TRANSLATION.

Hail! Prosperity! In the twelfth year of the increasing years of the glorious Dantivarma-Mahārāja, who was the ornament of the Pallava family (and) the lord adorning the Bharadviśa gotra,—the priests of the Tiruvallikkeni (temple) having mortgaged the field in Karumarachcheri, the offering for the god accruing from (?) the interest of forty-live kaṭris of paddy fell short. Pugalittunai-Visāiyarayan gave thirty kaṭris of paddy and five kaṟanjuś of gold, redeemed (the field), and made (it) his own. With two nājis of clean pounded rice (made) from five nājis of paddy, (the interest on) forty-five kaṭris (of paddy) per day, Saṅgasārman, Saṅhasārman and the younger Saṅhasārman shall present the night offering. If (this) fails, we shall present the offering out of the master's share in Avippulam, Dattaṅ's field and Kāraikilān's field. Having agreed that any one concerned in this charity might do what the king could and carry it out, we gave (it). The Ila-lamp, the cup (and) the metal pot have to be taken care of. This (is) Pugalittunai-Visāiyarayan's charity. The two feet of those who protect this (charity) shall be on my head. Hail!

No. 30.—TAXILA VASE INSCRIPTION.

By Professor H. Lüders, Ph.D.; Rostock.

There can be no doubt that the deciphering and interpretation of the smaller Kharaśthi inscriptions has made considerable progress during the last ten or fifteen years. Whoever has had occasion to deal with those records, knows how much we owe in this respect to the ingenuity and penetration of scholars like Bühler, Senart and others. On the other hand, there is no denying the fact that we are still far from having solved all the difficulties presented by those inscriptions. It may be safely asserted, I think, that at present there is hardly a single Kharaśthi inscription the reading and meaning of which might be called definitely settled in every detail. Under these circumstances I consider it not superfluous to republish the subjoined inscription. It is undated and cannot be said to be of great historical value, but it is excellently preserved and perfectly clear in every respect. The accompanying Plate, moreover, contains its first purely mechanical reproduction.

1 Read aia-galaśju. 2 Read iṟu-nāḍi. 3 Read raKaśha. 4 Cancel the letter k. 5 The word kādiyin in l. 10 appears to be used in the sense of kādiyin. 6 Avippulam means literally “oblation field.” The produce from this field was evidently used for oblations.

1 For the explanation of this term see above, Vol. VII. p. 134.
The Taxila Vase.

A. — The Inscription.

Full-Size.

From two inked estampages by Mr. Ram Singh, Lahore.

B. — The Vase.

From photographs by Mr. Ram Singh.

E. Hultzsch.
The inscription is engraved round a steatite vase, which was formerly kept in the Museum at Peshawar and is now in the Central Museum, Lahore. Nothing is known about its origin. Cunningham, it is true, was inclined to identify it with a vase said to be found by the villagers in one of the Stūpas near Shahpur; but this is nothing but a mere guess.

The inscription was first edited, together with a facsimile, in 1863 by J. Dowson in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XX. p. 24, and Plate iii. fig. 2. In the same year Cunningham published his version in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. XXXII. p. 151, and added a correction ibid. p. 172. Cunningham's readings were criticised by Dowson, ibid. p. 428. In 1871 Cunningham edited the record again, with a facsimile, in his Archæological Survey Reports, Vol. II. p. 125, and Plate lix. - The present edition is based on excellent impressions and photographs, sent to me, at the request of Dr. Vogel, by Mr. Ram Singh, Officiating Curator of the Central Museum, Lahore.

TEXT.
Sihi1ena Siharachhitena cha bhrrarcheti Takhaśilāe ayaś thuvo pratithavito savabudhana puyae.

TRANSLATION.
By the brothers Sihila (Siñhila) and Si1arachhita (Siñharakshita) this Stūpa was erected at Takhaśilā (Takshasila), in honour of all the Buddhas.

REMARKS.
The characters, which vary in size from \(\frac{1}{4}\)" to \(\frac{1}{2}\)" take an intermediate position between those of the Asoka edicts and those of the later Kushan inscriptions. From the latter they are easily distinguished by the absence of the cursive element so strongly predominant there. The differences from the Asoka characters are less numerous and less marked; but the la with its hook bent down and rounded and the sa with its vertical shortened at the top show clearly later forms than the corresponding letters at Shāhbazgarhi and Mansehra. The type of the characters is thus the same as that of the Taxila copper-plate of Patika, and this fact seems to me decisive for the transliteration of the only nasal occurring in the present inscription. From a grammatical point of view it might appear more natural to read Sihilena, Siharachhitena and savabudhana; but as the copper-plate inscription discriminates between na and \\

In the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1906, p. 453, Mr. Thomas has endeavoured to show that the inscription is composed in an unknown metre. He considers the whole text to be one stanza divided into two rhyming lines, each line consisting of five feet of five mētrās with a concluding spondee. According to him the text, with the long vowels and double consonants expressed in writing, would run:—

Sihilena Siharachhitena cha  
ayaś thuvo pratīṭhāvītō  
bhrrārēhi Takhaśilāe  
savabuddhāna puyē  

It appears at once that the regularity of the metre is less great than supposed by Mr. Thomas. His scansion is based on the wrong readings Sihilena and bhrratēhi. The correct readings Sihilena, which can only stand for Sihilena, and bhrratēhi would imply that
the first and third feet of the first line consisted, not of five, but of six matras, although, as regards the third foot, it might be urged that the lengthening influence of the initial bhr was removed by the cæsura standing between cha and bhraaareci. Moreover, neither the choice nor the order of the words are such as to suggest the text to be anything but plain prose. Considering these facts, Mr. Thomas’ suggestion, ingenious as it is, cannot be called certain, and until the metre assumed by him should turn up elsewhere, I should prefer to treat the record as written in prose.

No. 31.—Soraiikkavur Plates of Virupaksha;
Saka-Samvat 1308.

By T. A. Gopinatha Rao, M.A.; Madras.

These plates were discovered at Soraiikkavur near Kuttalam, a station on the South Indian Railway in the Tanjore district. Mr. O. N. Appasvami Ayyar of Tanjore was kind enough to obtain for me the original plates themselves, and I have copied the inscription direct therefrom.

The inscription is engraved on three copper-plates, held together by a ring which had already been cut when it came into my hands. The plates are about 6½” long, 4” broad, and 1½” thick. The ring is 1” in diameter, and the whole set weighs 16½ ozs. with the ring, which alone weighs 3½ oz. The rims of the plates are neither raised nor shaped thicker. The plates are numbered in Tamil numerals engraved at the top of the front side of each.

The writing is deep and distinct, and barring slight damage to the front side of the first plate and the second side of the last one—the two exposed sides—the inscription is in proper preservation; nor is there much difficulty in supplying the lost portions.

The inscription consists of twelve Sanskrit verses which give the genealogy of prince Virupaksha, a passage in Tamil prose (lines 39-150) detailing the apportionment of the shares of land granted among the donees, and the customary benedictory and imprecatory verses in Sanskrit. Following the above, and at the very end, there appears a solitary verse in Sanskrit, once again mentioning the name and the parentage of the donor.

With the exception of the colophon, which consists of the name of the god Sri-Harihara and is in Kanarese characters, the alphabet of the Sanskrit verses is Grantha. The prose passage is in Tamil characters occasionally interspersed with Grantha ones. It deserves to be mentioned that, as in other Tamil inscriptions of the age to which the plates belong, there is little difference between r and the secondary form of a; the secondary a, o, ai and au are very frequently broken up, the first symbol of them standing at the end of a line and the rest at the beginning of the next line, or again the first symbol and the consonant being placed at the end of a line and the second symbol beginning a new line, and so on; e.g. syā in line 23, bhā in line 115, hyā in line 116, vā in line 132, mā in line 138, bā in line 146; de in line 15, ne in line 28; ko in line 129; raś in line 53, kai in line 128; dhas in line 13, daw in line 164. In line 70 the lu of padindukku is engraved below the line; in line 57 the letter ku is corrected into the symbol of the secondary a; and in line 26 visaras is written as pāsaras. The Grantha letter ṇ is used for the Tamil ā in the words upadā and Āṭi occurring in lines 68, 121 and 138.

The inscription belongs to the time of Virupaksha (v. 5) or Vira-Viruppana-Udaiyar (l. 43 f.), the son of Harihara (II.) (v. 4) or Vira-Harihararāya (l. 42) of the first Vijayanagara dynasty, and records the grant of the village of Siraikkavur (v. 10, l. 53 f. and 60 f.) together with 10¹⁄₄ velis¹ of land adjoining it, under the name of Vijayasudarsanapuram, to

¹ In the Tamil portion this is given as 10¼ velis (l. 52 f. and 67 f.).
fourteen Brāhmaṇas of various gotras. This is the second copper-plate grant hitherto published of Virūpākṣa, the son of Harihara II. of the first Vijayanagara dynasty. It is dated in Śaka 1308, the Kṣaya-saṅvat-sara,—i.e. two years later than his Álampūṇḍī grant.1 Professor Kielhorn very kindly contributes the following remarks on the date (v. 8 f. and ll. 45-49):—

"The date, for Śaka-saṅvat 1308 expired, which was the year Kṣaya, regularly corresponds to Wednesday, the 20th March A.D. 1387. On this day the 15th tithi of the dark half of Phalgunī and the karaṇa Nāga ended 7 h. 35 m., the nakṣatra was Rēvati for 19 h. 3 m., and the ṣūkṣma Vaidhrīti from 6 h. 6 m., after mean sunrise. The day was the 25th day of the solar month Paṅguni (Chaitra)."

Both the Álampūṇḍī and Śoraikkāvūr grants resemble each other so far as the historical details contained in them are concerned. As in the earlier grant, the present record begins with Saṅgama, the reputed founder of the dynasty, and continues the succession down to Virūpākṣa, the donor of this grant. Herein again Rāmakshi, the wife of Saṅgama, and Mallādevī, the wife of Harihara II., are referred to. While in the Álampūṇḍī grant Mallādevī is spoken of simply as belonging to 'the family of Rāmadēva,' in the present record she is described as his 'grand-daughter' (son's daughter) in the beginning (v. 5); but the verse at the end (17), which occurs also in the Sanskrit drama Nārāyaṇīvīlāsa by Virūpākṣa, makes Mallādevī the daughter of king Rāma. In a supplementary note on the Álampūṇḍī grant, Rai Bahadur V. Venkayya expressed the opinion that Mallādevī may have been the daughter of the Yadava king Rāmachandra. Adverting to this Mr. R. Sewell writes as follows:4—

"The plate in question asserts that Mallādevī belonged to 'the race of Rāmadēva,' while the drama (Nārāyaṇīvīlāsa) explicitly declares her to have been the daughter of king Rāma, calling Virūpākṣa the 'daughter's son of king Rāma; ' and from this Mr. Venkayya deduces that the lady in question was the daughter of king Rāmachandra of the family of the Yadavas of Dēva-giri. But I think it far more likely that the plate is correct and the drama incorrect. Rāmachandra reigned from A.D. 1271 to 1309, his death occurring in the latter year. The reign of Harihara II. of Vijayanagara began, probably, in 1379 A.D. and lasted till the end of 1399, when he died. It seems quite impossible that he could have married a daughter of king Rāmachandra, and therefore I think we must assume that his wife Mallādevī, or Mallambikā, though she may have been 'of the race of,' was not the daughter of, king Rāma,—if Rāma was identical with Rāmachandra of Dēvagiri."

The present plates add a further relationship, viz. that Virūpākṣa was the son of the son's daughter (pautrī) of Rāmadēva. If we think with Mr. Sewell that the drama is perhaps wrong, we may conclude that Virūpākṣa was the great-grandson of king Rāmachandra.

In the present record Virūpākṣa seems to make the grant as a provincial governor, perhaps with the consent of his father; for the Śaka year 1308 falls in the reign of Harihara II.5 From an inscription belonging to the Shimoga district we learn that Harihara died in the

1 Above, Vol. III. p. 224 f.
2 Report on Sanskrit and Tamil Manuscripts by the late M. Seshagiri Sastri, No. I. p. 90.
5 I would suggest another solution of the puzzle. Rāmachandra of Dēvagiri (the Rāmadēva of verse 5) may have had an (otherwise unknown) son named Rāmahūpati (verse 17), who was the father of Mallādevī, the mother of Virūpākṣa.—E.H.
6 In the Tiruvilimilalai temple there are two inscriptions dated Śaka 1305 and 1307, which belong to the reign of Harihara II., and in which his son Virūpākṣa is mentioned as ruling the country. The first inscription records a grant of land by the headmen of the village, and the second states that a certain Munayādarsaīyan made a gift of land for a flower-garden. Tiruvilimilalai is only a mile distant from Tiruppāmburam mentioned in our record.