mi], in the royal wood, or, in the wood. Cf. the Kurram casket inscription.

Then follows, as read by Professor Thomas, thubami (or, perhaps thubāni) Sānghamitrenā navakarnā[na]. I shall not make any attempt at distinguishing the cerebral and the dental n, because the two copies differ from each other.

L. 2. The beginning is certainly edena kavalamulena, though the s of ku is not to be seen and the ša seems to be written twice, the second time in a distorted form, and though the final na of mulena looks like e. Professor Thomas supplied a na after mule and took e to the next word, which is certainly tešha. Then I accept Professor Thomas's dharmana, but read abhishuti for his lokika vija. He states that the different copies of these words in the India Office diverge considerably. As to the reading ti, we may compare the ti of pratistapita, l. 1, where the termination of ti has likewise been made into an apparent ja. The next word looks like yasha, which Professor Thomas takes to be a misreading for yaso. The preceding tešha makes me inclined to read yesha. Then follows dharmakhae, which I take to represent Skr. dharmakshaya, and not -kshaya. I accordingly translate: 'with suppression of those dharmas where there is a decay of dharma'.

Then I follow Professor Thomas in thinking that the next word is misread for bodhisattvā rīrā, though the first four akāshas are badly misdrawn.

The following words have been restored by Professor Thomas as sarvasatvā nirvānasāmbharā bhavatu rajasa agraprachānya. He takes the apparent prachānya to be either misread for prachāṃṣa or to represent Skr. agraprāṇya, in which the second member had the rare sense of 'tribute', 'share'. I take the final ya to be misread for ša, and as Mr. Masson's copies immediately go on with edena, I suppose that an e has been overlooked before the e, so that we should read prachāṃṣa or, perhaps, pratyāṃṣa.

It will be seen that the inscription cannot be properly read. With some confidence it can, however, be restored as follows:

TEXT

L. 1. sambatśarāe aṭhavirāśatīhi 20 4. 4. masye Apelae sastehi daśahī 10 iš[e] kshunanāmi pratisapita sarīra rajaraśaṃśati thubā[mi] Sānghamitrenā navakarnāna

L. 2. edena kavalamulena tešha dharmana abhishuti y[e]ṣa dharmakhae bodhisatvaśarā sarvasatvā nirvānasāmbharā bhavatu rajasa agraprachāṇa

TRANSLATION

In the twenty-eighth—28—year, in the month Apellaos, when ten—10—had appeared, at this term a relic was deposited in the king's grove, in a stūpa, by the architect Sānghamitra. Through this root of bliss may the Bodhisattva relic, with suppression of those dharmas where there is a decay of dharma, be for the equipment for Nirvāṇa for all beings, and for a principal share for the king.
LXXXIII. PLATE XXXI. 1: SHAKARDARRA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 40

Shakardarra is situated near Campbellspur in the North-West Frontier Province. In an old well at that place a Kharoshthi inscription was discovered and presented to the Lahore Museum by Mr. F. S. Talbot. It bears the Museum number I. 142.

The inscription has been read by Messrs. Bühler,1 Banerji,2 Konow,3 and Majumdar.4 The inscription is incised on a slab 1 ft. 6 in. high, with a polished surface measuring 1 ft. by 9½ in. It covers a space 10 in. long and 7½ in. high. The size of individual letters varies from ¾ in. to 2 in. At the end of the record is a rough drawing of an animal facing a jar with a branch of a tree.

The characters are similar to those of the Arā inscription, but the execution is still more rough. Two of the aksharas, viz. the ka and ḍa of l. 3, show a sloping bottom-line, which is well known from the Aśoka inscriptions and old coins. The vertical of ka in kaṭe, l. 2, is provided with a backwards curve, which reminds us of the curve marking long vowels in a Kharoshthi Sanskrit document from Eastern Turkestan.5 I shall therefore write ḍā. The akṣhara ḍa is almost indistinguishable from ā in Prothavadasa, divasa..., l. 1, di, divasa, l. 2, dromi, l. 3, and daṇamukho, l. 4, but has a more regular shape in khaḍa, l. 3.

L. 1 contains the beginning of the date. The o-stroke of pro has caused a slight peeling off of the stone, the result being an apparent curve. The r-stroke is not certain. It has an unusually sharp angle against the vertical and looks, on the stone itself, more like a flaw than a vowel-stroke. Finally, the horizontal protrudes to the left of the vertical, and seems to join the ensuing ṭha, which is, in its turn, damaged, while the sa shows the prolongation of the vertical known from old records. These features will prove to be of importance for our understanding of the Rāval inscription.

Then follows di[vasa], but the corner of the stone has been knocked off in this place, and there seems to have stood an akṣhara after sa. I therefore read divasa[ni*]. We may note that the fracture is responsible for an apparent stroke above sa.

L. 2 gives the continuation of the date, which is the 20th Pratushthapada of the year 40, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk, to the 27th July, A.D. 168.

The next two words are atra divasakātha, where we may note the shape of tra and the akṣhara which I have already stated that I take to represent ṭa.

Then follows an akṣhara which I follow Bühler in reading as ka and a mutilated letter, which he took to be ko, connecting kaka with the three first aksharas of l. 3, which he read as nikama, and explaining Šakunikama as the old name of Shakardarra. The existing traces of the last akṣhara seem to me to be more in favour of ka than of ko, and I shall provisionally read kā.

L. 3. The first akṣhara, which Bühler read as ni, was taken to be an e by Banerji, while Majumdar followed Bühler. It seems to me that we have certainly to do with a dental n, but I do not think that the vowel stroke is an i, because the i of ni is elsewhere written across the lower vertical. I think that we must read no. The next aksara, ka,

1 Anziger der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, xxxv, 1898, pp. 14 ff., with plate.
2 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, p. 66, with plate 1.
4 J&FASB, xviii, 1922, pp. 51 ff., with plate 111; cf. List, no. 61.
5 See Stein, Sāndali, pl. xxiv, N. xxiv, viii, 9, reverse.
is, as already remarked, provided with a sloping bottom-stroke. It is possible that it is without significance, but I think it more probable that it is an r-stroke, continued to the left of the vertical in the same way as we have found it to be the case with the horizontal of \textit{pa} in \textit{prothavada}. I therefore read \textit{nakrame}, corresponding to Skr. \textit{nukram}, bridge of boats. I take \textit{Salanauskrama} to be the old name of Shakardara, characterizing it as the eastern starting-point for the crossing of the Indus, and it is of interest to note that we find \textit{Salatuya}, the present Lahor, on the other side of the river.

The next word is evidently \textit{kuvo}. The \textit{u} is defaced and looks almost like \textit{o}, but the original shows that this appearance is simply due to the careless engraving.

Then follows \textit{khaado}, Skr. \textit{khatakah}, dug, and not, as suggested by Majumdar, \textit{kshatak}.\footnote{Cf. Pischel, \textit{Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen}, § 167.}

The remaining aksharas of the line were read as \textit{tiruvananasa} by Bühler, \textit{troniva} \ldots \textit{nasa} by Banerji, and \textit{tronivadrena sam} \ldots by Majumdar. The first is different from the \textit{tra in atra}, but reminds us of the \textit{d in divasakăle.} The projection to the left may be an \textit{r-mātrā}, and I would therefore read \textit{droni}. Then comes a clear \textit{sa} and an akshara which seems to me to be \textit{da}, with the same backward bend of the head which we often find in the Dhammapada manuscript. Below is the same sloping bottom-stroke which I read as \textit{r} in \textit{nakrame}. I therefore read \textit{dronivadra} and take this together with the ensuing \textit{pa} as one word, the genitive plural of a word which seems to contain \textit{droni}, and \textit{vadra}. \textit{Droni} can mean 'a canoe', but is also stated to be the name of a country, and \textit{vadra} seems to be Skr. \textit{padra}, a village. The \textit{dronivadras} might accordingly be the Dronji villagers, or the canoe villagers, but I prefer to leave the word untranslated.

The reading \textit{sam} of the last akshara of the line was originally suggested by myself. It seems, however, as if Bühler was right in reading \textit{sa}. It will be seen that the leg of the akshara is shorter than usual with \textit{sa}, and I think that the bottom has been bent in order to avoid its running into the figures standing below.

L. 4. The first word was read as \textit{jaraui} by Bühler, who explained it as representing Skr. \textit{jharas}, a well. Majumdar read \textit{guravo}. The first akshara runs into the letter standing above it in l. 3 and is badly drawn, but can hardly be anything else than \textit{ha}. The second is certainly \textit{ra}, and the third seems to be \textit{na} or \textit{ya}. I take these aksharas together with the last one in l. 3 and read \textit{sahara}, the genitive plural of \textit{sahara}, i.e. \textit{sahara}, which may represent a \textit{sahakara} or a \textit{sahachara}.\footnote{Cf. Pischel, \textit{Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen}, § 167.}

The last word being certainly \textit{daṇamukho}, I read the whole as follows:

**TEXT**

\textbf{TEXT}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{L. 1} \textit{saami 20 20 [Pro]havadasa masasa di[vasa\text{\textsuperscript{mi}}]} \\
\textbf{2} vi\text{\textsuperscript{ami}} di 20 atra divasakāle Ša[la]-
\textbf{3} nokrame k[\text{\textsuperscript{u}vo khadao Dronivadraṇa sa-}
\textbf{4} haraṇa daṇamukho.}
\end{tabular}

**TRANSLATION**

Anno 40, on the twentieth day—d. 20—of the month Praushṭhapada, at this day time this well was dug at the Šala ferry as the gift of the Dronipadra companions.
RAWAL INSRIPTION

LXXXIV. PLATE XXXI. 2: RAWAL INSRIPTION OF THE YEAR 40

Rawal is a village near Mathura, situated on the eastern side of the Jamma. It belongs to the localities which are included in the regular progression of pilgrims and is considered to represent the place where Radha's mother lived.

There is a fairly high and extensive mound at Rawal, and there the Honorary Curator of the Mathura Museum, Pandit Radha Krishna, found a stone, 1 ft. long and about 4 in. high, bearing a Kharoshthi inscription. The stone is now in the Mathura Museum.

The inscription consists of four lines, one on the upper surface, the other ones on the front side. The size of individual letters varies between $\frac{1}{2}$ in. and $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

As will be seen from the plate, the characters have a peculiar appearance, and I should not have been able to make anything out of the inscription, if I had not recognized some groups which I remembered from the Shakardara record. A detailed comparison further showed that the Rawal epigraph is a clumsy copy of the latter, made by a person who did not understand the text he tried to imitate.

L. 1. The initial sam is quite misdrawn, while the numerical figures 20 + 20 are fairly well executed. In Pratyaharadas the copyist has not seen any r-stroke in prṛ, and he has reproduced the blurred s-stroke as a semicircle and taken an apparent bend of the vertical of sa to be intended. The prolongation of the horizontal has been continued into the ensuing tha, which has been too indistinct. The sa and the da are fairly well copied, but the prolongation of the vertical of sa has led the copyist astray, and, on the whole, his sa's can only be recognized with the help of the original; cf. the ensuing masasa.

The edge of the stone was damaged as it is now, and the copyist has only been able to see diva, taking the apparent bar above the va as intended.

L. 2. The four first aksharas are represented by one sign, which seems to be a clumsy imitation of sa. The ensuing 20 atrava divasahāte can be recognized when we compare the original. The following sa has been misdrawn and looks like na, and the concluding akshara of the line is only of interest in so far as it makes it likely that the left limb of the supposed ta was less damaged than now, when the copy was made.

L. 3. The first akshara has been drawn as an α, with a sloping top-stroke instead of the upper curve of na. The second can still be recognized as kra, but the me has been misunderstood and looks like ra. The ensuing kuva hāda has been omitted, evidently through oversight, and in the following we can recognize adronīvadagana, where the aksharas which I have read as ṅro and ṅra, respectively, have been taken to be identical. Also the ensuing sa can be made out.

Then three aksharas have been added, which have nothing to correspond to them in the original. The first is repeated in l. 4, below the sa of l. 3, and the last looks like an attempt at reproducing the top of the picture shown in the Shakardara inscription.

L. 4. The first letter has been comparatively well copied, almost as an ordinary ha; the second and third ones, which look like dana, can only be understood by comparing the original.

The ensuing dana has come out fairly well. Now the copyist seems to have discovered his omission in l. 3 and wanted to add kuva. He has omitted the blurred u of ku, made the va into a ra, and added the e-stroke on the wrong side. Or else the two aksharas may be an attempt at reproducing mukho, with an inverted mu.
The remaining aksharas are too deformed to make it possible to find out what they are meant to render. The first has already been mentioned in connexion with I. 3, and the rest may represent an attempt at reproducing parts of the picture of the original.

It will be seen that the Rawal stone does not contain a genuine inscription, but is simply a forgery, or rather an attempt at imitating an older original. It is impossible to say when this attempt was made, but it is probably old. On the other hand, we can infer with certainty that the stone does not originally hail from Mathura, but has been brought from Shakardarra by some pilgrim. And it is comparatively easy to see why he did so. His intention was certainly not to deceive. He knew the Shakardarra well and its inscription, and the latter was, in his eyes, nothing more than a magic spell, which had shown its power in securing good water in the Shakardarra well. And he wanted to engage the same mystic power for the benefit of a well or some other pious establishment in Mathura. The inscription is, in this way, of importance as throwing light on the popular conception of lithic records as a kind of magic or spell, and there cannot be any doubt that this conception goes back into a remote past.

LXXXV. Plate XXXII. 1: ARA INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 41

Ara is a nala two miles from Baghnilab. According to information supplied by Dr. Spooner to Dr. Fleet, Baghnilab, 'the Chah Bagh Nilab of maps, is about ten miles south-south-west from Attock, and apparently on the south bank of the Indus, at a point where the river, having made a sharp bend about eight miles below Attock, runs to the west for some ten miles: the latitude and longitude appear to be 33° 46' and 72° 12'.'

At Ara a stone, measuring 2 ft. 8 in. by 9 in. and bearing a Kharoshthi inscription, has come to light, and it was presented to the Lahore Museum by Sir Aurel Stein, and bears the Museum number I. 133.

The inscription has been edited by Messrs. Banerji, Lüders, and Konow, and contributions to the interpretation were made by Dr. Fleet.

The inscription consists of six lines, and the size of individual letters varies between 1/4 in. and 1 1/2 in.

The characters are Kharoshthi of the later Kushana period. We may note the kha, which is almost identical with the kha of Shakardarra, the jha of Vajreshka, l. 2; the shape of de and ba; the prolongation of the left leg of the square ya; the separation of the i-stroke from the la in lt, l. 6; the circle shape of r in rka, and the two forms of shka in Vajreshka and Kaniush.

L. 1. The initial ma shows a bar across the right upright as in the Sui Vihar inscription. I have stated in the discussion of that record that I take the bar to mark the beginning. The first words maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa are quite clear, though the last aksharas, -trasa, are damaged. Nor can there be much doubt about the concluding word of l. 1, which Mr. Banerji read as pathadharasa, but which Professor Lüders recognized as kaisara, i.e. the Roman title Caesar.

Professor Lüders has drawn attention to the fact that the titles used in the inscription find a kind of commentary in the ancient notion about four emperors, the "sons

---

1 Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 58 ff., with plate.
4 JRAS, 1913, pp. 97 ff., p. 987; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 1.
of heaven' of China, India, the Roman empire and the Yüeh-chi, as they are styled in Chinese translations of Buddhist works. The tradition about the four 'sons of heaven' has been examined by Professor Pelliot, who shows that it was known over a large area at an early date. If it is of Indian origin, we should expect the arrangement of the four kingdoms to be India, Iran, China, and the Roman empire, and such an arrangement is clearly reflected in the titles of our inscription, where maha-raya is the Indian, rājātirāja the Iranian, devaputra the Chinese, and kaisara the Roman title.

No chronological inference can be drawn from the use of the Roman title in this record, as has sometimes been done. For the title Caesar was used by the Roman emperors down to a late date.

L. 2. The first word was read as Vasishkaputra by Mr. Banerji, Vajreshkaputra by Professor Lüders, and Mr. Majumdar took the second akshara to be perhaps 'a conjunct with d as the second member' and read the third as shpa.

It will be seen that the second letter is clearly the old form of jha which we find in the Asoka inscriptions. It is also almost certain that there is an e-stroke. The third one is identical with the shka of the Zeda inscription, and though shka has a different shape in the ensuing Kaniskhâsa, I have no doubt that we must read shka, the more so because a compound shka is never used in Kharoshthi records.

After Kaniskhâsa follows samhâtskara ekachaparâsî as read by Lüders. We may note this certain instance of ñ, i.e. ññ, for old tu. The sa of the last word, which stands at the beginning of l. 3, is defaced but certain.

Nor can there be any doubt about the reading of the words following after the ensuing sam 20 20 1 as jethasa masasa di 20 4 1. Mr. Banerji's Chetasa is out of the question, and what he took to be ra is certainly the figure 20, after which there is a short interval, occasioned by damage to the stone. The date, the 25th Jyaishtha of the year 41, has been calculated by Dr. van Wijk to correspond to the 24th April, A.D. 169.

As was recognized by Professor Lüders, the Kanishka of the Āra inscription cannot be the founder of the Kanishka era, whose last known date is from the year 23, and who had already been succeeded by Vasishka in the year 24. He is designated as son of Vajreshka, and there can hardly be much doubt about the identity of this Vajreshka and Vasishka, the Kushâna who had succeeded Kanishka I in the year 24. This Vāsishka is further identical with Kâlhana's Jushka, and we have already seen that a name beginning with Va and apparently containing an u in the second syllable, i.e. perhaps Vajreshka, occurs in a defaced Kharoshthi inscription in the Peshâwar Museum. The writings ñ, e, and u point to an indefinite vowel with a timbre which could not be exactly rendered in Indian script. The writings j, jh and s, on the other hand, are as many attempts at rendering the voiced s. Cf. the forms Kusulaka, Koivala, and Koéuldo; Jhila and Zoilos, &c.

We do not know anything about the length of the reign of Vajreshka-Vasishka or of his son Kanishka II. The dates of Vāsishka range between the years 24 and 28, and for Huvishka, who was perhaps a brother of Vāsishka, we have dates ranging between 33 and 60, i.e. the reigns of Kanishka II and Huvishka overlap. As pointed out in the Historical Introduction, the most natural assumption is that Kanishka I was succeeded by Vasishka, who is throughout in Brâhmi records designated as maha-raya rājātirāja devaputra Shaha, in the year 23 or 24, and he again, on his demise in an undefined year, by his son Kanishka II. At some time between 23 and 33 Huvishka became installed as king in the eastern provinces. He is usually styled maha-raya devaputra, and the imperial title rājātirāja is only added in an inscription of the year 40, i.e. about one

1 Young Pac, 1923, pp. 97 f. 2 Cf. JBoBrRAS, New Series, i, pp. 1 ff.
year before the date of the Ārā inscription. It would be tempting to infer that Vāsishtha
died about that time and that Huvisška and Kanishka II both claimed the succession.
But it is just as possible that Huvisška for some time acknowledged Kanishka II as
suzerain, and only extended his power to the north-west after the latter's death.

After the date follows śā[e], where e is uncertain but probable; divasaśchuyami,
and kha, which Professor Lüders supplied to khaṇa, but where the existing traces favour
the reading khaḍa.

L. 4. The first word was recognized by Professor Lüders as kupe, for the second
he read Dāshaśvateraṇa, while I suggested to read Dāshaśvaterena, cf. Scythic names such as
Spargaphtos. I have since then been able to examine the stone itself, and I found that
the apparent o-mātra in vhe seems to be a flaw, and that the ensuing letter is rather re
than le. I therefore read Dāshaśavatena, a name which is evidently Iranian. Then
follows, as read by Lüders, Poshapuriṇaputraṇa, which he translated 'of the Poshapuria,
i.e. Purushapirika, sons', taking putra to mean 'son'; 'one belonging to a group'.
I now accept this reading, because the corresponding passage in the Taxila silver
scroll also has -putran and not -putren. I also agree in considering Poshapuria as derived
from Poshapura, Peshāvar, but I do not think that the posha of this word is Prākrit pūṣa,
Skr. parus.a, but take it to correspond to Skr. parusha, from pūṣha, which in the
Kharašṭṭhī Dhammapada is represented by pūṣa. The form Purushapura is evidently
a pāṇīṭī' etymology.

Then follows maharāpiṭaraṇa puya, with traces of an akṣhara which I restore as e.

L. 5. The first akṣhara was read as e by Lüders, but I follow Banerji in reading a,
because the e-stroke of e is added at the bottom of the vertical in the certain e in
anugrahārthaṇa of the same line, where the a, moreover, has the same curved outline as
our akṣhara, and because there are also other traces of damage to the stone in this place.
The ensuing akṣharas are, as far as I can see, clearly imaṇasa and not naunahsa as
read by Lüders. In face of atavāṇo in the silver scroll, atavāṇasa in a Dharmaṇājikā
inscription, and apanage on the Māṇikāla stone, atmaṇasa seems to be a Sanskritized
form, in accordance with the increasing importance of Sanskrit in the north-west after
Kanishka I.

The remaining part of the line can be read with absolute certainty, though some of
the letters are defaced: sahārṣya[a] saṇpiṭaraṇa anugraḥ[a]ṛthaṇa sarvā[sap]aṇa. We may
note the blurred ha in anugraha, where the bottom-stroke seems to be missing. After
the final a of -sapaṇa the stone is very rough, and nothing seems to have followed.

L. 6. The first akṣhara were read as jatisha by Professor Lüders, but I think that
I can see distinct traces of an u below the sha, and I read shu. The next akṣhara looks
like the ha of anugraha, but is longer, and there is a distinct curve across the vertical,
wherefore I read hitaṇa.

After this Mr. Banerji read kiṇa and Professor Lüders imaṇa, but it seems to me that
the stroke projecting from the ma must be the o-mātra, and I read imaṇa, which I take to be
the neuter form imaṇ, which we know from Maṇḍhā and Paścā. The curious
curve below i may be the anusvāra, but is probably a flaw.

Then follows cha, with a curved bottom, la and a stroke, which Professor Lüders
took to be the usual stop, while I tried to explain it as the numerical symbol 1. It is,
however, written so near to the preceding la that I think it must be a misplaced i-stroke.
The next letter is khī, and the ensuing one looks like both the pa in posha- and the ya in
puya. I take it to be ya and explain likhiya as the gerund of likha, to write. 1

1 See Thomas, JRAS, 1906, p. 206.
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Then follows ma, with a dot at the bottom, which seems to represent an unevenness in the stone, and a stroke within the curve, which seems to be rather an e than an i. I therefore read me.

The ensuing aksharas are badly defaced. The first might be dhā, the second ma, and the third seems to be de, sa or sa. If we compare the final blessing of the Peshāwar Museum inscription no. 21, we might think of dharmasya (or dasanāya) vāyupratisatā, but it is impossible to arrive at satisfactory results. It may only be of interest to note that the result hoped for seems to have been partly connected with the engraving of the record, in which case we should have to state the same belief in the mystic power of the written aksharas which we found reflected in the Rāwal inscription.

My reading and translation are, then, as follows:

TEXT

L. 1 maharajas rajatirajas devaputrasa [ka][sa]rasa
2 Vajreshkaputrasa Kanishkasā sambatdarae ekachapar[i]-
3 [sa] sah 20 20 1 e[hasa masasa di 20 4 ins[e] divasakshupami kha[de]
4 ku[pe Da]shahavareṇa Poshapuriputrapāna matarapitaraṇa puya[e]
5 atma[sa saharyasa] saputrapa anugra[h]the sarva[sapa]ṇa
6 [ja]lūsh[u] [hi]r[ae [i]mo cha [li]khiya m[e] [dhama] . . .

TRANSLATION

(during the reign) of the Mahārāja, Rājātirāja, Devaputra, Kaisara Kanishka, the son of Vajreshka, in the forty-first year—anno 41, on the 25th day of the month Jyaiṣṭha, on this day-term this well was dug by Dashavara, of the Peshawarian seons, in honour of his mother and father, for the benefit of himself with his wife and son, for the welfare of all beings in the (various) births. And, having written this (might there) for me . . .

LXXXVI. PLATE XXXIII: WARDAK VASE INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 51

Wardak has become known to archaeologists as the site of some stūpas, which were partly opened under the directions of Mr. Masson, who found that some of them had already been dug into before his time. The place is situated about thirty miles to the west of Kābul. 1

The name of the place is given as Khawat on maps, and Mr. Pargiter has shown that this name is already found in the inscription now under discussion, which is found on a bronze vase, 9-9 inches high and 6-6 inches broad, which was brought back by Masson and is now in the British Museum.

The inscription has been edited by Messrs. E. Thomas, 2 Rajendralala Mitra, 3 Dowson, 4 Pargiter, 5 Senart, 6 and Konow, 7 and contributions to its interpretation have

---

1 See Wilson, Ariana Antiqua, London, 1841, pp. 117 ff.
2 In James Prinsep, Essays on Indian Antiquities, London, 1858, i, pp. 161 ff., with plate X.
7 SBAW, 1916, pp. 807 ff.
be published by Messrs. Cunningham,¹ Fleet,² Thomas,³ Lüders,⁴ Banerji,⁵ Grierson,⁶ Hultsch,⁷ and Majumdar.⁸

The letters consist of dots and vary in size from \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. to \( \frac{3}{4} \) in. in ll. 1–3 and \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. to \( \frac{5}{8} \) in. in l. 4. They are arranged in four lines, the three first ones encircling the shoulder of the vase, and the fourth, separated by three lines, covering about half of the broadest circumference.

The alphabet belongs to the later Kushāṇa type and presents some peculiar features. In Hashthuṇa, l. 2, there are, as first seen by M. Senart, two dots above the final \( \text{दा} \), which are without any parallel in Indian Kharoshthi records. They are, on the other hand, found in a Sanskrit Kharoshthi document from Endere in Eastern Turkestan,⁹ where they are used in such cases where we should expect a visarga, e.g. \text{manushya pathi varṇamāṇī}, but also in \text{hīvītī}, i.e. \text{hīvītāni}. Professor Rapson transliterates \( \text{āḥ} \) and, consequently, in our inscription, \text{Hashthuṇaḥ}. To me it seems more probable that the sound intended is the vowel which is noted in the same way in the Brāhmi Saka texts from Eastern Turkestan and which was the regular termination in the nominative and genitive singular of Saka \( \text{a} \)-bases. I shall, however, only retain the two dots and write \( \text{ā} \), leaving the question about the meaning of the two dots open.

The letter \( ε \) usually shows the \( r \)-stroke at the bottom of the ordinary \( a \)-sign. In \text{pad(r)jīvān}ar, l. 2, 3, however, the head of the akshara is omitted. Mr. Fargier takes this defective \( ε \) to be the sign of the anusvāra, but is himself aware of the obvious objection that the anusvāra is never written as a separate sign.

Some letters are provided with an apparently otiose \( r \)-stroke. Such is commonly the case with intervocalic \( g \), the only exceptions being \text{Kamagulīya}, l. 1, which is a name, and \text{jalayuga, yetīga, avasād(r)g}īwa, \text{mithyagas(r)}a and \text{agrabhaga}, l. 3, where we may assume carelessness of the engraver. The \( r \)-stroke in such cases has an angular shape, while it is a curve where also Sanskrit has \( gr \). It seems probable that the angular \( gr \), which usually corresponds to Skr. -\( ḍ \), marks a voiced guttural fricative. I shall write \( g(r) \).

In \text{da} such a \( r \)-stroke is used throughout, except in the word \text{aṅdaja}, where \text{da} is preceded by an \text{anusvāra}. I shall write \( d(r) \).

The termination \text{ami} of the locative singular is throughout written \text{amrī}; and I shall transliterate \text{am(r)i}, supposing an aspirated \text{m} to be meant.

Also \text{sa} occasionally occurs as an apparent \text{sra}, viz. in \text{Vigramareg(r)a sra}, l. 1. M. Senart compares the apparent \text{sra} which is often used in the genitive termination \text{asa}, but also in numerous other cases, e.g. sometimes in the pronoun \text{sa}, in the Kharoshthi documents from Central Asia. He thinks that no special value should be attached to the apparent \( r \)-stroke. He may be right, but it is also possible that we have to do with a modification, perhaps towards a voiced \text{s}.¹⁰

The apparent \text{sr} is sometimes used where we should expect \text{sy}; cf. \text{Houshkasra}, l. 2, \text{Mareg(r)asa}, l. 2, \text{mithyagrasa}, l. 3. The sign which I transliterate \text{sy} in \text{masy[s]}, l. 1, is distinctly more curvilinear. It is, however, not excluded that \text{sy} was also pronounced with a voiced \( s \), for we have, as has been mentioned above under the discussion of the Māṇikīśa inscription, the orthographs \text{sy} and \( j\text{h} \) for old intervocalic \text{s}.

¹ JASB, xxxii, 1863, pp. 146 ff.; cf. xxxiii, 1864, p. 37. ² JRAS, 1903, p. 647.
⁵ Ind. Ant., xxxvii, 1908, pp. 301, 60, 67.
⁶ JRAS, 1919, p. 141. ⁷ ZDMG, 73, pp. 224 ff. ⁸ J&AS, xviii, 1925, p. 64; List, no. 93.
⁹ Ed. Boyer, Rapson, Senart, JA, xi, xii, 1918, pp. 319 ff.
Some other ϭ-compounds exist in addition to sy; cf. sakyā, l. 1, arupya and milkyaga, l. 3.

With regard to other letters I shall only mention the use of the cerebral υ even where we elsewhere find ʌa, as in natig(ʌ)a, l. 2; the broad ya, which cannot easily be distinguished from ʌa, the compounds rh, rv, skh, and st.

L. 1. The reading of the date is certain, via. sanm 20 20 10 1 masy[ɛ] Arhamisiya sastehi 10 4 1, corresponding, according to Dr. van Wijk’s calculations, to the 25th April, A.D. 179. The e of masye has usually been read as a. It seems however that the backward bend of the head of ʌa is much more pronounced than elsewhere. The form Arhamisiya is evidently the locative or genitive of Arhamisi, adapted from Greek Artemision. The word sastha has already been dealt with. I may only add that M. Senart proposes to connect it with Skr. smasthā, to which he assigns an elsewhere unknown meaning, ahorātra.

Then comes imeya gad[ʌ][ɛ]na, which, as the analogy of other inscriptions shows, must mean ‘at this instant’ or some such thing. Professor Lüders is no doubt right in bringing gad[ʌ][ɛ]na, i.e. older ghatikā in connexion with Skr. ghatikā.

The ensuing portion runs: Kamaguyap[ɛ] Vagramar[ʌ]a s[ʌ]a ʌs[ʌ]a ʌsha Knavadam[ʌ]a kadalayig(ʌ)a. The tra of putra looks like dra, but we have no means for judging about the actual sound. The sentence s[ʌ]a — kadalayig(ʌ)a has been recognized as parenthetical by Professor Lüders, while Mr. Pargiter has given the right explanation of the last word as corresponding to Skr. kritalaya, having fixed his residence, and seen that Khavoda is the name of the place, the present Khatwat.

Then comes Vagramarig(ʌ)aiva[ʌ]aram[ʌ]a thu[bu]m[ʌ]ri, where the bu of the latter word has an extraordinary appearance, looking like sti but being less angular than the ste of sastehi. I take the state of things to have been as follows: the engraver had before himself a bu of the same shape as in the Kurram, Loriyān Tangai, and other inscriptions, with a vertical left-hand termination bent backwards and upwards and then continued downwards in a long leg. His draft seems to have been indistinct, and he has made the sloping stroke connecting the front vertical with the leg into two short unconnected strokes and by mistake continued the lower one beyond the leg vertical, the result being an apparent cross-bar. It is, however, noticeable that the part of this bar which protrudes to the right of the vertical only consists of one dot.

The last words of l. 1 are bhag[ʌ]aavadā Sakyamuno sariva parivhaevi, where we may note the Sanskritized genitive mune.

L. 2 opens with imeya kutalamulega maharaja rajatira[ʌ]a Hoveshkas[ʌ]a agraḥha-g(ʌ)a bhavatu. The only doubtful akshara is the ho of Hoveshkas[ʌ]a, where the o-stroke has ascended upwards bend, so that M. Senart is perhaps right in reading hu.

Then follows madapidadara me puyae bhavatu bhradara me Hashthunā Mareg(ʌ)a puyae bhavatu. The names Hashthunā and Vagramer(ʌ)a are evidently Iranian, and there are no a priori reasons for not explaining the form Hashthunā as the Saka nominative or genitive. The forms madapidadara and bhradara are genitives of the singular; with regard to the former we may compare matapilaram in the Pāṭa and matapitu in the silver scroll inscriptions.

The ensuing passage runs yo cha me bhuya natig(ʌ)aṇītasamābhagit(ʌ)aṇa puyae bhavatu. Mr. Pargiter originally read ʌsha for yo cha, but has accepted my reading. Professor Thomas was inclined to take ʌsha as an error for ʌcha, Skr. tach cha, but s never becomes ʌ. Yo is the regular neuter pronoun, corresponding to Skr. yad, and
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yo bhuya represents Skr. yad bhuya. The form yatig(r)a, where we should expect yatig(r)a, points to a vernacular somewhat farther to the east than the common dialect of Kharoshthi inscriptions.

The last words of l. 2, mahiya cha Vag(r)amareg(r)as(r)a agra(ah)ag(r)apati(r)yaistae, are continued in the first word of l. 3, bhavatu. Mahiya, for which Mr. Pargiter read mahika, Skr. mahīśā, has been explained by Professor Lüders as corresponding to Skr. mahīśā, Prākrit maṭīha, which is a common generic in Māhārashṭri and Ardhamāgadhī. The gr of Vagra in this place has the angular r-stroke which seems to denote a fricative g. The name being of unknown origin, I cannot do anything more than to reproduce the written form.

L. 3. After bhavatu comes sarvasatvaya arogadakshinā bhavatu, where we may note the absence of the otiose r-stroke in the ga of aroga. This g is derived from gr and probably stands for gg, with a non-fricative pronunciation.

Then follows avi ya nara(r)aparyata yava bhavagra yo d[iva] antara a[ny]ado jālayug[a] ya yeṭiga arṣaya dhariṇa puyae bhavatu. Mr. Pargiter corrected aviya to ariya, Skr. ārya, and M. Senart took aviya as one word, corresponding to Skr. avvīchi. What stands in the text is, however, aviya, and I do not think that this can be anything else than Skr. api cha. We have already had two examples of cha in the record, viz. yo cha and mahiya cha. In both cases the preceding word originally ends in a consonant. In sa parivara cha and mithyagas(r)cha, l. 3, on the other hand, a vowel precedes. In these last instances, however, cha seems to have a somewhat fuller meaning 'and also', 'and even', which may explain the retention of the initial. In the Kharoshthi Dharmapada the general rule is that cha becomes ya after vowels, but remains as cha or is softened to ja after consonants. Thus we find diva ya rudi cha, Skr. diva cha rūtiri cha. There are exceptions to the rule, but the rule itself is quite clear, and we have no reason for doubting that it also made itself felt in the dialect of Kharoshthi inscriptions, especially in passages which have a more or less literary turn.

For nara(r)a Mr. Pargiter read nava(r)a, which he explained as Skr. nippaka, king, but nara(r)a is, I think, certain, and can only be Skr. naraka, hell. Paryata has been recognized by Professor Thomas as representing Skr. paryanta, and yava bhavagra, which Mr. Pargiter read as sava bhavagr, Skr. śrava-bhavaka, is evidently yāvad bhavagraṃ.

The ensuing yo atra antara was explained by Professor Thomas as yad avṛtāra, and this explanation is evidently essentially right. I should only prefer to explain antara as antarān: from hell to the culminating point of existence, what there is here between.

Then follows the enumeration. A[ny]ado is Skr. audaja. The e-form of the nominative is of interest, because Wardak belongs to the territory where this form ends in e. In my opinion the form, as also the ya for old jā in yatig(r)a and the genitive mahiya, tends to show that the monks of Wardak were immigrants from a more eastern district in India. And, as a matter of fact, the Indian population of Afghanistan does not seem to have extended as far as Wardak. In other words, the Wardak inscription was drafted by foreign immigrants and not by old settlers in the country.

The ensuing jālayug[a] is evidently a careless writing instead of jālayug(r)a. It means the same thing as Skr. jāraya, as recognized by Mr. Pargiter, but is not the identical word.

1 Cf. my remarks Festschrift Wissowa, p. 91.
2 Mr. Majumdar has failed to understand my old translation of the word, 'Lebendigegeboren', i.e. viviparous, taking the German word to mean 'living beings'. 
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For ya yētiga Mr. Pargiter read saphatiga, Skr. tashpattika, grammatical; Professors Thomas and Hultzsch sāsetiga and M. Senart sāvetiga, viewing this as sāmsvedika, corresponding to Skr. sāmsvadaja. But the dental s cannot become t in the dialect.

As is well known, we often find an enumeration of four kinds of beings: anudaja, jāryujja, svedaja, and udāhikja, and as two of them are clearly referred to in our passage, we might expect to find the remaining ones as well. The fourth term is, however, certainly missing, and this fact is apt to make us suspicious. Now Professor Hultzsch quotes the Vaiśeshikasutra and its commentary, according to which there are two kinds of bodies, such as are born from a yoni, and such as are not. The former are of two kinds, jāryujja and anudaja. Here there is no question of the svedajas, and the same is evidently the case in our passage: it only enumerates the yoniyas.

Now it is hardly possible to distinguish t and y in our inscription, and as it does not seem possible to find a word such as sāsetiga or sāvetiga, the s making it impossible to think of sāvakika, and since ya yētiga, Skr. cha yāvat (cf. Prakrit jettī) suits the context in every respect, I see no reason for abandoning my old reading and explanation. Yētiga then stands for yēti(r)a.

The next word arupāyata was explained as arūpyatmā, incorporeal soul, by Mr. Pargiter and Professor Hultzsch, arūpyānta, including the invisible, by Professor Thomas and M. Senart, while I took it to be a verb. It now seems to me that the quotation from Childers given by M. Senart, according to which the bhavagga is the highest of the arūpa worlds, makes it probable that arupāyata is arūpyātā, i.e. essentially the same thing as arūpyadātā. I therefore take the enumeration to mean: what is born from an egg (anudajaḥ) and the viviparous ones (jāryujjas), as far as the formless existence.

The ensuing passage runs: mahīya cha rohṇa sada sarvīna avashad(r)vagama sa parivara cha agrabhagapad(r)vaniṣṭe bhavatu. Mahīya cha must be explained as above, M. Senart thought that nothing could be made out of rohṇa and suggested to read bhavāna, Skr. bodhana, instruction, teaching, though he agreed in considering rohṇa as the more likely reading. I have formerly translated it with 'structure', and I still think that this translation is possible. It is also conceivable that the term bears reference to the preceding kuśalamāla and means about the same thing as Pāli kuśalāmālaropana. It should be borne in mind that a kuśalamāla is not an act, but atobha, adusaha, or amoha. The act which arises from such a base is good, and may lead to further merit, so that we understand that it may have been mentioned separately. It is, however, probably more likely that Professor Thomas is right in proposing to consider rohṇa as the genitive plural of roha. He thinks that roha may represent Skr. rohiha and mean 'opponents' (persons or things). I should be more inclined to think of roha, a shoot, sprout, here used about the donor's descendants.

The reading avashad(r)vagama is due to M. Senart, who explains it as a-pāṣaṃsikānām. The dr looks like tr, and that has prevented other scholars from finding the true explanation. I should, however, prefer to identify the word with apasāṃsikānām. Sāparivara cannot be a genitive, and I see no other way of explaining it than to take it as two words beginning a new clause: and may also this surrounding structure be for the sharing of the principal lot.

The end of l. 3, mithyagasya ṣa agraḥagha bhavatu, is quite clear. We may note the absence of the otiose r-stroke after g. The range of persons to share in the benefit is here enlarged so as to comprise the heretics, who had just apparently been excluded.

L. 4 does not present any difficulty. We may only note the irregular shape of the
forward bend of the legs of \textit{ra} and \textit{cha} in vihara, acharya, which look like \textit{rāra}, \textit{chārā}, respectively. Our inscription is the only Kharoshṭhī record which speaks of the Mahāśāṃghikas as being in charge or possession of a vihāra. I have drawn attention to some linguistic details which seem to show that they were not old settlers in Wardak, speaking the local vernacular, but immigrants from a more eastern district. We have no means of deciding whence they had come to the Wardak country.

**Text**

L. 1 saṁ 20 20 10 i masy[e] Arthamisiya sosteh to 4 i imeṣa gaḍ(r)jag(r)enā Kama-
gulyapa[tra] Vagramata[r]a—sita isha Khavadam(r)i kadalayig(r)a—Vagramar-
g(r)avharam(r)i thu[ba]m(r)i bhag(r)avada Śakyamunī śarira pariḥaveti

L. 2 Imena kuśalamuleṇa maharaja rajatiraja Hō[or Hu]vēshkasā[r]a agra bhag[ra]e bhavato mādāpīdāra me putre bhavatu bhradāra me Hasithunā Mareg(r)as(r)a putre bhavatu yo cha me bhuya nātim(r)mitrasanbhatis(r)aṇa puyae bhavatu mahiya cha Vag(r)amareg(r)as(r)a agra bhag(r)apaṇ(r)iyaṃsē

L. 3 bhavato sarvasatvam arogadakśhipae bhavatu avī ya ṇarag(r)aparyata ṇava bhavagra yo ṇata aṅīturā aṅīkhaja jalayoga ya ṇetiga arupya sarvīṣa puyae bhavatu mahiya cha ṇohana sada sarvīṇa avahad(r)iṣgana sa paṇvara cha agra bhagapad(r)iyaṃsē bhavatu mithyaṅgas[r]a cha agra bhagā bhavatu

L. 4 esha vihara acharyaṇa mahasanaṅgīṇa parigraha.

**Translation**

Anno 51, in the month Artemios, when 15 had appeared, at this hour the Kamagulaya scion Vagramarega—he has made his abode here in Khawat—establishes the relic of the Lord Śakyamuni in the Vagramarega vihāra, in a stūpa. Through this root of bliss, may it be for the principal lot of the mahāraja rājatirāja Huvishta, may it be for the honour of my mother and father, may it be for the honour of my brother Hasithunā Mareg, and may it, generally, be for the honour of my relatives, friends and associates, may it be for the sharing in the principal lot for myself, Vagramarega, may it be for the benefit of health of all beings. And moreover, let it be for the honour of all, what there is here between, from hell up to the culminating point of existence: egg-born and the viviparous ones, as far as the formless existence, and for my descendants, always for all who are not heretics; and may also the surrounding structure be for the sharing of the principal lot, and may there also be a principal lot for the man of false belief. This vihāra is the acceptance of the Mahāśāṃghika teachers.

LXXXVII. PLATE XXXII. 2: UND INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 61

Und or Ohind is a village 15 miles above Attock, on the west bank of the Indus, in 34° 2' N. and 72° 27' E. An inscribed stone was found there by Cunningham in the year 1848 and deposited in the Lahore Residency, where it had already disappeared in 1853.

The inscription has been reproduced and published by Cunningham, and explanatory remarks have been made by Messrs. Dowson, Senart, Lüders, Banerji, Konow, and van Wijk.

---

1 JASB, xxiii, 1834, p. 705, with plate, no. 5, reproduced in E. Thomas's edition of Prissep's *Essays*, 1, p. 164, with plate X, fig. 2; JASB, xxxii, 1863, p. 145; ASI, v, 1875, p. 58, with plate XVI, no. 2.
2 JRAS, xx, 1863, pp. 333 and 365, with plate, fig. 2.
4 JRAS, 1909, pp. 665 ff.
UND AND MAMANE DHERI PEDESTAL

The stone is stated to have been 26½ inches in length and carried two lines of writing, the first of which seems to have been incomplete.

It opens with the date sam 20 20 20 i Chetrasa maha(sa)sa divase athami di 4 4 iša kshunami, as read by M. Senart, who is probably right in assuming that maha is a mistake for masasa.

Then follows in the old plate sakharana and in the second savirana[sha]. It seems probable that savirana or sakharana is the genitive plural of the designation of some association, and that kha should be filled up as khade khe.

L 2 consists of four aksharas, the three last of which were read as eṣhule by Cunningham and ashade by M. Senart. I have little doubt that the whole is meant for purvashade, and this mention of the nakshatra has enabled Dr. van Wijck to identify the date with the 26th February, A.D. 189.

TEXT

L. 1 sam 20 20 20 i Chetrasa maha(sa)sa divase athami di 4 4 iša kshunami sa(v)jra kha ...

2 purvashade.

TRANSLATION

Anno 61, on the eighth day, d. 8, of the month Chaitra, at this term (was dug the well) of the Saviras, in Purvashadha.

LXXXVIII. PLATE XXXIV. I: MAMANE DHERI PEDESTAL

INSCRIPTION OF THE YEAR 89.

Mamane Dheri is a small hamlet of about ten houses, built on the top of a small ancient mound in the Charsadda Tahsil of the Peshawar District. The mound is stated to have been largely cut about for manure by the villagers during the last forty years, and various pieces of Gandhara sculptures are said to have been found there, having subsequently been smashed by the villagers or disposed of by them as curios to those interested in them.

On the 26th June 1928 the Peshawar Museum acquired a sculpture from Mamane Dheri, which proved to contain a Kharoshthi inscription. The sculpture is 30 inches high and 29½ inches wide at the base, and, according to Mr. Dilawar Khan, the Curator of the Museum, it represents the visit of Indra to the Buddha in the Indrasaila Cave. To judge from a photograph it is similar to M. Foucher's Fig. 246.

On the pedestal, which is 29½ inches long and 1½ inches wide, there is a Kharoshthi inscription, 28 inches long. There is a defaced portion in the middle, where about eight aksharas have disappeared. In other respects the inscription is in a good state of preservation. It now bears the number 51 in the Peshawar collection.

The size of individual letters varies between ½ and 1 inch. Their general character is of the same kind as in other records from the neighbourhood. We may note the forward curve of most aksharas; the downward curve of the mātā of the final ṝ; the cursive (r)a of Margaśīra(r)a, and especially the curious shape of ante-consonantic r, which reminds us of the usual symbol for ṭa and of the akshara a.

The inscription is dated, on the fifth day of Margasira, the year 89. The palaeography of the record makes it impossible to refer this date to the older Saka era. It must belong to the Kanishka era, and Dr. van Wijck has been good enough to calculate it as corresponding to the 1st November, A.D. 216.
172 INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE KANISHKA ERA

This date is of interest in a double respect. In the first place it shows that the Kanishka era was used, side by side with the older reckoning, in the Charsadda District. In the second it enables us to date a Gandhara relief with comparative certainty in the third century A.D., and this fact strengthens the probability of the epoch proposed for the older Saka era, less than twenty years intervening between the Māmāṇe Ḍherī and Lorigān Tangai pedestals.

With regard to orthography and phonology we may note that the dental \( n \) is used throughout, with the exception of the word samanuyayana; thus niryāide, kshunami, Dharmapriena. In upajaya, Skr. upadhyaya, intervocalic jk, i.e. jik, has apparently been deaspirated. The disappearance of intervocalic \( t \) in niryāide, Skr. niryātitak, has its parallels in prethavetiṣye in the Taxila gold-plate, prethavide in the Jamālgarhi inscription of the year 359, and can perhaps be explained as a kind of dissimilation. In Margāṭ-

rasva we have the same genitive termination asra, i.e. perhaps asa, which we have found in Wardak and which also occurs in Tor Dherai. In other genitives we have the usual termination asa; thus upajayasa Budhapiasa.

The inscription opens with the date: saṁ 20 20 20 20 4 4 1 Ma[ṛga]tirasra masī 4 1. The last akṣhara in masī is defaced, but apparently certain. Masī is probably merely a slip instead of mase.

Then follows its kshunami, with a curious loop above the head-curve of ksha, which can hardly be anything else than a slip of the engraver's tool, and further niryāide ime deyāḍhar[me] Dharmapiena shamaṇena, where attention may be drawn to the different positions of the r-stroke in niryāide and deya-, to the shape of the r-stroke in dharma and dharm-, and to the irregular shape of the compound rm in the former word.

In the defaced portion which follows it is not possible to trace any lettering in the beginning. The last three akṣharas may be puyae, perhaps preceded by sa.

After the gap comes an almost clear upajayasa, where the left stroke of ja is broken, so that it is possible to read upajayasa. There can hardly be any doubt that the word represents Skr. upadhyayasa.

The final portion I read Dharmapiwasu puyae samanuyayana arogadakshinae, where I explain samanuyaya as representing Skr. samanuyāya, a fellow disciple. The cerebral \( n \) in this word points to a weakening of the difference between intervocalic \( n \) and \( n \).

TEXT


TRANSLATION

Anno 85, in the month of Mārgaśīra, the 5. (day), at this term was bestowed this religious gift by the śramaṇa Dharmapriya, in honour of . . . , in honour of his teacher Buddhapiya, for the bestowal of health on his fellow disciples.

LXXXIX. PLATE XXXIV. 2: KĀNĪZA ḌHERĪ INSCRIPTION

Kānīza Ḍherī is an ancient mound near the village Umarzai in the Chārśadda Tahsil of the Peshāwar District. While the mound was dug for manure by the villagers, a small fragment of stone, measuring 7½ inches by 6 inches, came to light and was purchased for the Peshāwar Museum on the 18 June, 1928.
KANIZA DHERI, TAJA, MOHENJO DARO, AND TOR DHERAI

The fragment is inscribed with seven Kharoshthi signs, 1 to 1½ inches high, and it bears the number 50 in the collection of inscriptions in the Museum.

The characters are of about the same date as in the preceding inscription, and the reading is absolutely certain: masasa di 20 4 1, i.e. we have before us the last portion of a date.

TEXT

masasa di 20 4 1.

TRANSLATION

The 25. day of the month . . .

XC. TAJA INSCRIPTION

A Kharoshthi inscription is reported to exist at Taja in the Peshawar District, but the place is said to be inaccessible and I have not received any estampages or photographs.

XCI. MOHENJO DARO FRAGMENTS

At Mohenjo Daro in the Larkana District of Sindh extensive excavations have been carried on since 1921-1922. The latest remains date back to the Kushana period, and in these strata were found some glazed fragments of pottery with Kharoshthi letters, which are now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. There are altogether three fragments, numbered B 15, D 29, and B 30, respectively. On the first we can read bramha, on the second esa, and on the third ma. The characters seem to belong to the time of or after Kanishka.

XCII. PLATE XXXV: TOR DHERAI INSCRIBED POTsherds

During the winter 1926-7 Sir Aurel Stein excavated a ruined Buddhist site at Tor Dherai, near Dabar-Kot and seven miles S.E. of Duki Tahsil, in the Thal valley, District Loralai, Baluchistan. He there discovered about fifty pottery fragments with inked lettering, five in Brahmi and the remainder in Kharoshthi.

The Loralai District some time formed the easternmost dependency of the province of Kandahar. The Buddhist settlements excavated by Sir Aurel, however, evidently bear witness to an extension of the Indian empire of the Kushanas towards the west, other stages being the settlements at Sui Vihar and Mohenjo Daro.

The Brahmi fragments do not allow us to form an opinion about the contents of the inscriptions. They present so much difference that they cannot all belong to one and the same record. I have consulted Professor Lüders, who states that one fragment seems to belong to the Gupta period, while the others make an older impression. The only test letter which they contain is the akshara ma, which has a shape intermediary between those of the Kushana and Gupta periods, though it is also used, in addition to the usual Kushana ma, in a Brahmi record of the reign of Huviska.4

One of the fragments contains the words [v]h[a]ra[n]maisyu Mira, another sv[y][a]-satvara hita, a third [v[a][r][a][d][i][k][a][s][a][c]].

The Kharoshthi fragments likewise belong to different jars and inscriptions. It is, however, possible to piece them together to one connected legend, which seems to have

1 Cf. Aiyar, ASIFC. 1915-16, p. 36; Majumdar, List, Addenda, no. iii.
2 Lüders, List, no. 38.
been repeated on several jars, only with slight variation in the wording and with a somewhat shortened text on some of them.

The characters remind us of those of the Wardak inscription, the Kharoshthi Dhammapada, and the Niya documents, and may roughly be dated about or after 200 A.D.

There is, however, considerable variety in the shape of individual letters. Thus <i>de</i> has the curvilinear shape with the <i>e</i>-stroke sloping upwards from the middle in no. 5, while the <i>e</i>-stroke has a downward slope in no. 3, and a cursive form, with the top bent backwards and the <i>e</i>-mātrā at the bottom in no. 4. <i>Dha</i> has the usual form of later inscriptions in no. 34, where it is an initial, and in no. 6, where it is used between vowels. In nos. 4 and 8 intervocalic <i>dha</i> is provided with a bottom-loop, so that it looks like <i>dhya</i>, a form which is also found in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada. <i>Ya</i> has the old angular shape in nos. 2-4, 7, 22-4, while in nos. 1, 25, 26, 35 the left leg is bent in a broad angle. The <i>e</i>-stroke is added to the right leg in no. 2, to the left in nos. 3, 22-4, and in the middle in nos. 1 and 26. <i>Yam</i> has the usual angular shape with the anusvāra at the bottom in no. 4, where it once stands for <i>ya</i>, while in no. 8 the right leg is curved forwards at the top and the left one rises above the point of jointure as in the Ārā inscription. In no. 33 the akṣara is so cursive that we must perhaps read <i>ah</i>. All these varying forms are also found in the Kharoshthi Dhammapada.

There are several compound akṣaras: <i>tya</i> in no. 30; an apparent <i>dhya</i> in nos. 4, 8; <i>rya</i> in nos. 11, 17; <i>syā</i> in nos. 3, 14, 34; <i>sa</i> in nos. 19, [30], 33; <i>tva</i> in no. 31; <i>pra</i> in nos. 4, [31], 33; <i>sra</i> in nos. 2, 4, 32; <i>sra</i> in no. 33; <i>sva</i> in no. 3; <i>ʃə</i> in no. 35; <i>rdh</i> in no. 10; <i>rma</i> in no. 4, [6, 8], 34; <i>rya</i> in nos. 11, [17]; <i>tva</i> in nos. 14-17, and <i>sa</i> in nos. 14, 16, 17, everywhere with the upwards continuation of the horizontal which has been taken to mark the aspiration of the <i>t</i> of <i>sa</i> in the Niya documents.

Of orthographical peculiarities we may note, in addition to the varying shape of certain letters mentioned above, the use of <i>na</i> both for <i>na</i> and <i>na</i>, e.g. in <i>acharyanām sarvativedinā</i> the occasional writing of <i>ya</i> for <i>yā</i> in <i>deyamādyarman</i> no. 4, of <i>sa</i> for <i>sam</i> in no. 28, of <i>syā</i> for <i>sa</i> in nos. 11, 14, and of <i>sra</i> for <i>sa</i> in no. 32. In the genitive termination of vocalic bases we find <i>syā</i> in nos. 3, 34, and <i>sra</i> in nos. 2, 4. Similar doublets are also found in Wardak and the Niya documents and perhaps point to a voiced <i>s</i>.

The language is strongly Sanskritized. Thus we find <i>deyam</i>(<i>n</i>)<i>dh</i>(<i>y</i>)<i>arman</i> <i>yān</i>, <i>pariyagato</i>, [na<sup>*</sup>]<i>lapitramā</i>. Some features, however, seem to show that the writers spoke the North-western Prākrit of other Kharoshthi inscriptions. The confusion between <i>ya</i> and <i>na</i>; the <i>syā</i>-termination of the genitive of <i>i</i>-bases; the termination <i>sra</i> side by side with <i>syā</i>; the use of the plural in [na<sup>*</sup>]<i>lapitramā</i>; the <i>ə</i> before voiceless sounds and <i>a</i> in <i>ito</i> <i>cha</i>, <i>pariyagato</i> <i>agre</i>, [pratiyaṇā<sup>*</sup>]<i>sa</i> <i>sarva</i>, and <i>ta</i> for <i>Skr</i>. <i>tna</i> in <i>taniya</i>, if this stands for <i>atmaniya</i>. It will be seen that the nominative singular of <i>o</i>-bases ends in <i>ə</i> as in eastern Kharoshthi inscriptions. To judge from the state of things in modern Sindhi, such was the case in Sindhi, and it is probable that the Buddhist settlers had come to Loralai from Sindhi in connexion with an expansion of the Kushāna dominion, as suggested above.

The restoration of the legend contained in these fragments is naturally hypothetical. The beginning is apparently found in nos. 1-4, which run <i>shahi</i> <i>Yola</i> . . . ., <i>Yola-Mirasra</i> <i>viharasva</i>, <i>Yola-Mirasra</i> <i>viharasvamisy</i> <i>dey</i> . . . ., and [sra] <i>deyamādyarman</i> <i>yān</i> <i>prapa</i> <i>sam</i>, respectively. We may restore this as follows: <i>shahi</i> <i>Yola-Mirasra</i> (or, -<i>sra</i>) <i>viharasvamisy</i> (or, -<i>sra</i>) <i>deyam</i>(<i>n</i>)<i>dh</i>(<i>y</i>)<i>arman</i> <i>yān</i> <i>prapa</i> <i>sam</i> . . . ., cf. no. 5 <i>d</i> [<i>ya</i>], no. 6 <i>dha</i>.<i>m</i>, no. 7 <i>ya</i>, no. 8 <i>dha</i>.<i>m</i> <i>yam</i>. 
TOR ĐHERAI INSCRIPTION

We accordingly hear about the dedication of a *prapa* by a certain *Yola Mira*, who bears the title *shahi*. *Prapa* is evidently Skr. *prapā*, a place or hall for providing water, and nothing could apparently be more appropriate in such an arid country. The fragments accordingly seem to be of water jars or drinking cups in the *prapā*.

The name *Yola-Mira* is not known to us. The Brāhmi fragment mentioned above shows that we must read *Mira*, and this name is evidently the same which we find in *Mira Boyana* in the Takht-i-Bahi inscription. *Yola* reminds me of *Ye-w-la*, the son of *Kustana*, the first king of Khotan according to Tibetan sources. If this is not a mere coincidence, we should be inclined to infer that Yola Mira's family hailed from the Khotan country and belonged to the little Yué-chi. The name *Yolamoja*, which seems to occur on a *Taxila* seal, may also be compared.

The title *shahi* was used by the old Sakas who founded an empire in the Indus country some time before the beginning of the Vikrama era. It was revived by Kanishka, who, however, used the Khotan Saka form *shao*, i.e. *shau*, in his coin-legends, after his conquest of Eastern India. It is met with for the first time in Kanishka's Brāhmi inscription of the year 7, and it is used in the Brāhmi inscriptions of his successors. Though it is possible that the form *shahi* was never discontinued in the old Saka province on the Indus, it is *a priori* likely that its use by Yola Mira points to a date after Kanishka. And the strong Sanskritization of the inscriptions points in the same direction. We find, it is true, a marked Sanskritization in the Sui Vihār inscription of the year 11, but the Tor Đherai record is much more Sanskritic. Now we learn from the Kurram record of the year 20 that the Prākrit Canon was then still in use, and it is only in the Fesahawar inscription no. 21, which seems to belong to the time of Vasishka, that we for the first time find a Sanskrit sentence in a Kharoshthi inscription. It therefore seems probable that we have to do with an expansion of Kusāna power under Kanishka or one of his successors, and the palaeography of our inscriptions makes me inclined to think that Yola Mira was a contemporary of Vāsudeva or even somewhat later. His title *shahi* shows that he was not a private person but a local governor or chief, probably under Kusāna suzerainty. It is of some interest that he is not styled *kshatrapa* as the governor Liaka of the Zeda inscription. It is possible that the title *kshatrapa* was never introduced in Loralai.

I have already drawn attention to the different writing of the genitive termination, *syā* and *sra*. In the Grammatical Introduction I have dealt with these writings and accepted a suggestion of Professor Turner that they may perhaps be intended to denote a voiced *s*. I shall write *s(y)ā* (s(r)a) respectively.

The final akṣara of no. 4 is *sāṁ*, which can be filled up by means of nos. 9-21 as *sāṁgaṃ chaturdīs acharyaṃ saṃ avastivadānam pratiṃgraḥa*. We shall see later on that another version of the legend seems to insert a passage between the words *prapa* and *sāṁgaṃ*.

No. 9 shows traces of three akṣaras which can be restored as [ghe cha]sū; no. 10 has [a]cha[yu]vdi[s]; no. 11 apparently [r]ti acha[ya]vyanāṃ syā; no. 12 acha[ya]; no. 13 cha[ya]; no. 14 [syā]vastivādināṃ prati; no. 15 syāv; no. 16 [r]vyāstivā; no. 17 [vyanā]vastivādināṃ; no. 18 [s]; no. 19 [da]nāṣṭi pratiṃgraḥ; no. 20 [prati]; and no. 21 [pratiṃgra].

There can hardly be any doubt about the restoration. The apparent *rāti* of no. 11 may stand for *rati*[s], and the initial *syā* of nos. 11 and 14 apparently stands for *sa*. In a similar way initial *sa* is occasionally written *sra* in the Niya documents, as mentioned in the Grammatical Introduction.

---

1 Cf. Professor Thomas in Stein's Ancient Khotan, pp. 581 ff.

2 Above, p. 101.
INSCRIPTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE KANISHKA ERA

I have mentioned above that another version, which may, however, belong to jars dedicated by different persons, seems to insert some words under pāpa and saṃgha. This must be inferred from nos. 22-8. For in no. 22 we find after pāpa, i.e. pāpa, the words Yola-Mira-shahi-śahar, where the ha of śahar is added below the line. No. 23 has [pa Y]ola-mira-śahar-[ha]. No. 24 begins with the head of a saṃgha, followed by ha with traces of an i-stem, and ya-va[la-Ma], which I would restore as svakiya-Yola-Mira-shahi-śahar-śahare. No. 25 has tānaśa or perhaps tāna[śa]. With every reserve I restore this as attaniya, Skr. attaniya, and take this as a variant of svakiya. Skr. attaniya occurs as atta- in some Taxila records and atta- in the Arā inscription. In a Sirkap seal legend, however, we find at-.

No. 26 has [Y]ola-Mira, and no. 27 vihāra. In no. 28 we have ha, followed by a defaced space, and then saṃgha. Though there seems to be room for more than one akshara between ha and saṃgha, i.e. saṃgha, I think we may restore vihāra sa[ṃgha] ghe chaturdiśe-acharyanāṁ sarvasvādanimāṇaḥ pratigrahe.

The remaining fragments should probably be inserted after pratigrahe. No. 29 has ksr iśo cha [sra], and no. 30 ritiyagato agra, i.e. pratigrahe iśo cha sra . . . paritragato agra. The doubtful sra in no. 29 may perhaps stand for sra[na], Skr. sanyās.

The continuation of the legend seems to follow in nos. 31-3. No. 31 has traces of a ha, followed by pāyukhe and remnants of an akshara which may be pā or pra. I restore this as matapāyukhe pratiyānus or pratiyānus. The form -pāyukhe is evidently meant to render Skr. pāyukhe. No. 32 runs sa[śa]ra, which only the bottom of the three last aksharas is preserved. The beginning of no. 33 is defaced. Then follows sarvasvādanimāṇaḥ agra pratiyānus, where, however, the second akshara from the end may stand for aha. I therefore restore pratiyānus, or pratiyānus sarvasvādanimāṇaḥ agra pratiyānus, or pratiyānus, taking the sra of sarvasra in no. 33 to be of the same kind as the sra which sometimes occurs in the beginning of the word satva in the Niya documents.

No. 34 seems to run [ṣ]a dharmapati[ṛya] and no. 35 has traces of what may be the ya-loop, followed by cha dh[ṛṛ]cha[ṛṛ]. There are some blurred lines below these aksharas, but they seem to be mere blottings. With every reserve I restore pratiyānus, or pratīyānus, dharmapatisya cha dirghayuta bhavatu, taking dharmapati to be a designation of Yola Mira himself. One of the Brāhmi fragments seems to contain the word bhavatu, with a dash above tu, which apparently marks the end of the record.

If we write such letters as seem to indicate a modification of the preceding sound within parentheses and the passage which is not found in all the inscriptions within brackets, we accordingly arrive at the following reading and interpretation:

**Text**

Shahi-Yola-Miraśa(y)a (or, -s(r)a) viharasvāmis(y)a (or, -s(r)a) deyadharma (or, deya-dh(y)arma) yaṃ prapa [svakiya (or, [a]s]a]-Yola-Mira-shahi-śahar] sam[or, sa]ghe chaturdiśe acharyanāṁ sa[or, s(y)a]rvādanimāṇaḥ pratigrahe. Ito cha s(r)a-uparityagato agra [ma]tapiṇiṇa [pratiyānus] sarvasa[or, s(r)a]rvādanimāṇaḥ agra pratiyānus (or, pratīyānus) dharmapatiśa(y)a cha dirghayuṣa bhavatu].

**Translation**

Of the Śahī Yola Mira, the master of the vihāra, this water hall (is) the religious gift, in his own Yola-Mira-shahi-Vihāra, to the order of the four quarters, in the acceptance of the Sarvāstivādin teachers. And from this right donation may there be in future a share for (his) mother and father, in future a share for all beings and long life for the master of the law.
D. INSCRIPTIONS OUTSIDE THE KHAROŠTĪ HI AREA

Some few Kharošṭhi inscriptions have been found in localities where we have no reason for assuming that Kharošṭhi was ever in common use. Those recovered at Mathurā have been dealt with above, because they can be referred to the rule of the Sakas in that place or to other datable records. There remain some few records of which it is more difficult to judge, and I therefore publish them in this place, in a roughly geographical arrangement.

XCIII. PLATE XXXVI. 1: KUMBHĀRĀ HU TERRA COTTA PLAQUE INSCRIPTION

During the excavations at the terrace of Kumrahar, Patna, in the year 1914, a terra cotta plaque, measuring 4 1/2 in. by 3 1/2 in., was recovered, on which some Kharošṭhi letters are visible.

The plaque was described by the late Dr. D. B. Spooner, who thought that its 'central and principal device is a detailed representation of the famous temple at Bodh Gaya, unquestionably the oldest drawing of this temple in existence'. The late Mr. Vincent Smith objected to this identification and thought that the plaque may just as well represent one of the great temples at Pātāliputra, while Dr. Spooner maintained his explanation. The inscription has been published by Konow.

The identity of the temple depicted on the plaque cannot, I think, be decided. The use of the Kharošṭhi alphabet, on the other hand, seems to show that the person who left the plaque in Pātāliputra was not an inhabitant of that place, but probably a pilgrim from the north-west. For we have no indication of Kharošṭhi having ever been used in Bīrār.

The characters are found to the left of the pillar depicted in front of the entrance to the temple, and they are not numerous enough to allow us to judge of the age of the inscription with anything approaching certainty. Ka has the rectilinear and square shape which we know from older inscriptions, and is perhaps most like the ka of the Mount Banj and Pājā inscriptions of the years 102 and 111. But similar forms also occur in later records, even in Jaulā. Sa has the straight-lined continuation of the leg which we also find on the Pājā stone, but the head is bent back as in some of the sa's of the Lion Capital and of the late Loryān Tangai records. It is impossible to draw any chronological inference from such a state of things.

The first akshara is ka. The leg has been bent forwards, and it is possible that we should read ka. Then follows a badly defaced passage, where I could not detect any traces of letters when I examined the original in Patna in the winter 1925. The photographs before me seem to make it possible to read thuma... saīn. Then comes an almost complete gha and a distinct da. The next akshara looks like da, but the top seems to be slightly turned towards the right and to run into the drawing above it, so that it is possible that we have before us a defective sa. The remaining aksharas are comparatively clear: sa ki ti. Kiti is evidently Sanskrit kriti, which is used in the Divyāvatāna with the meaning 'structure', 'house of relics', but may simply mean 'work'.

---

1 JBOIS, i, pp. 1 ff.
3 Ibidem, iii, pp. 378 ff.
With the utmost reserve I therefore give the following reading and explanation:

**TEXT**


**TRANSLATION**

The work of Suṁghadatta, the Kauthuma.

XCIV. **PLATE XXXVI. 2: PĀTHYĀR INSCRIPTION**

Pāthýar is situated nine miles south of Kanhiāra, on the bank of the Baner rivulet, at a distance of about one mile from the Dādhi Travellers’ Bungalow in the Kangra District. At this place Professor Vogel discovered an inscription in two lines, cut into the rock. The upper line is written in ancient Brāhmi, the lower gives a somewhat fuller version in Kharoshṭhī. Both records have been published by Professor Vogel. The characters are of about the same type as in the Asoka inscriptions and may belong to the second or the beginning of the first century B.C. We may note the use of a short stroke for the u-matra and the closed head of sr.

The first word, which is missing in the Brāhmi version, was read as rathidarasa by Professor Vogel, who thought it most likely that it is an old form corresponding to rathi, an agricultural caste in Kangra. It seems to me, however, that this rathi must be derived from an older rāṣṭrīka and cannot have anything to do with our word. With regard to the reading, it will be seen that the first akṣara has a curious sloping-bottom-stroke. It reminds me so much of the stroke used to mark a long vowel in some Kharoshṭhī Sanskrit verses from Eastern Turkestan that I feel tempted to read rā. The third akṣara I read as ta and not as da. In Rāhitara I see the Vedic Rāhitara, which is used as a patronymic by Satyavāhas in the Taiktīyī Upanishad, I, 9, 1.

The next word Vayulasas is the name of a person, representing Skr. Vayula, which is a short name for Vayudatta or some similar name. The remaining word pukariṇi again shows a sloping-bottom-stroke in the second akṣara.

**TEXT**

Rāhitarasas Vayulasa pukariṇi.

**TRANSLATION**

The Rāhitara Vayula’s pond.

XCV. **PLATE XXXVI. 3: KANHIĀRA INSCRIPTION**

Kanhiāra is situated three miles to the east of Lower Dharmasāla, on the bank of the Mānji torrent in the Kangra District. Sir E. C. Bayley here discovered two inscriptions, one in Brāhmi, the other in Kharoshṭhī, cut on large granite boulders, in a field about half-way between the village and the station of Dharmasāla. As in the case of the Pāthyr records the two inscriptions are of the same contents. They have been published by Messrs. Bayley, E. Thomas, Dowson, Cunningham, and Vogel. The Kharoshṭhī record consists of two lines.

---

2 Cf. Stein, Sāriḍiṭaka, pl. XXV.
3 Mr. Majumdar, J&PasB, xviii, 1922, p. 66, seems to consider Vayula as an un-Indian name.
4 JASB, xxxiii, 1854, pp. 37 ff., with plate I.
5 Prinsep’s Essays, i, pp. 159 ff., with plate IX, fig. 2.
6 JRAI, 1853, p. 254 and plate IX.
7 ASI, v, 1875, p. 175 and plate XLI.
8 Ep. Ind., vii, pp. 116 ff., with plate; cf. Majumdar, List, no. 23.
9 E. Thomas, E. Dowson, Cunningham, and Vogel.

---
PĀTHYĀR, KANHĪĀRA, AND KARNĀL INSCRIPTIONS

The characters are decidedly younger than those of the Pāthyr inscription and may be about contemporaneous with the Patīka plate. In the first line they are all, with the exception of the first, which has an Ɛ-stroke, provided with an angular bottom. The height varies from 5 in. to 1 in. At the beginning of l. 2 we see traces of a svastika.

The first word of the Brāhmi version is Krishayaśya. The first Kharoshṭhī akshara is kri and the second ska with a dot above, which Professor Vogel takes to be an anusvāra. In that case we should have to assume a direct imitation of the Brāhmi sign, and, besides, krishau is not a likely development of krishna. In the Kurram inscription krishna becomes tasha, where the sh is provided with a curve above, which seems to mark an aspiration. I take the dot to mean the same thing in our inscription and transliterate krish'ayaśa, of Krishṇayaśas.

TEXT

L. 1 Krish'ayaśa
2 aramo.

TRANSLATION

Krisṇayaśas' grove.

XCVI. PLATE XXXVI. 4: KARNĀL INSCRIPTION

Karnāl is the head-quarters of the district and tahsil of Karnāl, situated in 29° 41' N. and 76° E., on the old bank of the Jamna, about seven miles from the present course of the river.

No. 1. 89 of the Lahore Museum is a stone, 1 ft. 2 in. long and 5½ in. high, which is said to have come from Karnāl. It contains two incomplete lines and one akshara of a third one in Kharoshṭhī. The writing covers a space 10 in. long; and the size of individual letters varies from 1½ in. to 2½ in.4

The characters point to about the same age as the Kanhiāra inscription. We may note the u-mātrā in pu, l. 2, which consists of a short, straight line; the square ka, pa, and la, and the protruding leg of sa.

L. 1 opens with the word sidhi, Skr. sidhi. Then comes kra with indistinct traces of an i-stroke. The ensuing aksharas are all damaged, and there are several apparent cross-lines, which seem to be due to the roughness of the stone. The second akshara seems to be sa, and kriśa may be Skr. Kṛśa, a well-known old name. Then comes the lower part of a ka, a va with traces of an e or i-stroke, and the lower part of a vertical. It is accordingly possible to read Krisakavina. The last remaining akshara has consisted of a leg, provided with an u-stroke, but cannot be restored.

L. 2 is quite clear as far as it goes: lapotrena ae puka[r] ... It is evident that l. 1 originally contained the name of the donor's father, followed by putrena and the beginning of the grandfather's name. L. 2 can be partly restored, pukar ... as pukaranī or pukarini, and the remaining portion as karvita or svakiye.

L. 3 consists of the akshara a written below the ka of pukar ... If we compare the Kanhiāra inscription, we may think of restoring arame.

In such circumstances the reading cannot be certain.

TEXT

L. 1 sidhi Kṛ[iśa]kav[ina]. u[ ... putrena ... *]
2 lapotrena ae puka[riṇi karvita*]
3 a[rame*]

TRANSLATION

Hail. By Krisakavi, (the son of ...), the grandson of ... la, this pond ....

1 See Majumdar, List, no. 24.
LIST OF WORDS OCCURRING IN KAROSHTHI INSCRIPTIONS

ac XCVI.
akshatrasa XI.11.
aksha XVI.
agisala LXXII. 3.
agrapajitasca LXXVI. 11.
agrapacharitasca LXXII. 2.
agrabhaga LXXXVI. 3.
agrabhagaeae LXXXVI. 2.
agrabhaagapadiprathasca LXXXVI. 2.
agrahashebi XV. A. 2.
ague XCI.
aghedakshoshayan II.
acharya LXXIV. 2.
acharya LXXII. 4.
acharyana LXXII. 4, LXXX. 1.
acharyamant XII.
acharyanena XXXIV.
akSEA XI. 5, XIII. 4.
atthana XI. 4.
atthami LXXVIII. 1.
atthame XXXIX. 2.
atthavahi tsah XII. 1.
atthavise LXXIV. 2.
atthasattamac XSS. 2.
atthasranta XI. 1.
atthasa X. 3.
agradapiupreca XSS. 2.
agrapaharthee LXXV. 5.
agrapahena LXXX. 3.
arajyaka LXXVIII. 3.
atavatan LXXX. XI. 10.
atavatana VIII. 1. 2.
atureena XV. A. 6.
atmanasa LXXV. 5.
atra XIII. 2, XXV. 3, LXXXVI. 2, LXXVII. 3.
atmanasa XSS. 2.
ati nato XXXVIII. 3.
anti LXXII. 2.
asti LXXVIII. 3.
apana LXXIV. 2.
apalae LXXII. 1.
apattahitvata XIII. 3.
abhitakte XVII. A. 6.
abhitki LXXVIII. 2.
abhi X. 5.
abhisuvrata XV. A. 13.
amacha XXVIII. 4.
amata XXVII. 3.
ambales XXVII. 1.
arya XXVI. 1, 2, XXXVI. 4.
arya XXXII.
arya LXXIV. 2.
ayad LXXIII. 3.
aryaana XV. KL. 1, 3.
arya X., r XXVII. 1.
arya XV. A. 2.
aymita XV. KL. 2.
avahavardhaka XII. 4.
avahatradasa XXXVII. PI. XX. 9.
avame XI. 6, XCVI.
avaneo XCVI.
avahal'; "hua XXVII. 4.
avapaja LXXXVI. 3.
avagadakshini LXXVII., LXXVIII.
avagadakshinacca LXXVII. 3, 5, LXXXVI. 2, LXXI. LXXXVI. 3, LXXVIII.
avagadakshini LXXVI. 2, XLVII.
avagaya LXXXIV. 2.
avagaya LXXIV. 2.
avah L. 2.
avahamigiya LXXXIX. XXI. 1.
avadumaka LXXXI. 1.
avanutre LXXXI. 4.
avarjana XV. C. 1.
avashadrigana LXXVII. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi XXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
avi LXXVI. 3.
avi LXXVIII. 2.
ec XCVII.
ec XCVII.
ec XXXVIII. 2.
ec XXXVIII. 2.
eca LXXVIII. 1.
eca XXXXIV. 1.
ec XXXXIV. 1.
ec XXXXIV. 1.
ec XXXXIV. 1.
eca LXXVIII. 2.
eca LXXVIII. 2.
eca LXXVIII. 2.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
ekamukham XXVII. 1.
LIST OF WORDS OCCURRING IN...
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sakrastamana XV, P 1.
saktha XXXVII, Pl. XX, 14.
saghamitranjas LXXXV, 3.
saghamitrana LXXXV, 3.
sagarana A. 14.
saghasa A, O 2.
saghae XCI.
sagbarasas LX, 2.
saphakaraa LXXX, 2.
saphakaraa LXV.
sapharamana VIII A 1.
saphdharmasas CXI.
saphgamitranjas LVIII, 1.
saphgamitranjas XXXII, 3.
saphgamitranjas LXXI, 2.
saphgamitranjas XXXIV, 2.
saphgamitranjas XIII, 3.
saphdharamana XIII, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
s aphdhamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
saphdharamana XX, 5.
saphdharamana LVIII, 1.
saphdharamana XXXII, 3.
saphdharamana XXXI, 3.
PERSONAL NAMES IN KHAROSHTHI INSCRIPTIONS

Abulah, mother of Rājula’s queen 37.
Agilā, navakarmika 136.
Akshaya, donor
Akshāla 109.
Ananda-patra, patronymic
Ananda-patrapata 64.
Arajambha, man 102.
Ayāsia, Rājula’s queen 34.
Ayes, king
Ayā 16.
Bahlajā, matri 141.
Balasand, upāśikā 140.
Balasvinīn Boyana, man
Balsami Boyana 60.
Bhalu, chief 15.
Bhava, śakrāya 140.
Bosavarman, donor
Bosavaruma 115.
Brahmadatta, man
Bramadatta 101.
Buddhadeva, monk
Buddhatre 44.
Buddhamahosha, donor 106.
Buddhālītra, man 101.
Buddhāmitra, donors 94, 108.
Buddhāpiśita, upāśikā
Buddhāpiśita 127.
Buddharakshita, donors
Buddhasena, man
Buddhasena 137.
Buddhavarman, donors
Buddhasavuma 115.
Buddhasavuma 108, 124.
Buddhīla, monk 45, 46.
Buddhīla, navakarmika 149.
Buddhīla, navakarmika 149.
Buddhīla, navakarmika 149.
Buddha, hārāsamudrā 149.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
Buddhā, hārāsamudrā 168.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śivarakshita</td>
<td>man 16, 57, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivasena</td>
<td>kshatrapa 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śoḍāsa</td>
<td>kshatrapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śuṣāsa 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śramanamitra</td>
<td>donor</td>
<td>Shasanamitra 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śuhc ...</td>
<td>donor 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanbuddhi</td>
<td>brother of donor</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śvačavarna Vaśaputra</td>
<td>donor 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhalli</td>
<td>donatrix 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhtidra</td>
<td>donor 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takshila</td>
<td>chief 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutidora</td>
<td>donor 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thavarputra</td>
<td>patronymic 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetuddama</td>
<td>chief 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetidra, meridarkh 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetana</td>
<td>man 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiranaka</td>
<td>donor 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urumujaputra</td>
<td>patronymic 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagamaregra</td>
<td>donor 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajhenkha, king 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajhushka (?) 756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valavada, father of Damijada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasishta, man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasethu 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasudeva, brahman 155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vayula, donor 155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vešpaši, Vešpaša, kshatrapa</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvamitra, man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Viśpamitra 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vima Kadphises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvima Kavthina 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavalatra, man 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yola Mira, a šahī 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolamupalatra, father of Buddha-latara 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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abbreviations cxxvi.
Abdagaes, Parthian king xlvi.
Almašords cxvii.
alphabets
a 166, lxxii, cxxi.
compound letters cxxiv.
y with consonants and a cxxv.
subscription s cxxv.
ante-consonantic r cxxv.
\( \tilde{v} \) voiced s cvii.
\( \hat{v} \) voiced s cviii.
v = s 144, 147, 163, cvii.
s = s cvii.
s = s 166, 172, 174, cix, cvii.
\( \tilde{t} = \tilde{t} \) cix.
subscription r to indicate fricative 2, 39, 51, 155, 153, 166, cxxiv, 5, cv.
\( \tilde{v} = \tilde{v} \) 147, 152, 166, 174, cvii, cxi, cvii.
numerical symbols cxxvi.
signs of beginning or end of record 55, 139, 162, cxxvi.
signs of omission 44, 147, cxxvi.
* stops 21, 54, 78, cxxvi.
varying shapes of lotters cxxix.
ālāyāniā, Sakish for ‘prince’ 61, xlviii, lxi.
Ambavaga, Central Asian king lxxiv.
An-kuo, king of Khotan lxxiv, lxxv.
An-śi, Chinese name of Parthia xxix.
reduced by Kujūda Kadphises lxi.
atalāyana, hareem
āteṇa 37.
Apollonius of Tyana xlviii.
ādāma 179, cvi.
ādīl, name of Tocharian ivii.
origin and etymology lxi.
same as ‘Aroa, Asiani ivii.
Arā, father of Karakota 35, xxxv.
perhaps Mogā’s brother xxxvi.
conquer Sogdiana xxi.
kings of Tocharian xxii.
Adapvarma, strategos of Aṣes and Guduvhara xlv.
Advagōsha lxxix.
Avalīsdtīha, king of Khotan lxxiv.
Avārāsa, name of a country 103.
Aya, see Aṣes.
ayās, in Taxila scroll 71, lxxv, 2c.
Aṣes, king xxix.
a Parthian xi.
coins xxxix.
\( \tilde{m} \) at Bimar 50.
era and date xlix ; cf. Ensas.
as ‘King of Kings’ xlii.
mentioned as Aya in Shahdaur inscription 16, xxxii.
Aṣes = Azīlīsa xii.
Azīlīsa’s coins cxxix.
Bactria conquered by Indo-Scythians xxi.
Bahalas, ‘Baktarin’ 74.
Bahūruttaya, Buddhist sect 121.
Bhādu, perhaps = ruler of Bhaṇḍa 75.
Bhūmaka, Western Katarapara lxx.
blessing separated from record 76, 156, 158, cxviii.
Bodhisattva chapel 75.
Boysana, title 60.
Brahmī in Chinese Turkestan lxxii.
Buddha’s birthday 60.
buddhādātā 86.
Buddhism in inscriptions cxxvii.
Buddhism in Kāshgar lxxii.
Buddhist Prākrit canon 154, lxxii, cxviii.
Buddhist Sanskrit books quoted in Central Asian Kharaśhiṭi lxxii.
Busapara, Saka encampment at Mathurā 42, 44.
Calendar in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions Indo-Macedonian lxxix.
days of months counted through lxxix.
months lxxix.
\( \tilde{m} \) pūrṇimānta lxxix.
\( \tilde{m} \), Greek 24, 139, 152, 157, 167, lxxix.
\( \tilde{m} \), intercalated 73.
pakhașa xciii.
seasons xciii.
years, designation lxxix.
\( \tilde{m} \), beginning lxxix.
Chang K'ien, Chinese envoy xxii, liv.
Chashṭana, Western Katarapara lxx.
etymology of name lxx.
Chen-t'ang Kia-ni-ch'ū = Kanishka of Khotan lxxv.
Chukha, name of district 24, 62, xxxvi, lix.
classes of beings enumerated 108.
conjugation cvii.
consonant system cvii.
deprivation and redundant aspiration 172, ci, cvii.
t intervocalic stops cvii.
v and ș cv.
v cvi., lviii.
v cvii.
voiced ș cv.
voiced t cvii.
compound consonants cvii.
\( \tilde{m} \) < ąhī cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) < ānu and ęh cv.
nasals and stops cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) < ḍh and \( \tilde{m} \) cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) < ąt cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) < ānu and ęh cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
\( \tilde{m} \) k cv.
cursive characters 32, cxxix.
Damana, name of Sui Vihār 140.
Damājud, rājān of Haṣṭāra 13, xxxii.
dated inscriptions lxxvi.
calculated xci, lxxxvii.
dates, their arrangement 71, lxxxviii.
magic significance cvii.
name of ruler mentioned 72, xxix.
pakhașa 60.
in Takht-i-Bahi inscription 58, xxxiii.
in Central Asian documents lixv.
Devādirā, see Vādirā.
devaputra, royal title, adapted from Chinese 163, lxxx,
dharmakūṭa, preacher 140.
dharmarājīka, a stūpa with relics of the Buddha 75, 90.
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- dobá, primitive 127.
- double genitive 140.
- drakhme in Kharaoshtí inscriptions 98, cxvi.
- drawings 150, cxvvi.
- Drovidadaka, name of association 160.
- edo-silpa 116.
- ephi, kind of well 53.
- endorsement 28.
- eras
  - first secular era in India xcii.
  - old Indian xci.
  - in Brahmi inscriptions lxxiii.
  - in Kharaoshtí inscriptions lxxii.
- foreign lxxiv.
- Indian lxxiv.
- overlapping xci.
- Axes era 26, xxxv, xliii, xci.
- Axes and Vikrama era 71, lxxivv.
- Buddhist era xcii.
- Caesarean era lxxiv.
- Jain era xcii.
- Kanishka era lxxvi, lxxvii, xciii.
- Kālava era lxxvi.
- Mathurā era xcl.
- Mithradates era lxxv.
- Mauryan era lxxiv, xcl.
- Moga era 71, lxxiv.
- Paramā era lxxiv.
- Saka era, old 172, xxxvi, xci, xc, xcii.
- Saka era of 28, xxxviii, xcl, lxxvii, lxxviii.
- Saptarashmi era lxxiv.
- Seleucidan era lxxiii.
- Vikrama era xlvii, lxxxiv, lxxvi, xcl.
- Voonones era lxxv.

- ārjhana, prince 61, xlvii, lxi.
- Fang-tān, king of Khotan lxxv.
- Fan Ye, author of Hou Han-shu lxxiv.
- forged record 161, cxviii.
- four emperors 162.
- frasatives xcix, c, cv.
- Gad, brother of Gudhuvaha xlv.
- Gandhāra art, dated 172, cxviii.
- Gondoparnes, same as Gudhuvaha.
- grammatical sketch xcv.
- Greek rulers and their titles xv, xcxi.
- Greeks in Kharaoshtí inscriptions 1, 2, 4, 6, 65, 98, 134.
- Guda, Gudhā, Gudhuvaha's family name xlv.
- Gudhuvaha king xlv.
- coins xlv.
  - in Christian tradition xlv.
  - in Taht-i-Bāh inscription 28, xcvi.
- length of reign and date xcvi.
- Gudhuvaha, monastery near Mathurā 30, 44.
- Gudhā, same as Kushāna.
- Gudhāna mahārāya, Kujjila Kadhphises 68, xlvii.
- Gudhuvahavasathvardhāna 146.
- Guzan king xcl.
- Hatlamada, Saka khotrapa xxxiv.
- Hākas, same as symbol 9, cxviii.
- Harit 126.
- Ḥashmangar 117.
- Herakles on Indian seal 102.
- Hermaeus and Kujjila Kadhphises xciii.
- Hida, name of a village 132.
- hihn, the hanging passage xciii.
- hi-hin, title with the Ti-hia lvi.
- Himayāna in Kharaoshtí inscriptions cxvii.
- Hi-tun, principality lvi.

- Hiu-mi, principality lvi.
- Hodroe, name of association 91.
- hokhaphaparicara 37, cxvii.
- horamudi 148, cxviii.
- Hou Han-shu, period covered liv.
  - on Khotan bxiv.
  - on Ta-hia lvi.
  - on Tsin-chu cxvii.
- on Vai-chiu liv, bxiv.
- Huan-tou, on Old Tu-bo-lo lvi.
- Huqishka, career lxxi.
- coin at Manjikilla 150.
- dates and titles lxx.
- in Kaśmir lxx.
- Huqishka = Huqishka lxxiv.
- Intaavardipatra, name of association 74.
- Indian language in Chinese Turkestan lxxii.
- Indian population in Afghanistan, not as far as Wardak 168.
- Indian population in Chinese Turkestan lxxii.
- Indo-Scythia cxvi.
- inflexion of nouns cxiv.
  - genders 3, cxvi.
  - a-bases cxiv.
    - nom. sing. 69, 132, cxvi.
    - instr. in ēpas and ē cxvii.
    - gen. cxvii.
  - ē-bases cxiv.
  - i-bases cxiv.
  - ska, ška-bases cxiv
  - su-bases cxiv.
  - š-bases cxiv.
  - a-bases cxiv.
- consonantique bases cxiv.
- inscribed objects cxvi.
- arāma 170.
- box lid 151.
- bricks 137.
- Buddha's footprints 8.
- casket 135, 150, 152.
- copper-plates 4, 13, 138.
- elephant 49.
- gold plate 83.
- images and sculptures 12, 90, 91, 92, 105-110, 114.
  - 113, 124, 121, 171, cxvi.
- jars 120, 157, 173, cxvi.
- ladies 87, 88, cxvi.
- lamp 89, 116, cxvi.
- pavement stone 116.
- pedestals 113, 115, 118, 120, 123, 134.
- plastron base 114.
- pillar 102, 115.
- potsherds 63, 122, 124, 125.
- prāṇa 175, cxvi.
- seals 7, 100, 103.
- silver scrolls 70, 103.
- silver vessels and utensils 81, 97, 98, 99, 151, cxvi.
- stones 9, 13, 16, 18, 21, 57, 79, 103, 110, 127, 128.
- tanks 65, 178, 179, cxvi.
- terra-cotta plaque 177.
- toyahida 104, cxvi.
- vases 1, 50, 87, 164.
- volute bucket 90, cxvi.
  - 171, cxvi.
- writing-boards 159.
- inscriptions connected with Kanishka era 135.

 Old: Saka era 135.
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as charms 77, 86, 93, 137, 162, 165, cviii.
contents cvii.
drafting 41, 42.
execution, punched dots 24, 70, 87, 92-9, 135, 139,
inked 120, 137.
not destined to be read 31, 70, 137, cviii.
recopied 92.
rhythm and rhythm 86, 127, cviii.
separation of words and word-groups 139.
Jihoreka, Saka text 27, 36, xiii.
Jihoreka, Zezunises, kshattra of Chukhsa 82, lxix.
Jinakumara, designation of the Buddha 138.
Jushka = Vaisistha lxxx.
kudhacara, encampment 43.
Kadhphises, see Kujula and Wima Kadhphises.
kusarn, Roman imperial title 162, lxxx.
Kambjas, Iranian people 36, xxxvi, xxxvii.
Kamara, designation of Kharrastra and his daughter
34, 40, xxx.
Kanka, Khotan king lxxii.
of the Kusa race lxxv.
Kanishka, Kushāna king 1xxv.
and Buddhism lxxvi.
in Chinese sources lxxv.
coin-legends lii.
council lxxix.
date lxxv, lxxxvi.
death lxxvi.
K-media lxxvi.
in Baluchistan and Sindh 173.
in Kashmir lxxix.
supposed revival lxx.
importance lxxviii.
in India and route to India lxxvii.
and Khotan lxxvii.
and Kiern of Khotan lxxviii.
in Mathurā lxxvii.
and Partshana 143, lxxviii.
returns to his country lxxvii.
and Sanskrit lxxix.
his stūpa 135, lxxv.
his successors lxxx.
ant Tien-chu lxxx.
and Little Vede-chi lxxxvi.
Kanishka II, Kushāna king lxx, lxxi.
his titles lxxx.
Kāo-śa, principality lvi.
Kapa ertujansa 61, xlviii.
Kapiša, town 150.
Kara on coins of Kadhphises lxxv.
Kashmir, conquered by Kushiṣhas lxxix.
Kausa, locality 69.
Kālṣayapata, Buddhist sect 63, 88, 121, 122, cviii.
Kavalakshatrata, kshattra of Kapiša 150.
Khalamasa, Saka kuman 49, xxxv.
Kulaśandava, a stūpa, Loroyan Tangai 108.
Kharrastra, Saka yuvārāja 34, 40, xxxv, xxxvi.
kshattra lxxv.
coins xxxv.
doughter marries Rajula 26, xxxv.
same as Kharrahostes 35, xxxv.
Kharthaka, Saka kshattra 47, xiii.
Kharoshthi alphabet area xiii, outside of India xiii, lxxi, lxxiv.
name xiv.
origin xiii.
period xiii; yields to Bihāmi lxxix; in fifth century 92.
in books xiii; Dhammapada lxxiii.
on coins xiv.
Khavada, name of Wardak 165, 167.
Khotan in Kushāna period lxxi, lxxiv.
traditions lxxi.
Khotan Saka li.
Kudachia, locality 78, 148.
Kushāna mahārāja rajāśrāja devaputra, same as
Kujula Kadhphises 76, lxxv, lxxvi.
Kushāna yavuṇa, same as Kujula Kadphises lxxv.
Kien, king of Khotan lxxx.
Kien-shė, old Vede-chi capital lvi.
King of Kings; introduction of title xxx.
in India lxxvii.
with Sakas xxx, adopted from Partshana xxi,
abolished 36, xxxvi.
Kipin, country xxi.
and Kujula Kadphises lxxv.
and Sakas xxi, xxxiii.
and Taxila lxxvi.
Kujula Kadphises, same as Kujula Kadphises lxxi.
Kusana, years lxxv, xxx.
Kushāna kingdom, family or clan 24, xxxii, lxv.
Kushāna, locality in Taxila 15.
kubvaya, meaning and origin lxxxv, lxxxvi.
Kuei-shuang, principality, same as Kushāna xlix, lvi.
Kuei-shuang, principality, same as Kushāna xlix, lvi.
Kujula Kadphises, Kushāna ruler form of name lxxi, lxxiv.
coins lxxiv, lxxvi, at Rajar 118.
Kurile lxxi.
Kwai lxxi.
Kyrata, kingdom 33, xxxi.
Kuyala, kingdom 33, xxxi.
Lipāvalasudharlana, illustrated 130.
mahānāma, ams-lord 27.
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mahākṣatrapa, sa kṣatrapa.

mahārāja, Indian title 163, lxxv.

Mahāśāṅghika, Buddhist sect 46, 170, cxvii.

Māya, Saka prince. 40, xxxv.

marārīka, title of Kanishka 143.

Maues, same as Moga.

merišarīka, Greek title 2.

Mevaki Miylza, Saka kṣatrapa 45, xxxiii, xxvii.

Mithradates II, Parthian king xxix.

Mithradates I, Parthian king xxix.

Moga, same as Moga.

Moga, Saka king, 24, 39, 58, xxix.

coins xxvii, xxxi.

date xxvii.

death xxxv.

era 71, lxxiv.

in inscriptions 12, 24, 24, xxix, xxxii.

origin xxxv.

not first Saka emperor in India xxxi.

Monogram on Taxila scroll 77, lxxvi.

muruṣa, title of Kanishka 143.

muṣuṇḍa, Saka title xx.

Nagaraka, hailing from Nagaraka 45, 46, 95.

Nahapana, Western Kṣatrapa lxx.

nakshatras in dates 172, 171, xcviii.

nandapāda 101, 102, cxvii.

nandranama, boat bridge 140.

nakabharman, architect 28, 136, 149, 158.

Introduces his name 28, 137, 149, cxviii.

nimmā 38.

Nouchi, town 75.

North-western Prakrit xcv.

eastern limit xiv.

literary use xcv.

ο and e-dialects cxvii.

numerals cv.

Obhara, locality 156.

objects of donations cxvi.

oka, religious building 172, cxvii.

omitted hundreds lxxxiv.

Orthogonics, epitaph of Guduvhara xiv.

Orthokeybantioi, same as Saka Tigrakhauda xvii.

Phacores, Parthian ruler xvii.

parvirāra 38, 60, 141, 149, cxvi.

Parthian history xcv, xxv, xxviii, xcvii.

Patika, Saka chief 25, 45, xxxiii, lxxvii.

Phraorates, Parthian ruler in Taxila xlvii.

Pipalkhora, name of association 53.

Pusaputapiyatra, name of association or community 164.

Potiāo, Great Vṛćēchi king lxxvii.

pratyāvakṣavānapāla formula 154.

pronouns cxv.

Pu-ta, reduced by Kujiśa Kadphises lvii.

putra, scion 51, 56, 64, 65, 69, 74, lxxv.

Rāja image 118.

Rājāstrātīrga, or Kanishka's dynasty lxxix.

rajaśirāja, adopted Iranian title 153, lxxv.

Rajula, Saka mahākṣatrapa 34, xcvii.

Rājalībula, Rājīvula xxxvii.

Rajula's queen 34, xxxv.

Rāval inscription 167, cxvii.

relics cxvi.

relax bone 49.

dhātu 49, 73, 84.

hānta 83.

hast 145.

lakṣa 26, 38, 55, 128, 153, 154, 157, 167.

Romance, Saka city xvii.

Satakaurac, same as Saka.

sahaya and saharya cxvii.

sahaya 160.

sahaya 22, 67(?), 112.

saharya 29, 53, 78.

Sāri-rang, same as Saka murundā xix.

Saka, people 15.

Saka or Saka xvi.

in Chinese literature xix.

in classical literature xxvii, xxvi.

in Indian sources xxvii, xxxv.

in Persian inscriptions xvii.

Amyrgioi xviii.

Haunavarka xviii.

Murundā xx.

Tigrakhauda xviii.

gulagān language li.

in Khotan country lxxiii.

in Kushāna coins and inscriptions lii.

in literature li, lxxi.

phonetic development lli.

nationality xxxvii.

wanderings xvi, xix, xxii.

history, in Ikcirata xvi, xxii.

in Kārūn xxvii, xxvii.

in Seistan xvii, xix, xxvi, xxv, xxx.

history in India xx, xxvi.

replaced by Parthians xxvii.

date of invasion xxv.

route of invasion xxv.

empire after Vikramaditya xxvii, xxviii.

empire in Moga's days xxii.

decline after Moga xxvi.

in Indus country xxvii, xxviii.

in Kāṭhāwār xxvii, xxvii.

in Lāghmān xxv.

in Mastij xxv.

in Mathurā 45, xxii.

in Parīlīk xxvii.

in Ujajī of xvii.

inscriptions xxii.

rulers and their titles xx, xxvii.

genealogy 47.

'King of Kings' xxvii, xxxi.

kṣatrapas xxii.

succession xxvi.

Sakaratnai, Sakaucae, same as Saka xx.

Sakasatnai, the Saka realm 45, xxvi, cf. Sakas in Seistan.

Śalansokrama, name of ferry station east of Indus 160.

Śalātura, name of a town west of Indus 160.

sahādhi xvii.

sahgńa, the Buddhist order 46.

sahgńa chāhiditā 63, 88, 121, 175.

sahgńaśrīma 64, 40, 136, cxvi.

Sahabanes, Parthian ruler xxvii.

Sanskrit in inscriptions 156, xxv.

Sanskrit and Kharoshthī lxxix.

Sanskrit in Turkestian xxxvii.

Sanskritization 159, 164, 174.

Sapedama, Parthian ruler in India xvii.

śārdhūvīcharin, śārdhūvīcharin, companion 107 ff.

Śarvāstivādin, Buddhist sect 45, 46, 95, 136, 144, 154, 157, cxvii.

Sāsā, Parthian chief xvii.

wrong etymology lxxix.

sata, Saka word for day 152, 157, 167.

Satavāstra, Parthian ruler xxvii.

Sivira, perhaps name of association 172.

semi-compounds of titles and names 35, 37, 41, cxiv
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Vashiṣṭha, name of association 29.
Vāśisṭha, Kṛṣṇa, king lxxx.
dates and titles 163.
forms of name lxxxi.
Kṛṣṇa's successor lxxxvi.
Vāsudeva, Kṛṣṇa, ruler lxxvii, lxxviii.
coin at Fāmirāpurī 117.
Veṭṭiyarāṭhuva, name of a sītāpa 56.
Veṭṭiyāḷḷuva, Saka enclosure at Mathurā 42, 44.
vēṭṭarakottina 149.
vēṭṭarukkotina 123, 173.
vēṭṭarukkotina 140.
Vijayaśikri, Khotan ruler lxxv, lxxvi.
Vijayaśikriha, Khotan ruler lxxv, lxxvi.
Vikramaditya, king xxvii, lxxv.
Vina, name of Sārastsāvāna 95.
Vonones I of Pathia lxx xvii.
Vonones, 'King of Kings' x, lxxiii, lxxiv.

vowel system xxv.

Vardak and north-western Pākṣik 168, cv, cxii.
water at donations 44.
Weḷalla about Yē-ṭe-chi lvi.
Western Countries and China lxxiv.
Wima Kadphises, Khotan ruler lxxv, lxxvi.
Wima Kadphises, Khotan ruler lxxvi.
and China lxxvi.
coins lxxvi.
form of name lxxvi.
founders of Saka era lxxvi.
his governors (Western Khotanapās, Soter Megas) lxxvii.
reconquers Thien-chu lxxvi, lxxvii.
western pictured 134.
writing as charm cvii.
yaṭi l40, cvi.
Yavanas and Kāraṇṭhā ṣa inscriptions xv.
yōtyupa, yōtie, Kṛṣṇa, title l, lxxv.
Yen-kao-chēn, same as Wima Kadphises lxxi.
Yin-mo-fu, King of Kipin xxiv.
not = Moga xiv.
Yola Mīra, a sāhā 175.
2 in Khotanī Sūka 147, lxxi.
Yamotikā, same as Bhūmasaka lxx.
Ye-ṭe-chi, people lxxvi.
nationality lx.
Little and Great (Ta) Yē-ṭe-chi lxxvii.
Little Yē-ṭe-chi lv, lxxvi.
Great Yē-ṭe-chi lv.
old form of name, not = Arsi lxxvi.
same people as 'Aṣū, Asāvī, lxxv, lxxv, lx.
original home lxxvi.
expeled by Hsung-nu lxxvi.
conquer Sai-wang xix, lxxvi.
expeled by Wu-sun lxxvi.
Chiang Kien about Yē-ṭe-chi lv.
conquer Ta-hia lxxv, lv, lv.
identified with Ta-hia lxxv.
capital Kien-hē lxxvi.
capital Lan-ṭhī lxxvi.
kings of Kien-hē lxxvi.
in Chinese Turkestān lxxv.
in Kāshgār lxxvii.
Yawariṣha, Saka title 36, lxxv.
Zeotins, same as Jihonika.
ALPHABETICAL LIST OF INSCRIPTIONS

Årā 162.
Bajaur 6.
Bededi 88.
Bimārān 90.
Box lid 151.
Dewal 104.
Fatehjang 17.
Ghar Dheri 123.
Hashtragar 117.
Hidda 157.
Jamālgārhi image halo 114.
   lamp 115.
   pavement stone 115.
   pedestal 113.
   plaster base 114.
   stone 110.
Kala Sang 52.
Kāłdārā 65.
Kanhira 178.
Kāmna Dheri 172.
Kanral 179.
Khatlas 79.
Kumranār 177.
Kurram 152.
Lahore halo 175.
   pedestal 115.
   writing-board 130.
Loriān Tangai 105.
Main 11.
Mābānā Dheri 171.
Māgošā bronze casket 150.
   silver disk 151.
   stone 145.
Mānschrā 18.
Mārguz 66.
Mathurā elephant 49.
   Lion Capital 30.
Mir Ziyārat 124.
Mohenjo Daro 173.
Mount Bani 53.
Muchai 90.
Naugrām 129.
Nowshera 134.
Pāljā 53.
Pālāna Dheri 120.
Panjārā 87.
Paris cornelian 71.
Pāthiyār 178.
Peshawar Museum No. 1, 127.
   " " " 3. 133.
   " " " 4. 128.
   " " " 5. 133.
   " " " 6. 133.
   " " " 7. 133.
   " " " 21. 155.
   " " " 1938, 134.
   " " " " " " " " " " " 129.
Kāwal 49, 161.
Saddo 9.
Sahā-Bahlol 122.
Shahdaur 13.
Shahji-kt-Dherf
   Kanishka casket 135.
   bricks 157.
Shahr-i-Nāpurān 123.
Shakardara 159.
Sivasena seal 103.
Skārah Dheri 124.
Sul Vihar 138.
Swāt rock 9.
Swāt vase 1.
Tāla 173.
Takhta-Bāhtī
taxi 62.
pottery 63.
stone 57.
Taxila
   Dharmarājikā 89.
gold plate 83.
   Jaulī 92.
   Thaoli 4.
lamp 87.
   Meridarkī plate 4.
   Patrika plate 25.
   pillars 102.
   seals 100.
   silver cups 97.
   silver plates 98.
   silver scroll 70.
   silver scroll, lost 103.
   silver sieve 99.
   silver vase 81.
   stone matrix 102.
   volute bracket 99.
Tirath 8.
Tor Dherai 173.
Unjā 170.
Wardak 165.
Yākub 131.
Zedā 142.
CORRIGENDA

Page 9, line 11, for one of Bühler’s reproductions read Bühler’s reproduction.

9. 54. for Hsüan-tsang read Hsüan-tsang.
17. 16. add: Or the beginning may be Urasrajasālahāna dharma.
20. 5. for sīyātī read sītātī.
22. 27. for mukapāgatāya read mukapāgatāya.
27. 25. delete inverted comma before To.
30. 25. for an enormous read an enormous.
47. 33. for Ayapi read Ayasī.
49. 22. for Rawal read Rawal.
51. 12, 14, 34 ff., and 42. After the text had been printed I received a new plate prepared from a photograph taken by the Clarendon Press. It shows that the actual reading is Mūnjañānada, and that the r-stroke of pañca really joins the ts in a sharp angle.
57. 6. for L. 3 read L. 2.
57. 71. for 2 read 3.
83. 19. for Cukkhaṭa read Chukkhaṭa.
88. 2. for Hvaraka read Hvaraka.
155. 19. for instant read term.
162. 4. for Rawal read Rawal.
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