

XXV.

NOTES ON THREE BUDDHIST INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

The inscription on the Piprāwā vase.

FOR representations of the now well known Piprāwā relic-vase, reference may be made to this Journal, 1898. 579, plate, bottom; to *Antiquities in the Tarai*, plate 28, fig. 2, and see plate 13, fig. 1; and to Mr. Vincent Smith's *Early History of India*, 14, plate.

The inscription on it has been figured in this Journal, 1898. 577, and in *Antiquities in the Tarai*, plate 13, fig. 2. But it is to be hoped that it may prove practicable to prepare, from the plaster cast which was sent to this Society (see this Journal, 1898. 868), a facsimile reproduction which would enable us to judge the inscription properly from the palæographic point of view; that cannot be done from those two representations of it.

The record itself has been handled, in respect of its text and translation, in this Journal, 1898. 388, 586, 588, note; and 1899. 426.

I have lately had occasion to examine this record for myself. And I find much to say in connection with it which has not as yet been said. For the present, however, I only draw attention to two preliminary points.

In the first place, the record is not inscribed in two lines, though it has been so treated in this Journal, 1898. 586. It runs round the body of the upper part, the removable top, of the vase, in one line, but with two syllables, *yanam*, above the line.

In the second place, the record does not begin with the word *iyam*, though it has hitherto always been treated as if that were the case. It begins with the word *Sukiti-bhatinam*.

The commencement of this record is, indeed, not marked by any special device, such as the vertical line between the first and last words which is found in the inscription on the Sōnāri vase, dealt with on the next page. But it is marked with equal plainness by the fact that the syllables *yanam*, of the word *Sakiyanam*, stand above the line, over the syllables *suki* of the word *Sukiti-bhatinam*. The word *Sakiyanam* was manifestly engraved last, as the final word of the record. There was no room for the syllables *yanam* on the line. Therefore, as in the case of the final syllables *yasa* of the Sōnāri record, they were placed above the line. But, there being here no impediment, such as the vertical line which stands there, they were not unnaturally placed so as to be read straight on, with an avoidance of any looking back, after the syllables *saki* of the word which they complete.

With the assumption that the original shews the *Anusvāras* throughout, the Piprāvā record therefore runs thus :—

Text.

Sukiti-bhatinam sa-bhaginikanam sa-puta-dalanam iyam salila-nidhanē Budhasa bhagavatē Sakiyanam.

And the exact meaning of it, according to the order of the words in the original, is as follows :—

Translation.

Of the brethren of the Well-famed One, together with (*their*) sisters (*and*) together with (*their*) children and wives, (*is*) this receptacle (or deposit) of relics of Budha, the Blessed One ; (*namely*) of the Sakiyas.

Why the order of the words should have been thus arranged, is not altogether apparent. But it is just possible that the word *sakiya* was used in a two-fold sense ; first, as the tribal name, and secondly, as equivalent to the Sanskrit

svakīya, 'own.' In that event, the translation would be:—
 " of relics of Budha; (*namely*) of the own Sakiyas
 of the Blessed One;" that is, of the members of that
 particular line of the Sakiyas to which Buddha himself
 belonged.

The inscription on a vase from Sōnāri.

The record with which I deal here was first brought to notice by General Sir Alexander Cunningham, in his *Bhilsa Topes*, 121, 317. It is on a relic-vase which was found by him in the Stūpa No. 2 at Sōnāri, near the well-known Sāñchi in the Bhōpāl State, Central India, and which appears to be now in the British Museum.

The inscription on the vase is figured in *Bhilsa Topes*, plate 24, "box" No. 3. And an excellent illustration of the vase itself, shewing the whole of the inscription very clearly, has been given in this Journal, 1898. 579, plate, above the illustration of the Piprāwā vase. I work from that illustration of the record.

This record commences with the word *sapurisasa*. We know that, not only because various other similar records begin in the same way, but also because here there is a vertical line, extending both above and below the line of writing, before that word. As in the case of the Piprāwā record, the inscription runs in one line round the body of the upper part, the removable top, of the vase. And the final syllables *yasa*, for which there was no room in the line of writing, stand before the vertical line, and over the syllables *vatāchari* of the word which they complete.

Text.

Sapurisasa Kōtīputasa Kāsapagōtasa sava-Hēmavat-
 āchariyasa.

Translation.

(*Relics*) of the sainted (literally, the good man) Kōtīputa,
 (*namely*) of Kāsapagōta, the teacher of all the Himavat
 region (or, of all the people of Himavat).

Now, tradition tells us that, after the third so-called "Council," which was held in or about the eighteenth year after the anointment of Aśoka to the sovereignty, Moggaliputta-Tissa, the president of the "Council," sent forth certain Thēras to establish the Buddhist doctrine in *pachchanta*-lands; that is, in border-lands, in territories bordering, it may be, on the dominions of Aśoka, or, it may be, on the Madhyadēśa, the middle region, the central land, the special sphere of Buddhism.

Nine missions are said to have been sent out. And the assertion is, as we shall see, so well authenticated to a sufficient extent by inscriptions, the best evidence of all, in respect of a mission to the Himavat region, the Himālayas, that, as nothing to the contrary is known, and as nothing improbable is involved, there really seems no reason for refusing to believe the whole statement.

At the same time, there is nothing to lead us to suppose that the missions were sent out by king Aśoka, and to speak of them by any such appellation as "the missions of Aśoka."

The earlier Ceylonese chronicle, the *Dipavaṃsa*, says (ed. Oldenberg, 8. 1, 2):—"The far-seeing Moggaliputta, having by supernatural vision beheld the establishment of the doctrine in the future in the border-land, sent out the Thēras Majjhantika and others, each with four (*companions*), for the establishment of the doctrine in the border-land (*and*) for the enlightenment of sentient beings."

The same is said by Mahānāman in the earlier part of the other Ceylonese chronicle, the *Mahāvāṃsa*, written by way of being a commentary on the *Dipavaṃsa*, which certainly needed, and still needs, elucidation in various respects, though it does not deserve a somewhat scathing criticism which has been passed upon it. Adding a little detail of his own, regarding the time of year at which the missions are supposed to have started, Mahānāman has said (Turnour, 71):—"Having accomplished the (*third*) joint rehearsal (*of the scriptures*), (*and*) being engaged in viewing the future, the Thēra Moggaliputta, the illuminator

of the doctrine of the Jina, having perceived the establishment of the doctrine in border-lands, sent out, in the month Kattika, these and those Thēras hither and thither."

So, again, from India, Buddhaghōsha, who wrote some forty years before Mahānāman, has said in the introduction to his Samantapāsādikā (Vinayapiṭaka, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 314):—"We are told that the Thēra Moggaliputta-Tissa, having accomplished the (*third*) joint rehearsal of the faith, reflected thus: 'How, indeed, may the doctrine become well-established in the future?' Then it occurred to him, thinking over matters: 'Verily, it will become well-established in the border-countries.' (*And so*), having weighed (*the merits of*) these and those Bhikkhus, he sent these and those Bhikkhus here and there."

Thus, all the three authorities attribute the despatch of the missions entirely to Moggaliputta-Tissa. And nothing is known from epigraphic sources, tending to render that attribution questionable.

It may be remarked that the Dīpavaṃsa rather curiously omits, so far at least as the published text goes, to state the name of the country to which the Thēra Rakkhita was sent; it says (8. 6):—"Then another (*Thēra*) Rakkhita, skilled in magical transformations, having risen into the air, preached the Anamataggiya (*doctrine*)."¹ The name of this country, Vanavāsi, is supplied by Buddhaghōsha (*loc. cit.*), and by Mahānāman (*loc. cit.*), who obtained it from him.

For the rest, though the Dīpavaṃsa states that four companions were given to each leader of a mission, it names companions in only the case of the mission to the Himālayas. It says (8. 10):—"And the Thēra who (*was*) Kassapagotta, Majjhima, Durabhisara,¹ Sahadēva, (*and*) Mūlakadēva,—they evangelised the tribe of the Yakkhas in Himavanta."

On the other hand, Mahānāman has said nothing about each of the leaders being supplied with four companions; and he has named companions, four in number, only in the case of the Thēra Mahā-Mahinda who was deputed to

¹ Regarding this corrupt name, see page 687 below.

Laṅkādīpa, Ceylon. In respect of the mission to the Himālayas, he has said in the first place (Turnour, 71):—“He sent the Thēra Majjhima to the Himavanta region.” But further on in the same chapter he has said (Turnour, 74):—“Having gone with four Thēras, the sage Majjhima taught the Dhammachakkapavattana (*discourse*) in the Himavanta region: they caused eighty crores of living beings to reach the fruition of the paths (*of sanctification*); those five Thēras evangelised five countries, each of them one: in the presence of each of them, a hundred thousand men became wandering religious ascetics, through faith in the doctrine of Him who fully attained perfect knowledge.” He has not, however, named the “four Thēras.” The names given in brackets by Turnour as “Kassapo, Mālikādēva, Dhundābhinnosso and Sahasadēvo,” and by Wijesinha (48) as “Kassapa, Mūlakādēva, Dhandhabinnassa, and Sahasadēva,” seem to have been taken from the commentary.

Buddhaghōsha, however, like the Dipavaṁsa, has stated that each leader of a mission was attended by four companions (*loc. cit.*). And he has named the companions in the case of the mission to the Himālayas, as well as in the case of the mission to Ceylon. In respect of the mission to the Himālayas, he has first said (*loc. cit.*):—“He sent the Thēra Majjhima to the region of Himavanta.”¹ But, further on, he has said more fully (*op. cit.* 317):—“Again, the Thēra Majjhima, with the Thēra Kassapagotta, the Thēra Alakadēva, the Thēra Dundubhissara, and the Thēra Sahadēva, went to the region of Himavanta, and evangelised that territory (*dēsa*) by narrating the Dhammachakkapavattana-Suttanta, and caused eighty crores of living beings to obtain the treasures of the fruition of the paths (*of sanctification*). And

¹ The expression in the original is *Himavanta-padēsabhāga*, which might be rendered “a part of the region of the Himavanta;” especially in view of the fact that, according to Buddhaghōsha, the Thēra Majjhantika, who was deputed to Kashmir and Gandhāra, converted also numbers of Yakkhas, Gandhabbas, and Kumbhāṇḍas, dwelling on Himavanta. But that appears to have been done by Majjhantika *en route* to the country or countries —(the Dipavaṁsa mentions only Gandhāra)—to which he had been sent. And *padēsabhāga* seems to be constantly used in Pāli in the sense of simply the Sanskrit *pradēśa*, *dēśa*, ‘region, country.’

these five Thēras evangelised five countries (*pañcha ratṭhāni*); in the presence of each of them, a hundred thousand people became wandering religious ascetics. Thus they established the doctrine there." Finally, he has summed up the account of this mission in a verse, which says (*loc. cit.*):—"The Thēra Majjhima went to Himavanta, and evangelised the band of the Yakkhas, expounding the Dhammachakka-ppavattana."

Thus, we see that the Dipavaṃsa plainly indicates Kassapagotta as the leader of the mission to the Himālayas, and marks Majjhima as one of his companions. Next, Buddhaghōsha reverses the relative positions of these two persons, and finally marks Majjhima as the leader of the mission. And then Mahānāman ignores Kassapagotta altogether, and mentions only Majjhima in this matter.

Owing to views propounded when only the Mahāvaṃsa was known to European inquirers, Mahānāman's version of the matter has been generally accepted. And two recent writers of high authority have even cited, in support of it, a Sāñchi inscription, adduced by them as describing Majjhima as *sava-Hēmavat-āchariya*, "the teacher of all the Himavat regions." That, however, is a mistake, which must be attributed to an omission to make a personal examination of the epigraphic records.

There is not, in reality, any known inscription, either from Sāñchi or from any other place, which speaks of Majjhima in the terms which have been alleged. And, on the other hand, the inscriptions distinctly shew what the real facts were.

In the Sāñchi Stūpa No. 2, there was obtained a relic-casket which bears inscriptions (*Bhilsa Topes*, 119, 287, and plate 20, "box" No. 1) to the following purport. On the outside of the lid:—"(*Relics*) of the sainted Kāsapagōta, the teacher of all the Himavat region;" matching exactly, except in the omission of the metronymic, our Sōnāri inscription. On the inside of the lid (the word "outside" in *Bhilsa Topes*, plate 20, is a mistake; see pp. 119, 287):—"(*Relics*) of the sainted Majjhima." And on the outside of the lower part of the casket:—"(*Relics*) of the sainted Hāritiputta."

It is, in fact, simply a combination of the first two of these three records, which has led to the belief that there is an inscription which characterises Majjhima as the teacher of all the Himavat region. And that combination seems to have been made as the result of taking the rather exceptional personal name Kāsapagōta in a different sense; namely, as meaning 'belonging to the Kāsapa clan,' and as qualifying Majjhima. But, if Majjhima was Kāsapagōta, the teacher of all the Himavat region, it is difficult to understand why there should be two separate inscriptions for relics of him deposited in one and the same box. And, as regards the personal name Kāsapagōta, it may be remarked that it occurs as such in also the Vinayapiṭaka, Mahāvagga, 9. 1 (ed. Oldenberg, 1. 312):—Kassapagottō nāma Bhikkhu; "the monk by name Kassapagotta."

The other inscriptions, however, make the distinction between the two persons perfectly unmistakable.

First, there is our Sōnāri inscription, the subject of the present note, which mentions Kāsapagōta, the teacher of all the Himālaya region, with the metronymic Kōtīputa.

In the second place, from the same deposit in the Sōnāri Stūpa No. 2, there was obtained another relic-vase bearing an inscription (*Bhilsa Topes*, 317, and plate 24, "box" No. 2) to the following purport:— "(Relics) of the sainted Majjhima, (*namely*) of Kōḍiniputa."

This latter record marks Majjhima, Majjhima, as a Kōḍiniputa. Our record marks Kāsapagōta, Kassapagotta, as a Kōtīputa. These two different metronymics stamp the two persons as perfectly distinct individuals. And nothing remains to support the belief that Majjhima is mentioned in an inscription as the teacher of all the Himavat region.

These Sāñchi and Sōnāri records, probably of the third century B.C., certainly not later than the early part of the second century, are of considerably greater authority than the statements of Buddhaghōsha and Mahānāman, written some six or seven hundred years later. In fact, in any matter of disagreement, they would be valid even against

the *Dīpavaṃsa*, though we may perhaps carry back some portions of that work to even the same early time. But there is no such disagreement here. The inscriptions are exactly in concord with the *Dīpavaṃsa*.

In what circumstances the Indian tradition, recorded by Buddhaghōṣa and then accepted by Mahānāman, came to depose Kassapagotta from the leadership of the mission, and to put Majjhima in his place, is not at present apparent. But the inscriptions distinctly endorse the statement of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, and establish the fact, that Kassapagotta was the leader of the mission to the Himālayas.

Mahānāman's treatment of the whole account of the missions is very instructive. He omitted anything which apparently did not interest him. But, otherwise, he followed Buddhaghōṣa very closely; adopting a great deal of his phraseology, but adapting it, by changing words and making little additions, to his own composition in verse against Buddhaghōṣa's prose. The result is quite enough to make it obvious that, for the original Ceylonese tradition in other matters also,—and, as regards the period from the time of Buddha to the arrival of Mahinda and Saṅghamittā in Ceylon, for the earlier Indian tradition, carried to Ceylon, and preserved for us there,—we must go to the *Dīpavaṃsa*.

Another inscription from Sōnāri.

There is another epigraphic record which gives further corroboration of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, 8. 10, in respect of another of the four companions, there named (see page 683 above), of Kassapagotta, the leader of the mission to the Himālayas. The companion is that one whose name stands in the published text in the form *Durabhisara*, which, however, Professor Oldenberg has in his index marked as corrupt or doubtful. In Buddhaghōṣa's introduction to his *Samantapāsādikā*, the name appears in its correct form, *Dundubhissara* (see page 684 above); but with the various reading *Duddabhiya*. Judged from the forms given by Turnour and Wijesinha (see page 684 above), it seems to have been

corrupted in Ceylon into something like Dundubhīnasa or Dhundhurīnasa.

The record in question is the inscription, found and brought to notice by Sir A. Cunningham (*Bhilsa Topes*, 121, 316), on the front and back of a small piece of stone about $\frac{3}{4}$ " in length by $\frac{1}{2}$ " in breadth, which had been deposited inside a crystal relic-casket in the Sōnāri Stūpa No. 2. I edit it from his reproduction of it in *Bhilsa Topes*, plate 24, "box" No. 1.

As regards my reading of the proper name presented in this record,—there is a temptation to restore an Anusvāra, which very possibly stands in the original, though the reproduction does not shew it, and so to read *Duṇḍubhisara*. We have, however, distinctly *Suganāṃ*, not *Sumganāṃ*, in an inscription at Bharaut (IA, 14. 138, and plate); and probably other instances of an apparently unnecessary and improper omission of an Anusvāra could easily be found. So, the Anusvāra may have been omitted here also; and I refrain from supplying it. With this reservation, the record runs thus:—

Text.

- 1 Sapurisasa Gōti-
- 2 putasa Hēmavata-
- 3 sa Dudubhisa-
- 4 ra-dāyādasā

Translation.

(*Relics*) of the sainted Gōtiputa, of the Himavat region, (*namely*) of Dudubhisara, an heir of the faith.

As regards the word *Dudubhisara-dāyāda*, it seems sufficiently obvious that it is a Karmadhāraya compound, not a Tatpurusha; that is, *dāyāda* qualifies *Dudubhisara*, just as, for instance, *muni* qualifies *Gautama* in *Gautama-muni*, "the saint Gautama," and the compound means not "an heir of Dudubhisara," but "Dudubhisara, who was an heir."

The exact meaning to be given to *dāyāda*, 'inheritor, heir,' which stands here for a fuller expression, *sāsana-dāyāda*, 'inheritor of the doctrine, heir of the faith,' is found in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, 7. 17 (ed. Oldenberg; compare the *Mahāvaṃsa*, Turnour, 36), in a statement put into the mouth of Moggaliputta-Tissa in the following circumstances. Asōka had announced to the community of monks that he had become an heir of the faith of the teacher Buddha,¹ in virtue of his great liberality to the followers of the doctrine, and of the wealth that he had spent in founding 84,000 monasteries, and of the enormous daily offerings made by him. This came to the ears of Moggaliputta-Tissa, "the clever decider of cases," who, in order to secure the comfortable existence of the community, and to propagate and ensure the continuance of the doctrine, asserted to Asōka that even the giver of any amount of the things that constituted the four requisites of Buddhist monks, namely clothing, food, bedding, and medicine, was still a stranger to the doctrine, outside its pale; and that he only might become a veritable heir of the faith² who should give up a son or a daughter, legitimate issue, to become a wandering religious ascetic. Thereupon, to make things doubly sure, Asōka dedicated to an ascetic life, with their consent, both his son the prince Mahinda and his daughter Saṅghamittā, and so became an heir of the faith.

As regards other points,—my treatment of the important detail in this record, the personal name, differs so much from that given to it by Sir A. Cunningham, that it seems necessary to say something in explanation.

In one transcription of the record (*Bhilsa Topes*, 316), he presented the name as *Dadabhisāra*; and, it may be observed, he there placed the word *sara* before *Hēmaratasa*. In his other transcription (*id.* 121), he gave the name as *Dadabhisara*, with the short *a*; and he there presented it as a separate genitive, *Dadabhisarasa dāyādasa*. But we distinctly have

¹ Verse 8: *dāyādō satthu Buddhassa sāsane*.

² Verse 17: *sō vē dāyādō sāsane*.

the base in composition, not a separate genitive ; there is no *ā* in the third syllable ; there is distinctly the vowel *u* attached to the consonant of each of the first two syllables ; and there is not the word *sava* before *Hēmaratasa*.

He took the name as a tribal appellation. And he rendered the record thus :— “ (Relics) of the emancipated Goti-putra, the relation [of the faith] amongst the Dadabhisaras of the Hemawanta ” (*id.* 121) ; and again :— “ (Relics) of the emancipated Gotiputra, the brother of religion amongst the Dardabhisāras of the Hemawanta ” (*id.* 316). In doing so, however, he invented a word *Dārdabhisāra*, which he explained (*id.* 121) as denoting “ the hilly country lying on both banks of the Indus, to the west of Kashmir.”

He was thinking, of course, partly of the tribe of the Darads, Daradas, or *Dāradas*, and partly of the *Dārvābhisāra*, the country of the *Dārvas* and the *Abhisāras*, of, for instance, the *Rājatarāṃgiṇī*, 1. 180 ; which latter word denotes (see Dr. Stein’s note on that passage, and the previous authorities referred to by him) the territory of the lower and the middle hills of Kashmīr between the *Chandrabhāgā*, *Chināb*, and the *Vitastā*, *Jēhlam*. And that is the influence which led him to misread the proper name, and to interpret the record wrongly.

The record is quite clear and unmistakable ; so much so, that I had recognised the name, and its alternative Sanskrit form, even before looking into *Buddhaghōsha*’s account of the mission.

It commemorates an heir of the faith named *Dudubhisara*, — or *Duṇḍubhisara*, if we supply the *Anusvāra*, — who had the metronymic *Gōtīputa*, and who, whether by birth or by domiciliation or in some other way, belonged to the territory of the *Himālaya* mountains.

And, taking one thing with another, we cannot doubt that we have here the mention, not of some other person of the same name, but of that *Dundubhissara* who was one of the companions of the *Thēra Kassapagotta* of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, the *Kōtīputa-Kāsapagōta* of the *Sōnāri* inscription (page 681 above), who was the leader of the mission to the *Himālayas*.

The Sanskrit form of the name may have been either Dundubhisvara, 'having a voice sounding like a drum,' which occurs as a proper name in the Lalitavistara, ed. Lefmann, 171, line 11; or else Dundubhīśvara, 'drum-lord,' which, according to Burnouf, Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien, 1. 530, occurs as the name of a Buddha. In either case, the original reading in the Dipavaṃsa, 8. 10, would be *Dundubhissarō*, which exactly suits the metre.