

ART. XV.—*A new fragment of the Thirteenth Edict of Piyadasi at Girnar.* By ÉMILE SENART, Hon. M.R.A.S.

My learned colleague and friend, Professor Rhys Davids, in the course of his recent travels in India, found at Junagadh two fragments that had broken away from the Girnar Rock. One was in the museum; the other was lying on the floor by the rock, and has now been removed to the museum. They belong to the Thirteenth Edict of Piyadasi. It will be remembered, in fact, that only a part of this tablet was found *in situ*. I am all the more obliged to him for the friendly confidence with which he asked me to present them to our colleagues of the Royal Asiatic Society, because, unless I am mistaken, the study of them will enable us to introduce important corrections into the reading or interpretation of several passages.

Truth to tell, only one of these fragments appears to be of real importance; it is the one of which I have now in my hands an excellent photograph, a reprint of which accompanies the present notice. The second, very much broken and effaced, is smaller, and on a slab extending over only eight lines with about six characters on each. I only know its contents from a simple and partial sketch, but it contains characteristic indications sufficient to assign it without difficulty to its proper place in the body of the inscription.

It is the left side, the beginning of the edict, which has disappeared from the rock; it is therefore to these beginnings of lines that our fragments belong; the first to lines 1-11, the second (in the part of which I have a sketch) to lines 8-12. The latter I am inclined to put very close, if indeed

it does not actually fit on with it at the end, to the right of the first. This will be clear at once from the transcription which I shall give presently.

In order to group together all useful indications, I think it will be well—first, to enclose within brackets all that belongs to the small fragment; second, to reproduce, after transcribing the new parts, the first words (printed in italics) in which the actual text, as known and transcribed in the various reproductions of the edicts, goes on; and third, to indicate within parentheses, before and after each part of the new line, the approximate number of *akṣaras* which are still wanting and await further discoveries. I say ‘approximate’ for two reasons. One is general: we can only found such calculations on the collation of the parallel versions; now, although the essential identity of the various copies cannot be doubted, we must always reserve the possibility, nay the likelihood, of a few variations. The other reason has to do only with the twelfth, the last, line: the only legible character on the small fragment may have belonged to either of two contiguous words; I have taken it as belonging to the second, but the appearances which lead me to this conjecture are too slight to inspire me with any great confidence. However, in any case, this is too secondary a question to detain us longer.

- (1) . . . . (21) . . . . ño kalingā v.j. . . . .  
                   (19) . . . . *dhe satasahasramātraṃ*°  
 (2) . . . . (22) . . . . sayo devānaṃpriyasa v.j.  
                   . . . . (19) . . . . *vaḍho va*°  
 (3) . . . . (18) . . . . ? bāmaṇā va samaṇā va añe  
                   . . . . (21) . . . . *sā mātāpitari*°  
 (4) . . . . (25) . . . . abhiratānaṃ va vinikhamāṇa  
                   yesaṃ vāp . . . . (22) . . . . *hāyañātikā*  
                   *vyasanaṃ*°  
 (5) . . . . (21) . . . . ? sti ime nikāyā añatra yo nesa  
                   . . . . (19) . . . . *mhi yatra*°  
 (6) . . . . (22) . . . . srabhāgo va garumato devā-  
                   naṃ ? . . . . (24) . . . . *na ya sakam*°

- (7) . . . . (22) . . . . cate tesam devānaṃpiyasa ?  
 . . . . (21) . . . . *sarabhūtānaṃ achatim*<sup>o</sup>
- (8) . . . . (26) . . . . ladho . . naṃpriyasa idha  
 [ . savesu ca . ] . . . . (21) . . . . *yonarājā*  
*param*<sup>o</sup>
- (9) . . . . (29) . . . . idha rājavisayamhi yo[nā-  
 kambo . ] . . . . (17) . . . . *māhapirīndesu*<sup>o</sup>
- (10) . . . . (25) . . . . ? dhamānusaṣṭim ca dhama  
 [anuv. ? ya ?] . . . . (20) . . . . *vijayo*  
*savathā*<sup>o</sup>
- (11) . . . . (24) . . . . m̐priyo etāya a[ . ya ayaṃ  
 dhammal . ] . . . . (16) . . . . *m̐ vijayaṃ mā*<sup>o</sup>
- (12) . . . . (30) . . . . [ . . . . ki . ] . . . .  
 (15) . . . . *ilohikā ca*<sup>o</sup>

Line 4. These first words call for no special remark, as the new characters fill in, just as one would expect, a part of the lacuna. I would merely observe that here the *va* is perhaps, and even probably, followed by the *anusvāra*, *vaṃ* = *va*. Compare my "Inscriptions de Piyadasi," ii, 331. It seems certain, by way of compensation, that the required *anusvāra* has been omitted at the end of *vinikhamāṇa*.

Line 5. The phrase in question here is couched in the following terms at Khālsi—I accept the most recent transcription of Bühler (Epig. Ind., ii, 464): *Nathi cā se janapade yatā nathi ime nikāyā ānaṃtā yenesa baṃhmane cā samane cā nathi cā kuvāpi janapadasi yatā nathi manusānaṃ ekatalasi pi pāsādasi no nāma pasāde*. The text of Mansera (ibid.) would correspond exactly, as far as it is preserved, with that of Khālsi, and the part which our fragment takes in would be represented by *nasti ime nikaya a . . yeneṣa*. At Shahbaz Garhi the phrase is cut short by an inadvertency of the graver.<sup>1</sup> I had translated: "There

<sup>1</sup> I do not know why Bühler (Epig. Ind., ii, 471, note) seemed so adverse to admitting a material error on the part of the graver. As the phrase stands at Shahbaz Garhi, it is halting, abrupt, and hardly explainable. I can only adhere to my first conviction ("Inscriptions de Piyadasi," i, 297).

is no country where there are not found congregations such as brahmanas and śramaṇas, and there is no (place) in any country where people do not profess the faith of some sect or other." Bühler translates: "And there is no country where there are not found these countless congregations into which these brahmanas and ascetics (are divided); and there is nowhere a country where the people have faith in one creed alone." We took *ānantā*, he, as = *anantāḥ*, I, as = *ājñaptāḥ*: we were both wrong, and it is *anatra*, *añatra*, that is to say *anyatra*, which ought to be understood; this the fragment from Girnar states distinctly. It proves, moreover, that the *ye* which follows in the other versions, being here represented by *yo*, does not stand, as Bühler thought, for the first syllable of the instrumental *yena*, but, as I had supposed, for the nominative *yaḥ*, here in its usual Pāli orthography, there under its Māgadhī form. As to my idea of correcting *nesa* into *esa*, already condemned to all appearance by a comparison with Mansera, it is altogether set aside by our fragment.

This being premised, *anyatra* can only be taken as a preposition implying 'outside of,' 'independent of,' the word it governs—according to rule in the ablative, and sometimes in the instrumental, in Buddhist language—being included in the relative *yaḥ*. The simplest way would just be to understand *nesa* = *no* (*naḥ*) *esa*, and to translate "such congregations, independently of the (congregations of) brahmanas and śramaṇas which exist among us." But I have great hesitation in admitting this very exceptional sandhi which would convert *no esa* into *nesa*, and especially in believing that the king would have employed the simple word 'us' to indicate his dominions in distinction from territories beyond. The only other alternative is to take *nesa* = *na esa*, and *na* as a negation; a redundant negation, certainly, and an involved, though not, I think, inadmissible, construction. It would recall in some measure such an inexactitude of language as the Greek οἱ ἄλλοι ξένοι (compare Krüger, Griech. Sprachl., 50, 4, 11), that is to say, "the others who are foreigners," instead of "others, foreigners," to

express simply 'foreigners.' Such awkwardness of style would not be strange in the rather halting and inexperienced prose of the edicts. The sense, at any rate, is not doubtful, and as I feel justified in maintaining my first interpretation against the secondary modifications which Bühler proposed, I should translate: "There is no country where such congregations are not found, even besides brahmans and śramaṇas, and there is no (place) in any country where men are not attached to some sect."

Line 6. The adverb *aja* seems to have been wanting in this version: one cannot be certain that this was by accident; the sense is not affected by its omission to any appreciable extent.

Line 7. The passage to which this fragment belongs has not yet been quite satisfactorily explained. Our text, by rejecting after *vucate tesam* the genitive *devānampiyasa*, necessarily upsets the explanation of Bühler, who thought the stop ought to be supposed before *vucate*. On the other hand, if we break up into an independent proposition the words *vucate tesam devānampiyasa* or *devānampiyasa vucati tesam*, what can one make of these two genitives side by side? I conclude that the words (I am taking the text of Shahbaz Garhi) from *anutape* to *tesam* compose a single sentence, and, modifying one or two meanings in which I think Bühler is undoubtedly wrong, I translate the whole passage thus: "And the (savages of) the forests who are in the territories of Devanampriya, even these he treats kindly and tries to bring them back to good ways,<sup>1</sup> and they are told that even the might of Devanampriya is based on repentance;<sup>2</sup> let them therefore repent (of their crimes) and let them not be (instead of being) chastised." The context explains immediately afterwards how this conduct

<sup>1</sup> The signification of *nijhatti*, *nijhapeti*, appears to me firmly established, not only by the comparison of Delhi iv, 17, 18; viii, 8 (compare my notes), but by the literary use, as in *Milinda-pañha*, Trenckner's edition, 210, 1; 8. These words could in fact be translated fairly exactly by 'conversion, to convert.'

<sup>2</sup> An allusion to the *anusaya* of the commencement (*anusaya*; *anutāpa*, *avatrapā* are practically equivalents), to the regret which the outrages of which Kalinga had been the scene had caused the King, a regret which is put forward as the starting-point of the edict and the cause of his own conversion.

arises naturally from the desire which the King professes to proscribe all violence, even in the name of punishment.

Line 9. To the reading *hidālāja visavaji* of Khālsi, *hidaraja viṣavajri*, . . . *raja viṣavajri* admitted by Bühler for Shahbaz Garhi and for Mansera, our fragment opposes a new reading which seems very different: *idha rājavisayamhi*. It is perfectly straightforward and clear. I hasten to remark that the other readings can be brought into line with it without doing them violence, but that the contrary proceeding is impossible. From the first, I read *visavasi* at Khālsi, and the very facsimile which Bühler has published fully confirms me in this opinion; the width of the lower hook, which extends to the right beyond the middle hook (ㄣ), entirely bars the reading *ji*. As to Shahbaz Garhi, to refer to our only positive document, the special drawing which Bühler has tried to give of the corresponding letter (ZDMG., xliii, 168), one sees that it is, to say the least, quite as easy to interpret it as = *si* as = *jri*. I lay no stress on Mansera, for here we have no further authority than Bühler's reading, and he owns himself that the group is not distinct. To sum up, it is *si* which the parallel versions, some certainly and others probably, have for the concluding syllable. As to the preceding one, it appears likely that Khālsi has *va*; for the copies in Kharoṣṭhī, the confusion between *y* and *v* is very easy, especially with such a flowing execution and on such friable stone; there is therefore at least great room for doubt. Even supposing a common reading *visa(ṣa)vasi* to be certain, there are sufficient instances in the spelling of the edicts of the substituting of a *v* for the etymological *y* (I will only mention the desinence *evu* for *eyu*, normal or sporadic) to authorize us in interpreting with full confidence *visavasi* = *visayasi*, *visayamhi*, and in Sanscrit *viṣaye*. We get by this the advantage of doing away, in the Kharoṣṭhī versions, with the substitution, not perhaps inadmissible, but certainly less normal, of an *ṣ* for a different sibilant, *ś* (according to Bühler). The pretended proper names *Viśa* and *Vajri* (*Vrii*) ought to be definitively struck out. The same holds

good of my *Henas* or *Hūnas*, and of Bühler's *Hidas*; they must be relegated to the oblivion from which they should never have emerged. The *idha* of Girnar proves incontestably that in the same way *hida* is only the equivalent, quite well known indeed, of the Sanscrit *iha*. At Girnar, the *j* of *rāja* is not accompanied by the mark of *ā*, and I have no doubt that we must likewise read *lāja* at Khālsi. Even were it otherwise, the *ā* would be simply one error the more among so many other analogous ones: we are obviously face to face with the compound *rājaviṣaye*, that is, "here, on the King's territory," the "King" being of course Piyadasi himself, who always speaks of himself thus in the third person.

The locative connects the locution with the expressions following *yonakambojesu*, which are in the same case. Thus it is evident that the two *evameva* which Bühler's punctuation—before *hida*—left oddly side by side in one clause, ought to be separated; the first concludes the previous enumeration, the second commences a fresh one, presented in a different grammatical relation: "and the same here in the King's territory, among the Yavanas and the Kambojas."

Line 10. The *anusvāra* grammatically necessary at the end of *sastīm* appears to be visible on the stone; only the dot which expresses it has coalesced with the upper part of the *ti* by a fracture into which it has run. The *ca* is wanting in the other versions, but it is perfectly natural, *dhammānusastīm* being co-ordinate with *dhammarutani vidhānam*.

These observations will suffice, I hope, to show the deeply interesting nature of the new fragment, short as it is, and how greatly we are indebted to Professor Rhys Davids for having brought it to our knowledge.

---

[NOTE.—I take this opportunity of expressing the gratitude felt by European scholars to His Highness the Nawāb and to

his able and courteous Diwān, for the enlightened interest they show in the venerable stone, and the care they have taken, and still take, to preserve it from further injury. A roof or canopy has been erected over it; and this is now being replaced by a more substantial and ornamental structure. It is to the Diwān that we owe the photograph here reproduced. He has promised to send us also one of the second fragment; and also of fragmentary inscriptions of a later date still existing on the adjacent rocks.—R.H.D.]