

connection with the general development of Indian art. Indian sculptors, like their colleagues, the poets, evidently from an early time delighted themselves in expressing their ideas in a more or less veiled and enigmatic manner, and their predilection for doing this met with ample support, not only from the taste of the Indian public, but also from the primitive state in which Indian art has always remained prior to its touch with modern Europe. To the primitive man, as well as to the child, the picture of a drum or some other musical instrument conveys the idea of the sound which it produces, and wherever he sees it in painting or carving he understands that it means that music is heard in that particular scene. I am afraid the Indians have been very late in passing beyond that primitive state of artistic conception, if they really ever have passed beyond it before coming into contact with the civilization of modern Europe.

T. BLOCH.

### THE GANGA PRINCE BUTUGA II

The supplementary inscription on the Ātakūr stone of A.D. 949–50 (*Epigraphia Carnatica*, vol. 3, Maṇḍya, No. 41) records the grant of the Banavase twelve-thousand province and some minor districts to the Western Gaṅga prince Būtuga II by the Rāshtrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III, as a reward for killing the Chōla king Rājāditya. The scholars who have dealt with this inscription have accused Būtuga II of treachery in connection with the killing of Rājāditya, whom he slew by stabbing him with a dagger,<sup>1</sup> and the accusation has been repeated quite recently in the Imperial Gazetteer of India.<sup>2</sup>

This accusation, however, is simply based on a wrong interpretation of the expression *bisugeye kaḷan-āgi*, which

<sup>1</sup> *Epigraphia Carnatica*, 3. introd., 6; *Epigraphia Indica*, 2. 168; 3. 282; 6. 52, 57 and note 1.

<sup>2</sup> *The Indian Empire*, vol. 2 (1908), p. 59.

occurs in the passage which mentions the event. Decipherers of the text read *kallan*, 'thief,' instead of *kaḷan*, and translated *kallan-āgi* as meaning "by stealth" or "treacherously". Further, the meaning of the word *bisuge* not being known, the conjectural senses of 'anger' based on *bisu*, 'heat,' and of 'embrace' based on *bisu*, 'to join,' have been given to it, and the translation of *bisugeye* has run thus—"making him angry," and again "in the act of embracing him (*in pretended friendship*)". The real meaning, however, of the word *bisuge* is 'a howdah'; and *kaḷa*, which is the word that we really have here,—not *kalla*,—is very commonly used both in Kannada and Tamil in the sense of 'a battlefield'. In the list of words given at the end of Kēśirāja's Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa, the words *sāri*, *bisuge*, and *deñcheya* are clearly mentioned as synonyms.<sup>1</sup> *Sāri* or *śāri* is a Sanskrit word meaning 'an elephant's housings':<sup>2</sup> it also means 'a man or piece at chess'; and this meaning is erroneously put down for *bisuge* in Kittel's Dictionary, p. 1124. All the three words—*bisuge*, *sāri*, and *deñcheya*—are met with in Kannada literature in the sense of 'a howdah':—

(a) Āgaḷ ēṛida *bisugegaḷum* . . . berasu . . . taḷarva  
madāndha-gandha-sindhuraṅgaḷumam.<sup>3</sup>

(b) Kari-sēnā-sāri-bhāra-grathanam.<sup>4</sup>  
Śiraṁ kariyinde nelakke biḷe . . . gata-prāṇam ad  
ēm malaṅgidudo *sāriyan* andu kabandham ātanā.<sup>5</sup>

(c) Vikramapāla-Pāvusa-śiraḷ-kañjaṅgaḷ allāḍutirduvu  
tann āneya honna *deñcheyada* chañchat-kētu-  
daṇḍaṅgaḷol.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kittel's edition, p. 404, No. 49 :—*Sāriy-endum bisugey-endum deñcheyam*.

<sup>2</sup> *Yuddhārtha-gaḷa-paryāṇam* : Mēdinikōśa.

<sup>3</sup> Pampa - Bhārata or Vikramārjunavijaya, x, prose passage after stanza 51 (p. 217).

<sup>4</sup> Chandraprabhapurāṇa (Mysore edition), x, 65 (p. 43).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., x, 103 (p. 52).

<sup>6</sup> *Ep. Carn.*, vol. 11, Dāvāṅgere, No. 25, line 39.

It will thus be seen that the correct interpretation of the expression *bisugeye kaḷan-āgi* is "the howdah itself having become the battlefield". And we learn from the large Leyden grant that Rājāditya was seated on the back of an elephant (*nāgēndra-skandha-varttī*) during the battle with Kṛishṇa III, and died there.<sup>1</sup> It may therefore be concluded that Būtuga undauntedly mounted the elephant on which Rājāditya was seated, and, engaging him in hand-to-hand fight in the howdah itself, stabbed him with a dagger and thus killed him. We see nothing at all deserving blame in the conduct of Būtuga: on the contrary, his intrepidity is really worthy of our admiration.

R. NARASIMHACHAR.

As one of those concerned in doing the injustice which is now corrected, I may, I hope, be allowed to explain the interest which attaches to Mr. Narasimhachar's note, given above. Būtuga II was a great prince, —a member of the family of the Gangas of Mysore,— who in and about A.D. 950 held the administration of a large province, comprising parts of Mysore, North Kanara, Dhārwar, Belgaum, and Bijāpūr, under his brother-in-law the Rāshtrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III. He appears to have been a Jain by religion: at any rate, he and his wife Rēvakanimmaḍi were long remembered for doing much to promote the welfare of the Jain faith. He was also a warrior: and it is most satisfactory that it should be so conclusively shown that he was not guilty of any unfair behaviour in slaying the Chōla king with whom his own paramount sovereign was at war.

<sup>1</sup> *Archæological Survey of Southern India*, 4. 207, line 44.—[It must be observed that this text says that Rājāditya was killed by having his heart pierced by flights of the sharp arrows of his enemies. This, however, may be accepted as a partisan statement: the Chōlas may have hesitated to admit that their king was slain by a single foe in hand-to-hand fight.—J. F. F.]

The question not unnaturally arises: how is it that none of the Kanarese Pandits, attached to the office in which the text and translation of the Ātakūr inscription were first prepared for publication, detected and checked the misreading that was being made and the wrong that resulted from it? But a more special point is this: the case illustrates well how easy it may be, when once a particular reading and interpretation of an epigraphic record have been laid out, —especially when an analogous instance at once presents itself in apparent justification (I allude to a well-known occurrence in Marāṭhā history),— for subsequent examiners of the record to be unconsciously biassed by that reading and interpretation, and to be prevented from seeing that they may be improved.

J. F. FLEET.

---

#### HARSHAVARDHANA AND ŚILĀDITYA

Mr. Vincent Smith has kindly drawn my attention to the silver coins of Śilāditya, published by Mr. Burn in this Journal for 1906, pp. 843 ff. I am sorry that they escaped my memory at the time when I wrote the remarks on Harshavardhana's coins on pp. 94 and 106, where, of course, they should have been noticed. I hasten to repair the omission, all the more because, while not touching the question of the identity of Yaśodharman and Vikramāditya, they afford welcome evidence as to the existence of the "son" of Vikramāditya.

The correct attribution of these coins is not quite so simple as it may appear at first sight. Mr. Burn is disposed to attribute them to Harshavardhana. To myself that attribution is very doubtful. The title Śilāditya was not uncommonly assumed by, or given to, rulers of that (still very obscure) period. Hiuen-Tsang gives the title principally to Harshavardhana, but he mentions other rulers who also bore it. The assumption, now prevalent