Bammala-Devi, and she was the *paṭṭa-mahādevi* or crowned chief queen down to 1141, during which time Rājala-Devi, a princess of Chālukya connexion, was the *piriy-arasi*. In 1136 he married another Śāntala-Devi, who bore a lovely daughter, Chikka-Śāntale, but they both died the same year, and Śiva temples were erected to their memory by the mother of the family. With Bammala-Devi may have come into the Hoysala kingdom a special Śaiva influence. As regards other parts of Mysore, evidence has lately been found that the Bhōganandiśvara temple at Nandi, at the foot of Nandidroog, was erected before 806 by Ratnāvali or Māṇikabbe, queen of Bāṇa-Vidyādhara, one of the line of Mahābali kings who claim to have made Śiva their doorkeeper. A *maṭha* also existed in connexion with the Yōganandiśvara temple at the summit of the hill, and the Kālāmukha sect of Śiva *yogis* were recognized in that part in the eighth century. Then farther north, in 943, under the Nolambas, who were Pallavas, Chilluka represents himself as a reincarnation of Lakuliśa, a great Śaiva teacher of the first century. Under the Chālukyas, in 1035, there was, in the Shimoga country, a Kālāmukha monastery at Baḷḷigāve, the capital of the Banavāsi province, where a Lakuliśa had his abode. But it was in 1136 that we find the Kālāmukhas settled at Dorasamudra (Haḷebīḍ), and in the same century they appear at Arsikere and other places around.

L. RICE.

SIR J. H. MARSHALL'S KHAROSTHI INSCRIPTION FROM TAXILA

A few further remarks may be allowed concerning this interesting discovery ; but they shall be brief.

1. *Ayasa*. This reading is fully confirmed by the photograph. It is satisfactory to note that the proposed reading *viyasa* has been withdrawn (by its author, Dr. J. F.

Fleet, *supra*, p. 316); for, though it might have been possible to argue that the facsimile does not absolutely exclude it, the form did not seem to be dialectically reconcilable with the rest of the inscription.

Dr. Fleet now (p. 317) adopts the explanation of *ayasa* as genitive of *ayam*, which I had previously (1914, p. 989) suggested as a possibility, referring to a passage in Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, which I also cited (*loc. cit.*). While this may be acceptable as a last resort, I am still unprepared to rely upon it, and prefer rather to find an error on the part of the workman who copied the record, whose carelessness has been already noted (*supra*, p. 156).

The use of the genitive has been made the subject of some observations, both in regard to the word *ayasa* here and in regard to cases elsewhere, especially the *maharayasa mahamtasa* of the Taxila plate. The true doctrine concerning the genitive, that it signifies "in the reign of" the king in question, was clearly laid down by M. Senart (*Journal Asiatique*, VIII, xv, pp. 127-8); it was accepted by Bühler (*Epigraphia Indica*, iv, p. 56), and it has not to my knowledge been seriously impugned. It is analogous to the genitive on coins, and may be explained as due either to ellipse of "in the reign", or, as I myself should rather hold, as a genitive absolute, the predicate being "king", whether expressed or understood. Hence I see no reason to follow Dr. Fleet in taking it in the case of the Taxila plate as dependent upon the word "month" (p. 315).

2. *Khusanasa*. Baron von Stael-Holstein is probably prevented at the present time from considering this new evidence (JRAS., 1914, pp. 990-1), which definitely proves that the composers of Indian inscriptions regard the racial or family designation as *Kuṣaṇa* and not *Kuṣa*, and from considering also M. Lévi's note upon the occurrence of both forms in the Chinese translations of the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā-sāstra* (JRAS., 1914, pp. 1019-20). Probably

he would admit, what to me has never seemed doubtful, that the *Khuṣaṇasa* of the coins is also a genitive singular, but would still hold that the evidence which he has adduced suffices to prove that the real name was *Guṣa*, and that this is represented by the Chinese form *Yue-chi*, *Kwei-shān* being later, and due to importation from India. To what I have previously (pp. 990–1) urged to this effect I should like to add that the simplest explanation of all is that the genitive plural of the original dialect, *Guṣāna*, “of the Guṣas,” was mistaken in the first instance by Indians *only* for a nominative singular and accordingly declined. Thus India’s acquaintance with this race begins with a sort of Hobson-Jobsonism. This explanation deserves consideration, and it has met with the approval of several eminent scholars.

3. Sir J. H. Marshall’s observations (JRAS., 1914, p. 983, and *supra*, pp. 195–6) remind me of the fact that in Wilson’s *Ariana Antiqua* also (pp. 73–4 and 101–2) correspondences are noted by Masson between different styles of building observed in topes and the coins found in the topes. We may add the fact that tope No. 13 of Hidda, as it contained the Hidda inscription of the year 28 (*supra*, pp. 91–6), will belong to the style prevalent under the Kanīṣka dynasty.

It would accordingly be possible for Sir J. H. Marshall to compare his results at Taxila (perhaps he has done so already) with the plates contained in *Ariana Antiqua*, and so to ascertain whether there are any interesting correspondences.

F. W. THOMAS.

MALAVA-GANA-STHITI

Dr. J. F. Fleet in his last note upon this expression (*supra*, pp. 138–40) again upholds the view that the word *gaṇa* is here used in the sense of “tribe”. He