

## XIX

### THE INSCRIPTION ON THE MANIKIALA STONE

By F. E. PARGITER

THIS record has been treated by M. Senart in the *Journal Asiatique* (sér. ix, vol. vii), 1896, i, 5 ff. (where he has described its provenance and appearance and has mentioned earlier notices of it), and by Professor Lüders in this Journal, 1909, pp. 645 ff. My treatment of it is based on my own reading of the two facsimile plates published with M. Senart's paper, and I have to thank Dr. Fleet for various criticisms and suggestions. Where pages are cited in connexion with M. Senart's or Professor Lüders' readings, they mean the pages of their respective articles; and when quoting their readings of particular words, I distinguish the readings by adding S or L, using these letters for the sake of brevity.

In considering the record it is well to notice the salient features, because they may reveal its general character and supply criteria as to what may, and what may not, be expected or permissible.

First, as to the writing. A careful look shows at once that there are three different handwritings on the stone. In the two lines on the right side, which contain the engraver's name and the date, the letters are irregular and of various sizes, markedly different from the bulk of the inscription; in fact, they are a scrawl, such as might be expected from a workman-engraver who was not a practised scribe. Moreover, he writes *m* in *Samdha* differently from *m* in the rest of the inscription. These two lines are evidently his own work entirely and form no part of the inscription proper; hence in the remainder of these remarks I refer only to all the rest as the "inscription" or "record".

The record is well written, and clearly was not engraved by the workman unaided. It is too good to be wholly his handiwork : that is, it must have been written out by some scribe with ink or paint on the stone, and he merely incised the written letters. This is the obvious inference, and it is fully corroborated by what has been revealed of the method of engraving by the copper plate found at Kasiā.<sup>1</sup>

The inscription consists of two parts, which I will call (1) the middle section, and (2) the left section, comprising all the writing on the left side. These two sections are not uniform, but betray two hands. The writing in the middle section from line 2 to *sthavayeti* in line 7 differs from that in the left section in three respects : (1) in the latter the letters are narrower and neater than in the former ; (2) the tails of the letters, when not straight, have a leftward curve in the former and a rightward curve in the latter ; and (3) the characters for *ṇ* and *n* are interchanged in the two sections. M. Senart and Professor Lüders make no definite distinction between these letters, but a scrutiny will show there is a difference. Thus, in the middle section *n* has a straight stem, as in *janayago* (*nayago*, S and L ; l. 4) and *asvanana* (*atra nana*, S ; *etra nana*, L ; l. 6) ; but the character with the curved stem appears in places where, as my reading will show, *ṇ* should properly occur, as in *Guṣaṇo* (l. 2) and *apanage* (l. 5). In the left section, however, *ṇ* has the straight stem, as in *parivareṇa* (l. 9), and *n* has the curved stem as in *mulena* (l. 10). These distinctions will be found to hold good throughout the two sections—with only a single variation in *dana* (or *etana* ; l. 9), where the stem is bent to the right. I may add, however, that these distinctions are not material to the reading of the inscription, and the reading is unaffected, even if I should follow M. Senart and Professor Lüders in ignoring them.

<sup>1</sup> JRAS, 1913, p. 151.

Two passages, however, are doubtful, namely, line 1 and the second half of line 7. The writing of the latter seems intermediate between that of the two sections, yet appears rather to belong to the middle section, because the final nasal has the stem straight in the three words *taena Vespašiena Khudentiena* (though the tail is slightly curved in the last), and, as the nasal is certainly *n* in *Vespašiena*, it must be read *n* alike in all, thus showing agreement with the characters in the middle section. Line 1 may be different, and the view taken of it will depend on the explanation of it. It would be by a fourth hand, if my suggestion regarding it be sound (p. 658).

There appear to be several new letters in this Kharoṣṭhī script, namely, *kṣ* (or *kś*) and probably *θr* in *kṣaθra* (l. 2); a letter that seems (speaking provisionally) to be *ṇṭi* in *vihaṇṭi* (l. 5) and *Khudentiena* (l. 7); and *nt* in *Spantakahi* (l. 10); while *sth* in *sthavayeti* (l. 7) deserves notice. As regards the vexed letter which M. Senart reads as *spa* and Professor Lüders as *e*, I cannot but agree with the former that it is *spa*, because there are undoubted *e*'s in *patiaśae* (l. 1), *taena*, *Vespašiena* and *Khudentiena* (l. 7) and *karaphaena* (l. 8), and there is no good reason to suppose that the scribe quite unnecessarily wrote *e* sometimes like *sp* with the probability of confusing the two, especially in the same word if we follow Professor Lüders' reading of *Veešiena* for *Vespašiena* (l. 7). It is but reasonable to suppose that the scribe meant a difference where he made a difference. The letter when read as *spa* yields good sense, and that is one main test whether the reading is right. There is one clear mistake in *parivaveṇa* for *parivareṇa* (l. 9), with probably a second in *vaśam* for *vaṃśam* (l. 3), and a third in *Spantakahi* (l. 10).

Next, as regards the nature of the record. It seems obvious (and here I agree with M. Senart, p. 14) that there are Iranian words in it, such as *Purvaspa* (l. 2) and *Vespaši* (ll. 4, 7) as he and I read these words.

The phrase *vihara-karaphaṇa* is especially significant. I agree with him in the reading of the word *karapha*<sup>1</sup> and his view of it (p. 19), and I take it as it stands, though he has suggested a modification (p. 22). Obviously it is not Indian. Being joined to *vihāra*, it must denote some official of position in a *vihāra*. No Buddhist title such as *svāmin* is used, but a foreign term is applied and presumably it also is Iranian. Hence *karapha* is no doubt the nomin. sing. of the Iranian *karapan*, *karafn*, the term applied to teachers and priests hostile to the Zoroastrian religion (Bartholomae, *Dict.*). The priest of the *vihāra*, that is, obviously the abbot, is described by a Zoroastrian title; and this shows that the author of this inscription was not a Buddhist but a Zoroastrian. It is highly improbable, then, that the stone can record the dedication of any Buddhist memorial; and the co-operation of a Zoroastrian donor with a Buddhist abbot suggests that the benefaction commemorated was something non-religious.

The language is Prakrit, but the character of the Prakrit is unequal, and in this respect there is no material difference between the middle and the left sections, except that the latter may be a little better. Obvious peculiarities are the following, and I choose instances which appear certain, because my readings of them are supported by M. Senart or Professor Lüders or both. While the pure Sanskrit form *saṃvardhaka* is used (l. 3), a single Sanskrit *k* is changed to *g*, as in *janayago* (*nayago*, S and L; l. 4), and Sanskrit *p* passes through *b* to *v* in *sthavayeti* (l. 7); yet Sanskrit *t* is not changed to *d*, but persists in *bhatara*, *patiaśae* (l. 1), *pati* and *sthavayeti* (l. 7). The treatment of conjunct *r* varies. In an initial compound it is dropped, as in *bhatara*, *patiaśae* and *pati*; in a medial compound it often persists, as the first member in *saṃvardhaka* and *murta* (ll. 5, 6), and as the second

<sup>1</sup> The result is the same if we read *karafa*, see p. 657.

member in *agra* (l. 1) and *chatrapasa* (l. 4); yet it is modified to *m̐* in *saṁveṇa* (l. 9), and is dropped or assimilated in *sadha* (if that be the word in l. 9).<sup>1</sup> *V* conjoint is not dropped, either in an initial compound as *Svara* (l. 1), or in a medial as *asvanana* (l. 6, where M. Senart acknowledges that a *v* is the primâ facie reading, p. 15).

The case terminations in nouns are generally of the ordinary form, and the nomin. sing. ends in *o*, as in *janayago* (*nayago*, S and L; l. 4); but the instrum. sing. takes strange forms. It occurs correctly in Indian words of the *a* class in the left section as in *parivareṇa* (l. 9) and *mulena* (l. 10); but its ending *ena* in that class is used as a termination for words of other classes that are foreign, as in *Vespaśiena* for *Vespaśinā* (l. 7) and *karaphaṇa* for *karaphaṇā* or *karaphṇā* (l. 8). Clearly the dedicator was a foreigner not skilled in Prakrit, for otherwise he could hardly have permitted such irregular forms, whoever the actual composer was. It may be added that, in neuter nouns at least, the accus. sing. does not end in *m̐*, because there must be an accus. between the nomin. *janayago* (l. 4) and the verb *sthavayeti* (l. 7), yet there is no word there ending in *m̐*. *Vaṣum* (l. 3) is specially noticed *infra*.

I follow M. Senart in the order and numbering of the lines. The crucial portion of the record lies in lines 5 and 6, and there occur my chief differences from him and Professor Lüders. The inscription, as I read it, commemorates the establishment of some instrument for measuring hours in the market-place by Lalana, the President of Mānikīāla. The Satrap Vespaśi was precise about the observance of times, and Lalana provided that the hours should be announced publicly, no doubt for the due regulation of the market and probably during

<sup>1</sup> In the workman-engraver's dialect *r* is retained in *karmigeṇa*, but is dropped or assimilated in *sara* (l. 12).

market-time only. In conclusion I will offer some suggestions as to how the inscription was put together and the meaning of the first line.

### Text

- 1 Bhatara Svarabudhisa agra-patiasae
- 2 Sam 10 4 4 Kṣaṭra-Purvaspa-maharajasa Kane-
- 3 ṣkasa<sup>1</sup> Guṣaṇo-vaśam<sup>2</sup>-samvardhaka Lala-
- 4 no janayago Vespaśisa<sup>3</sup> chatrapasa
- 5 hora-murta-satasa apanage vihaṇṭi (?)
- 6 hora-murto-asvanana bhaṇa va śudha-ñava
- 7 pati sthavayeti saha taena Vespaśiena Khudeṇṭi(?)ena
- 8 Buritreṇa ca vihara-karaphaena<sup>4</sup>
- 9 samveṇa ca parivaveṇa<sup>5</sup> sadhaka dana<sup>6</sup> ku-
- 10 śala-mulena Budhehi ca Spantakahi<sup>7</sup> ca
- 11 sacasana bhavatu
- 12 Saṁdhabudhilena sava-karmigeṇa
- 13 Kartiyasa maña divase 20

### Translation

*May this tend to the brother Svarabuddhi's obtaining the share of a supreme lot!*<sup>8</sup>

In the year 18 Laṇa, the President of the people, the aggrandiser<sup>9</sup> of the Guṣaṇa race of Kaneṣka, *who is* the great king of the realm Puru-aspa, establishes in the market-place of the Satrap Vespaśi,<sup>10</sup> who is fond of hours,

<sup>1</sup> I read this final as *sa* because I do not know what else it can be; but it is quite unlike all the *s*'s in this inscription. Can it be intended for *śya*, the full form of the genit. used honorifically as on the Wardak vase?

<sup>2</sup> Read *vaśam*.

<sup>3</sup> It looks more like *Vespośisa*, but I adopt *Vespaśisa*, because the name is clear in l. 7, and Professor Lüders has explained the loop-like stroke (p. 648).

<sup>4</sup> Or *karaphaena*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *parivareṇa*.

<sup>6</sup> Or perhaps *sadha etana* (for *etena*).

<sup>7</sup> Read *Spantaehi*.

<sup>8</sup> I follow the meaning which similar words appeared to me to have on the Wardak vase (EI, xi, p. 214).

<sup>9</sup> This no doubt means "scion", as M. Senart (p. 12) and Professor Lüders (p. 648) agree.

<sup>10</sup> The market-place built by Vespaśi, or named after him.

*i.e.* muhūrtas,<sup>1</sup> a vihaṇṭi (?) for the purpose of the clear announcement through ringing or through calling out of the hours, *i.e.* muhūrtas—along with the said Vespaśi, with Khudēṇṭi (?), and with Buritra, the priest of the vihāra, and with all *their* attendants. May the useful gift by *its* meritorious foundation,<sup>2</sup> with *the aid* both of the Buddhas and of the Holy Ones, be the seat of accuracy.<sup>3</sup>

By Saṁdhabudhila, workman in all crafts.

On the day 20 of the month Kārttika.<sup>4</sup>

### Notes

Line 1. *Bhatarā* = Skt. \**bhrātarah*, genit. of *bhrātṛ*, from the base *bhrātar* with visarga dropped in Prakrit. But (since consonants are not written double in Kharoṣṭhī) it may also be read *bhattara*, which = Skt. \**bhartarah*, the similarly formed genit. of *bhartṛ*, "lord, master."

Line 2. *Kṣaθra* (*spatra*, S; *etra*, L). The first letter does not contain *sp*, because its top is straight, rather than round as in *Purvaspa* (l. 2) and *Vespaśi* (ll. 4, 7); but contains *k*. It has moreover two downward strokes beneath the *k*, which look too precise and clear-cut to be accidental marks in the stone, and so must have a significance. The whole character can only be *kṣ* (or perhaps *kś*), and this initial double consonant shows that the word cannot be Indian, for Indian *kṣ* would become *kh* or *ch* in Prakrit, cf. *chatrapa* (l. 4). The second letter is a consonant conjoined with *r* as the second member. Its top is not like *t*, *b* or *v*, and it differs from *tr* in *chatrapasa* (l. 4; though M. Senart regards them as alike, p. 10) and *Buritrena* (l. 8). These particulars show that the word can hardly be anything but the Iranian *khshaθra* (*xšaθra* in Bartholomae's *Dict.*), "kingdom, realm." The

<sup>1</sup> That is, "who is particular about time," "who likes punctuality," "who requires methodical arrangements."

<sup>2</sup> Or perhaps, "By this meritorious foundation may it be, etc."

<sup>3</sup> Or perhaps, "be always correct."

<sup>4</sup> Or probably, "At noon of the day 20 of Kārttika."

second letter therefore appears to be *θr*. The word being Iranian would not be subject to ordinary Prakrit modifications, but is transliterated as closely as possible, and thus gives us the new characters for *kṣ* (or *kś*) and *θr*. Even if the second letter be read as *tra*, the result is the same.

*Purvaspa* (so S; but *purvae*, L). This can only be Iranian *puru-aspa*, "rich in horses," which M. Senart notices but does not adopt (pp. 20-2). Here it must be the name of some country, as would be natural after *kṣaθra* and before *maharaja*. Can it be the Iranian equivalent of Skt. *Aśvaka*, Greek *Aspasioi* and *Hippasioi*?<sup>1</sup> Against this construction Dr. Fleet points out "that it is quite opposed to the practice of, at any rate, the early inscriptions, to find *mahārāja* in composition in that fashion; if this expression qualified *Kaneśka*, the text ought to have been — *kṣaθra-purvaspa-rajasa maharajasa*, etc." I see, however, no other way of construing the words, which are quite clear; possibly this may be an exception, for the record certainly has peculiarities in its grammar and construction (see pp. 645, 650, 655).

Line 3. *Guṣaṇo* (*Guṣana*, S and L). The *ṇ* has a clear-cut stroke to the left, near its foot, and the stroke must have a meaning. It does not, I think, denote *u*, which would be formed by a loop,<sup>2</sup> and can only indicate *o*, although it is placed somewhat low.

I had reached this conclusion before Baron von Staël-Holstein's article, "Was there a Kuṣana Race?" appeared (p. 79 *ante*), and had written it here before the criticism of that article by Dr. Fleet, "The Name Kushān," appeared (p. 369 *ante*). In both those papers this last letter is discussed. Nothing material depends on whether the consonant is read as *n* or *ṇ*. The point in dispute

<sup>1</sup> McCrindle's *Ancient India*, pp. 22, 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Nu* with the loop will be found often in the Stein MSS., as in the word *mahanuava*; see Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. ii, plate xcii, fig. N. xv. 88 (first word); etc.



between them is whether it has the vowel *u* or *a*. I have therefore reconsidered it carefully, because my view differs from both theirs. The letter is *ṇ* (see p. 642), and its tail is forked, consisting of a downward stroke and a leftward stroke. The Baron regarded the former as part of the stem of *n* and the latter as the vowel-mark *u* (p. 84 *ante*), and so read the letter as *nu*. Dr. Fleet dissents and, agreeing with M. Senart and Professor Lüders in reading only the vowel *a*, says, "The turn to the left at the bottom of the vertical stroke [i.e., the stem of the *ṇ*] is nothing but a slight exaggeration of the slope to the left with which the Kharōṣṭhī *ṇ* often ends, and is quite in agreement with the general sloping character of the writing of this record" (p. 374 *ante*). Hence he reads the letter as *ṇa*.

The two forked strokes at the tail are clearly cut,<sup>1</sup> so cleanly that I do not think either can be treated as a mere flaw or accident.<sup>2</sup> Both appear to be precise and deliberate, and must therefore be dealt with as such.

The first question then for decision is, which of these two strokes constitutes the tail of *ṇ*? Now, *ṇ* and *n* occur singly in nineteen other places on this stone, and in every instance the tail of the letter is either straight or, if curved, has a curve so slight that it is almost straight. In no case does the tail make a sharp bend to the left like the leftward stroke found here. Hence the only conclusion that seems consistent and just is, that the downward stroke constitutes the tail of the letter,<sup>3</sup> and that the leftward stroke is an addition to the letter.

That being so, the leftward stroke can denote only one of two things, either the vowel *u* or the vowel *o*. The vowel *u* occurs ten times added to various consonants

<sup>1</sup> This is plain from M. Senart's first plate, and also from Dr. Fleet's reproduction of the word (plate opposite p. 378 *ante*).

<sup>2</sup> True flaws occur above *go* and *tra* and perhaps in *spa* (l. 4).

<sup>3</sup> If the leftward stroke constituted the tail, the letter would be *d* rather than *ṇ*.

here (putting aside the very peculiar character *mu* which appears thrice), and is expressed by a loop in every instance.<sup>1</sup> In no case is it denoted by a straight stroke. In earlier times, in the Aśoka inscriptions *u* was indicated by a leftward stroke attached to or near the foot of a letter,<sup>2</sup> and *u* in *nu* was denoted by that stroke applied, however, to the very extremity of *n*,<sup>3</sup> whereas here the stroke is attached higher up. That *u* stroke passed out of use, and *u* is always indicated here by a loop. Though neither *nu* nor *nu* occurs elsewhere on this stone, yet that *nu* was expressed by a loop added to *n* is proved by its occurrence in the Stein MSS.<sup>4</sup> Clearly therefore the leftward stroke here cannot denote *u*. It can, however, represent *o*, because it is the regular *o* mark attached in the usual way. The only objection that can (as far as I can see) be raised to its denoting *o* is that it is applied here lower than the *o* stroke is generally placed; but the *o* mark is found added quite low sometimes, as in the well-known character *ho* (which occurs twice here) and also in the word *prothavadasa* on the pedestal of the Hashtnagar statue of Buddha.<sup>5</sup>

For these reasons it seems clear to me that the last letter in this word must be read *no*. There need be no hesitation in reading the word as *Guṣaṇo*, for *Guṣaṇo* is the nomin. sing. of *Guṣaṇa*, both in this Prakrit and in Iranian, and is used in the compound *Guṣaṇo-va(m)saṃ* after the Iranian fashion of using the nomin. form instead of the base-form in the first member of a compound word.<sup>6</sup> Here the relation of the two words is genitival, "the race of the Guṣaṇas," or adjectival, "the Guṣaṇa race"; and another

<sup>1</sup> The loop in *kuśala* (l. 9) does not appear quite complete, because it is near the edge of the stone.

<sup>2</sup> Bühler's Table I, cols. i-v.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* col. v.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 648, note 2.

<sup>5</sup> IA, xviii, p. 257; JASB, lviii, p. 144; Journ. Asiat., sér. VIII, vol. xv, pp. 124-6.

<sup>6</sup> Jackson's *Avesta Grammar*, § 865. Many other examples will be found in the Index to the Zend Avesta, SBE.

similar instance occurs in the phrase *hora-murto-asvanana* (l. 6).<sup>1</sup>

*Vaṣam-saṁvardhaka* (*vaśa*°, S and L). The *śa* has *m* plainly attached to it. This appears to be a fine phrase used honorifically; but either the scribe has mistakenly attached *m* to the *śa* instead of to the *va*, or the composer's learning was inadequate, for he has made *saṁvardhaka* govern the accus. case and has kept it with the base °*ka* as in a compound instead of writing it °*ko* as it should be in this Prakrit.

Lines 3 and 4. *Lalaṇo janayago* (*laladodānayago*, S; *Laladaḍanayago*, L). The first letter in line 4 appears to be *ṇ* and not *d*; compare *ṇ* in *Guṣaṇo* (l. 3), while in *d* the tail is short and curved to the left. I agree with M. Senart that it has the vowel *o*, which appears more clearly in his second plate; and there should be an *o* somewhere here, because this whole expression contains a name and a title, both in the nomin. case, and the name should have the nomin. termination *o*, just as the title has it in the final *go*. This being so, the *ṇo* shows that the name ends with it and is therefore *Lalaṇo*; hence the remaining letters compose the title. The first letter of the title is *ja*, like *ja* in *rajasa* (l. 2), so that the title is *janayago*. This can only be interpreted (since letters are not written double in Kharoṣṭhi) as *janayyago*, which = *janāryako* = *jana* + *ārya* + *ka*, *ry* becoming *yy* and *ārya ayya* in Prakrit,<sup>2</sup> and *k* declining to *g*, as M. Senart

<sup>1</sup> This reading *Guṣaṇo* strengthens Dr. Fleet's argument about the name *Kuṣān* (pp. 373-4 ante). The reading *Guṣaṇa* is in itself inconclusive, for it might equally well be the base-form *Guṣaṇa* or the Prakrit genit. plur. of *Guṣa*; but *Guṣaṇo* can be nothing but the nomin. sing., which declares plainly that the name must be *Guṣaṇa* (i.e., *Kuṣān*) and nothing else. Professor Konow's remarks about *Koṣaṇo* as an old Khotanī genit. plur. do not apply here, because all the terminations here are Prakrit: ZDMG., 1914, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 284. Professor Lüders, reading *daḍanayago*, regards it as = *daḍanayago*, and finds this term in *dāḍanāyakasya* in a Mathurā stone-inscription (EI, ix, p. 242); but

and Professor Lüders both regard it. *Janāryaka* would mean "the noble man among the people", "the President of the people", probably "the head of the civic government".

Line 5. *Hora-murta-satasa*; and so S. Professor Lüders reads *horamurta sa tasa*, but if so read, or as *horamurtasa tasa*, the construction becomes grammatically untenable. *Satasa* must therefore be one word. It cannot = *sattvasa*, because conjunct *v* is not dropped here (p. 645); and can only = *sattasa*, genit. of *satta*, which = Skt. *sakta*, "attached to, fond of." The phrase might equally well be read *horma-murtāsattasa* with *āsatta*, i.e. *āsakta*, and the meaning would be the same, but this seems to be too scholarly an expression for the general character of this inscription. *Hora* can, I think, be nothing but the Greek *hōra*, "hour" (which M. Senart suggested but hesitated to adopt, pp. 13-14), especially as *murta* can hardly be anything else than *muhūrta*. The two words fit each other and are used as practically equivalent, *muhūrta* being added to *hora* as the nearest Indian approach to the Greek *hōra* in order to explain *hora*, which had not been introduced into India at this time. *Hora* would have been familiar in the Greco-Bactrian states and to the author of this inscription, but not to the Indians; hence the use of both words in apposition. Dr. Fleet tells me that the practical division of time seems to have been the *nāḍī* and not the *muhūrta*. But the *nāḍī* of 24 minutes was not the equivalent of *hōra*, and *hōra* could only be translated into and explained in an Indian language by the word

there is a serious difficulty in the comparison. That word is not written continuously in that inscription, for *dāṇḍa* ends one line and *nāyakasya* occurs in the next line, and before *nāyakasya* there is a space (sufficient for two letters) where the line of the left margin of the inscription suggests that there must have been two letters originally, though now obliterated. The reading therefore should be *dāṇḍa* . . . *nāyakasya*; hence the parallelism seems faulty, besides requiring that a nasal should be added. My reading accepts the phrase just as it is.

*muhūrta*, which as containing 48 minutes was its nearest equivalent.<sup>1</sup>

This interpretation depends on the question whether *muhūrta* could have been contracted to *mūrta*. Internal consonants can certainly drop out; thus *udūkhala* becomes *ohala*<sup>2</sup>; *kutūhala*, *kohala*; and *sukumāra*, *somāra* and *sūmāla*.<sup>3</sup> *H* is undoubtedly a fairly persistent letter in Prakrit, and the question is whether it can so drop out. Pischel says it does not drop out,<sup>4</sup> but others do not agree with him,<sup>5</sup> and there are undoubted instances to show that it does drop out sometimes. Thus *iha* becomes *ia* in the Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra edicts, which belong to this very region.<sup>6</sup> Southward in the Bombay Presidency *h* between *a* and *ā* drops out; thus *Mahārāṣṭra(ka)* becomes *Marāṭhā*, *Mādevī* = *Mahādevī*,<sup>7</sup> and *Māvali* = *Mahāvali*, *Mahābali*.<sup>8</sup> Another instance occurs in the word *galatthia*, "caught by the throat," which is explained as = *galahastita*, "having the hand on the throat."<sup>9</sup> These instances go to show that *h* between the similar vowels *a* and *ā* is specially liable to drop out<sup>10</sup>; and it would be natural and probable that *h* between the similar vowels

<sup>1</sup> Professor Konow has proposed to connect *hora* with the old Khotanī word *hora*, "gift" (which view Professor Lüders had also arrived at previously), and *murta* with Zend *murta*, "man"; and so translate *horamurta* as "the alms man", i.e., an official in charge of the alms, in connexion with the *vihāra* (ZDMG, 1914, p. 98). See final note.

<sup>2</sup> Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 148. <sup>3</sup> *Id.* § 123. <sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 266.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, Professor Lüders postulates the dropping out of *h* to explain the word *masa* in l. 13 (JRAS, 1909, p. 666).

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Fleet has given the references for this in JRAS, 1909, p. 1089. I have to thank him for this and the following instances.

<sup>7</sup> Kielhorn's *Southern List of Inscriptions*, Nos. 224, 268 (EI, vii, Appendix).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* Nos. 649, 651, 670. Similarly *mājana* = *mahājana*.

<sup>9</sup> Weber's *Saptaśataka*, 2nd ed., p. 280, verse 584, with Comm. In his note thereto, Weber disputes Pischel's dictum. I have to thank Dr. Hoernle for this instance and the next note.

<sup>10</sup> This tendency is fairly common in the modern vernaculars; thus *tān* = *tahān*, "there"; *kān* = *kahān*, "where?" etc. Hoernle's *Grammar of the Gaudian Languages*, § 467. He also tells me that *Brhaspati* appears as *Bihapphai* and *Biphai*.

*u* and *ū* might drop out, though no instance can be cited because the combination *uhū* is very rare. There seems nothing improbable therefore in the equation, that *murta*, i.e. *mūrta* = *muhūrta*.

*Apanage*. The mark like a grave accent over the *g* appears to be too clear-cut to be an accidental blemish, and I agree with Professor Lüders in reading it as *e*. To the illustration cited by him (p. 651) I may add the *e* sign in *muleña* here (l. 10) where the inclination is similar though not so pronounced; and also the *e* sign in the letter *le* in tablet N. xvi. 2 reverse, in the words *lekha* (near the end of l. 2) and *lekheña* (middle of l. 3).<sup>1</sup> It seems to have been so written here and in those instances of *le* in order to make it distinct from the left curve of *g* and of *l*. *Apanage* is the locat. of *āpanaga*, which = Skt. *āpana* + *ka*, "market-place," *k* being modified to *g* as in *janayago* above.

*Vihanṭi* (*vihare*, S and L). The final syllable is not *re*, but contains more strokes than *re*. It closely resembles the third letter from the end of l. 7, which is read as *ci* by M. Senart and Professor Lüders, and the resemblance shows that all the strokes in both are intended and that both must presumably be read alike. It seems to be some compound letter with the vowel-mark *i*. The context suggests that the word is the name of some instrument for measuring "hours", so that it is a special term and therefore an uncommon one outside the ordinary vocabulary. Hence it is difficult to fix the value of the letter unless we can divine what the word must be. This, however, I have been unable to do, and I can only suggest provisionally that it is *ṇṭi*, because it appears to contain the letter *ṭ*,<sup>2</sup> and the other consonant can only be a nasal, since the language is Prakrit and the character does not

<sup>1</sup> Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. ii, pl. ci; the portion that appears upside down.

<sup>2</sup> See Bühler's Table I, cols. ii, iii.

contain the sign of *y*, *r* or *v* conjunct. The nasal appears to be indicated by the small horizontal bar attached to the middle on the left side, as more fully explained in the note on *Spantakahi*, *infra*. *Ghaṭi* is the term for a "water-clock", which meaning would suit the context perfectly, but I cannot connect *vihanṭi* with it linguistically. A bell, *ghaṇṭā* or *ghaṇṭī*, would not measure hours. *Vihanṭi* is, I think, one word, and cannot be split up into *vi* (= *api*) *hanṭi*, because such a use of *vi* here seems highly improbable: and I doubt if *hanṭi* could well = *ghaṭi*.

Line 6. *Hora-murto*; see above. The only point to be noticed here is the final *o*, and I would suggest that it is the Iranian use of the nomin. sing. form in compounds, as mentioned above in explanation of *Guṣaṇo*. Here also the dependence is genitival, but the construction is loose, for the compound is not merely *hora-mūrto-āsvananā*, but includes the whole phrase *āsvananā bhāṇā vā*.

*Asvanana* (*atra nana*, S; *etra nana*, L). The first letter appears to be *a*; the tail has been cut broad as in *v* in *saṃvardhaka* (l. 3), but I see no indication of a rightward stroke. M. Senart noticed the form of conjunct *v* in the second letter, but preferred to read it as conjunct *r* (p. 15). It seems to me plainly *sv* as in *Svara* (l. 1) and the form in Bühler's Table I, col. xiii, No. 37, as distinguished from *tv* in *ibid.* No. 31; for the *r* stroke is not carried so high as here, compare it in *chatrapasa* (l. 4) and *Buritrena* (l. 8). I take the word as the ablat. *āsvananā*, a legitimate formation from the root *ā-svan*.

*Bhaṇa va* (*bhagava*, S and L). The second letter has not got the left curl of *g*, and could not have lost it, because the stone is higher on the left side of the letter than on its right side and so would have clearly retained any incision there. It seems to be *ṇ*; and the reading appears to be *bhāṇā vā*, with the ablat. case.

*Śudha* (*Budha*, S and L). The first letter has two distinct legs and can only be *śu* or *yu*. The *u* sign has

been attached to the right leg instead of the left, but this may be only a scribe's peculiarity, like the *e* sign in *apanage* (l. 5). The only tenable reading appears to be *sudha*.

*Ñava* (*thuvam*, S; *thuvam*, L). The first letter appears to be plainly *ñ*. It has a long curved tail, and the *v* a faint curved tail. M. Senart and Professor Lüders interpret the former curve as *u*, and the latter as *m*; but neither *u* nor *m* is so made here, and *m* in particular is always made in one way, compare *sam* (ll. 2, 3, and 9) and *śam* (l. 3).<sup>1</sup> Both curves therefore, if intentional, are merely flourishes as in *sa* of *saha* (l. 7). The word can therefore be only *ñava*, which = *ñāva* = Skt. *jñāpa* for the ordinary *jñāpana*, *p* degenerating to *v* as in *sthavayeti* (l. 7). It is in the accus. case, treated as a neuter noun, governed by the following *pati*.

Line 7. *Pati sthavayeti* (*patithavayati*, S; *pratistavayati*, L). I can perceive no *r* subscript to *pa*, and it would be naturally dropped (see p. 644). If the whole be one word, it represents Skt. *pratiṣṭhāpayati*, but, since the first *p* has dropped its *r* and the second *p* has degenerated into *v*, it is hardly credible that *sth* could persist or could appear as anything but *tth*, that is *th*, since consonants are not written double. The third letter, however, is certainly not *th*, but resembles *st*, and yet differs from *st* in having the middle horizontal bar turned well upward on the right side; so that it can only be *sth*.<sup>2</sup> This fact that *sth* persists and has not been turned into *th* shows that it must be the initial letter and not a medial letter, and therefore that *pati* is not compounded with the verb, but is a separate preposition governing *ñava*. The fifth syllable appears to be *ye*, and the verb therefore is *sthavayeti*. *Ye* is possible and intelligible, because *°yeti* would correspond to Iranian

<sup>1</sup> As regards the form of *u*, see p. 650.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Lüders approved this view, but did not adopt it (pp. 653-4).



*°ya'ti*, and Iranian influences are prevalent here, as already pointed out.

*Taena* (so L; but *taena*, S). The final seems to be *n* rather than *ṇ* (see p. 643, *ante*); hence I hesitate to adopt their reading *taena* = *trayena*, excellent though it is; and also for the reason that this Prakrit does not appear to drop out medial *y* where it is an essential part of a base (cf. *sthavayeti*) but only where it is part of a termination (cf. *patiaśae*, l. 1). Hence I feel constrained to think it an irregular form of *tena* fashioned like the following *Vespaśiena Khudeṇṭiena*, for it will be noticed that there is no correct instrumental in this middle section. It does not, however, affect the general sense whichever interpretation be taken.<sup>1</sup>

*Khudeṇṭiena* (?) (*khudaciena*, S; *khujaciena*, L). The second letter appears to be *de*; it is not like ordinary *ḍa*, nor like *ja* in *rajasa* (l. 2). The difficult letter is the third, and it has been discussed in the note on *vihaṇṭi*, *ante*. The word appears to be a name, though an adjective agreeing with *Vespaśiena*, and meaning "approving" or "concurring", would equally well suit the context.

Line 8. *Karaphaena* (so S; *karavhaena*, L). This has been discussed above (p. 644). The third letter might well be read as *f* according to Professor Franke's suggestion mentioned by Professor Lüders (p. 654), and would agree with the Iranian *karafn*.

Line 9. *Sadhaka dana* (*sadha etena*, S and L). *Etena* would agree with the usual formula and is expected; but the first duty is to read the actual script. The third letter may be either *e* or *ka*; but the fourth is not *t*, nor has it the vowel-mark *e*; it is *da*. I am constrained, therefore, to read *sādhaka dāna* as what has been actually written, and as it gives a perfectly good meaning, "a useful gift," I cannot suggest that there is

<sup>1</sup> The word might be read as *daera*, but the Iranian *daera* is untenable.

a mistake for the usual formula, especially since this gift was not one of the ordinary Buddhist donations, nor indeed a Buddhist donation at all. Either reading, however, yields the same sense practically.

Line 10. *Spantakahi* (*spavaspahi*, S; *ṣavaehi*, L). I agree with M. Senart in reading the first letter as *spa*, because there are two curves at the top, a right and a left (as he has pointed out, p. 20), and not a single curve as in *ṣ*. The second letter has a *v*-shape, yet appears to have a small horizontal bar on the left side of its stem. Now the character for *v* with a cross horizontal bar denotes *st*, and I would suggest that this letter with its half bar on the left is based on that *st* form and denotes *nt*. I have given reasons for holding that a conjunct *m* is denoted by a cross bar in the word *tumbi* on the Wardak vase (EI, xi, p. 213); and here a nasal for *nt* could only be indicated by a half bar, because the full cross bar had been appropriated for *st*, and the nasal could not be attached as *m* to the preceding *sp* because there was not enough room. The third letter seems to me plainly *ka*, because its top is straight rather than curved, but I agree with Professor Lüders that it should be *e*. The whole word then is *Spantaehi*, a crude instrum. plural from *Spanta* (cf. *karaphaena*, l. 8), the Iranian *spānta*, "holy." *Spantaehi*, "with the Holy Ones," would be the corresponding Zoroastrian term to the Buddhist *Budhehi*; the two terms are obviously *ejusdem generis*, and both should be expected here because, as already pointed out, a Zoroastrian donor has joined with a Buddhist abbot in this dedication.

Line 11. *Sacasana* (*saca sada*, S; *sachasana*, L). The second letter appears to be *ca*, for its stem is not straight. The fourth appears to be *n* (compare *n* in *mulena*), though *d* is not impossible. *Sacasana* can only = *saccāsana* = Skt. *satyāsana*, "seat of truth or accuracy." *Saca sada* would be *sacca sadā*, "always true or correct."

The two readings mean the same practically, though the former seems certainly pretentious.

Line 12. *Samdhabudhilena* (so S; *samdha Budhilena*, L). I agree with M. Senart in regarding the whole as a name. It has been pointed out that lines 12 and 13 were added by the workman-engraver (p. 641), and he could not have been associated with the dignitaries mentioned as a participator in the dedication. The name is that of a workman, and it seems to me unnecessary to perplex one's self about irregularities in its formation.

*Sava-karmigēṇa* (so S; *navak<sup>o</sup>*, L). The first letter appears to be clearly *sa* in the second plate. It may be noted that the *ṇ* here differs from the *n* in *budhilena*, as it should.

Line 13. *Maña* (*masa*, S and L). The second letter is *ña*, and I can see no resemblance to *sa* in it. *Maña* may be meant for *māsa*, but if so, there are two difficulties: (1) it should precede *Kartiyasa*; and (2) since it follows, it should have the genit. form *māsasa*, for this was quite within the workman's competence since he has declined both words in l. 12. Three explanations may be suggested: (1) *maña* may be a mistake for *māsasa*; or (2) it may be the nearest way of writing *māśnhō*, the Iranian genit. of *māh*, "month";<sup>1</sup> or (3) the word may (as Dr. Fleet suggests) be *mājha*, read with the following *divase*. The first involves too improbable an error; the second postulates too much knowledge in an Indian workman. The third seems most reasonable, "at noon of the day 20."

There remain some questions concerning the relation of the different parts of the inscription, namely:—

(1) What is the purport of line 1, for the inscription must have begun originally with l. 2, as pointed out by Professor Lüders (p. 660)?

(2) How came the left section to be written? For, if

<sup>1</sup> Jackson's *Avesta Grammar*, §§ 352-3: *ñ* being written for *nh*, since Kharoṣṭhī had apparently no character for *ñ*.

it had formed part of the original inscription, the whole would have been written out properly by the scribe (see p. 642) in longer lines across the stone, so as to have it all uniform.

The most reasonable explanation seems to me to be this. The inscription consisted originally of lines 2 to 7 only. The engraver incised it, and put his name and date on the right side. Then, almost immediately afterwards, all the left section was added to enlist the co-operation of the persons named therein, in order that the gift might be preserved in good working condition (*sacasana bhavatu*); because in the left section the Buddhist abbôt is named, and the "Buddhas" are given precedence over the Zoroastrian "Holy Ones". The stone would then probably have been set up in the market-place, close to the object given.

That object may very likely have become damaged or destroyed afterwards; indeed, if it was an instrument for measuring time, it would almost certainly have been soon neglected as a bother to easy-going Indian ways, and have disappeared. The vihâra people, when building their stûpa, might then have appropriated the stone, partly to preserve it<sup>1</sup> and partly to make use of it in the position where it was discovered. Some vihâra monk would have done that, and he would have been Svarabuddhi, who, to obtain the merit of doing so, added line 1 at the top, which was the best space left where to inscribe it and was the most prominent position.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It was worth preserving, because it constituted a testimonial by the President (and the Satrap) to the existence and importance of the vihâra at that time.

<sup>2</sup> After this was in type I saw Professor Lüders' remarks on *horamurta* in SKPA. d. W., 1913, pp. 421 ff. I do not think it has any connexion with *horaka* or *horamurnâvaga* (if this word can be relied on). *Hora*, "alms," does not suit the context. *Murta* = *murnâda*, or = *marâta* seem difficult equations.