

J. HARMATTA

NEW EVIDENCES FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY MEDIEVAL NORTHWESTERN INDIA

I

In the volume containing the summaries of the papers, the participants of the XXVIth International Orientalist Congress, held in New Delhi between the 4th and 10th January, 1964, could read with interest the statement of H. Humbach and R. Göbl,¹ according to which the latter scientist succeeded in discovering two inscriptions, which place the question of the chronology of Kaniška in a new light. According to the summary one of the inscriptions contains Arabic and Bactrian text, while the other represents a Sanskrit-Bactrian bilingual text. In the inscriptions — with the exception of the Arabic text — dating can be found. Especially interesting is the Sanskrit-Bactrian bilingual inscription, inasmuch as in this dating according to two different eras can be observed. The authors think that the Sanskrit text was dated according to the Saka Era, while the Bactrian text uses a time-reckoning different from this which could be called Bactrian Era. According to their opinion the dating of the Surkh Kotal inscriptions was also made according to this Bactrian Era, and on this basis their absolute chronological position can be determined. Finally they also assume that this newly discovered «Bactrian Era» is identical with the Kaniška Era.

The paper of H. Humbach and R. Göbl was actually read on the 5th January 1964 in the afternoon,² but the results described in it were considerably different from the conceptions of the summary in several points. It seems, that the results of the authors at the time of the sending in of the summary were still in a rather liquid state. At any rate from the paper it has become clear that we have to deal not with two, but with three inscriptions the first of which contains Arabic and Bactrian text, and in the Bactrian text a dating relating to the 635th year of an era can be read. The second inscription is a Sanskrit-Bactrian bilingual text, in which the Sanskrit version contains a dating relating to the 38th year of an era, while the Bactrian text contains a dating relating to the 612th year of an era different from the former. Finally the third

¹ Summaries of Papers. Ed. by R. N. DANDEKAR. Delhi 1964. 126 foll.

² In section 6/D (Indology. History and Culture), under the title «The Date of Kanishka in the Light of a Sanskrit-Bactrian Bilingual».

inscription is an Arabo-Sanskrit bilingual one in the Arabic text of which the dating Hīgra 243 occurs, while its Sanskrit text contains a dating relating to the 32nd year of an era.

According to Humbach's argumentation, starting out from the dating of the Arabic text, the beginning of the era used in the Bactrian text can easily be determined. If the 32nd year of the era used in the Sanskrit text corresponds to the 243rd year of the Hīgra, or to 857 A. D., then in the Sanskrit-Bactrian bilingual the 38th year of the era used in the Sanskrit text will correspond to 862 A. D. Subtracting from this the 612 years of the era used in the Bactrian text, we shall get 250 A. D., as the beginning of the «Bactrian Era». According to Humbach's opinion the «Bactrian Era» is identical with the Kaniṣka Era, and thus we ought to date the beginning of the reign of Kaniṣka to 250 A. D.³

As it became clear in the course of the discussion following the lecture, the specialists participating at the session of the section received Humbach's conception with definite scepticism, and on the one hand they doubted the bilingual character of the inscriptions (thus for example Mme. J. van Lohuizen, Dutch professor), and on the other hand they held the supposed identity of the «Bactrian Era» and the Kaniṣka Era unestablished. After this, the next day a summary of Humbach's paper appeared in the «Daily Bulletin» the conception of which again considerably differed from the paper, as well as from the summary printed in advance. The new element in the text of the summary was that Humbach now already presumed a «Bactrian Era» beginning in 251 A. D., which according to him was to eternize the victory won by the Sassanians over the Kuṣāṇas, and thus the middle of the IInd century A. D. renders itself as the starting date of Kaniṣka's reign.⁴

It is not known, whether in the drawing up of the summary the intention of H. Humbach asserted itself, or it was Mrs. R. Thapar, secretary of the section, who simply drew the conclusions necessarily resulting from the critical remarks. The recent assumption, according to which the *raison d'être* of the «Bactrian Era» was the victory of the Sassanians over the Kuṣāṇas, supports rather the first possibility. At any rate, the main thesis of Humbach's lecture, according to which the «Bactrian Era» occurring in the described inscriptions is identical with the Kaniṣka Era, and thus the beginning of the reign of Kaniṣka can be placed to 250/251 A. D., can already be omitted.⁵

³ On the basis of my notes prepared at the session.

⁴ Cf. «Daily Bulletin» 5th January 1964, International Congress of Orientalists XXVI Session, New Delhi, 9–10. The text of the summary is as follows: «Two inscriptions the Peshawar Museum found in the Tuchi agency of the north-west throw light on the history of the Seythian domination in Bactria and India. The calculation of the eras referred to in these inscriptions relates to the date of Kanishka, one of the yet unsettled major problems of ancient Indian chronology. A Bactrian era of A. D. 251 was suggested perhaps to commemorate the Sassanian victory over the Kushans, and this would strengthen a date in the mid-Second Century A. D. as a possible date for Kanishka.»

⁵ H. HUMBACH read a paper at the XXVI. International Congress of Orientalists also on the 5th January 1964 in the forenoon in the Section of Iranian Studies, entitled «New

Although thus the great expectation which hoped from the above-mentioned inscriptions the solution of the chronology of Kaniska, proved to be idle, still the discovery of Bactrian records written in Greek letters in the Indus Valley deserves great interest. Therefore a great service was rendered to science by Ahmad Hasan Dani, professor of the Peshawar University, when he published the inscriptions⁶ with the cooperation of R. Göbl and H. Humbach, and hereby he made their study available for a broader circle of scholars.

Altogether four inscribed stones have been published, and these contain 2 Arabic, 2 Sanskrit, and 3 Bactrian inscriptions.⁷ All the stones have been found in the territory of the Tochi Agency, between Idak and Spinwam, west of Bannu, and at present are kept in the Peshawar Museum. The inscribed stones were described already in 1946 by M. A. Shakoor,⁸ but stone «A» containing Arabic and Sanskrit inscriptions was studied still earlier by M. H. Kuraishi and M. Shafi,⁹ moreover the former also published the reading of the Sanskrit inscription given by H. Sastri. According to the card-index of the Peshawar Museum H. Sastri deciphered a few words from the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B», too.¹⁰

In the above-mentioned publication the Arabic and Sanskrit inscriptions were in charge of A. H. Dani, while the Bactrians were described by R. Göbl and H. Humbach. A. H. Dani completed the interpretation of the Arabic inscription given by Kuraishi and Shafi with the remarks of Haji Muhammad Idris, professor of Arabic at the Peshawar University, and he also corrected the interpretation of the Sanskrit inscriptions given by Sastri, in several points.

As for the historical background of the inscriptions, A. H. Dani thinks that the construction of a tank on part of the Arab official mentioned in the Arabic text clearly shows the consolidation of the Arab rule in the region of Idak and Spinwam as from 856/857 A. D. According to his opinion, however, the local ruler continued to be in his office also under the Arab rule, and this

Materials on Bactrian Language». It appears that in this he dealt also with the explanation of the Tochi inscriptions, but regarding this we do not find any nearer foothold either in the summary of the lecture printed in advance (Summaries of Papers. 35), or in the «Daily Bulletin» (5th January 1964. 4). I had no opportunity to attend this lecture of HUMBACH's.

⁶ A. H. DANI—H. HUMBACH—R. GÖBL: Tochy Valley Inscriptions in the Peshawar Museum. Ancient Pakistan (Bulletin of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar) 1 (1964) 125—135. I express my gratitude to Dr. L. BESE, Director of the Oriental Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, who drew my attention to this publication.

⁷ A. H. DANI speaks only about three inscriptions, because he believes that we have to do with bilingual inscriptions.

⁸ M. A. SHAKOOR: A Handbook to the Inscriptions Gallery in the Peshawar Museum. Peshawar 1946. It is inaccessible for me.

⁹ M. H. KURAISHI: A Kufic Sarada inscription from the Peshawar Museum. Epigraphia-Indo-Moslemica. 1925—26. 27—28. It is inaccessible for me. M. SHAFI: هندو-سینا قدیمہ سنہ ۸۵۶ء کی کتبہ. Similarly inaccessible for me.

¹⁰ Cp. A. H. DANI: *op. cit.* 126.

explains why besides the Arabic inscription, also Sanskrit and Bactrian texts appear. According to Dani the title of the local ruler appearing in the Sanskrit and Bactrian inscriptions is *nṛpa* in Sanskrit, and *ṣahi*, *kuzula* or *kuzana*¹¹ and the descendant of *Fromo* in Bactrian, and his name in the Sanskrit variant is *Navīna Candra Phruma*, son of *Khojana*, and in the Bactrian variant *Gomo ṣahi*. Regarding the question, to which historical dynasty the local ruler can be ranged, Dani raises also two possibilities. On the one hand he thinks that the rulers bearing the title *ṣahi* belong to one of the branches of the old *Kuṣāṇa ṣahi* kings of Gandhāra. On the other hand, however, he considers possible that they are identical with the rulers of Zābulistān, who bore the title *ratbil*, and he wants to trace back the latter word to *ratna-pāla*.¹²

H. Humbach and R. Göbl complete A. H. Dani's conclusions with the assumption that the beginning of the Bactrian Era used in Tochi falls on 230 A. D., when the delegation of the Kuṣāṇa king Po-t'iao paid a visit to the Chinese Court. For the time being the authors do not decide, whether the Bactrian Era beginning in 230 A. D. was introduced by Po-t'iao after the return of his delegation, or by one of his rivals, who in the meantime achieved some results.¹³

Even if temporarily we disregard the interpretation of the inscriptions, at any rate a series of considerations arise immediately concerning the historical explanation connected with them. As it becomes clear from the arguments of A. H. Dani, the inscriptions can by no means be regarded as bilingual or trilingual texts, because according to the Arabic inscription an Arab official had built a tank, while according to the Sanskrit inscription a *nṛpa* named Navīna Candra Phruma, and according to the Bactrian inscription a certain *ṣahi* Gomo eternized a certain establishment of his. We can, of course, imagine that in the Indian territories under Arab rule Arabo-Sanskrit bilingual inscriptions were prepared. In this case, however, the texts of the inscriptions in different languages should be identical in their contents. It is, however, quite unlikely that besides the inscription of an Arab governor the local ruler should have carved his own inscription with identical or similar contents, or that he should attribute to himself the establishment eternized in the Arabic inscription. In fact in the case of stone «A» from the Sanskrit text only the dating could be read, while on the Arabo-Bactrian «bilingual» stone «C/1» the Arabic inscription could not at all be deciphered. Thus, as a matter of fact, it cannot be proved that the text or content of the inscriptions was identical. It can also easily be imagined that the Sanskrit text on stone «A», and the Bactrian text on stone

¹¹ DANI brings also the place names *Khazana* and the the form *Khojana* into connection with the name *Kuṣāṇa*. This, however, is unacceptable from the the viewpoint of phonological development.

¹² A. H. DANI: *op. cit.* 126—127.

¹³ H. HUMBACH—R. GÖBL: *op. cit.* 135.

«C/1» was carved in only later on, and that they with regard to their contents are not in connection with the Arabic text. We could most easily regard the Sanskrit and Bactrian inscriptions of stone «B» as bilingual texts, but these according to the reading and interpretation of the authors differ from each other in such a degree that they cannot be held bilingual either.

The historical conceptions attached to the Tochi inscriptions — even if we disregard the correctness of the reading and linguistic interpretation of the inscriptions — must therefore be held unlikely already in advance. But in order to make a correct picture of the historical background of the inscriptions, we have also to examine their reading and their interpretation, inasmuch as this is possible on the basis of the unsatisfactory photographic reproductions.

II

The stone bearing inscription «A» was found in 1907 (Shakoor No. 49) A. H. Dani does not give its nearer site. On the stone above there is an Arabic inscription consisting of 9 lines, and under the same a Sanskrit inscription consisting of 5 lines follows. Since on the published photograph (see Fig. 1) the lower part of the stone cannot be seen, it cannot be stated whether the Sanskrit inscription also originally consisted of only 5 lines, or the lower part of the stone was broken off, and thus part of the inscription is missing.

The style of writing of the Arabic inscription can be defined as *kūfī*, which, however, shows to some extent the effect of the *nashī* style. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine the exact form of the letters on account of the poor quality of the photographic reproduction. For a similar reason the reading of the inscription is difficult in several points. Besides this the uncertain readings of those, who studied the inscription in original, point to the fact that also the stone is considerably worn off, and as a result of this certain parts of the letter forms have disappeared. What we can see of the inscription on the photograph under a magnifying glass, is represented by the autography prepared by me, and the letter forms determined in a similar way are shown on the table of script (Figs 2 and 3). We also have to remark that according to the statement of Dani the inscription does not use dots for the distinction of the letters with identical form. On the other hand, however, on the photograph in certain cases, thus in line 2 on the letters *qāf*, *bā*, and *nūn* we can clearly observe the use of dots. If the photograph does not mislead me, and this is really so, then the inscription in general follows the practice of the early *kūfī* inscriptions, according to which in certain cases the dots were used.¹⁴

^{13a} [For technical reasons, the Figs referred in the text will be published in the continuation of this paper appearing under the title «Late Bactrian Inscriptions» in the forthcoming number of the *Acta Antiqua*. — Editor.]

¹⁴ See for example V. A. КРАСКОВСКАЯ: Эпиграфика Востока 6 (1952) 46 ff., Pls. III, V—VI.

The text of the Arab inscription of stone «A» can be read as follows:

line 1 *hd' m' 'mr 'qd hd'*
 2 *'l-tl'h qy bn 'm'r tq' b'l*
 3 *'lh mnh sl[']h' '[m]'lh*
 4 *wgf'r' lh sqy g' dth*
 5 *k't'b ywm 'l'gm'h ll'lh*
 6 *'srh hlwn mn 'gm'dy*
 7 *'l-'hrh fy' snh ll'lh w'rb'wn*
 8 *wm'y't'n' sly 'l' 'ly' m'hd*
 9 *w'l m'hd 'l-'ms'[t]y*

Remarks on the reading

Line 1. Instead of *hd'* standing at the end of the line M. Shafi gives the reading *bn'[']*, but on the basis of the photograph the reading *hd'* can be regarded as quite sure (thus correctly also A. H. Dani), and beside the verb 'aqada' 'to prepare a structure' the occurrence of the verb *banā* 'to construct' seems also superfluous. M. H. Kuraishi after the word 'mr did not read anything.

Line 2. In the beginning of the line A. H. Dani gives the reading *'l-tl'h hyy*. The reading and explanation of the word *tl'h* originates from H. M. Idris. On the basis of the photograph the reading can be held certain. After the word *tl'h*, however, there is no other *h* or *h*, but before the word *bn* only two combined letters can be seen. Of these the head of the upper one is considerably curved and is supplied with two dots, thus it can be read clearly as *qāf*. The reading 'm'r originates from M. Shafi.

Line 4. A. H. Dani reads this line as *w'f' lh sw['] wqdr 'mlh*, noting that instead of *f'* others read *g'fr*, and that the reading of *sw[']* originates from M. Shafi. From the viewpoint of the interpretation of the text it is absolutely indifferent, whether we count in the text with the verbs 'afā' 'extinguish, forgive', or *qafara* 'forgive', and the character of writing of the two words also differs only in the last letter. On the basis of the photograph, however, the reading *r* seems to be more likely.

Dani gives the following translation of the whole line: «and forgive his sinful deeds!». The reading of the line, however, does not correspond to this interpretation. The text given by Dani could be translated as follows: «and he should forgive him the wickedness and should appreciate his activity!». In this case, however, from the linguistic point of view the difficulty arises that before the word *sū* 'wickedness, sin' the article, or after it the pronominal suffix *-hū* is missing. From the palaeographic point of view the main difficulty of this reading is that on the photograph no trace of the *r* in the word *qdr* can be seen,

and besides that the letters presumed after the word *lh* cannot find enough room in the line. All these linguistic and palaeographic difficulties are solved by the observation that the letter following after *s* cannot be *wāw*, because it is linked to the left. Thus we can read it only *qāf*, after which traces of a *yā* can be seen. After this, quite clearly, *ḡ* can be read after which an *ṣ/d* and an *ālif* follows. Hereafter again the traces of *ṣ/d* or eventually *qāf* can be seen, after which traces of a *t/n/y*, and a somewhat damaged *hā* can be deciphered. Thus on the basis of the photograph the most likely reading seems to be *ṣqy ḡd'ḏth*.

Line 5. At the beginning of the line M. H. Kuraishi read *k'n*, and A. H. Dani at the end of the line gives the reading *'l-ḡm'th bllth* (or *bllt*). The reading of Kuraishi (= *kāna* 'to happen, to take place') would fit into the context, and the middle letter is so indistinct, that in place of *tā* we could also think about *ālif*, but the last letter can by no means be *nūn*, because in this case it ought to reach under the line. Thus it is definitely more correct to read this *bā*. In contradiction to Dani's reading, on the photograph the correct form *'l-ḡm'h* is clearly seen. Similarly at the end of the line as against Dani's form *bllth* the correct reading is *llth* beyond any doubt.

Line 7. Dani gives the following reading of this line: *'l'wly snth llth w'rb'yn*. Against this reading already in advance doubts are raised by such incorrect linguistic forms, as *snth*, *llth*, and *'rb'yn*, as well as by the incorrect grammatical structure of the dating, inasmuch as in its beginning the preposition *fī* is missing. In fact, if we examine the photograph, we can state immediately that on the stone the forms *snh* and *llth* can be read. Although the end of the word *'rb'wn* is very indistinct, and only the left upper part of the *wāw* is seen, the fact that this letter remnant has to be read *wāw*, and not *yā*, is still made doubtless by the circumstance that the unlinked form of the *nūn* stands at the end of the word. As regards the absence of the preposition *fī*, in connection with this we can state the following: Between the letters *'l* and the word *snh* there is such a large space that even 5 to 6 letters can find room in it. The letters *hrh*, the remnants of which can be seen on the photograph left of the *lām-ālif* in the form of dark strokes (otherwise the letters on the photograph appear mostly as white strokes), reach up to the place, where a horizontal white stroke can be seen. The *hā* rests on the left part of this white stroke, and the lower part of the *rā* curving to the left crosses the right part of the same white stroke. Right of the white stroke, in the form of a dark stroke, we can clearly enough discern the form of the *hā*. By this the reading *'l'wly* of the earlier interpreters of the inscription can be excluded. Left of the white stroke on the photograph a white dot can be seen. If we examine this under a magnifying glass, above it we can see the upper part of a *fā* in the form of dark strokes. And from the left side of the white dot a semicircle starts out downwards, similarly in the form of a dark stroke. We have to remark that between the

6th and 7th lines above the letters *rh fy* there is a dark stroke with several ramifications. This is obviously a scratch independent from the inscription, or a chipping out of the stone. Thus in conclusion the correct reading of the passage in question will be as follows: 'l-*hrh fy snh llh w'rb'wn*.

Line 8. In the beginning of the line A. H. Dani gives the reading *wm'yty*. On the basis of the photograph this reading seems to be possible, but in this case we ought to presume a clerical error, because the correct form of the word is *m'yt'n*. This difficulty is solved, if we examine the photograph under a magnifying glass: the short vertical line read *yā* discernibly continues upwards in the form of a vague dark stroke, and thus it can be interpreted as *ālif*. At the end of the line the letters 'ly *mḥmd* appear in the form of dark strokes.

Line 9. In this Dani gives the reading 'l-*t'hryn* originating from M. Shafi, while the reading of M. H. Kuraishi was 'l-*mṣṭfy*. Of the two readings the latter seems to be acceptable, because on the photograph the letters 'l-*mṣ. y* are fairly well discernible. It would be also imaginable that instead of the only partly visible *mīm* we should read *ṣād*, but the letter following hereafter can by no means be read as *ālif*. Thus the reading 'l-*t'hryn* must in any case be excluded.

Remarks on the interpretation of the inscription

Line 2. The explanation of the word *tl'h* (or *tl'h*, *tl'ḡ* and *tl'h*, *tl'h* *tl'ḡ* respectively) is difficult. According to H. M. Idris the form *tl'h* is the arabized form of the Urdu word *tālāb* 'water-reservoir, pond, tank'.¹⁵ This opinion has, however, serious difficulties. Urdu *tālāb* is the adoption of the New Persian word *talab*, but this borrowing is in all probability much later, than the IXth century from which the inscription originates. Besides this, if this word would have been adopted by Arabic either from Urdu, or from New Persian itself, it is entirely incomprehensible, why would it have been arabized in the forms *talāḥ*, *talāḥ*, or *talāḡ*. Thus we must regard the explanation of H. M. Idris as unacceptable.

We do not get a satisfactory solution even, if instead of the form *tālāb* we start out from *talao*, which is held by A. H. Dani a variant of the former word. The Urdu dictionaries actually contain such a word the more precise form of which they give in *tālāw* and *tālāo*.¹⁶ This word, however, is not at all in

¹⁵ Cp. J. T. PLATTS: A Dictionary of Urdū, Classical Hindī, and English.² Moscow 1959. تالاب *tālāb* 'pond, pool, tank, reservoir of water'; А. П. БАРАННИКОВ: Урду-русский словарь. Moscow 1951. 185: تالاب *tālāb* 'пруд, резервуар, водоем'; Z. ANSARI: Урду-русский словарь. Moscow 1964. 237: تالاب *talāb*. 'водоем, пруд, бассейн'.

¹⁶ See J. T. PLATTS: *op. cit.*, who holds the word being of Hindi origin.

connection with the word *tālāb*, but it belongs to the old elements of the vocabulary of the Indian languages. Thus it is doubtless that the form *tālā'o* would also not have been adopted by Arabic in the forms **talāḥ(un)*, **talāḥ(un)*, or **talāḡ(un)*, but its phonemic form would be also in Arabic **tala'(un)*, and its written form **tl'*.

It seems at any rate likely that the word *tl'h* is some local phrase, because neither of the possible interpretations of its written form can be explained from Arabic. Taking into consideration the possible interpretations of the written form of the word given above, the reading *tl'ḡ* is obviously to be connected with the Sanskrit word *taḍāga-* 'lake, tank, artificial pond'. The Sanskrit word has a rich variety of forms (*taṭāka-*, *taṭākinī-*, *taḍaga-*, *taḍāka-*), and it is widely spread in Middle Indian (cf. Pāli *taḷāka-*), and New Indian (cp. Hindi *talāu* = *tālā'o* mentioned above, etc.).¹⁷ Whether we start out from the Sanskrit *taḍāga-*, or from the Middle Indian form **talāga-*, in Arabic the adoption of either of them must occur in the form **talāg(un)*, or later **talāḡ(un)*. Therefore, the word *tl'g* occurring in the inscription is undoubtedly the adoption or eventually transliteration of a local Indian word *taḍāga-* or *talāga-* 'artificial pond, tank'.

Line 4. Above we have already referred to the difficulties encountered by A. H. Dani's interpretation of the end of the line. All these are eliminated by the proposed new reading of the text. We can identify the reading *s/šqy* with the word *šaḡīy* 'unfortunate, mean, wicked', and the form *ḡd'dt-* with the word *ḡaḍāḍa* 'absence, mistake, blemish'. Thus the meaning of the whole line will be as follows: «and he should forgive him his mean blemish!».

Line 5. The phrase *l'ltḥ 'šrh hlwn mn ḡm'dy 'l-'hrh* «when 13 (nights) from (the month) *ḡumādā l-āḡira* elapsed» resulting from the new reading corresponds fairly well to the usual Arabic indication of time, cf. for example *li-sab'i layālin ḡalauna min ḡa'bāna* «when 7 nights from (the month) *ḡa'bān* elapsed».

Line 9. A. H. Dani translates the line, read by him *w'l mḡmd 'l-ḡhryn*, as follows: «(Muḡammad), the chosen, and his descendants». This translation, however, does not correspond to the reading at all, since the meaning of the word *ḡāḡir* is not 'chosen', but 'pure', and besides this it is not clear either, how the genitive plural *aṭ ḡāḡirīna* can be fitted into the context. All these difficulties disappear as a result of the reading *'l-mḡṭfy*. Dani probably adopted the translation of Kuraishi, who read this passage in this way, and he did not notice that his own reading about which he does not tell, from where it originates, does not correspond to this translation.

¹⁷ Cp. M. MAYRHOFER: Kurzfassstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. I. Heidelberg 1956. 470.

On the basis of the aboves we can interpret the inscription as follows:

- line 1 «This is, what he ordered to be built — this is
 2 that tank — Qayy bn 'Amār. May accept
 3 Allāh from him his pious deed
 4 and forgive him his mean blemish!
 5 Written on Friday (*yaum al-ġum'a*), when
 6 13 (nights) elapsed from (the month) *Ġumādā*
 7 *l-āhira*, in the 243rd year.
 8 May Allāh bless Muḥammad
 9 and the progeny of Muḥammad, the chosen!»

In connection with the structure and style of the inscription we can remark in addition that the absence of the *basmala*-formula in the beginning of the inscription — in contradiction to the statement of A. H. Dani — is not at all surprising. It is frequently missing exactly on early inscriptions, thus *e. g.* on the famous inscription of the *Qubbat aš-šahra* at Jerusalem. The whole style of the inscription follows well the formulae and structure of the contemporary Arabic inscriptions. The conclusive formula can be regarded as a variant of the well known blessing *ṣalla-llāhu 'alayhi wasallama*.

The dating of the inscription caused many problems to A. H. Dani, as well as to H. Humbach and R. Göbl. On the basis of the erroneous readings *bllth* and *'l-wly* of lines 5 and 7, Dani interpreted the text as follows: «It was recorded on Friday, the thirteenth day of Jumādā I». As it becomes clear from this interpretation, he disregarded the word *halauna*, which in the structure *bllth 'srh hlen* has really no meaning, and he identified *yaum al-ġum'a* (Friday) with the 13th day of the month *Ġumādā l-ūlā*. Since in the 243rd year of the Hiġra the 1st day of the month *Ġumādā l-ūlā* corresponds the 26th August, 857 A. D.,¹⁸ the 13th day of this month falls on the 7th September, 857 A. D., which however is not Friday, but Tuesday. Thus obviously there is some mistake here with the dating. H. Humbach and R. Göbl thought that the preparer of the inscription mistook the year of the date, and thus the dating ought to be corrected to the 242nd year of the Hiġra, in which the 13th day of the month *Ġumādā l-ūlā* would really fall on Friday.

This conception according to which the error must be sought for in the year of the dating, did not seem to be likely already in advance. It can be observed that at the dating mistakes can occur much easier in the smaller units of time, in the days, than in the years or months. Thus, if we ought to

¹⁸ Regarding the conversion of the dating according to the Hiġra to the Christian era see E. MAHLER: *Wüstenfeld—Mahler'sche Vergleichungstabellen der mohammedanischen und christlichen Zeitrechnung*.² Leipzig 1926.

count with an error in the dating of the inscription, then this ought to be looked for not in the year of the dating, but in the days. But in this case we ought to count with a mistake of four days (Tuesday instead of Friday!), and it is also difficult to presume so much.

The problem is not solved even, if we accept the assumption of Humbach and Göbl, and we place the date of the inscription to the 242nd year of the Hīgra. In the 242nd year of the Hīgra the 1st day of *Āmādā l-ūlā* corresponds to the 5th September 856 A. D., which falls on Saturday. In accordance with this the 13th day of *Āmādā l-ūlā* according to the Christian time-reckoning falls to the 17th September, this however is not Friday, but Thursday.

As we have seen above, the mistake was in the erroneous reading of the name of the month and in the misunderstanding of the dating formula. If we start out from the correct reading of the inscription, then all difficulties are solved at once. In the 243rd year of the Hīgra the Friday following the 13th day of the month *Āmādā l-āhira*, i. e. the 14th day of *Āmādā l-āhira*, falls on Friday also according to the Christian time-reckoning. The 1st day of the month *Āmādā l-āhira* in the 243rd year of the Hīgra corresponds to the 25th September 857 A. D., which is Saturday. According to this the 14th day of the month *Āmādā l-āhira* falls on the 8th October, which is Friday. Thus the dating of the inscription is correct, and according to the Christian Era it corresponds to the 8th October 857, which is a Friday.

III

The Sanskrit text of inscribed stone «A» can be read as follows:

- line 1 ¹om ^{śrī} sam^{va}-tsa^{re} dvā^{tr}m^{śa}-ti-
 2 ^{ta}-me sam^{va}-t 32 kā^{rtti}-
 3 ^{ka}-mā^{sa}-ba^{hu}-la^{ti}-thau dvī^{ti}-
 4 ^{yā}-yā^m ba di 2 a^{ttra} di^{va}-
 5 ^{se} ta^{dā}-ka^m vi^{bhi}-[^{nam} kā^{ri}-]
 6 [tam]

As a result of the very poor photographic reproduction the reading of this inscription is even more difficult than the Arabic text. The identification of several akṣaras was possible only with the help of reduced and consequently sharper photostatic copies with different tonality. The majority of the akṣaras appear on the photograph in the form of white, and their smaller part in the form of dark strokes. What we can see of the inscription with the help of the photostatic copies and the magnifying glass is shown by the autograph prepared by me and the akṣara-forms identified in a similar way are indicated by the table of characters (Figs 4 and 5). In connection with this it has to be re-

marked that the table of characters prepared by A. H. Dani¹⁹ does not reproduce the actual forms of the akṣaras seen on the photographs, but their somewhat idealized and schematized forms, and therefore it can hardly be used from the palaeographic point of view. Regarding the script Dani only remarks that the alphabet is neither pure Nāgarī, nor pure Sāradā.²⁰ This negative statement is undoubtedly correct, because on the basis of the akṣara-forms and the stylistic peculiarities of the script the alphabet used in the inscription can be defined as Siddhamāṭṛkā.²¹ This applies also for the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B», on which the cuneiform shape of the heads of the akṣaras («nailheaded type») characteristic of the Siddhamāṭṛkā script can well be observed in certain cases (cf. Fig. 5, akṣaras *a, la, ha, etc.*). On the photograph of the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B» the slanting to the right of the akṣaras can also be seen well. As a whole the inscription shows a somewhat more archaic form of the Siddhamāṭṛkā script than the Sanskrit inscription of stone «A». Since according to Bīrūnī about 1030 the Siddhamāṭṛkā alphabet was used in Northern India (*Kashmir*) as far as Banaras,²² thus in the territory where the inscriptions discussed were found, in the second half of the 9th century the use of this script was mostly expected.

Remarks on the reading

Line 1. The reading of this line given by A. H. Dani is the following: [*om namaḥ samvatsa*] *re dvāṛiṃśati*. Apart from the typographical errors, this reading has also two difficulties. First of all it is doubtless that in the last word the reading *riṃ* (*rṃ*) is incorrect. The akṣara in question can clearly be defined as *ṛ* and it is possible that the white spot to be seen above it is the sign of *ṃ*. Since the pronunciation *ri* of the sound *ṛ* goes back to a very ancient time and the sound value of akṣara *ṛṃ* was in practice *triṃ*, thus its use instead of *triṃ* can easily be understood. An exact parallel of the form of akṣara *ṛ* can be found already in the inscription of Toramāṇa (about 500).²³ The other difficulty lies in the restoration. The restoration of the formula *om namaḥ* in the beginning of the inscription would be obvious in itself, but before the clearly legible akṣara *re* there is space only for 5 akṣaras at the most, and in fact only the traces of so many can be seen. In the beginning of the line in the form of dark strokes an indistinct akṣara *o* can be observed above which clearly enough the dot marking *ṃ* appears. After this, similarly in the form of dark strokes, but

¹⁹ A. H. DANI: *op. cit.* 129.

²⁰ A. H. DANI: *op. cit.* 128.

²¹ For the Siddhamāṭṛkā script cf. G. BÜHLER: *Indische Paläographie*. Strassburg 1896. 49 foll.; H. JENSEN: *Die Schrift in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*.² Berlin 1958. 351 foll., Fig. 346.

²² G. BÜHLER: *Indische Paläographie*. 49–50.

²³ Cf. G. BÜHLER: *Indische Paläographie*. Pl. IV, akṣara VIII/22.

somewhat more definitely, the akṣara *śrī* can be seen. Right of this a white spot can be observed the contours of which reflect the form of akṣara *sa* fairly well, as we can see this immediately from the comparison with the akṣara *sa* of line 3. The small white spot to be seen above it is possibly the dot marking *ṃ*. Hereafter again a white spot follows the form of which is similar to that of the akṣara *va*. This is followed by a fairly sharply shaped black spot the outlines of which correspond quite well to akṣara *tsa*. The other characters can be read fairly well, only the akṣara *śa* is obliterated.

Line 2. The reading of A. H. Dani is: [*tame*] *saṃvat 32 Kārti-*. On the photograph the first really clearly visible character is the akṣara *t*. Before it the akṣara *va* appears quite well in the form of dark strokes, but in the beginning of the line the akṣara *ta* can be discerned and after this the contours and straight parts of *me* and *saṃ* can also be seen. The last akṣara of the line is undoubtedly *rtti* and not *rti*.

Line 3. Dani marks the last akṣara as a restoration. At the end of the line, however, the akṣara *tī* can clearly be read and even the *i-mātrā* is well discernible (Dani restored an akṣara *tī*).

Line 4. Dani's reading: [*yā*] *yāṃ vadi 2 atra diva-*. On the photograph the akṣara *yā* is also discernible. Since in the alphabet used in the inscription the akṣaras *va* and *ba* are identical, Dani's reading *vadi* is of course correct. Taking into consideration, however, that this is the abbreviation of the phrase *bahula-pakṣadina-*, we must give preference to the transcription *ba di*. After the akṣara *a* on the photograph we can clearly read an akṣara *ttra* (in the form of dark strokes), and not *tra*.

Line 5. This line is marked by Dani as illegible, he gives the restoration *se* only in the beginning. But in fact a few characters can be deciphered in the beginning of the line and only the akṣaras standing at the end of the line are unidentifiable, because only the heads of these can be seen, or they were entirely destroyed as a result of the whittling down of the stone. The vertical strokes of the first akṣara, an akṣara *se*, can be observed in the form of dark strokes above the white spot to be seen on the lower edge of the stone. Right of this again a white spot can be seen under which, however, the form of an akṣara *ta* is fairly well discernible. After this, in the form of dark strokes, clearly enough an akṣara *da* or eventually *dā* can be observed which, partly already in the form of white strokes, is followed by a *ka*. The sharp white stroke to be observed under this is obviously the chipping of the stone and does not belong to the akṣara. Hereafter an *i-mātrā* and parts of an akṣara can be observed in the form of white strokes, which can be restored most probably as *va* or *ba*. After the *bi* the very faint outlines of another *i-mātrā* emerge from the dark background under which a downwards open semicircular part of the akṣara can be observed which can most easily be interpreted as *bha*. Following this only the upper parts of the akṣaras can be seen which do not render a sufficient

foothold for their identification. After the *bhi* at any rate a one-stemmed akṣara follows which can be among other things *na* or *nna*. Hereafter a long, horizontal stroke can be observed, obviously the head of an akṣara with *ā-mātrā*. Of the next akṣara the *i-mātrā* can easily be discerned in the form of a dark stroke. The proposed restoration ([*nnaṃ ka-ri-*]) is in harmony with these remains of characters. It is possible that after the *i-mātrā* there was also another akṣara in line 5 under the akṣara *va* of line 4. In this case also the akṣara *taṃ* restored in line 6 can be placed still in this line.

Remarks on the interpretation of the inscription

From the linguistic point of view first of all the part of the inscription following the dating would be interesting. Of this, however, only the fragmentary line 5 has been preserved. In this we can identify the word *taḍākaṃ* fairly well which is the exact equivalent and obviously also the source of the word *tl'g* (**talāg*) occurring in the Arabic inscription. The occurrence of the word *ta lākaṃ* proves already in itself that the subject of the Sanskrit inscription could be similar to that of the Arabic inscription, *viz.* it reported on the establishment (or reconstruction) of a tank. Thus on the basis of its theme it can be regarded as a humble parallel of the famous *praśasti*-s of Rudradāman and Skandagupta which tell among other things about the reconstruction of the embankments of the water-reservoir Sudarśana. Of course, the Tochi valley Sanskrit inscription is very laconic, while the above-mentioned inscriptions are literary works of high standard, but even so they can be very valuable as parallels from the viewpoint of the restoration of the inscription discussed.

On the basis of the remnants of characters the word following after *taḍākaṃ* can be restored most probably as *vibhinnaṃ*. If this reading is correct, then the inscription does not report on the construction of a new water-reservoir, but on the reconstruction of the damaged dams of a reservoir. The derivatives of the root *bhid-* occur as technical terms for the bursting of dams of water-reservoirs also in other inscriptions. A good example for this is the Junagarh inscription of Skandagupta lines 26 and 27 of which report on the bursting of the dams of Lake Sudarśana, *viz.*:

26 *atha krameṇāmbudakāla āgate nidāghakālaṃ pravidārya toyudaiḥ*
 27 *vavarṣa toyam bahusaṃtataṃ ciraṃ sudarśanaṃ yena bibheda cātvarāt*
 «Then, when the season of clouds has come, driving away the season of heat with clouds, much rain was falling, uninterrupted, for a long time, and from this Lake Sudarśana suddenly burst.»

As compared with the detailed description of Skandagupta's inscription, however, the more modest Tochi inscription refers concisely to the bursting of the dams of the water-reservoir, *viz.*: «the water reservoir broke through

(or: the burst water-reservoir)». In the following part at any rate the reconstruction of the reservoir could be reported. In accordance with this the reading [.]ā-[.]î-[.] can be restored as *kāritam*, at least the remnants of script do not contradict to this restoration. The phrase *kāritam* occurs on inscriptions also in connection with the construction or reconstruction of water-reservoirs, although on account of its general meaning its use is naturally much broader. We have a good parallel to this part of the Tochi inscription in the passage of the Junagarh inscription of Rudradāman, which describes the reconstruction of the Sudarśana lake, viz.:

16 . . . *svasmātkośāt mahatā dhanaughena anatinmahatā ca kalena triguṇadr̥ḍhataravistārāyāmam setuṃ vidhāya . . . sudarśanataram karitamiti*

« . . . from his own treasury at a high cost and in a short time causing to be built a three times stronger, larger and longer dam . . . he had the Sudarśana made larger».

The Tochi inscription does not give the details or circumstances of the reconstruction. If the restoration of line 5 is correct, then the whole inscription can be interpreted as follows:

line 1 «Bliss! In the thirty-second year,
 2 in the 32nd year, on second day of the dark (fortnight)
 3 of the month Kārttika
 4 on 2nd d(ay) of the da(rk fortnight). On this day
 5 the burst water-reservoir was reconstructed».

The disproportionateness of the contents of the inscription is conspicuous, viz.: four fifths of it are occupied by the dating and only one line is left for its actual say. This is by all means remarkable and unusual in the practice of Indian inscriptions, and thus we have to presume that the inscription was originally longer and after the word *kāritam* there followed still the name, rank and titles of the king or official by whom the reconstruction of the water-reservoir was caused to be done, and eventually the blessing formula usual at the end of the inscriptions. Unfortunately neither the photograph nor the publication of A. H. Dani give any foothold to show, whether originally the stone continued underneath and was only broken away or chiselled off, or the Sanskrit inscription consisted of 5 lines only also originally. The inscription undoubtedly represents a rounded whole also in its present form, but the construction of its text differs so much from the usual type of the Indian inscriptions that, even if this was its original form, it must have had a special reason.

Here we can raise the question, in what relationship is the Sanskrit inscription with the Arabic inscription arranged on the stone above it. The

circumstance, if the Sanskrit inscription could be shown to be the translation of the Arabic inscription, or at least an equivalent of the latter from the viewpoint of the contents, would obviously explain clearly the divergence of the construction of its contents from the usual type of the Indian inscriptions. Unfortunately, this question cannot be decided definitely on the basis of the text of the Sanskrit inscription. In fact, as regards the text the Sanskrit and the Arabic inscription differ so much from each other that actually we cannot speak about a bilingual text. It seems to be likely, however, that the word *tadākam* occurring in the Sanskrit inscription refers to the same water-reservoir, as the phrase *l'g* used in the Arabic inscription. In this case two suppositions can be offered regarding the relationship of the two inscriptions. One of them is that the two inscriptions were prepared at the same time and that the Sanskrit inscription was meant as the translation of the Arabic text, but, either as a result of the difficulties of translation from the Arabic or on account of the immense cultural differences, a considerable part of the Arabic inscription could not be translated into Sanskrit. We could think also of the possibility that the concise drafting was demanded because of the shortage of place on the stone under the Arabic inscription, or that in the concealing of the measure taken by the Arab governor a certain political resistance was manifested against the Arab rule. According to the other supposition the two inscriptions were not made at the same time, but the Sanskrit inscription is later and reports on the reconstruction in a later time of the water-reservoir established by the Arab governor. The correctness of either of the two suppositions can only be decided by the definition of the dates of preparation of the two inscriptions.

IV

As we have seen, the dating of the Arabic inscription corresponds to October 8th, 857. H. Humbach and R. Göbl do not doubt that the dating of the Sanskrit inscription is exactly identical with that of the Arabic inscription.²⁴ They believed further that the dating of the Sanskrit inscription was made according to the *Laukika*-Era. The latter assumption is really obvious, because as we know it on the basis of experiences of A. Cunningham, A. Stein and others,²⁵ the *Laukika*-Era was in use till the latest times in Kashmir, or in that area of Northern India, which geographically is situated comparatively near to the site of the inscription. When, however, H. Humbach and R. Göbl converted the date of the inscription into the Christian Era, it turned out that it does not correspond to 857, but to 856. They endeavoured to eliminate this difficulty by correcting the date in the Arabic inscription from 243 to 242.

²⁴ Ancient Pakistan 1 (1964) 134.

²⁵ A. CUNNINGHAM: *Book of Indian Eras*. Calcutta 1883. 7 ff.; M. A. STEIN: *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kāśmīr*.² Delhi—Patna—Varanasi 1961. I. 58 etc.

But, as we have seen, this is impossible. Thus as regards the relationship of the dating of the inscription we are faced by a seemingly insolvable difficulty, because, on the other hand, it seems to be unlikely that the Sanskrit inscription would be earlier than the Arabic one. This is quite clearly shown already by the order of the two inscriptions on the stone.

The solution of the problem is rendered possible by the report of Bīrūnī on the *Laukika*-Era. This goes as follows: «The common Indian people reckon the years according to centuries which they call *saṃvatsara* or 'century'. On every occasion, when a century is completed, they leave out (the century number) and start to reckon the next century (from the beginning). They call this era *Loka-kāla*, which means 'the era of the people' . . . It is said that the inhabitants of Kanir, adjacent to Kashmir, start the year with the month *Bādhrapada*. As compared to the year chosen by us as an example (= 422 H. = Yazdgird Era 400 = 1031 A. D.) their date will be 84. Those people, who live between *Bardar* and *Marigala*, start the year with the month *Kārttika* and reckon the year chosen by us as the 10th year of their own era. According to the calendar of Kashmir this year corresponds to the 6th year of the new 'century'; such is the practice of the Kashmiri people. The inhabitants of the province of *Nīrāhāra*, which spreads over Marigala up to the farthest regions of *Tākēśar* and *Lohāvar*, start the year with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa* and count the year taken by us as an example as the 8th year of their own era. The inhabitants of *Lanbaga*, or *Lamgan* follow them in this respect. I heard the inhabitants of *Mūltān* saying that this custom spread also among the inhabitants of *as-Sīnd* and *Kanauj* and that these start the year with the new moon of (the month) *Mārgaśīrṣa*, but the inhabitants of *Mūltān* gave up this procedure a few years ago and joined the practice of the Kashmiri people and in agreement with them start the year with the new moon of (the month) *Caitra* . . . 99 — these are those years which elapsed from the started 'century'. This is confirmed by a page of the *zīg* discovered by me, which was compiled by Durlabha of *Mūltān*. In this he says: 'Write 848 and add to this figure the *Laukika-kāla*, that is the people's era; as a total the *Śaka-kāla* will result'. If we write down first that year of the *Śaka-kāla*, which corresponds to the year chosen by us as an example *viz.* the year 953 and subtract from it 848, then the remaining 105 must be the year of the *Laukika-kāla*, while the destruction of Somanātha falls really to the 98th year of the century' of the *Laukika-kāla* (an obvious clerical error instead of 99 — J. H.). Durlabha says: 'The year starts with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa*, but the astronomers of *Mūltān* start it with the month *Caitra*.'»²⁶

From the quoted report of Bīrūnī it can be stated that in the first half of the 11th century several versions of the *Laukika*-Era were in use in Northwestern India. On the basis of this report, we get the following picture:

²⁶ АБУ РЕЙХАН БИРУНИ, Избр. произведения. II. Transl. A. B. HALIDOV—YU. N. ZAVADSKIY: Taskent 1963. 358—359.

1. In the territory of *Kanir* the 84th year of the *Laukika-kāla* corresponded to the year 1031 A. D. and the beginning of the year was reckoned from the month *Bādhrapada* (July-August). The identification of *Kanir* has not been possible so far. At any rate we can state that *Kanir* was situated northwest of Kashmir, since at the southwestern border of Kashmir the province of *Nirāhāra* and at its southern border the region of *Tākēśar* was situated. Taking this into consideration, it is obvious to correct the written form *kn̄yr* either to *kn̄r* and read it as **Kunār*, or to read it as **Kunir* and to regard this as the transliteration of a form **Kunər*. In both cases the name can be identified with the name of the river and locality *Kunar*. The territory of *Kunar* could include *Chitral* and *Swat*.

2. In the territory between *Bardar* and *Marigala* the 10th year of the *Laukika-kāla* could correspond to the year 1031 A. D. and the beginning of the year was reckoned from the month *Kārttika* (September-October). According to *Bīrūnī Marigala (mryklh)* is identical with *Takṣasīlā*.²⁷ The geographical identification of *Bardar* has not been possible so far. Considering the other territories mentioned in *Bīrūnī's* report, it seems to be doubtless that this city can be looked for only south, southeast or southwest of *Takṣasīlā*. In this area we really find a place-name, with which *Bardar* can be identified without any greater difficulty. This is *Bīrūza* occurring in the *Hudūd al-Ālam* and in *Mas'ūdī*. According to the *Hudūd al-Ālam* «*Bīrūza* is a town within the limits of *Mūltān* in *Hindūstān*. All the merchandise of *Hindūstān* comes there and in it are idol-temples.»²⁸ As it becomes clear from this report, *Bīrūza* was a significant city, and we must definitely regard also *Bardar*, mentioned together with *Takṣasīlā*, as a large city. From the report of *Mas'ūdī* we learn the following about *Bīrūza*: «The king of *Qinnauj*, one of the kings of *Sind*, is (called) *B.rūza*. This is the title of the king of *Qinnauj*, and here (too) stands a town called *B.rūza* (named) after the title of the king. It is now the territory of *Islām* forming a district of *Mūltān*. From the town comes one of the rivers which form the *Mīhrān* of *Sind*.»²⁹ On the basis of the data of *Mas'ūdī* and the *Hudūd al-Ālam* V. *Minorsky* places *Bīrūza* convincingly on the banks of the *Sutlej*. In the *Hudūd al-Ālam* and in *Mas'ūdī* we find the following variants of the written form of the name *Bīrūza*: *byruzh*, *brucz*, *brudh*, *bvrh*, *brvrh*. The writing of the name *Bardar* in *Bīrūnī* is *brdry* and this can be well fitted among the variants of the written form of *Bīrūza*. The form *brdry* can be corrected without any difficulty to **brvry* or **brvzy* and this can be read as **Bīrūza*.

²⁷ BĪRŪNĪ: *op. cit.* 277.

²⁸ *Hudūd al-Ālam*. 'The Regions of the World'. Translated and explained by V. MINORSKY. Oxford—London 1937. 91—92.

²⁹ V. MINORSKY: *op. cit.* 253; J. Marquart: *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*. AGGW N. F. III. 2. Berlin 1901. 264.

As it follows from the report of Mas'ūdī, the name was originally the title of the rulers of Kanauj and thus we must obviously regard it as a word of Indian origin.³⁰ Taking this into consideration, the Indian source of the forms *byruvzh*, *bruvzh*, **bruzy* can be reconstructed in the form **bhīraujaḥ*. The meaning of this would be 'of formidable strength', just like that of the compound *bhīma-ujas-* 'of formidable strength'. The attribute **bhīraujaḥ* as a title suits undoubtedly well the Pratihāra rulers of Kanauj, who were regarded as the most powerful kings of their age. This view is well reflected by the report of the *Hudūd al-Ālam* on Kanauj, viz.: «Qinnauj, a large town and the seat of the raja of Qinnauj who is a great king; most of the Indian kings obey him and this raja does not consider any one his superior. He is said to have 150,000 horses and 800 elephants (destined) to take the field on the day of battle.»³¹

Thus according to these in the area spreading from *Takṣaśila*, that is from the intermediate space between the Indus and the Jhelum, to *Birūza*, that is to the Sutlej, they used that variant of the *Laukika-kāla* according to which the 10th year of this era corresponded to 1031 A. D.

3. In the territory of *Kashmir* the beginning of the year was reckoned from the month *Caitra* and according to the *Laukika-kāla* used there the 6th year of the era corresponded to 1031 A. D.

4. In the province of *Nirāhāra* the year started with the month *Mār-gaṣīrśa* and according to the variant of the *Laukika-kāla* used there the 8th year of the era corresponded to the year 1031 A. D. Regarding the area of the province of *Nirāhāra* a foothold is rendered by the remark of *Bīrūnī*, according to which it spreads as far as the borders of *Tākēšar* and *Lohāvar*. The two latter place-names can easily be identified. *Tākēšar* (*t'kyšr*) is obviously the equivalent of *Takka-deśa* mentioned in the *Rājataranḡiṇī*, which was situated south of Kashmir and east of Sialkot between the upper courses of the rivers Chenāb and Rāvi.³² As regards the form of name used by *Bīrūnī*, this is very likely the Arabo-Persian name of the region and goes back to an original form **Takke-šahr* 'Takka land'. The geographic situation of *Lohāvar* (*loh'wr*) was identified by A. Stein.³³ This place-name can be identified very likely with the fort *Lohara* frequently occurring in the *Rājataranḡiṇī*, which was situated south of the mountain chain of Pir Pancāl. If the Arabic form reflects the contemporary Indian form correctly, then we can trace back the name *Lohāvar* or

³⁰ For the criticism of the different supposition of J. MARQUART (Über das Volkstum der Komanen. Berlin 1914. 100) see V. MINORSKY: *loc. cit.*

³¹ V. MINORSKY: *op. cit.* 89. In connection with the title *bīrūza* we could think also of the Middle Persian word *pērōz*. However, this, on the one hand, was adopted in Arabic in the form *fīrūz*, and on the other hand, from the historical point of view in the case of the *Pratihāra* dynasty a title of Middle Persian origin is not likely either.

³² *Nirāhāra* (*Nagarahāra*) was situated 8 kilometres south of Jalālābād, see V. MINORSKY: *op. cit.* 252–253. Regarding *Tākēšar* see M. A. STEIN: Kulhaṇa's *Rājataranḡiṇī*. I. 205; V. MINORSKY: *op. cit.* 249.

³³ M. A. STEIN: *op. cit.* II. 293 ff.

Lohaur to an Old Indian form **Lohāvāra* 'Copper Fort' or **Lohapura* 'Copper City'. If this explanation is correct, then the names «Copper Fort, Copper City» for the designation of forts held impregnable can be regarded as considerably wide-spread not only in Inner-Asia,³⁴ but also in Northern and Western India.

5. In the province of *Lanbaga/Lamgan* a similar variant of the *Laukika-kāla* was used as in *Nīrāhāra*.

6. In the territories of *Mūltān*, *Sind* and *Kanauj* at the time of *Bīrūnī* the year was started already with the month *Caitra* just like in the Kashmir calendar, but according to the variant of the *Laukika-kāla* used there the 5th year of the era corresponded to 1031 A. D. This is proved exactly by the calculation of *Bīrūnī* made on the basis of the *zīg* (astronomical tables) of the *Mūltānī* astronomer *Durlabha*.

7. Since according to *Bīrūnī* on the territories of *Mūltān*, *Sind* and *Kanauj* the year was started earlier with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa*, inasmuch as by this the beginning of the year fell on *Mārgaśīrṣa*, after *Caitra*, this can cause a postponement of one more year. Thus in this case the 4th year of the *Laukika-kāla* would correspond to 1031 A. D. In the 9th century we must obviously reckon with this possibility in the territory under discussion.

If now on the basis of the data of *Bīrūnī* we calculate the years which corresponded in the 9th century to the 32nd year of the *Laukika-kāla* in the different territories of Northwestern India, we get the following picture:

1. In the territory of *Kunar* (Chitral and Swat) 833.
2. In the territory between *Takṣaśilā* and *Bīrūza* 853.
3. In the territory of *Kashmir* 857.
4. In the province of *Nīrāhāra* 855.
5. In the territory of *Lamgan* 855.
6. In the territories of *Mūltān*, *Sind* and *Kanauj* 858.
7. In the territories of *Mūltān*, *Sind* and *Kanauj*, if the year started with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa*, 859.

Since in the Sanskrit inscription an earlier dating than that of the Arabic inscription can hardly be presumed, thus the 32nd year of the *Laukika-Era* can correspond in the *Tochi* inscription to 857, 858, or 859. As we have seen, however, H. Humbach and R. Göbl converted the 32nd year of the *Laukika-Era* as 856. This conversion corresponds to that version of the *Laukika-kāla*, which was studied first by G. Bühler in Kashmir,³⁵ and the traditions of which

³⁴ For the Iranian and Turkish «Copper Cities» of Inner Asia see J. MARQUART: *Ērānšahr*. 93; J. MARKWART: *Wehrot und Arang*. Leiden 1938. 159 ff., 164 ff.; K. CZEG-LÉDY: *Ant Tan* 4 (1957) 302, 7 (1960) 211 ff.

³⁵ G. BÜHLER: *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Kaśmir, Rajputana and Central India, Bombay 1877*. 59 foll.

were found later on by A. Cunningham also in the mountain states situated southeast of Kashmir, between the Chenāb and the Jumna.³⁶ These data and traditions recorded in the 19th century paralleled the 1st year of the century of the *Laukika-kāla* with the 1825th year of the Christian Era. On the basis of this were prepared those chronological tables, thus among others also that of Cunningham, which are used by scientific investigation even now for the conversion of the years of the *Laukika-kāla* into the years of the Christian Era. According to this converting the dating of the Tochi inscription, viz. (*Laukika-kāla*) *saṃvat 32 Kārttikamāsabahulatīthi 2*, we find that this corresponds to the 20th September 856, which day was a Sunday. This conversion gives a date, which is more than a year earlier than the date of the Arabic inscription, which corresponds to October 8th 857. Since the Arabian dating is correct, we can look for the cause of the contradiction between the two datings only in the conversion of the *Laukika-kāla*.

As we have seen, reckoning on the basis of the data of Bīrūnī, in the 9th century exactly 857 corresponds to the 32nd year of the *Laukika-kāla* in the territory of Kashmir. If on the basis of this we convert the dating of the Tochi inscription precisely, the resulting date will be Saturday, the 9th October 857. This dating differs only by one day from the date of the Arabic inscription, which is Friday, the 8th October 857. It is possible, however, that even this difference is only illusory, because in the Sanskrit dating the designation *tīthi* 'lunar day' occurs. If we assume that the *tīthi* was reckoned from the rise of the moon to the rise of the moon, then the beginning of *Kārttikamāsabahulatīthi 2* falls on the 8th October 857 and in this case the Arabic and Sanskrit datings coincide exactly also in the days.

The other two possible conversions of the Sanskrit dating to be made on the basis of Bīrūnī are Thursday, the 29th September 858 and Monday, the 18th September 859. In these cases, of course, neither the months nor the days coincide with the Arabic dating. In the first case, however, the Arabic and the Sanskrit datings coincide so strikingly that, on the one hand, we must regard this conversion as the most likely one, and on the other hand this exact congruence induces us to revise the conversion of the *Laukika*-Era of Kashmir generally used so far.

The data of Bīrūnī on the *Laukika-kāla* are judged by investigation differently. On the one hand their accuracy is stressed and their authenticity is asserted,³⁷ while on the other hand it is presumed that he did not get his data from sufficiently well informed individuals.³⁸ The reason of this not quite unanimous standpoint is obviously the fact that Bīrūnī's data on the

³⁶ A. CUNNINGHAM: Book of Indian Eras. 12 foll.

³⁷ M. A. STEIN: Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. I 58, note 6, A. CUNNINGHAM: Book of Indian Eras. 6. 10, 16.

³⁸ For example A. CUNNINGHAM: *op. cit.* 11.

Laukika-kāla are in contradiction to the informations of Bühler and Cunningham on Kashmir and the territories situated southeast of it. This turns out clearly already from the fact that according to Cunningham's calculation the 7th year of the century of the *Laukika-kāla* corresponds to the year 1031 A. D., although according to Bīrūnī in Kashmir the 6th year and in Mūltān the 5th year corresponded to it. This difference cannot arise from the supposition that Bīrūnī worked on the basis of unreliable sources. From his text quoted earlier it becomes clear that his data on Mūltān originate from the *zīg* of Durlabha, that is from a first-rate written source, and at another place he refers to a Kashmir calendar as a source.³⁹ Thus we can hold it doubtless that Bīrūnī's data are based on reliable sources, therefore the contradictions appearing between them and the data of the 19th century should not be removed but they should rather be explained.

Cunningham tried to smooth away the contradiction between the data of Bīrūnī and the Kashmir *Laukika-kāla* of the 19th century by the assumption that the *Laukika-kāla* year 99, resulting as the date of the destruction of Somanātha on the basis of the calculation of Durlabha, must be calculated as an elapsed year and as a matter of fact the occupation of Somanātha falls in the 100th year of the *Laukika-kāla*, which corresponds to 1025/26 A. D. and thus the calculation is correct inasmuch as the destruction of Somanātha occurred in January of 1026.⁴⁰ This assumption, however, cannot be accepted at all. In fact Bīrūnī identifies the 99th year of the *Laukika-kāla* with the 947th year of the *Śaka-kāla* and if we place the destruction of Somanātha in the 100th year of the *Laukika-kāla*, then this will correspond to the 948th year of the *Śaka-kāla*, although the occupation of Somanātha happened really in the 947th year of the *Śaka-kāla*. Thus it is evident that the explanation of Bīrūnī, according to which 99 mean the years that elapsed from the *Laukika-kāla* century, must not be interpreted so that in the computation the *Laukika-kāla* appears with elapsed years and the *Śaka-kāla* with current year. This is clearly excluded by the data of Bīrūnī according to which the 105th year of the *Laukika-kāla* corresponds to the 953rd year of the *Śaka-kāla*. Bīrūnī looks back to the time computation of the destruction of Somanātha as a past event and thus it is natural that he marks the 99 years of the *Laukika-kāla* as elapsed. But besides this the explanation of Cunningham is unacceptable also for the reason, because Bīrūnī's computation does not agree with the *Laukika*-Era used by him in his tables even with 1 year's correction. In fact the date of the destruction of Somanātha, January of 1026, does not fall on the 100th, but on the (10)1st year of the *Laukika*-Era even according to Cunningham's own chronological tables.

³⁹ BĪRŪNĪ: op. cit. 356.

⁴⁰ A. CUNNINGHAM: Book of Indian Eras. 16.

Cunningham's error had two reasons. On the one hand, he did not take into consideration that Bīrūnī's computation regarding the date of the destruction of Somanātha is based on the work of Durlabha, that is on the *Laukika*-Era used in Mūltān, which was by 1 year lagging behind the Kashmiri *Laukika*-Era. On the other hand, he did not notice that the *Laukika*-Era used in Bīrūnī's age in Kashmir was not identical with the time-reckoning used there in the 19th century, but was lagging behind it similarly by 1 year. The 2 years' difference (99 instead of 101) of the computation of Bīrūnī from the chronological tables of Cunningham results from here.

Regarding the Kashmiri *Laukika*-Era of Bīrūnī's age we have a first-rate source, viz.: the work entitled *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* by Kalhaṇa. In this we find the following datum of decisive importance regarding the *Laukika*-Era:

I 52 *laukikebde caturviṃṣe śakakālasya sāmpratam|*
saptatyābhyadhikaṃ yātam sahasraṃ parivatsarāḥ ||52| |
 «In the twenty-fourth *Laukika*-year at present from the *Śaka-kāla*
 by seventy more than thousand complete years have elapsed. ||52||»

In this passage Kalhaṇa accurately gives the relationship of the *Laukika*-year to the *Śaka*-Era, viz.: 1070 full years of the *Śaka-kāla* have elapsed now, when the 24th year of the *Laukika-kāla* is in progress. Since the beginning of the year is identical according to both time-reckonings, Kalhaṇa's text can be interpreted only so that the 24th current year of the *Laukika-kāla* corresponds to the 1071st current year of the *Śaka-kāla*. Cunningham, however, interpreted this passage of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* incorrectly as follows: «The 24th year of the *Laukika* corresponds with the year 1070 of the Saka-Kāl.»⁴¹ Thus, of course, at the identification of dates of the *Laukika-kāla* 1 year's error slipped into his tables, although the exact agreement of Kalhaṇa's evidence with the data of Bīrūnī ought to have made it doubtless for him that there is 1 year's difference between the *Laukika*-Era used in Kashmir about the year 1000 and the data of Kashmir from the 19th century, which cannot be removed.

The fact that something is wrong with the conversion of the *Laukika*-Era was observed already by A. Stein, who revised Cunningham's work entitled «Book of Indian Eras» for the publication, translation and commentary of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* very thoroughly and he wrote several corrections into the copy of this book used by him on the Mohan Marg, Kashmir, which he left to the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Thus for example he wrote in pencil in the beginning of the book the following remark: «The Kali, Śaka and Saptarṣi years given in Cunningham's General Table are all Expired years, comp. Rāj. i. 52. Lauk. 24 = Śaka 1070 expired = Kali 4249 expired.» Stein's reference to verse I. 52 of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* quoted above shows that its correct interpretation drew his attention to the problem of the

⁴¹ CUNNINGHAM: *op. cit.* 6.

conversion of the *Laukika*-Era. In fact, in his translation of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* this passage appears undoubtedly in correct interpretation, viz.: «At present, in the twenty-fourth year of the *Laukika* [era], one thousand and seventy years of the Śaka era have passed.»⁴² His noting in Cunningham's book also betrays, however, that he could not form an entirely clear conception about the conversion of the *Laukika*-Era. As a matter of fact his above quoted remark has two deficiencies. On the one hand he reduces the *Kali-kāla*, *Śaka-kāla* and *Laukika-kāla* to the same denomination by regarding the years of each of them as expired in Cunningham's tables. The consequence of this would be that the destruction of Somanātha would fall not in the 4126th year of the *Kali-kāla*, the 947th year of the *Śaka-kāla* and the 1st year of the *Laukika-kāla*, but on the 4127th, 948th and 2nd year, respectively, of the above-mentioned eras. This is, however, absolutely impossible. On the other hand, the second part of the noting parallels the current 24th year of the *Laukika*-Era with the past 1070th year of the *Śaka*-era and the 4249th expired year of the *Kali-kāla*. Thus, however, the absurd situation results that a current year becomes the equivalent of an expired year, which is, of course, impossible. The correct wording would have been as follows: In the general table of Cunningham the years of the *Kali*-Era and *Śaka*-Era are expired years as compared with the years of the *Laukika*-Era. The given years of the *Laukika*-Era (= Sapt. Rishi.) correspond always to the years of the *Kali*-Era and *Śaka*-Era of the next item. Thus the following item of Cunningham, viz. A. D. 1025 = Kali Yuga 4126 = Sak Sal 947 = Sapt. Rishi 1, will run correctly as follows: A. D. 1025 = Kali Yuga 4126 = Sak Sal 947 = Sapt. Rishi 100. Cf. Rāj. i. 52 Lauk. 24 = Śaka 1071. The fact that A. Stein in spite of his essentially correct observation could not arrive at the solution of the question is very likely due to a considerable extent to the high authority of Bühler and Cunningham and to his respect felt towards them (he dedicated his book directly to the memory of Bühler).

At any rate the exact agreement of the data of Kalhaṇa and Bīrūni renders doubtless that in the course of the Middle Ages a variant of the *Laukika*-Era different from that of the 19th century was in use in Kashmir. The difference between the two was 1 year, thus if, on the basis of the conversion table used at present, we want to define the equivalent of a date in the *Laukika*-Era, we must always deduct 1 year from the date of year of the *Laukika*-Era. If, on the other hand, we want to convert a date expressed in the *Laukika*-Era into another era, we must always take into account the data of the item following after the date of the *Laukika*-Era concerned.

Thus it seems to be very likely that the dating of the Tochi Sanskrit inscription has to be interpreted as the 8/9 th October 857 according to the contemporary *Laukika-kāla* of Kashmir. This is to a certain extent surpris-

⁴² M. A. STEIN: Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. I. 11.

ing, because from the geographical point of view in the region of Tochi we would rather expect a dating according to the *Laukika*-Era of Mūltān. Bīrūnī, however, does not publish data just on this region, thus, naturally, nothing contradicts to our reckoning in Tochi with the *Laukika*-Era corresponding to that of Kashmir.

Now we can raise the question, what is the reason for the difference between the time-reckoning according to the Kashmiri *Laukika-kāla* in the Middle Ages and in the modern times. Bīrūnī's data on the *Laukika-kāla* clearly show that in Northwestern India several views relating to the different eras existed side by side and that these very often influenced each other considerably. In the case of the *Laukika-kāla* it is especially clear that behind the different variants there are different theories of time-reckoning which placed the beginning of the eras on different dates. The different variants of the same era could obviously influence each other most easily. Thus it becomes clear from the report of Bīrūnī that a few years before in Mūltān they adopted the Kashmiri practice according to which the year was started with the month *Caitra*. The difference between the *Laukika-kāla* of Kashmir in the Middle Ages and modern times has very likely also a similar explanation. Some time after the age of Kalhaṇa, in the 13th and 14th centuries, or even later another variant of the *Laukika*-Era spread in Kashmir which differed by 1 year from that used in the age of Bīrūnī and Kalhaṇa.

The origin of this *Laukika*-Era used also in the 19th century can be ascertained without difficulty. According to the report of Bīrūnī in the western, southern and southeastern territories adjacent to Kashmir, in the provinces of Lamgan and Nirāhāra, as far as *Lohāra* and *Ṭakka-deśa* a variant of the *Laukika*-Era was in use according to which the year was started with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa* (October—November) and the 8th year of the era corresponded to 1031 A. D. Since at the choosing of the year 1031 as a chronological example Bīrūnī was governed by the viewpoint that in this year in the different time-reckonings the beginnings of the year are rather near each other (the beginning of the 953rd year of the *Śaka*-Era = the 25th February 1031, the beginning of the 422nd year of the *Hīgra* = the 29th December 1030, the beginning of the 400th year of the *Yazdgird*-Era = the 9th March 1031), it is obvious that in connection with the different variants of the *Laukika*-Era he took into consideration always the years beginning within the framework of the year chosen as an example. This means that in the western, southern and southeastern territories adjacent to Kashmir the beginning of the 8th year of the *Laukika*-Era fell on the 19th October 1031 (provided that the beginning of the year was reckoned from the 1st *Mārgaśīrṣa su di*). Thus, on the other hand, the 7th year of the *Laukika*-Era of these neighbouring territories was parallel with the greater part of the 6th year of the *Laukika-kāla* used in Kashmir. Thus in these territories as a whole that variant of the *Lau-*

kika-Era was used already in the age of Bīrūnī, which was still found there and in Kashmir by G. Bühler and A. Cunningham in the 19th century, the only difference was that they started the year not with the month *Caitra* but with the month *Mārgaśīrṣa*. Very likely sometimes after the age of Kalhaṇa they adopted in Kashmir the *Laukika*-Era of the adjacent southern and south-eastern territories, but they maintained the beginning of the year with the month *Caitra*. Thus it seems that the *Laukika*-Era used in the 19th century in Kashmir developed actually from the amalgamation of the variants of the *Laukika-kāla* used in Kashmir and in the adjacent southern and southeastern territories.

Regarding the date of this event some foothold can be rendered by the consideration that the break of the continuity of the time-reckoning suggests a certain break in the tradition of time-reckoning of the astronomers in Kashmir. This is obviously connected with some historical event. If we make a survey of the history of Kashmir during the time after Kalhaṇa, it seems to be doubtless that up to 1399, the rise of the Muhammadan sultanate of Kashmir, we cannot reckon with any historical event, which could have broken the continuity of the *Laukika*-Era of Kashmir. In itself, of course, the Muhammadan rule could not cause a break in the time-reckoning, because — as it is shown by the report of Bīrūnī — the different variants of the *Laukika-kāla* were used invariably also in the territories occupied by the Arabs. Later on, during the reign of Sikandar (1394—1416), however, an event occurred which can be brought well into connection with the break taking place in the continuity of the *Laukika*-Era in Kashmir. Sikandar expelled the brāhmaṇas from Kashmir,⁴³ and they were called back again only after several decades by Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn (he reigned from 1420 to 1470). The brāhmaṇas expelled from Kashmir could find refuge obviously just in the neighbouring territories, where that variant of the *Laukika-kāla* was in use, which differed by 1 year from that of Kashmir. The astronomer brāhmaṇas of Kashmir could adopt at this time the variant of the *Laukika*-Era, which dated the beginning of the era to 3076/75 B. C., but at the same time they continued to start the year with the month *Caitra*. When, several decades later, they returned to Kashmir on the invitation of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, they could take along with them already this variant of the *Laukika*-Era.

Thus for the time being, as long as eventually more recent data do not suggest another assumption, it seems to be likely that the variant of the *Laukika*-Era used in Kashmir in the 19th century was introduced in Kashmir only between 1420 and 1470, and the datings according to the *Laukika*-Era originating from earlier times than this, according to the evidence of Bīrūnī and Kalhaṇa, reflect the *Laukika-kāla* used in their age in the territory of Kashmir.

⁴³ R. C. MAJUMDAR—H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI—KALIKINKAR DATTA: *An Advanced History of India*.² London 1958. 353 foll.

V

Stone «B» (Shakoor No. 15) was found in 1926 in a place named Khazana about 4 miles from Mir Ali on the Idak--Spinwam road in the territory of the Tochi Agency. It was delivered to the museum on the 30th July 1926 by Captain H. A. Barnes, who made the following remark on the find: «There are several remains of ancient forts and buildings at Idak-Spinwam and Shertulla plain. In addition I have had coins brought to me discovered on three sites. The coins were chiefly of Azes and those of several Kushana kings, notably Kanishka I.»⁴⁴ On the stone in longitudinal direction side by side two inscriptions were engraved, *viz.* on the left side a Sanskrit inscription and on the right side a Bactrian inscription. The two inscriptions are separated from each other by a double vertical line. The left side part of the Sanskrit inscription is broken away, so that -- as this can be stated on the basis of the doubtless restoration of line 2 -- only about one half of the inscription has been preserved. Since the script of both inscriptions goes from left to right, their arrangement shows already in itself that first the Sanskrit inscription was engraved.

For the first time H. Sastri dealt with the Sanskrit inscription. Some of his readings are also mentioned by A. H. Dani.⁴⁵ A. H. Dani himself gives the reading of a great part of the preserved text and he also restores lines 1 and 2. He remarks, however, that on account of the breaking off of part of the text it is difficult to ascertain the meaning of the Sanskrit inscription in itself, but with the help of the Bactrian inscription this can be solved easily. Thus, relying on the interpretation of the Bactrian inscription given by H. Humbach and R. Göbl, he translates the Sanskrit inscription as follows: «Hail. Salutation. In the year thirty-eight, year 38, on the seventh day of the bright fortnight of the month of Bhadra. On this day . . . Navīna-chandra Phruma . . . (established?) . . . king of the family of . . . the son of Khojana (*i. e.* the Kushana).»⁴⁶

The Sanskrit inscription of stone «B» on the published photograph (see here Fig. 6) can be read considerably better than the Sanskrit inscription of stone «A». What can be deciphered on it with the help of a magnifying glass is indicated on the annexed design (Fig. 7), while the forms of characters can be studied on the table of script (Fig. 5). The surface of the stone is on certain places worn off and on other places it is chipped so that the reading of all akṣaras cannot be ascertained with complete surety. As we have already mentioned, the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B» was written in a somewhat cursive variant of the Siddhamātrkā alphabet, the vertical axis of the akṣaras is leaning by about 30 degrees to the right. The text of the inscription can be read and restored as follows:

⁴⁴ Ancient Pakistan 1 (1964) 126.

⁴⁵ Ancient Pakistan 1 (1964) 126, 130.

⁴⁶ Ancient Pakistan 1 (1964) 131.

- line 1 [oṃ śrī saṃ-va-tsa-re a-ṣṭa-triṃ-śa]-ti-ta-me saṃ-vat 38 bhā-dra-
 2 [pa-da-mā-sa-śu-kḷa-pa-ⁱṣa-sa-pta]-myāṃ su di 7 a-ttra di-va-
 3 [se pa-rja-nya-sya ve-gai-ru-da]-p^rā¹-naṃ i-na-bha-gna-hru-^rtaṃ¹
 4 [dṛ-ṣṭvā-lpa-kā-la-tvaṃa-ku-ru]-ta saṃ-yā-na-sṛ-tvā-u-da-
 5 [pā-naṃ pa-ra-me-śva-ra-va-si]-ṣṭha-ai-la-ha-ra-va-ra bho-ja ^rsa¹-pu-tra

Remarks on the reading

Line 1. Jitame saṃvat 38 Sastri. The beginning of the line is restored by Dani to oṃ na-mah. As regards the subject this is possible, thus, however, 11 akṣaras ought to be restored and this seems to be much. Thus it seems to be more likely that after oṃ only the word śrī followed.

Line 2. The restoration originates from A. H. Dani. The *su di 7* appearing in the preserved part of the line renders the restoration sure. The 6th akṣara was read by Dani as *tra*, but on the photograph we can clearly see *ttra*.

Line 3. A. H. Dani's reading was *naina candra phruma*, while Sastri read *nayana* instead of *naina* and *bhupa* instead of *phruma*. The first akṣara of the line is slightly damaged, but the U-formed body of akṣara *pā* is well discernible, and also the *ā*-mātrā starting out from the upper end of its right stroke. The next akṣara is undoubtedly *naṃ*, the dot marking the anusvāra *ṃ* above the akṣara is clearly visible. The next two akṣaras were read by Dani correctly as *i-na*. Hereafter an akṣara can be seen the form of which resembles to some extent to that of akṣara *na*, but its right side stroke does not extend so deep. Dani read this akṣara as *ca* and included it so even in his table of characters, but the akṣara *ca* is of quite different form, so that this character can by no means be read as *ca*. In the alphabet used the form of the *bha* is nearest to that of the *na*, so that this akṣara must definitely be read as *bha*. The next, compound akṣara was read by Dani as *ndra*. This reading, however, can by no means be brought in harmony with the constituent parts of the akṣara. The reading could be held uncertain also by Dani himself, because he did not even include the character in his table of script. First of all the sign of the *r* is missing from the akṣara. Then the upper part of the akṣara could perhaps be *na*, but its lower part can by no means be interpreted as *da*. Thus the reading *nda* cannot be taken into consideration either. The akṣara consists of two semicircular parts open downwards the lower one of which is linked to the right side stroke of the upper one. Thus the akṣara can have only two interpretations. If we hold the two constituent parts identical, then the resulting reading will be *nna*. We can also think, however, that the upper akṣara is a rounded off *ga* and in this case the character must be read as *gna*. In the case of the next akṣara the reading *bhu* of Sastri can by no means be taken into account. This is also a compound akṣara and the sign of the *u*-mātrā and the *r* can clearly be observed in it. Thus only the basic akṣara is questionable. Dani thought of *pha* and actually the akṣara resembles to some extent to a

pha. The difficulty of this spreading is, however, that the *pha* is usually such a U-formed character, the right side stroke of which is curving inside backwards in a narrow curve and reaching the horizontal lower stroke it forms a narrow noose.⁴⁷ Contrary to this in the case of the discussed akṣara this U-form is missing, the left side stroke is underneath bulging out to the left, the lower stroke goes downwards to the right at 45 degrees and from its end in a circular form a stroke curving outwards to the right goes out which, however, does not form a closed noose (Dani in his table of characters changes the form of the akṣara considerably). This form is characteristic of akṣara *ha*, so that the whole compound akṣara can most likely be read as *hru*. The last akṣara read by Sastri as *pa* and by Dani as *ma* is also questionable. In connection with this akṣara some difficulty is caused by the fact that it is touched by a long straight oblique line, which was made very likely at the engraving of the lines separating the Sanskrit and Bactrian inscriptions eventually by the slip of the chisel. The fact that this does not belong to the akṣara is clearly shown by the circumstance that on the one hand it extends considerably higher than it ought to, and on the other hand it is not parallel with the right side stem of the akṣara, as this ought to be in the case of *ma* or *pa*. Observing it thoroughly, we can see that the short vertical stem of the akṣara bifurcates underneath and is curving downwards (this can be observed in the form of obliterated, dark strokes) and the right side stroke extends deeper than the left one. This is on the inscription the characteristic form of the akṣara *ta*, and thus we must read the same also here.

Line 4. Dani's reading was . . . *sa ya . . . dda . . .* The first letter of the line at the edge of the break is a clearly legible *ta*. Hereafter follows the *sa* read by Dani, above which, however, even the dot marking the anusvāra *ṃ* can be seen well (between the two stems of the *naṃ* above it), thus its correct reading is *saṃ*. The next akṣara was identified by Dani also correctly as *ya*, but he did not take into consideration the *ā* mātrā starting out from its right side stem above. Thus the correct reading of the akṣara is *yā*. This is followed by a well discernible *na*, and then tightly beside this, so that the two akṣaras touch with each other above, a *sa* can be seen, which is linked underneath with a *ṛ*-mātrā, partly crossing the *o*-mātrā of the akṣara appearing under it. Thus the reading of this akṣara is *sṛ*. Now that akṣara follows, which was read by Dani as *dda*. It is doubtless that we have to do here with a compound akṣara the lower component part of which at the first glance really resembles to the *da*. Its upper constituent, however, can by no means be *da*, but can be clearly defined as the akṣara *ta*. Of course, a compound akṣara *tda* cannot come into consideration. Observing the lower constituent more thoroughly, we can state that it is by no means *da* (cf. for example with the *di* to be seen in line 2),

⁴⁷ G. BÜHLER: Indische Palaeographie. Pl. IV, 28/VII, IX—XIII.

but a small-size, stubby *va*. Thus the compound akṣara must be read as *tva*. Besides this we must also take into consideration that obviously an *ā-mātrā* starts out from the upper part of the akṣara, thus the exact reading of the akṣara is *tvā*. The penultimate akṣara is a clearly legible *u*. The last character is considerably obliterated and its reading is disturbed also by two white spots. The form of the akṣara appears in the shape of faint dark lines. The vertical stem of the character passes through the lower white spot, and then it culminates considerably to the left and from here a horizontal stroke starts out from it which is closed down by a well discernible vertical stroke. This is the characteristic form of *da* used on the inscription.

Line 5. Earlier readings are: *putra* Sastri, *kulanarapa khojana-putra* Dani. Before the first character read by Dani still another akṣara can be seen. This is U-formed above, and in its lower third part its two vertical strokes are connected by a horizontal stroke. The stone is chipped out between the two horizontal lines. Thus the upper part of the aksara can be defined as *ṣa*. Under this a slightly oval noose appears, which can be interpreted as *tha*. Thus the reading of the compound akṣara is *ṣtha*. The form of the next letter resembles to a right triangle standing with its vertex downwards. From its upper part in the form of a dark line a semicircle starts out to the left. This letter form can undoubtedly be identified as *ai*. It is absolutely incomprehensible how Dani read *ku* instead of it. The next akṣara was correctly read by Dani as *la*. The following character was interpreted by Dani as *na*. This, however, differs considerably from the form of the other akṣaras *na* occurring in the inscription. Its vertical stroke is considerably profiled, it turns outside in a quadrangular form to the left and from its end a semicircle starts out. This letter form can most likely be interpreted as *ha*, although it slightly differs from the form of the *ha* occurring in the compound akṣara *hru*, in which its vertical stroke is less profiled. The next akṣara was defined by Dani correctly as *ra*. The akṣara following this, however, can by no means be *pa*, because underneath on the left side it terminates in a vertex and above, its left side stem is curving towards the right one and almost touches the latter. As a whole the form of the akṣara corresponds accurately enough with the *va* to be read in line 1, so that another reading than *va* can hardly be taken into consideration. Hereafter Dani reads an akṣara *kho*. This reading came about so, that Dani interpreted the one-stemmed akṣara coming after *va* and also the second akṣara following the same as one character. This, however, is impossible, because the two akṣaras are not interconnected above by any horizontal stroke and their strokes do not touch each other underneath either. Thus we have undoubtedly to do not with one but with two akṣaras. Of these the first one can be read as *ra*. In the case of the second akṣara under the wedge-formed head the vertical stroke of the akṣara bifurcates and its left branch forms a wedge-shaped noose, while its right branch curves downwards. The

oblique line to be seen right of the akṣara obviously does not belong to either of the characters. On the head of the akṣara an *o*-mātrā can be seen. The form of the character as a whole corresponds with that of the akṣara *bhā* occurring in line 1 (the vowel mātrās are, of course, different), and thus here we must read definitely *bho*. The next letter was read by Dani correctly as *ja*. The akṣara following hereafter according to Dani's reading is *na*. The form of the letter really reminds of the *na*, but certain details still distinguish it from this akṣara. From its left stroke in its outer side underneath an oblique stroke extends upwards. The right stroke goes downwards at a 45 degree angle and then broken at a sharp angle extends upwards, but it reaches only to about the middle of the akṣara. It is doubtless that the akṣara in this form does not correspond to any character accurately, but at any rate it is nearest to the *sa*. Very likely the upper part of the right stem of the *sa* has been worn off on the stone and therefore it cannot be seen on the photograph.

Remarks on the interpretation of the inscription

Lines 1 and 2 of the inscription contain the dating and on the basis of the remaining part the missing part can be restored with surety. Thus from the restoration of line 2 we can conclude that 9 to 10 akṣaras are missing from each line.

In line 3 only the word *inabhagnahrutaṃ* has been preserved in a complete form. This is a compound, the parts of which are *ina-* 'strong, mighty', *bhagna-* 'broken; break' and *hruta-* 'deviated, went aside, missed the road' (from the verb *hru-* 'diverge, go aside, deviate' etc.). Thus the meaning of the whole compound could be 'from a mighty break went aside (from its place)'. This attribute refers obviously to the noun preceding it of which only the part *pānaṃ* has been preserved. The fact that this form cannot be a complete word is clearly shown by the circumstance that if we identify it either with the word *pāna-* 'drinking, drink' or with the word *pāna-* 'protection', the attribute *inabhagnahrutaṃ* does not fit any of them. On the other hand, if we take into consideration that at the end of line 4 the word *uda-* can be read, which may stand there either as the first or the last part of a compound word, but has the meaning 'water' in any case and thus it shows that we have to do with «water» in the inscription, it is obvious to restore the form *pānaṃ* to [*uda*]pānaṃ. The meaning of the word *udapāna-* is 'water-reservoir, well' and it appears frequently in inscriptions commemorating its construction or repair.⁴⁸ The attribute *inabhagnahrutaṃ* will receive a meaning as soon as we correlate it with the word *udapānaṃ* in as much as the whole phrase can be read as follows: «the water-reservoir inundated from the mighty break (of dam)». This phrase points to the fact that the inscription reported first on the damage of the water-reservoir. It is obvious that later on the inscription de-

⁴⁸ H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. Göttingen 1961. 99, 135.

scribed also the reconstruction of the water-reservoir. Therefore it seems to be very likely that the word *udapāna-* occurred again in the inscription. Taking this into consideration it is obvious to restore the word *uda-* occurring at the end of line 3 as *uda[pānam]*. We can still mention that instead of the reading *inabhagnahrutaṃ* we can eventually read also *ina^rbhi^lnnahrutaṃ*, if we presume that in akṣara *bhi* the *i-mātrā* is worn off from the stone. This does not change the meaning of the compound at all, since the word *bhinna-*, as we have seen above, is also used to express the bursting of a dam.

On the basis of the above line 3 can be restored as follows: [*se letters 6—7 u-da*]-*pā-naṃ* etc. On the basis of the inscriptions of similar subject it is obvious to restore between the initial formula and the word *udapānaṃ* some phrase referring to the cause and circumstances of the damage of the water reservoir. Besides the above quoted passage of the Junagarh inscription of Skandagupta we can also refer to that part of the Junagarh inscription of Rudradāman, which describes the causes of the bursting of the dam of Lake Sudarśana. In this we find among others also the following passage:

line 6 *palāśinīprabhṛtīnāṃ nadīnāṃ atimātrodvṛttairvegaiḥ . . .*

«by the excessive destructive power of the rivers carrying along trees».

A phrase similar to this, but naturally more simple and shorter, could stand also in the inscription under discussion before the word *udapānaṃ*. On the basis of the phrases occurring in the Junagarh inscription of Rudradāman, we could think most probably of the following restorations: *sr̥ṣṭavr̥ṣ.inā parjanyaena* «by the rainfall of pouring rain»⁴⁹ or *nadīnāṃ vegaiḥ* «by the power of the rivers» or *parjanyaṣya vegaiḥ* «by the power of the rainfall» etc. Of these the latter one occupies just the space corresponding to akṣaras 6—7, and therefore we can restore line 3 with this phrase at a high probability.

From the viewpoint of the further restoration of the inscription it is important to clarify the question with what syntactic structure we can count in the part beginning with line 3. From this point of view the syntactic function of the word *udapānaṃ* is of decisive importance. With regard to its form this compound could be masculine accusative or neuter nominative and accusative. It will be decided by the gender of the word *udapāna-* which of the two possibilities can be taken into consideration. In the Mathurā inscriptions the nominative of the word appears once in the form *udapāno* and at another time in the form *udapānaṃ*⁵⁰, which could point to the possibility that it was used in masculine as well as in neuter. The form *udapānaṃ*, however, cannot be regarded as sure. On the published photograph of the squeeze⁵¹ not one, but two dots can be seen above the akṣara *na*. These two dots are arranged in equal height above the akṣara and can be regarded without any difficulty as

⁴⁹ Cp. line 5 of the Junagarh inscription of Rudradānam.

⁵⁰ H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. No. 64 and No. 98.

⁵¹ H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. 296, Fig. §98.

the remainders of the *o-mātrā*. Thus it can hardly be doubted that also in this case the correct form is *udapāno* and thus the use of the word in masculine seems to be exclusive. On the basis of this the form *udapānam* can be regarded at a high probability as masculine accusative also in the inscription under discussion and as a consequence of this we can reckon with an active construction in the passage beginning with line 3.

This conclusion is in good agreement with the last line of the inscription the remaining part of which]*ṣṭha ailaravarabhoja saputra* obviously contains the name and title of the restorer of the water-reservoir. The fragment *-ṣṭha* is very likely the termination of a superlative adjective, like *vasiṣṭha-* 'bravest', *variṣṭha-* 'most eminent' etc. The next words, viz.: *aila-* 'giver of refreshing drink', *hara-* 'mighty, of destructive strength', *vara-* 'most eminent', are also fitting well as epithets among the titles of a ruler or a high dignitary. The name of the restorer is obviously *Bhoja*, as this is indicated by the subsequent phrase *saputra* 'together with his son'. Thus the remaining part of line 5 can be interpreted as follows: «the [brav]est, giver of refreshing drink, mighty, most eminent Bhoja together with his son». Since this phrase stands in nominative, only an active or middle predicate can belong to it and the word *udapāna-* must really stand in accusative.

If we observe the attributes of Bhoja, it is striking that there is no actual dignitary name among them, although the long enumeration of attributes in comparison to the shortness of the inscription renders it doubtless that Bhoja was some significant personality and had a high office. For this reason we must presume that in the broken off part of the line before the word [*vasi*]-*ṣṭha* still a dignitary name must have stood. We can think of the following titles of rulers: *mahārājan-*, *adhīrājan-*, *rājatirājan-*, *parameśvara-* etc., or some other dignitary name. Since in the beginning of the line in all probability [*pānam* . . . has to be restored, and before the akṣara *ṣṭha* still at least 2 letters could have stood, thus taking into consideration that from line 5 also otherwise more has been preserved on the stone than from the other lines, it can be held doubtless that between the words *uda[pānam* and *vasi]ṣṭha* there was space at the most only for 4 or 5 akṣaras. This is filled up by any dignitary name and thus it is evident that the predicate could not stand in line 5, but only in line 4.

In line 4 before the word *uda* the form *saṃyānastivā* can be read. This is a compound word and it must be obviously the attribute of the word *udapāna-*. However, the termination of the word can only be explained with difficulty. The second element of the compound is undoubtedly the word *s tvan-* 'flowing, running, hurrying' and beside the form *uda[pānam* this ought to appear as an attribute in the form *saṃyānasitvānam* and as an attributive compound in the form *saṃyānasṛtvoda[pānam*, instead of this, however, we find the masculine nominative form *saṃyānasṛtvā*. In fact we could think that instead of

uda[*pānam* we could restore the form *uda*[*pāno* in the last line. But, on the one hand, we ought to expect the form *saṃyanasṛtvoda*[*pāno* also in this case, which would not solve the actual problem, and on the other hand we ought to count with a double anakoluthia within three lines, which is rather unlikely. Thus we can most probably suppose that the scribe preparing the inscription interpreted the *o* as a *pluta* vowel and thus in accordance with this he wrote it with the orthography *ā-u*.

The interpretation of the word *saṃyāna-* in the given context is rather difficult. The meaning of the word is very diversified, *viz.:* 'mould, bricks, going together, travelling, start, means of travelling' *etc.* Of these meanings in correlation with *udapāna-* perhaps the first one could be taken into consideration at the highest probability. In this case the word *saṃyāna-* could mean the bed of the water-reservoir, which in the course of the reconstruction was strengthened with bricks or stones and shaped into the «mould» of the tank. If this interpretation of the word *saṃyāna-* is correct in the given context, then the phrase *saṃyānasṛtvāḥuda*[*pānam* can be translated as follows: «the water-reservoir flowing in bed (paved with stone)».

In line 4 before the word *saṃyānasṛtvā* still an akṣara *ta* can be read. Since we have to look for the predicate in line 4, the beginning of which could have been occupied still by the end of the sentence started in line 3, the word from which this letter has been preserved, can hardly be anything else than the predicate sought for. The termination *-ta* could be either the passive past participle or the middle preterit form of a verb. However, as we have seen above, we must undoubtedly presume an active construction in the sentence, and thus the first possibility can be left out of account. Considering that in the inscriptions the forms of the verb *kar-* are used in the meaning 'to cause to prepare, to cause to make' in general it is obvious to restore the fragment]*ta* as the form *akuru]**ta* 'caused to be made, caused to be prepared'. Thus the translation of lines 3 and 4 could be as follows: « . . . the great king, the bravest, the giver of refreshing water, the mighty one, the most eminent Bhoja together with his son caused to prepare a water-reservoir flowing in a bed (paved with stone).»

The predicate *akuru]**ta* satisfies well the syntactic requirements of lines 4 and 5, but does not explain the accusative *uda*[*pānam inabhagnahrutam* to be read in line 3, since this can by no means depend on this predicate. Thus we can only think that in line 4 before the verbal form *akuru]**ta* there must have been also another verbal form, to which the phrase in question was subordinated. For the restoration of this passage of the inscription a good parallel is rendered by one of the Mathurā inscriptions.⁵² In this after the introduc-

⁵² H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. No. 99.

tory part describing the earlier history of the *devakula* we can read the following:

- line 3] . . . 'ta'ta'sca deva'kulam bha'gnapatitavi'sir'nam dṛ'sya ma'ha'[tā dhanaughena devakulam . . .]
 4 . . .]'mahār'āja'rājā'tir'ājade'vapu[trasya] Huvīṣkasya āyuba'lavṛddhya'rtha cakkre[. . .]
 5 . . . mahāda]ṇḍanāyaka . . .

On the reading and restoration of the inscription we can remark the following. In line 3 the fragment *ma'ha'*[, of course, could be restored also as the form *ma'hā'*[*rājasya* or the complete title of Huvīṣka and in this case we could presume the word *pratimā* 'image, statue' as possession to the genitive, which definitely must have appeared in the inscription, which is carved into the base of a statue. It is, however, unlikely that in the same sentence the name and titles of Huvīṣka would have appeared twice. Thus we can think at the most that the word *pratimā* stood without a genitive and with a separate predicate between the phrase *mahatā dhanaughena* and the word *devakulam*. In this case the passage would be run as follows: *maha[tā dhanaughena pratimām pratyasthāpayat devakulamca] . . . cakkre*. Another possibility would be to insert the phrase *pratimām pratyasthāpayat* in the text after the verbal form *cakkre*. For the fact that the name and titles of the person represented by the statue are not repeated once more, if these have occurred already once in the context of the sentence, a good example is rendered by the Dalpat-ki-Khirki Mohalla inscription originating from the 14th year of Kaniṣka, the parallel passage of which runs as follows: . . . *Samghilā bhagavāto Pitāmāhasya samṃyasaṃbuddhasya svamatasya devasya pūjārtham pratimām pratiṣṭhāpayati* «Samghilā in honour of the saint Pitāmaha, the Most Fully Enlightened One, the god preaching his own teaching causes the image to be erected». ⁵³ In connection with the reading of the inscription we must still remark that H. Lüders read in line 4 the form *cakkra* and in connection with the next akṣara he thought of the reading *ma*. The latter reading is, however, entirely uncertain and the verbal form 'caṃ'kkra'ma'[te or 'caṃ'kkra'mi'[ti to be restored thus, would not have any meaning in the context, because in this passage obviously a verbal form meaning 'caused to be made' must stand. Of the two photographs of squeezes published the lower one ⁵⁴ shows the reading *kkre* possible and thus we can very likely count in the context with the verbal form *cakre* as a restoration fitting in this passage.

On the basis of the afore-said the quoted passage can be interpreted as follows:

⁵³ H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. No. 81.

⁵⁴ H. LÜDERS: Mathurā Inscriptions. 297.

«And later seeing that the sanctuary broke in, collapsed and is in a ruined state, at a high expenditure the sanctuary . . .
 caused to be repaired for the increase of the life and power of the great king, the king of kings, the son of god, Huviṣka . . .
 . . .the commander in chief of the army . . .»

As we can see, the syntactic construction of this part of this inscription is very near to that of the inscription discussed by us, so that on the basis of this it is very likely that also in this we can restore the absolutive *drśya* or *drṣtvā* at the beginning of line 3. In this case only a space for 4 or 5 akṣaras will remain between the words *drṣtvā* and *akuruta*, so that we can restore here some adverb at the most. The word *alpakālatvaṃ* recommended is, of course, only one of the numerous possibilities (*tvarayā*, *ātvarayā*, etc.).

On the basis of these remarks we can give the following interpretation to the inscription:

- Line 1 [«Bliss! In the thirty-eight]th year, in the 38th year
 2 [on the seven]th [of the bright fortnight of the month] Bhādra[pa-
 da], on the 7th d(ay) of the bri(ght fortnight), on this day
 3 [seeing the water]-reservoir flooded [from the strength of the rainfall]
 with mighty bursting of dam
 4 [in a short time caused to build] in (paved) bed flowing water-
 5 [reservoir the great king, the brav]est, the giver of refreshing drink,
 the mighty one, the most eminent Bhoja together with his son.»

VI

In connection with the inscription still two further problems arise. One of them is the question of dating. If we presume that the era used in the inscription is the same variant of the *Laukika-kāla*, which was used in the Sanskrit inscription of stone «A», then the 38th year of the *Laukika*-Era, the 7th day of the bright fortnight of the month Bhādrapada corresponds to Saturday, the 4th September 863. The second problem is the identification of the person named Bhoja causing the reconstruction of the water-reservoir, in whom we must see in all events a significant ruler on the basis of his strikingly numerous titles as compared with the shortness of the inscription. The name Bhoja occurs rather frequently in the History of India, but in the 9th century we know only of one Bhoja, whose name can appear on an inscription in this region and this is Bhoja I, one of the most significant rulers of the Pratihāra dynasty, who held Kanauj firmly in his hands already as from 836.⁵⁵ Bhoja, who also appears under the names Mihira, Ādivarāha, Prabhāsa, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Deogarh (from 862 A. D.), Gwalior (from 876

⁵⁵ See R. C. MAJUMDAR—H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI—KALIKINKAR DATTA: *An Advanced History of India*. 170.

A. D.) and Pehoa (from 882—883 A. D.) On the basis of this his reign is dated to the years between 836 and 890.⁵⁶

In the year of the preparation of the inscription Mihira Bhoja was already the ruler of a mighty empire. On the Deogarh inscription originating from the year 862 he bears the title *paramēśvara*, this is why we restored line 5 of the inscription with this title. One of the historical reports of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* also elucidates how the name of Bhoja can appear on the inscription found in the region of Idak—Spinwam. According to Kalhaṇa's report Śaṃkaravarman, king of Kashmir between 883 and 902, led a warfare against Alakhāna, ruler of Gurjara situated between the Jhelum and the Chenab. The warfare brought victory for Śaṃkaravarman, who thus succeeded to get hold of the already mentioned *Takka-deśa*, which by this was drawn out from the rule of Bhoja, the chief king (*adhīrāja*)⁵⁷. This datum of the narrative clearly shows that Alakhāna, as ruler of Gurjara, was in fact a satellite of Mihira Bhoja. But Kalhaṇa also tells that in the fight against Śaṃkaravarman, Alakhāna was helped by Lalliya Śāhi, the ruler of Udabhāṇḍa, against whom the king of Kashmir could not have any success, although he would have liked to put him under his own regime.⁵⁸ The role of Lalliya Śāhi in the war between Alakhāna and Śaṃkaravarman shows that he belonged to the same power grouping as Alakhāna, and thus he was probably also the vassal of Mihira Bhoja. Lalliya Śāhi was the founder of the Hindu Śāhi dynasty of Udabhāṇḍapura. The story of his accession is known from the report of Birūnī. According to this Lalliya (in Birūnī *klr*, read *lly*, as this was recommended first by Ch. Seybold⁵⁹) was the Minister of Lagā-Tūrmān (*lg'twrm'n* = ? **Laghu Toramāna* 'Heedless Toramāna'), the last ruler of the Turk Śāhi dynasty, who on the side of the evil-minded king acquired great power and influence, and finally he had Lagā-Tūrmān imprisoned and occupied the throne himself.⁶⁰ Taking into consideration that Lalliya later on, in the beginning of the reign of Śaṃkaravarman, that is about the years 883—885, was the vassal of Mihira Bhoja and participated in the repulsion of the Kashmiri attack on his side, it is obvious to suppose that this vassal relation dates back still to the time, when there was a need for the consolidation of his reign and that his accession to the throne was carried out in fact with the help of Mihira Bhoja.⁶¹

⁵⁶ B. PRAKASH: India as described by a Tenth Century Persian Geographer. Summaries of Papers. 78.

⁵⁷ M. A. STEIN: Zur Geschichte der Čāhis von Kābul. Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth. Stuttgart 1893. 6 ff. (lithographic print), as well as Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. I. 205 ff., II. 336. ff.

⁵⁸ M. A. STEIN: Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. I. 206.

⁵⁹ CH. SEYBOLD: ZDMG 48 (1894) 700.

⁶⁰ Birūnī: op. cit. 361.

⁶¹ Already B. PRAKASH: *loc. cit.* thought of the possibility that the coming into power of the Hindu Śāhi dynasty in Udabhāṇḍapura is connected with the occupations and expansion of the Pratiharas in Punjab.

This event must have taken place much before the 880-s, because in 897 already Kamaluka reigned in Udabhāṇḍapura,⁶² who was preceded on the throne even by Sāmanta. It seems to be likely, therefore, that Lalliya Śāhi must have died soon after the warfare of Śaṃkaravarman. Thus the beginning of his reign must be dated at least around the year 860, because two decades were surely needed by Lalliya Śāhi to consolidate his rule and to regain the power and authority of the kingdom of Udabhāṇḍapura. Thus the coming into power of Lalliya Śāhi and simultaneously with this the expansion of the power of Mihira Bhoja can be dated to the years in the neighbourhood of 860. The vassal dependence of the rulers of Udabhāṇḍapura from the Pratihāra kings of Kanauj lasted to the end of the 9th century, when the Hindu Śāhi dynasty for a time became the vassal of the kings of Kashmir. In the twenties of the 10th century, however, the rulers of Kanauj restored their supremacy over the kingdom of Udabhāṇḍa and maintained it up to its fall in the 11th century. This is clearly testified by the report of the Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam on Udabhāṇḍa, viz.: «Vayhind (= Udabhāṇḍa), a large town. Its king Jaypāl is under the orders (of the raja) of Qinnauj. In it live a few Muslims, and the Hindūstān merchandise, such as musk, precious things, and precious stuffs, mostly come to this country.»⁶³

This historical picture is now completed by the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B» with very interesting new details. From its text it becomes clear that the territory of Idak-Spinwam in 863 as part of the Udabhāṇḍa kingdom belonged already under the regime of Mihira Bhoja, who rendered help to the reconstruction of a damaged water-reservoir in that territory. According to later sources the power of the rulers of Udabhāṇḍa extended from Lamghān to the Chenāb and from the southern border of Kashmir to the limits of the properties of the Amīr of Mūltān.⁶⁴ The territory of Idak and Spinwam was obviously a border region between the kingdom of Udabhāṇḍa and the territories under Arab regime. Under the weak last ruler of the Turk Śāhi dynasty of Udabhāṇḍa the Arabs extended their rule also over the Tochi valley. This is clearly shown by the Arabic inscription of stone «A», according to which in 857 in this region an Arab official had built or reconstructed a water-reservoir. When, however, Lalliya Śāhi came into power, who by the recognition of the supremacy of Mihira Bhoja consolidated his position very soon, the kingdom of Udabhāṇḍa regained the territory of Idak and Spinwam about 860 with the help of the Pratihāra ruler. For the development of the agricultural production of the area Mihira Bhoja rendered help in the form of reconstruction of water-reservoirs which is eternized by the Sanskrit inscription of stone «B».

⁶² See J. MARQUART: *Ērānšahr*. 296 foll.

⁶³ V. MINORSKY: *Hudūd al-‘Ālam*. 92.

⁶⁴ V. MINORSKY: *op. cit.* 254.

Thus the three inscriptions discussed so far reveal quite different historical relationships from those thought by the publishers. A. H. Dani thought that the inscriptions prove the definitive consolidation of the Arab rule in the territory of Idak-Spinwam from the year 857. In reality just the opposite has turned out. In this area the Arab rule was only of transitional character. As a result of the defectiveness of the sources for the time being it is difficult to state exactly when the Arabs extended their power over the territory of Idak-Spinwam. According to the report of Balādūrī al-Muhallab bn Abū Ṣufra led a predatory expedition already under the reign of Mu'āwiya in 664/5 (44 H.) against *bnh* and 'lhw'r «which are situated between Mūltān and Kābul». ⁶⁵ The identification of the two place-names is disputed. J. Marquart identifies *bnh* with *Fa-la-na* of Hiūan-tsang and looks for it far to the south of the area of Idak-Spinwam, in the region of the Bholan mountain pass. ⁶⁶ This definition can well be adjusted with the fact that Balādūrī in his report on the warfare mentions the province of Qīqān, which can definitely be looked for in the above-mentioned region. Thus, however, the geographical definition will be in contradiction with the datum, according to which *bnh* and 'lhw'r are situated between Mūltān and Kābul. We could eventually think that the narrative of Balādūrī deals in fact with two clashes, one of which took place at *bnh* and the other in the province of Qīqān. In this case it would be possible to identify *bnh* (**Banna*) with Bannu, which is really situated between Mūltān and Kābul. ⁶⁷ If this identification is correct, then we can count with the transitory appearance of the Arabs in the area of Bannu and thus in the region of Idak and Spinwam already in the 7th century.

According to another report of Balādūrī and Ya'qūbī under the caliph Maṣṣūr (754—775) the governor of Sind, Hīšām bn 'Amr al-Taḡlibī, launched an attack against 'lqndh'r navigating upwards in the river Indus. ⁶⁸ It is a general custom to identify the place-name 'lqndh'r (**Qandhār*) with the province *Gandhāra*, although it is not absolutely sure, whether the name **Qandhār* refers to the capital Udabhāṇḍapura. ⁶⁹ At any rate it seems to be likely that the more southern territories of the kingdom of Udabhāṇḍa, thus also the regions of Idak, Spinwam and Bannu came under Arab rule only at this time or hereafter. Thus we can reckon with Arab administration in this region only as from the end of the 8th century, and as it is proved by the Arabic inscription of stone «A», the Arab regime existed in this area at any rate up to 857.

⁶⁵ J. MARQUART: *Ērānšahr*. 273.

⁶⁶ J. MARQUART: *op. cit.* 274—277.

⁶⁷ As this has already been assumed by M. REINAUD: *Mémoire géographique, historique et scientifique sur l'Inde*. Paris 1849. 109 foll. 176.

⁶⁸ J. MARQUART: *Ērānšahr*. 271.

⁶⁹ J. MARQUART: *loc. cit.*; V. MINORSKY: *Hudūd al 'Ālam*. 254.

It is not difficult to recognize those historical reasons, which led to the end of the Arab regime in the region of Idak—Spinwam. In the Eastern Iranian main territory of the Arab rule, in Siyistān started those disturbances and fights about 850, which led to the elevation of the Ṣaffarids. Ya'qūb bn Layt aṣ-Ṣaffar gained the rule over Siyistān already in 861.⁷⁰ As a result of these struggles, however, the Arab rule was considerably shaken in the territories of Eastern Iran and Western India, as this is shown just by those warfares, which had to be led against these territories by Ya'qūb and after his death by his brother, 'Amr bn Layt, for the restoration of their regime between 868 and 897. It is obvious to think that the perturbation of the Arab rule as from 850 was exploited by the Pratihāra ruler, Mihira Bhoja, and his vassal, Lalliya Śāhi, king of Udabhāṇḍapura, to liberate the region of Bannu, Idak and Spinwam and eventually also other territories, from the Arab rule. Since neither the warfares of Ya'qūb, nor those of 'Amr affected the territory of India, it is evident that the region of Idak and Spinwam remained under the regime of the ruler of Udabhāṇḍapura also after 863.

From the above analysis it also becomes clear that the Turk and then Hindu Śāhi rulers of Udabhāṇḍapura in the period under discussion cannot be identified either with the Kābul-śahs, or with the rulers of Zābulistan. The latter fell victims to the wars of conquest of the Ṣaffarids during the 9th century and had been in vassal dependence already earlier. The rulers of Udabhāṇḍapura, on the other hand, have never been under Arab supremacy and as from the 860-s with the support of the Pratihāra kings, as their vassals, played the role of the bulwark of India against foreign occupation, up to their fall in the 11th century.

⁷⁰ See W. BARTHOLD: *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*. London 1928. 216.