

## VIII.

## THE INSCRIPTION ON THE PIPRAHWA VASE.

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

## II.

I HAD not intended to write anything more about the inscription on the Piprahwa relic-vase, treated by me in this Journal, 1906. 149 ff., until I should have completed my examination of the tradition about the corporeal relics of Buddha,<sup>1</sup> and should be able to offer a facsimile of the record.<sup>2</sup> And it is only recently that the occasion has arisen for presenting sooner any further remarks, as the result of the criticism of my interpretation of the record advanced by M. Senart in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1906, 1. 132 ff., and by M. Barth in the *Journal des Savants*, 1906. 541 ff. That two such distinguished scholars should differ from me so radically, is an important matter. And I wish that I had seen M. Senart's remarks sooner; but, though issued early in the year, they did not become known to me until towards the end of September. M. Barth's paper, issued in October or November,— in which he has reviewed all the principal previous treatments of the record and suggestions made regarding it, and has endorsed M. Senart's conclusions except in the grammatical analysis of the compound *sukiti-bhatinam*,— reached me after the writing of this article, but in time for me to make a few additions to it.

<sup>1</sup> The concluding instalment of this inquiry is held over in consequence of want of space.

<sup>2</sup> There have been unexpected difficulties in the way of doing this; one of them being that, of the two casts before me, the cast that belongs to this Society is the one that should be reproduced, but unfortunately at some time or another it was broken into six pieces. It is confidently hoped, however, that a facsimile can be given at a fairly early date from a fresh cast.

We may defer, until the issue of the facsimile, any further discussion of the period to which the framing of the record should be referred.

I must defer to another occasion a consideration of any of his observations which may not be covered by my present remarks.

M. Senart and M. Barth have recognized and accepted my point,— established, indeed, by clear and unmistakable proof (see this Journal, 1905. 680),— that the record commences, not with the word *iyam* as had previously been believed, but with *sukiti-bhatinam*. They have not, however, accepted the conclusions which I base on that all-important point. I am sorry for that. But I do not despair of bringing them round eventually to my view. Meanwhile, though I shall have more to say hereafter, it is convenient to make now the following observations: they may perhaps lead to a further ventilation of the matter before I write finally about it; they will at any rate materially shorten what I should otherwise then have to say.

\* \* \* \* \*

For the decipherment of the record I have now been able to use, in addition to Mr. Hoey's cast, the cast belonging to this Society (see this Journal, 1898. 868), which had been lost sight of for a long time. The text runs exactly as previously given by me. I repeat it here for easy reference. Given precisely as it stands on the original vase, without the expression of long vowels and double consonants, it is as follows:—

#### Text.

Sukiti-bhatinam sabhaginikanam sa-puta-dalanam iyam  
salila-nidhane Budhasa bhagavate sakiyanam.

The rendering which I gave— (to be modified in two details at the end of this article, page 130 below)— was as follows:—

#### Translation.

Of the brethren of the Well-famed One, together with (*their*) little sisters (*and*) together with (*their*) children and wives, this (*is*) a deposit of relics; (*namely*) of the kinsmen of Buddha, the Blessed One.

First, as regards the category to which we must refer the language of the record.

The language is not what is called Pāli. This is shewn partly by the use of *l* for *r* in *dalanam* for *dālānam* = *dārāṇām*, and in *salila* for *satīla* = *śarīra*, and by the final *e* instead of *am* and *o* in *nidhane* for *nidhāne* = *nidhānam*, and in *bhagavate* for *bhagavato* = *bhagavataḥ*; partly by another detail which I mention just below.

The features specified above tend to stamp the language as Māgadhī; as also does the substitution of *n* for *ṇ* in *dalanam*. At the same time, it is not exactly the Māgadhī of the edicts of Aśōka. It differs from it, as also again from Pāli, in the substitution of *ṇ* for *n* in *sabhagiṇīkanam* for *sabhagiṇīkānam* = *sabhaginīkānam*.

In remarking previously on this last-mentioned detail, I said (loc. cit., 149, note) that I had no object in differing from Dr. Bloch's opinion that the *ṇ* is only apparent and is due to an accident in engraving the record; and I stated that Mr. Hoey's cast pointed plainly to a different conclusion. At that time, however, I had not recognized the importance of this point. I certainly have now an object in maintaining my view about it. But I have to observe that the cast belonging to this Society also makes it quite certain that the writer had written, and the engraver intentionally formed, the lingual *ṇ*. The full and intended formation of the top stroke, which makes the difference between the dental and the lingual nasal, is clear and unmistakable, in spite of a small portion of the stone having peeled off along the whole of the top line. It might be argued that the lingual *ṇ* may be erroneous, and that we ought to have the dental *n*. But it is not open to assert that the *ṇ* was not intentionally formed. And I consider that the *ṇ* is correct; and that this feature removes the language of the record out of the category of the Māgadhī of Aśōka's edicts.

The Brāhmī versions of the edicts of Aśōka nowhere present the lingual *ṇ*, except at Gīrnār and in Mysore. Except in those localities, a Sanskrit *ṇ* is always represented by *n*, as in *dalanam* in our present record. In the edicts

published in those localities, the use of the  $\eta$  and the  $n$  is somewhat peculiar. Sometimes an original  $\eta$  was retained : for instance, Gīrnār edict 1, lines 10–11 and 12, *prāṇā* = *prāṇāḥ*, and edict 3, line 6, *gaṇanāyaṃ* = *gaṇanāyāṃ* ; Brahmagiri edict 1, line 5, *sāvane* = *śrāvāṇaṃ*. In terminations, however, the original  $\eta$  was at Gīrnār turned into  $n$ , as in the other Brāhmī northern versions of the edicts : for instance, edict 1, line 4, *priyēna* = *priyēṇa* ; edict 9, line 7, *mitrēna* = *mitrēṇa*. Sometimes the  $\eta$  was used, as here, in the place of an original  $n$  : for instance, Gīrnār edict 4, line 3, *dasanā* (twice) = *darsanā* for *darśanaṃ* ; Brahmagiri edict 1, lines 1 and 8, *dēvānaṃ* = *dēvānāṃ*. And peculiar cases, resembling our present text in apparent inconsistency, are the following. In Gīrnār edict 1, line 9, in the compound *prāṇa-sata-sahasrāṇi*, we have both the retention of the  $\eta$  in *prāṇa*, and also the substitution of  $n$  for it in *sahasrāṇi*. And in Gīrnār edict 8, line 4, we have *dasanaṃ* against *dasane* (twice) in the preceding line.

The usage of  $\eta$  for  $n$  in the Mysore edicts was noted by Professor Bühler (EI, 3. 136) as being perhaps one of some features suggestive of a mixture of southern Prākṛit with Māgadhī. And M. Senart has said (*Inscriptions de Piyadasi*, 2. 431 f. ; IA, 21. 171 f.) that the use of the  $\eta$  is one of several features which divide the Aśōka records into two main groups, and mark a dialectic difference of a leading kind.

I claim that the  $\eta$  in *sabhaginīkanaṃ* is a correct and instructive detail. There is nothing essentially peculiar in it, or requiring us to assume an error in it. That a Sanskrit  $n$  has frequently changed to  $\eta$  in the Prākṛits, is notorious. The word *bhaginī*, ‘sister,’ itself became *bhāṇī* and *bahiṇī* in Prākṛit, and, while preserving the  $n$  in some of the modern vernaculars, has in others finally assumed the following forms with  $\eta$  :<sup>1</sup> in Uṛiyā, *bhāuṇī*, *bhāṇī* ; in Panjābi, *bhāṇ* (and *bāinh*) ; in Sindhī, *bhēṇu* ; and in Marāṭhī, *bahīṇ*. In the form *bhaginī* which is at the bottom

<sup>1</sup> I quote them from Mr. Louis Gray’s useful work, *Indo-Iranian Phonology*, § 314.

of the *sabhaginikanam* of our record, we have plainly one of the first steps— possibly the very first— in the transition to the later forms. And the presence of that form distinctly removes the language of our record from the category of the Māgadhi of the edicts of Aśōka, and marks it as a local Prākṛit,— a dialect, indeed, with some of the peculiarities of Māgadhi, but clearly separated from Aśōka's Māgadhi.

As regards something else that I said about the word *sabhaginikanam* (loc. cit., 150, note 1), I have to remark that of course the metre now shews, against my previous opinion, that the base is *sa-bhaginī* with the suffix *ka*; not *sa-bhaginika* from *sa + bhaginikā*, 'a little sister.' I have, therefore, to substitute 'sisters' for 'little sisters' in my translation.

\* \* \* \* \*

Next, as regards the word which stands in the original as *sakiyanam*.

I have taken the base of it as representing the Sanskrit *svakīya*, 'own, belonging to oneself, one's own man, a kinsman.' I still do so. But the following additional remarks must now be made.

Dr. Bloch has kindly drawn my attention to a point which might be considered an objection to my rendering of the record, as follows. On the analogy of Aśōka's Māgadhi, we should expect the *sv* of *svakīya* to remain unchanged, as in various other words in the edicts<sup>1</sup> which are too numerous to be cited, and mostly too well known to need it. Or else we should expect it to be resolved, as in *suvāmika* and *shavāmikya*, = *svāmika*, in the Dhauli edict 9, line 10, the Jaugada edict 9, line 17, and the Kālsī edict 9, line 25, and edict 11, line 30.

But we have now seen that the language of our record is not exactly the Māgadhi of the edicts of Aśōka; it is a dialect, a local Prākṛit, with some of the features of Māgadhi, but with at any rate one important difference in

<sup>1</sup> The Aśōka records do not happen, so far, to disclose any use of the words *sva*, *sviya*, *svaka*, or *svakīya* themselves.

presenting the lingual *ṇ*. The change, by assimilation, of *sv* to *ss*, *s*, is a regular change in the Prākṛits, as well as in Pāli. And a few instances, particularly apposite because they concern the word *sva* itself, which enters into *svakiya*, are as follows.<sup>1</sup> From *svaira*, 'wilful, wilfulness,' we have the Prākṛit *saira* (Vararuchi, l. 36, commentary). From *svāmin*, 'lord,' we have the Prākṛit *sāmi*, the Pāli *sāmī* (beside *sucāmī*), the Uṛiyā and Bengālī *śāim*, the Hindī and Panjābī *sāim*, and the Sindhī *sāmim*. From *svānga*, 'mimicry,' we have the Hindī and Panjābī *sāng*, the Sindhī *sāngu*, and the Gujarātī and Marāṭhī *sōng*. And from *svaka*, 'own,' we have the Hindī and Marāṭhī *sagā*, the Panjābī *saggā*, the Sindhī *sāgō*, and the Gujarātī *sagum*. So, also, it need hardly be added, from *svakiya* we have *sakiya* in Pāli; and from *svaka* we have *saka*, not only in Pāli, but also in Prākṛit, as, for instance, in the Mathurā inscription P. (this Journal, 1904. 707 ff.; 1905. 155).

In all these circumstances, it is no matter for surprise that we should find in our text *sakiya* as the representative of *svakiya*. And M. Senart has agreed that there is no formal impossibility of that.

There is, however, a question as regards the length of the vowel of the second syllable. On the previous occasion, I treated the matter as if we could only have *sakiya* with the short *i*, as, in Pāli, in this word itself and in *dutiya* = *dvitīya*, *pāpiya* = *papīyas*, and various other words. The so-called Queen's edict, however, on the Allahābād pillar (IA, 19. 125), gives us both *dutiya* (line 2) and *dutiya* (line 5) as corruptions of the Sanskrit *dvitīya*. So, also, Professor Pischel's Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages, § 449, gives us both *dudia* and in verse *dudīa*, as = *dvitīya*, in Śaurasēnī and Māgadhī, with some other instances, in §§ 82, 91, 165, of a similar optional length of quantity in other words.

In these circumstances, we must, in proceeding further,

<sup>1</sup> These instances, again — (except the first), — I take from *Indo-Iranian Phonology*, § 905.

understand that the word may be *sakiya*, with the long *i*, quite as much as *sakiya*, with the short *i*.

\* \* \* \* \*

This last point brings us on to the consideration of the record as a verse, the recognition of which feature in it we owe to Mr. Thomas. It would greatly simplify matters if, carrying M. Barth's doubt a step further, I could dismiss the view that the record is a verse.<sup>1</sup> But I do not see my way to that. I quite agree with him, however, that the metrical question does not in any way prejudge the meaning that is to be given to the word *sakiyanam*.

The record is a verse in a metre of the same class with the well-known Āryā. And, with restoration of the long vowels and double consonants, omitted in the original, it may be scanned in two ways, according to the treatment of the last *pāda* or line, as follows :—

**Text.**

- 1 Sūkīti|bhātī|nām śabhāgī|-
- 2 nīkā|nām śa-pū|tta|-dālā|nām|
- 3 iyam śa|līlā-nī|dhānē|
- 4, a būddhā|ssā bhāgāvā|tē| śakiyā|nām|
- 4, b būddhā|ssā bhāgā|vātē śa|kiyā|nām|

With the last *pāda* scanned as 4, *a*, so as to present fifteen *mātrās* or short-syllable instants, the verse is an Upagīti. With that *pāda* scanned as 4, *b*, presenting eighteen *mātrās*, it is an Udgīti.

Mr. Thomas (see this Journal, 1906. 452) has erroneously taken the verse as an Āryā, beginning with *iyam* and having the real fourth *pāda* as the second line of it, and has scanned that *pāda* thus :—

- 4, c būddhā|ssā bhāgāvā|tē śa|kiyā|nām|

<sup>1</sup> This feature had not come to notice when M. Senart wrote.

To this scanning there is the strong, if not fatal, objection, that the spondee *tē sā* in the third foot (the sixth of the half verse) is quite contrary to the rule, which requires there, whether in the second or in the fourth *pāda*, either an amphibrach, or four short syllables, or one short syllable; and, as far as my observation goes, it is equally opposed to practice, even in Pāli and Prākṛit as well as in Sanskrit. However, we may waive this objection, in favour of admitting anything which cannot be actually stamped as impossible; and so we may find, hypothetically, an Udgīti with the last *pāda* scanned in this manner. The question remains, whether the sense could allow us to take the first syllable of *sakiyanam* as long, which can only be done by taking the word as a tribal name; to this we shall come further on.

At this point, I have only to add that, in presenting according to his own method (*ibid.*, 453) my scanning of the verse with the last *pāda* as 4, *a*, Mr. Thomas attached the remark:—"Possibly the last word might be scanned *sākyā(nam)*." On that observation, I will only remark that I cannot see any such possibility, there being no reason for which we should double up two syllables into one; that such a scanning, if possible, is not necessary even from what seems to be his opinion about the meaning of the word; and that, if we were concerned here (as he appears to hold) with some form of the tribal name, that form would be either Sakiya or Sākīya, and neither Sākiya for Śākīya, nor Sakya or Sākya for Śākya.

In view of what has already been said by Mr. Thomas and myself (this *Journal*, 1906. 452, 714 f.), there is no need to comment further upon the metrical peculiarities in the composition of this verse,<sup>1</sup> except as regards the last *pāda* taken as 4, *b*, with a lengthening of the final *a* of *buddhasa*. This is justified by the following two exactly similar cases in Pāli verses of the same class:—

<sup>1</sup> They may be called "peculiarities;" but it seems hardly correct to continue to mark them as "irregularities:" because they were plainly recognized features of Pāli and Prākṛit verse.



In the Thēragāthā, verse 590, we have:—

chitta|ssā sa|ṅṭhāpanāṃ|  
 ētam| samaṇa|ssa| paṭirū|paṃ|

And in the Thērigāthā we have a stanza, verse 493, which may be quoted in full, because, in addition to the special point, it presents (1) a treatment of the *o* of *attano*, = *ātmanah*, as short, just as the *e* of *bhagavate*, standing for precisely the same *o*, has to be treated in our record scanned according to 4, *a*; and (2) an optional treatment of a final *e* as either long or short, in more marked circumstances than even in our record:—

Kim mama| parō ka|rissati|  
 āttānō| sīsa|mhi ḍayha|māna|mhi|  
 anuba|ndhē jāṛā|-māṛāṇē|  
 tassā| ghātā|ya| ghaṭita|bbam|

with actually the various reading *tassā*.

At this stage, I have only to remark further as follows. With the last *pāda* scanned as 4, *c*, the base of the word which is presented in the original as *sakiyanam* would be *sākīya*. That could not represent *svakīya*. It could only be *Sākīya* for *Śākīya* as a tribal name. But even setting aside the objection based on the general purport of the record, to which we shall come further on, the invention of that form of the tribal name of the kinsmen of Buddha can, in my opinion (see this Journal, 1906. 162 ff.), only be referred to a period very much later than that of our record.

With the last *pāda* scanned as 4, *a*, the base of the specified word is *sakiya*. This admittedly may be, and in my opinion must be, a corruption of *svakīya*. But of course it might (other things permitting) be an already established form of the tribal name, obtained by a resolution into *kiy* of the *ky* of a *Sakya* for *Sākya* = *Śākya*. As regards, however, the

form Śākya, my opinion is (see *ibid.*) that it was obtained from Śākīya through Śākiya, and must consequently be referred to a still later period.<sup>1</sup>

With the last *pāda* scanned as 4, *b*, the base of the same word is *sakīya*. This can only represent *svakīya*. We might have Sakiya from Śākya through Sākya and Sakya, but we could not have Sakiya.

\* \* \* \* \*

We come now to the meaning of certain parts of the record. And I must at this point introduce M. Senart's translation, which, adhering to the previous understanding that the relics are relics of Buddha, runs thus (*JA*, 1906, 1. 136):—

“Ce dépôt de reliques du bienheureux Bouddha [de la race] des Śākya est [l'œuvre pieuse] de Sukiti et de ses frères, avec leurs sœurs, leurs fils et leurs femmes.”

That is:—‘This deposit of relics of the blessed Buddha (*of the race*) of the Śākya is (*the pious work*) of Sukiti and his brothers, with their sisters, their sons and their wives.’

M. Barth's translation (*Journal des Savants*, 1906. 553) is the same, except in omitting the words “[de la race],” and in giving “the brothers of Sukīrti” in the place of “Sukiti and his brothers:”—

“Ce dépôt de reliques du Saint Buddha des Çākya est (l'œuvre pieuse) des frères de Sukīrti, conjointement avec leurs sœurs, avec leurs fils et leurs femmes.”

On the other hand, M. Sylvain Lévi, though writing while it was still thought that the text begins with *iyam* and with a different estimation of the meaning of *sukiti*, took a wider view, which, with the remarks attached to it, led me to form my opinion of the meaning of the record. Without actually discarding the view that the inscription registers a deposit of relics of Buddha, he regarded the

<sup>1</sup> From his footnote on page 134, M. Senart seems to have misunderstood me on this point. I have not suggested that Śākya was obtained by an erroneous restitution from the Prākṛit *sakīya* = *svakīya*. I have traced, separately, the form Sākya from *svakīya*, and the form Śākya from *śakīya*.

text (*Journal des Savants*, 1905. 541; and see more fully this *Journal*, 1906. 152) as equally capable of the following translation :—

“ C'est ici les reliques des Çākyas, frères bienheureux du saint Bouddha, avec leurs sœurs, leurs fils et leurs femmes.”

That is :—‘ Here are the relics of the Śākyas, the blessed brothers of the holy Buddha, with their sisters, their sons and their wives.’

\* \* \* \* \*

Now, first as regards the interpretation of the word *sukiti*, regarded as standing for *sukīti* or *sukitti* = *sukīrti*, ‘ possessed of good fame.’

I said (this *Journal*, 1906. 154) that I did not trace this word as a name in Pāli literature; by which I sought to convey, not that it might not at any time be found to occur even in that literature as a proper name, but that, so far, I could not find any person who might be recognized as mentioned in our record. And I took it as a special appellation of Buddha, used here, in a more or less sentimental or poetical fashion, to denote him as “ the Well-famed One.”

Mr. Thomas has pointed out (*ibid.*, 452) that, in its Sanskrit form *Sukīrti*, this word is found as a proper name in Buddhist literature in the *Mahāvastu*, ed. Senart, I. 136, line 14. It occurs there in the following circumstances. Mahā-Kāśyapa asks Mahā-Kātyāyana for the names of the Buddhas under whom the Blessed One, who was born in the race of the Śākyas, had accumulated religious merit in the first seven Bhūmis or stages of progress of the Bōdhisattvas, which stages were each of immeasurable duration. And Mahā-Kāśyapa gives him, in reply, a long list, which is in many respects sufficiently startling, and suggests that the composer was occasionally rather hard put to it in making it out. It includes such appellations as *Mṛigarājaghōsha*, “ the Lion’s Roar ; ” *Rishabhanētra*, “ the Ox-eyed ; ” *Vajrasaṃghāta*, “ the

Hard-as-adamant," or <sup>1</sup> "the Diamond-cement;" Chaturasradana, "the Man with the square mouth;" Gaganagāmin, "the Sky-traveller;" and Yōjanasahasradarsin, "the Ten-thousand-mile-seer." It presents choice selections of names ending with *dāman*, *makūṭa*, *gupta*, *kētu*, and other favourite terminations. And in the way of names ending with *kīrti* it presents those of Satyadharmavipulakīrti, with whom it opens; of Sukīrti, who stands actually second in it; and of Brahmakīrti and Udāttakīrti: and it only leaves us to wonder why the composer did not make much more use of this convenient termination.

There is no difficulty about taking *sukīti*, *sukīti*, as the proper name of an ordinary man. And, in now laying aside my opinion that the word was used in our record to designate Buddha, I do so, not because it occurs in the Mahāvastu as the name of apparently a somewhat fabulous person, but in recognition of two objections pointed out to me by a friend, who may remain unnamed unless he may come to take any part in the discussion of the record, to the following purport. If the author began his inscription with a word intended to denote Buddha, he must have chosen such a word as by his readers would at once be understood to refer to Buddha; and that cannot apparently be said of the word *sukīti*. Further (and this point has been urged by M. Barth), if *sukīti* does denote Buddha, there is tautology in the description of certain people both as "brethren of Sukīti" and as "kinsmen of Buddha."

For these reasons, I abandon my opinion that there is any reference to Buddha in the word in question. I cannot, however, alter my opinion as to the nature of the compound which we have before us; namely, that it is a Tatpurusha, in which *sukīti* is dependent on *bhātinām*.

M. Senart would hold,— as did, optionally, Professor Bühler (this Journal, 1898. 388),— that in *sukīti-bhātinām* we have a Dvandva, a copulative compound:—"of Sukīti and his brothers." But, if the author had intended to

<sup>1</sup> See Brihat-Samhitā, 57/56. 8.

say that, he would certainly have used a totally different construction, giving us words which would yield:—"of Sukīti, and of his brothers, and of the sisters and children and wives of them."

Again, it has been informally suggested to me that, using a Dvandva, the author may have intended to say:—"of Sukīti and Subhatti (Subhakti)." That would be perfectly legitimate, whether in verse or in prose, from the point of view both of grammar and of construction.<sup>1</sup> But we can, I think, hardly attribute to the author of our record as much grammatical ingenuity as that; here, again, he would almost certainly have used a construction which would yield:—"of Sukīti, and of Subhatti, and of the sisters and children and wives of them."

The compound might of course be a Karmadhāraya, an appositional determinative compound, with *sukīti* qualifying *bhātīnam*:—"of the well-famed brothers." But to me, at least, that seems not appropriate; from any point of view some name is wanted here, to give force to the record.

I can only, as before, take the word as M. Barth takes it; namely, as a Tatpurusha, a dependent determinative compound, pure and simple and of the most common description, in which *sukīti* is dependent on *bhātīnam*, and is so in the sense of the genitive:—"of the brothers of Sukīti."

The question remains:—Who was Sukīti? It is presumed that there is no desire that we should find him in the Sukīrti of the Mahāvastu; that person seems to have lived (if he ever lived at all) somewhat too long ago. What I would suggest, pending our obtaining further light on this point, is as follows. Sukīti was plainly the principal personage of the group referred to in the record. Yet, by the expression "of the brothers of Sukīti," instead of "of Sukīti and his brothers," the text excludes Sukīti himself from any connexion with that which it commemorates; namely, according to my view, the great slaughter of the

<sup>1</sup> There is somewhere a good epigraphic instance of this. But I cannot find it on the spur of the moment; and it is not necessary to spend time in searching for it, because the permissibility of such an arrangement is undeniable.

Sakyas, the kinsmen of Buddha, by king Viḍūḍabha. Tradition tells us (this Journal, 1906. 173) that amongst those who were spared on that occasion there was Mahānāma, the maternal grandfather of Viḍūḍabha. The Mahānāma of this story was a paternal uncle of Buddha. His daughter Vāsabhakhattiyā, the mother of Viḍūḍabha, is styled *Sakyaṛājadhītā*, “daughter of a, or the, Sakya prince.” And some texts seem to represent him (see Hardy, *Manual*, 293) as the successor of Śuddhōdana, the father of Buddha, as the chief of the tribe. It is not at all impossible that Sukīti was the original name of the person who figures as Mahānāma, literally “he of the great name,” in the works from which I took the story, but who appears to be left altogether unnamed in the version of it which is given in the Avadānakalpalatā.

\* \* \* \* \*

We take next the term *salīla-nidhane*, for *salīla-nidhān* = *śarīra-nidhānam*.

M. Senart has expressed the opinion that the use of this term is not compatible with the notion of relics of any ordinary people; because (as I understand him) the word *nidhāna* implies an idea of ‘a treasure, a valuable deposit,’ and *śarīra*, in the sense of ‘a relic or relics,’ is elsewhere found in connexion with the name of Buddha, or with his appellation Bhagavat, the Blessed One.

The word *nidhāna* means ‘a putting or laying down; an act of depositing; a place or receptacle for depositing anything; anything laid up; a store, hoard, treasure, deposit.’ It may be used of anything sacred or not sacred, specially valuable or not so.

In the compound *śarīra-nidhāna*, the first component may represent either the genitive singular,— *śarīrasya nidhānam*, or the genitive plural,— *śarīrāṇāṃ nidhānam*. We have the word *śarīra*, in connexion with Buddha, and otherwise than in composition with a following word, in the singular in, e.g., the Wardak vase inscription (this Journal, 1863. 256, plate, line 1), and the record on the Taxila or Sir-Sukh plate (EI, 4. 55, line 3), and the Mathurā inscription A, ii.

(this Journal, 1894. 533, line 6), and in the plural in, e.g., the Bhaṭṭiprōlu inscriptions I, A, and IV. (EI, 2. 326, 328), and the two inscriptions on the Bīmarān vase (this Journal, 1863. 222, plate, fig. 3).

It is, of course, only by a free translation that we have all been rendering *śarīra*, here and elsewhere, by 'relic' or 'relics.' The word means in the singular 'body,' and in the plural 'limbs or bones.' The difference between the singular and the plural, and the meaning to be given to the latter, are well marked by the narrative of the cremation of the corpse of Buddha given in the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta (this Journal, 1906. 662 ff.): it was *sarīraṃ*, 'the body' of Buddha, that was burnt; and it was *sarīraṇi*, '(some of) the (harder) bones,' which remained unconsumed and were treated as 'relics.' And, in all such cases as those that we have in the inscriptions, the word would be more strictly translated as meaning 'corporeal fragment or fragments.' But the rendering 'relic or relics' has become established, and seems unobjectionable as a convenient free translation.

For the rest, it may be fairly claimed that the kinsmen of Buddha were not exactly ordinary people: a special importance, if not any actual odour of sanctity, attached to them in virtue of their kinship; and neither here nor anywhere else in the discussion must we overlook the point that tradition, as reported by Hiuen-tsiang and indicated by Fa-hian (see this Journal, 1906. 166) claimed that the bones of the slaughtered people were collected and buried. And the use of *śarīra* was not confined to the cases of remains which were to be made sacred objects of worship; in at any rate the Aitarēya-Brāhmaṇa, ed. Haug, 7. 2, we find *śarīraṇi* used to denote the bones, by similar free rendering "the ashes" (translation, 444), of any person who had maintained the sacred household fire.

I can really see no reason why the word *śarīra* should not have been used to denote remains, relics, of the kinsmen of Buddha, just as readily as to denote relics of Buddha himself there was used, in addition to *śarīra*, the word *dhātu* (see, e.g., this Journal, 1906. 883, and note 2, and 895, 904),

which, meaning 'a constituent part, an element,' seems to have derived its free meaning of 'relic' from denoting the constituent parts, including the bones, of the human body.<sup>1</sup> Besides, having regard to the particular nature of our record, it is difficult to see what other word would have suited the author's verse: neither would *dhātu* suit it; nor would *asthi* or *kikasa*, 'bones,' nor any other word, that can be traced, meaning either 'bones' or 'remains' or 'relics.'

\* \* \* \* \*

We come next to the expression *budhasa bhagavate sakiyanam*.

M. Senart has agreed that there is no formal impossibility that *sakiya* might represent *svakīya*. But he has preferred to follow the previous interpreters of the record, and to find here a tribal name. And he has translated these three words as meaning:—"of the blessed Buddha (*of the race*) of the Śākya." So, also, M. Barth has translated them as meaning:—"of the sainted Buddha of the Śākya."

Except in the detail that the text would not give us the form Śākya (see page 112 above), there is no actual impossibility attending such an interpretation; we might (other things permitting) quite well take these words as giving us:—"of the blessed Buddha of the Sakiyas, or of the Śakiyas."

It must, however, be observed that, in prose, such a collocation of words could only mean—(with *sakiyanam* left for the moment untranslated)—"of the *sakiyā* of the blessed Buddha;" and that, to give us the sense desiderated by M. Senart and M. Barth, the author ought to have written *sakiyanam budhasa bhagavate*.

To this it might be replied that we are here dealing with a verse, the framing of which necessitated a placing of the genitives *sakiyanam* and *budhasa* in inverted order.

But there was, in fact, no such necessity. If the author

<sup>1</sup> We have *dhātu* in a passage with two meanings in the Harshacharita, Kashmir text, 370, line 1. From one point of view it there means 'mountain minerals;' from the other it means *laghāni asthīni*, 'the small bones' (commentary),—"the ashes" (trans., Cowell and Thomas, 159);—of king Prabhākara-vardhana.



had wished to give us the meaning “of the blessed Buddha of the Sakiyas, or of the Sākīyas,” he could have done so in unmistakable and strictly correct terms, retaining the grammatical prose order, by framing his last *pāda* thus :<sup>1</sup>—

4, *d*    sākiyā|nām bhāgāvā|te| buddhā|ssā|

Or thus :—

4, *e*    sākī|yānām| bhāgāvāte| buddhā|ssā|

Or, again, while there is no objection to the employment of the genitive plural of a tribal, etc., name in the manner in which M. Senart would take *sakiyanām*, the same sense could have been obtained, and in a certainly more natural way, by the author speaking of Buddha as “the Sakiya, or the Sākīya.” The genitive singular *sakiyassa*, instead of *sakiyānām*, would have suited equally well the scanning of the *pāda* as 4, *a* (page 111 above), and would have stood in a place quite permissible for it in prose; so also *sākīyassa*, instead of *sākīyānām*, would have suited equally well the hypothetical scanning of it as 4, *c*.

However, the author used, not a genitive singular, but a genitive plural. The actual expression given to us by him is *budhasa bhagavate sakiyanām*. And this arrangement of the words, taken as it stands, distinctly makes *budhasa* dependent on *sakiyanām*, not *sakiyanām* on *budhasa*, and indicates that the intended meaning was:—“of the *sakiyā* of the blessed Buddha.”

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

With *budhasa* thus marked, by the arrangement of the words, as dependent on *sakiyanām*, it follows, as I said on the previous occasion (this Journal, 1906. 157), that the base of *sakiyanām* cannot be a proper name. Any such expression as “of the Sakiyas, or Sākīyas, of Buddha” would be inept. It becomes obvious that the base of that word can only be

<sup>1</sup> It need hardly be remarked that, with *bhagavat* simply qualifying *buddha*, any case of *bhagavat* might stand either before or after the appositional case of *buddha*.

a noun or adjective expressing some relationship or connexion of that sort. And we find the required explanation of it (see page 109 ff. above) in the Sanskrit *svakīya*, 'own, belonging to oneself, one's own man, a kinsman.'

As an objection to this, however, M. Senart has claimed that, while *svakīya* might be used in that way with the subject of a sentence, it could not be so used in the phrase which we have before us.

Put into the form of an illustration, this means that we might say in classical Sanskrit:— *Dēvadattaḥ svakīyān=arakshat*; "Dēvadatta protected his own people, his kinsmen;" but we may not say:— *Dēvadattō Buddhasya svakīyān=arakshat*; "Dēvadatta protected the own people, the kinsmen, of Buddha."<sup>1</sup>

But the use of *sva*, *svīya*, *svaka*, *svakīya*, all of which mean 'one's own, belonging to oneself,' and may in any given sentence mean 'one's own people, one's kinsmen,' must have been uniform. In this record, we are not dealing with classical Sanskrit, but with a Prakṛit; and, whereas we have from *svaka* the present vernacular form *sagā* (see page 110 above), it is — (unless my memory betrays me badly) — quite as customary and correct to say in Marāṭhī:— *tō tyāchā sagā bhāū*; "he is that man's full-brother," as it is to say:— *tō ām<sup>a</sup>chā sagā bhāū*; "he is my full-brother." Further, it is questionable whether even in classical Sanskrit the use of *sva*, etc., is as restricted as is claimed. The word *sva* enters into various compounds, such as *dēvasva*, 'the own belongings, the property, of a god,' and *brahmasva*, 'the property of a Brāhmaṇ.' For the construction of sentences in which such terms figure, I will not fall back on epigraphic records, but will quote the following instance from the Mahābhārata, 3. 225:— *Ēsha dharmāḥ paramō yat=svakēna rājā tushyēn=na para-svēshu gridhyēt*; "this is the supreme law, that a king should be content with his own, and should not covet the own belongings, the possessions, of others."

<sup>1</sup> I am using, of course, the customary Dēvadatta, whose lot it has been to be chosen as the subject of so many grammatical illustrations. The Dēvadatta of the Pāli books, though he was a cousin of Buddha, would apparently have done anything to the kinsmen of Buddha rather than protect them.

With such instances before us, we might, I claim, anywhere meet with such a sentence as :— Dēvadattō Buddhasya svakīyān=arakshat (or its vernacular equivalent), or with any phrase analogous to the *budhasa sakīyā*, = *Buddhasya svakīyāḥ*, of our record.

\* \* \* \* \*

The points may be held to remain, that, in the sense of “kinsmen of Buddha,” we might in classical Sanskrit meet more freely with the expression *Buddhasya jñātayaḥ* than with *Buddhasya svakīyāḥ*, and that throughout the Pāli story about the slaughter of the Sakyas (this Journal, 1906. 167 ff.) the words used to denote “kinsmen” are *nāti*, *nātaka*, *nātika*.

The question then arises: that being so, why did not the author of our record use the word *nāti* = *jñāti*?; especially in view of the fact that *nātinam*, in the place of *sakīyānam*, would have suited equally well his last *pāda* scanned as 4, *a* (page 111 above).

The answer may be one of two. It seems to me probable that there had arisen a current term *Buddhasa sakīyā*, “the kinsmen of Buddha,” having its origin in some such habitual expression as :— Buddhaḥ svakīyān=arakshat (or its vernacular equivalent), “Buddha protected his own people, his kinsmen.”

Or there may be another reason. Mr. Thomas has observed (this Journal, 1906. 452) that the record is not only a verse but also a rhyming verse. And *nātinam* would not have given a two-syllable rhyme with *dālānam*; whereas *sakīyānam* gives it.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

We come now to the meaning of the record as a whole. And, to save some inconvenient repetitions, I would point out here again, as on the previous occasion, that, if we

<sup>1</sup> We all know that rhyme plays a considerable part in vernacular Indian poetry. It figures in also Sanskrit lyrical poetry: see remarks by Colebrooke, *Essays*, 2. 58, and Wilson, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 434, *b*; and for some instances see Colebrooke, 68 f., Wilson, 449, and Brown's *Sanskrit Prosody*, 22. And we have a two-syllable rhyme, whether intentional or not, in the verse on the Peshāwar vase (see this Journal, 1906. 453, 714).

exclude from our record the appositional genitives of *sukiti-bhatinam* and *budhasa* which embellish the sense of it but are not in any way essential to the construction, the record reduces itself to:—

**Short text.**

Sukiti-bhatinam iyam salila-nidhane Budhasa sakiyanam.

**Short translation.**

This is a deposit of relics of the brethren of Sukiti, kinsmen of Buddha.

\* \* \* \* \*

In support of one of the leading features of his interpretation, M. Senart has said that there are numerous inscriptions, comparable with this one, especially in the western caves, which determine precisely the function of the opening genitive *sukiti-bhatinam*; because, as far as he remembers, when the subject of a donation is expressed and the word *dāna*, 'a gift,' or *dēyadharmā*, 'an appropriate religious gift,' is not presented,<sup>1</sup> the genitive with which such a record opens always designates the donor.

It might be wished that M. Senart had specified some of the inscriptions which he had in view. I am not able to recall, from amongst any class of inscriptions, any record really analogous to this one in offering an opportunity of so easily altering its meaning by making a simple addition to the text of it. And it does not seem necessary to search a large number of records with a view to discovering any such instance: partly, because we must judge our record as it stands; partly, because, if the author had wished to mark this deposit of relics as one of relics of Buddha given or made by his kinsmen or tribesmen, nothing would have been easier than for him to do so, in one or other of more ways than one.

<sup>1</sup> Or, of course, any other suitable word of that class, or some such term as *pratishṭhāpita*, 'caused to be set up, erected,' or *kārita*, 'caused to be made.'

In the first place, the author might, surely, have written in prose, and so might have used any word or words, or construction, which he could not conveniently handle in a verse.

In the second place, there was nothing in the metre to prevent the author, writing in verse, from beginning the record with *iyam*. He would then have given us either an Upagīti verse with the second *pāda* scanned as 4, *a* (page 111 above), or an Āryā with that *pāda* scanned as 4, *b*, or, hypothetically, as 4, *c*. And that would have given us, in outline:—

Iyam salila-nidhane budhasa sakiyanam sukiti-bhatinam.

Even this text, indeed, is at least capable of being translated thus:—

“This is a deposit of relics of kinsmen of Buddha, the brothers of Sukīti.”

Still, such an arrangement of the words might be held to go far towards indicating an intention that we should “understand,” i.e., supply, something which is not in the text, so as to render it thus:—

“This deposit of relics of Buddha is (*the gift, act, etc.*) of his kinsmen,— *or* of the Sakiyas, *or* Sākiyas,— brothers of Sukīti.”

And, certainly, no reproach attaches to previous translators for having interpreted the record on those lines; considering that, with the belief that the opening word is *iyam*, they had in view, as a guide to the meaning of the record, only the statement in the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta that the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu did enshrine at that place some of the corporeal relics of Buddha. We have only to protest against that understanding of the record being allowed to create a bias strong enough to prevent its being considered from another point of view.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As M. Barth has indicated (*loc. cit.*, 551, note 1), I myself at first translated the record (this Journal, 1905. 680) under the influence of that understanding of it. But I felt, at the time, that that was a strained translation in view of the

In the third place, the author, even beginning with *sukiti-bhatinaṃ*, might have made such a meaning clear by introducing the required word *dāna* itself, by framing his last *pāda*, in the Udḡiti metre, thus:—

4, *f* bhāgāvāṭe | būddhā|ssā dāne | śākiyā|nāṃ |

Or, apparently, using a somewhat unusual metre of the same class, Anugīti,<sup>1</sup> he might have made it run thus:—

4, *g* bhāgāvāṭe | būddhā|ssā dāne | śāki|yānāṃ |

That would have given us, in outline:—

Sukiti-bhatinaṃ iyaṃ salila-nidhane budhasa dane saki-  
yanāṃ.

And then, without having to supply anything, we could translate:—

“Of the brothers of Sukiti, this deposit of relics of Buddha is the gift; of them who are his kinsmen, *or* who are Sakiyas, *or* Sākiyas.”

According, indeed, to another view, it is not necessary either to understand *dāna* or some other word, or to find a means of actually inserting it in the text. Another distinguished Continental scholar, Professor Pischel, has drawn attention (ZDMG, 56, 1902. 157 f.) to the point that the word *kṛiti* is used to mean ‘a work,’ in the sense of a Stūpa, in a certain passage in the Divyāvadāna (see my translation, this Journal, 1906. 889). He has therefore proposed to break up the opening syllables of our record into two separate words, *sukiti* and *bhatinaṃ*, and to take *sukiti* as standing for *sukṛitih*, ‘a good work, a pious foundation.’ And he has thus arrived at the following meaning:—

corrected order of the words. I did not, however, then see exactly how to improve upon it. As I have said elsewhere (this Journal, 1906. 149), I subsequently obtained the required clue from what M. Sylvain Lévi wrote about the record.

<sup>1</sup> See Colebrooke, *Essays*, 2. 138, No. 9. But, is this only a theoretical variety of these metres?

‘This receptacle of relics of the sublime Buddha is the pious foundation of the Śākya, of the brothers with their sisters, with children and wives.’

This, again, could be made to suit the metre perfectly ; because (I understand) the final vowel of the Prākṛit *sukiti* may be taken as either short or long, and so we have only to scan the first *pāda* thus :— *sūkīti| bhātī|nām*, etc.

But, even apart from other points, it is questionable whether the form *sukiti* for *sukṛiti* can be justified for the place and period to which the record belongs (see this Journal, 1906. 153 f.). And it seems unnatural to take the first six syllables of the text as anything except a compound, in which the first member is a proper name or an appellation of that class, and stands for *sukīti* or *sukitti = sukṛiti*.

\* \* \* \* \*

The gist of the matter is this. Are we to take the words of the record precisely as the author gave them to us? Or may we transpose the order of them, and make additions to them, to suit our own views?

Even if it should not be admitted that the author of the record had the option of writing in prose, there was nothing in the metre to prevent him from beginning his text with the words *iyam salīla-nidhānē*. And, even apart from any suggestion deducible from such an arrangement of the text, the metre permitted him to actually introduce the word *dāne*, and so to mark this deposit of relics as one of relics of Buddha given by the other people mentioned in the record.

But the proof is clear and unmistakable that the author actually commenced his text with the word *sukīti-bhātīnam* ; and he did not include *dāne* or any such word. We must surely credit him with sense enough to have known what he was about in doing that, and to have used all the words which he thought necessary to express his meaning clearly. And we must, at least *primâ facie*, accept the text exactly as he gave it to us.

Still, he wrote in verse. And words in a verse do not necessarily follow what would be the proper order of them in prose.

But the best versification, even when rhyme is a feature in it, is always that which adheres most closely to the natural prose order. And, before rearranging the words of a verse and making additions to them, we are bound to consider whether the words of the verse give any proper construction and sense as they stand. The words of this verse do that.

If, however, we treat this verse otherwise, we can find various meanings in it, in addition to that accepted by M. Senart and M. Barth.

Without even any transposition of the words, but by supplying something which is not in the text, we might make this record say, in outline :—

“This deposit of relics of the brothers of Sukīti is (*the gift, act, etc.*) of the kinsmen of Buddha.”

And when once we begin, not only to supply something which is not in the text, but also to transpose the order of the words, we can obtain at least two other interpretations which have not been indicated above. We might say, in outline :—

“This deposit of relics of the kinsmen of Buddha is (*the gift, act, etc.*) of the brothers of Sukīti.”

Or, with an unquestionable use of *sakīya* as = *svakīya*, we should have no difficulty in finding in our text the record of a tribute paid to the memory of his kinsmen by Buddha himself; thus, in outline :—

“This deposit of relics of the brothers of Sukīti, his kinsmen, is (*the gift, act, etc.*) of Buddha.”

Or, following the application given to *sakiyanam* by M. Senart and M. Barth, we might say :—

“This deposit of relics of the brothers of Sukīti is (*the gift, act, etc.*) of the Buddha of the Sakiyas, or Sākīyas.”



But, in order to obtain any of the above meanings or the meaning accepted by M. Senart and M. Barth, we have at least to supply something which is not in the text, even if we do not transpose the order of the text.

On the other hand, the arrangement of the text actually given to us, prominently assigns the first place to the word *sukīti-bhātīnam*. In doing that, it distinctly indicates that that word, and not *buddhassa*, is the genitive which is dependent on the first component of the directly following *salīla-nidhāne = śarīra-nidhānam = śarīraṇām nidhānam*.<sup>1</sup> The phrase *buddhassa sakīyānam* was purposely separated from *sukīti-bhātīnam*, not to tell us anything about the tribe to which Buddha belonged, but to emphasize the reason for which it was found appropriate to enshrine relics of the brothers of Sukīti; namely, because of the fact that they were kinsmen of Buddha. And the phrase does that in a thoroughly grammatical as well as an artistic manner.

\* \* \* \* \*

Taken exactly as they stand, the words of our text distinctly mean, and can only mean, in outline :—

### Short translation.

This is a deposit of relics of the brothers of Sukīti, kinsmen of Buddha.

To account for the record and the Stūpa or memorial mound in which it was found, we have, not only the story of the massacre of the kinsmen of Buddha (this Journal, 1906. 167 ff.), but also the tradition, reported by Hiuen-tsiang and indicated by Fa-hian (ibid., 166), that, “prompted by the gods,” men collected the bones of the slaughtered people and gave them burial, marking the place by one Stūpa according

<sup>1</sup> This is the grammatical construction according to either view of the case. According to the view of M. Senart and M. Barth *buddhassa*, according to my view *sukīti-bhātīnam*, is dependent, not on *salīla-nidhāne*, but on *salīla*. This construction, of case-nouns standing outside a compound and to be construed not with the entire compound but with one of its members, is of frequent occurrence; see Speijer's *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 231.

to Fa-hian, or, according to Hiuen-tsiang, by Stūpas which could be counted by hundreds and thousands.<sup>1</sup>

And in view of the vagueness with which words denoting relationship are used in India and<sup>2</sup> were already used in early times, I can see no objection to taking the *bhāti* = *bhrāṭri* of our record in a wider sense than that of simply actual 'brothers.'

In these circumstances, I can only translate the full record as follows ; with (as compared with my previous translation) the alterations in detail, which I have explained above, in the rendering of *sukīti* and *sabhagiṇīkānaṃ* :—

#### Full translation.

This is a deposit of relics of the brethren of Sukīti, kinsmen of Buddha the Blessed One, with their sisters, with their children and wives.

<sup>1</sup> I have made some remarks on this point in this Journal, 1906. 179. Dr. Grierson, however, has suggested to me that the explanation is that there was one large prominent Stūpa, with a great number of miniature Stūpas, like the "model Stūpas" found in large numbers at Bōdh-Gayā (see, e.g., ASI, 3. 87), lying all about the place.

<sup>2</sup> See remarks by Professor Kielhorn in EI, 8. 30, note 3.