

## Again on the Donation Made by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena and on Other Inscriptions from Phanigiri

Oskar von HINÜBER (Freiburg)

While the article on Dhammasena's donation published in the previous issue of this journal was in print<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Dr. Ingo Strauch, Université de Lausanne, visited the site of Phanigiri and procured excellent photos of the inscription together with a booklet published locally and containing also photos of some new inscriptions from Phanigiri.<sup>2</sup> This precious gift, first of all the excellent photos of the Dhammasena inscription, for which I am most grateful, helped to remove most doubts and to correct some mistakes caused by reading the occasionally deceptive rubbing, which was the only basis of the previous article. The progress in understanding the inscription is considerable. This, at the same time, aptly demonstrates the dangers of working with inadequate material of inferior quality, which, however, cannot always be recognized as such, if there is no immediate access to the original inscription.

In line 1 the second *akṣara* is completely destroyed without any trace left. There are some scratches below line 2, which, however, do not seem to be to script, but a damage of the stone rather. The reconstruction [*pati*] *thāpitā* remains valid. The first *akṣara* in line 5 is almost lost with a very minor trace of the lower right part of what might have been a *na* just visible. It is not even impossible that this *akṣara* was deleted on purpose. If so, a segmentation *bhātūputenā budhinā* would be possible with a wrong long *-ā* in the ending of °-*putenā* which could be explained by the preceding and the following instrumentals correctly ending in *-nā*. Although this remains a rather uncertain assumption, it would remove the strange personal name Nābuddhi and lead to perfect set of names for the brother and his sisters: Buddhi, Bodhā and Buddhā.

At the end of line 5 the last word is to be corrected to *pāvajitikāya* followed by *dhammasiriya*: *ca* was a misreading for the missing case ending *-ya* now clearly visible

---

<sup>1</sup> O. v. Hinüber, "A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena's Donation," in: *ARIRIAB* XV. 2012, pp. 3-10.

<sup>2</sup> R. Chenna Reddy, *Phanigiri. A Buddhist Site in Andhra Pradesh (An interim report 2001-2007)*, Department of Archaeology and Museums. Archaeological Series No. 76. Hyderabad 2008. This useful report contains besides some general information on the site also attempts to read some inscriptions including the Dhammasena inscription, which, however, is published only repeating the fairly faulty transcript (cf. *ARIRIAB* XV. 2012, p. 3) and without accompanying translation or image. The errors in lines 8 and 9 persist: *ekato* is read as "*charka[to]*" (sic) and interpreted as "the installation of a *chakra* (*Dharmachakra*) at Sadi Vihara" in the summary of the content.

on the photo. This is not without consequences for the interpretation. First, grammar and structure of the sentence are improved. Second, there is no name Pāvajitikā as assumed earlier: “and with the sister Dhammasiri, who has left home.”

At the end of line 6 both vowels in *bodhā* are not very distinct, but likely. The same is true for the last *akṣara* of line 8. The long vowels in *hātūna*, line 9, are not clearly visible. However, there is no longer any doubt about the long first vowel of *thāpitaṃ*.

In line 10 the problematic *bha(sa)khula* disappears. Instead, an only slightly less problematic *bhaṃḍaphula* emerges now with an *anusvāra* placed above the line between *bha* and the following *ḍa*, which was hidden on the rubbing. Moreover, reading the rubbing only, it seemed as if the *ḍa* and the first half of *phu* formed one *akṣara*, a not very distinct *sa*, and the second half was, consequently, mistakenly taken as *khu*. However, *bhaṃḍa*, though certain, is also difficult to explain, perhaps as a crossing of *khaṇḍa* as in *khaṇḍa-phulla*,<sup>3</sup> which is common in Theravāda texts, and *bhagga* < *bhagna* as in *bhagna-sphuṭita*.<sup>4</sup> The meaning however does not change: “to make repairs of what is broken.” At any rate it remains an expression not found elsewhere so far.

Another improvement is *pavāraṇāmahe* in line 11 with the locative ending not recognized earlier “on (the occasion of the) Pavāraṇā festival.” The last *akṣara* in this line is, though legible only with some difficulties, without doubt *pha*. The dot visible immediately above *pha* is a damage of the stone.

The first *akṣara* of line 14 is damaged but the reading is certain. The text at the end of this line is better comprehensible now: *bhikhusaṃghena dātavā puphamolaṃ*, although the meaning is surprising and puzzling: “by the community of monks must be given as the price for flowers .....” There is hardly any possibility to avoid the conclusion that the monks themselves have to contribute, however modestly, it seems, to the celebration of the Pavāraṇā festival. The word °-*mola* corresponds to Prakrit *molla* derived from Sanskrit *maulya* or *mūlya* “price.” The plural form *dātavā* is justified because it refers to the six Kāhāpaṇas.

The enigmatic *kāhāpaṇava* in line 15 disappears, because instead of *va* the *akṣara cha* emerges now, “six” in words and figures: *kāhāpaṇa cha 6*. The word *kāhāpaṇa* ends in a short vowel. The last word in this line is *sāṇikāyo* with a long first vowel, which is hardly visible. However, the right stroke of the *akṣara sa* does not reach the top of the line as it would, if a short vowel is intended. This difference can be easily verified in the word *sāka* in line 19.

In the previous article, the meaning of word *sāṇikā* was misunderstood<sup>5</sup>. Now, there is a parallel in the inscription “Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b” discussed below. If this is compared, there are two options for interpretation. The meaning should either be “pot” of unknown derivation or “a measure,” derived from Sanskrit *sāṇa* “a weight of four māśas.”

<sup>3</sup> It is perhaps even conceivable that *bhaṇḍa* also means “defective” given the meaning *chinnamūrdhā* listed in the much later *Deśināmamālā* by Hemacandra (6.109).

<sup>4</sup> On the use of both these expressions cf. O. v. Hinüber, *Behind the Scene: The Struggle of Political Groups for Influence as Reflected in Inscriptions* (in press).

<sup>5</sup> ARIRIAB XV. 2012, p. 9.

The reading of line 16 can be greatly improved by using the photograph. First, below the line the numerical sign “4,” which is completely hidden in the rubbing, appears below the *akṣara dā*. This number obviously refers to *sāṇikāyo* “4 *sāṇikās*, i.e. weights or pots”.

Moreover, all doubtful readings in line 16 disappear, and the lines 14 to 17 can be translated now as follows: “then, as the price for flowers six 6 *kāhāpaṇas* must be given annually by the community of monks and for oil for lamps 4 *śāṇikās* are to be given.”

Here, the verbal root  $\sqrt{dā}$  is used as a simplex and with two different prefixes to describe the act of giving. First, Dhammasena uses *saṃpadattaṃ* when he “hands over” his 150 cows (and?) 150 *tarīḍelas*.<sup>6</sup> Then, six *kāhāpaṇas* are given by the monks which is expressed by *dātavā*, and finally the verb *paridātava* occurs in combination with the four *sāṇikās*.

By using the available lexicographical resources it seems impossible to precisely define the semantic nuances, by which *dātava*, *saṃpadatta* and *paridātava* are distinguished. At least *sam-pra-dā* can be understood better by comparing the technical use of this word as found in the *Arthaśāstra*. Here, *sam-pra-dā* seems to mean “to hand over” as in *saṃpradānākalikena arghēṇa*, Kauṭalya 3.12.26 “according to the rate at the time of giving (the goods for them for sale)” (R. P. Kangle). It is remarkable that the same verb is used also in one of the rare inscriptions from the time of Rudrapuruṣadatta: *khetam saṃpadattaṃ*, Tsukamoto II Gurz 1.2, and that this is the only epigraphical reference listed by K. Tsukamoto.<sup>7</sup> This verb seems to have been used to express a legal transfer of property by the Ikṣvāku administration and in the *Arthaśāstra*.

Incidentally, *paridāna* also occurs twice in the *Arthaśāstra*, e.g., in *prajñāpana-ājñā-paridāna-lekhāḥ*, Kauṭalya 2.10.38 “documents of communication, command and gift” (K. P. Kangle), which, however, does not allow drawing any definite conclusion on the precise meaning of *pari-dā*.

The verb *pari-dā* usually means “to hand over” or “to deposit.” Therefore, the difference between *dātavā* and *paridātava* is perhaps that the monks are asked to actually pay the 6 *Kāhāpaṇas* for flowers, but keep the oil ready for use.

Consequently, Dhammasena first states that he transfers the property 150 cows to the Buddhist monastery at Phanigiri. Then, however, he continues by demanding something in return from the monks, when he uses the *participium necessitatis* twice in *dātava* and *paridātava*.

The demand is underlined, as can be seen now from an improved reading, by a second demand: “this must be respected without breaking the agreement.” This is expressed by the negated instrumental case *a-vi-saṃ-vadamtena*, a syntactical device also found in Vinaya texts.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt now that the figure is “150,” and a reading “7” instead of 50 can safely be ruled out.

<sup>7</sup> Keisho Tsukamoto, *A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions. Part I. Texts, Notes and Japanese Translation*. Kyoto 1996. *Part II Indices, Maps and Illustrations*. Kyoto 1998 [rev.: G. Fussman, *BEFEO* 88, 2001, p. 383-385], on the Gurzāla inscription cf. also *ARIRIAB* XIV. 2011, p. 9 note 7.

<sup>8</sup> O. v. Hinüber, *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beihefte. Neue Folge 2. München 1968 § 101; for a similar use of the locative case cf.

Not much changes in the last two lines. At the end of line 18 the *akṣara rā* is clearly readable now and a reconstruction as *purā[nā]* is perhaps not unlikely. Following a name the word *purāṇa* might indicate a former occupation of the *ācārya* Buddhisiṛi such as *purā[nāmātya]*. This, however, is not more than a guess. As the instrumental case of the name Buddhisiṛi is used, the missing verb must be a *participium necessitatis*, meaning something like “this must be executed by ...”

The reading *sakā* in *bhagavato sakāni baṃdhanā[ni]* in line 19 is a simple error for *sāka* of unknown meaning. The word *sāka* could be connected to Sanskrit *śākya* or *śāka*, what does not help.

The segmentation of *sākanibaṃdhanī* poses difficulties, because, most unfortunately, nothing at all is left of the last line 20, where no more than 10 *akṣaras* could have been lost, because the space below the word *bhagavato* in line 19 remained empty. It is, moreover, unlikely, but not at all impossible, that the inscription ends exactly at the end of line 19. Therefore, it cannot be decided, whether or not the last word of line 19 is *nibaṃdhanī* “band, fetter” or *nibaṃdha* meaning perhaps “endowment” with the last *akṣara ni* being the beginning of the next word. The expression *bhagavato sākanibaṃdhanī* “bond, fetter to, of the *sāka* of the Buddha” remains incomprehensible, and it is uncertain that *nibaṃdhanī* is intended at all. Only a parallel might help to understand of the end of the inscription.

Once all corrected readings are inserted the following text of the inscription can be established now. Corrections of the first reading are printed in normal boldfaced type (Fig. 1a-e):

- 1: p./l./h + k./r. + + + + + + + +
  - 2: vinayadharena dhammasenenā **[pati]**
  - 3: thāpitā saha apāno jeṭṭhabhātūhi
  - 4: budhisirīnā dhammasirīnā bhātupute
  - 5: na (n)ā (bu)dhinā bhagīnīya ca pāvajitkā
  - 6: ya dha(m)masiriya bhātuputihi bodhā
  - 7: ya budhāya ca evaṃ savehi nātimita
  - 8: baṃdhavehi sadhivihārinisavihāri(bh)i
  - 9: ekato h(ā)t(ū)na thāpitaṃ sasatakālikam
  - 10: imaṃ deyadhammaṃ bhaṃḍaphulasamthapasa
  - 11: ca anuvasikaṃ ca pavāraṇāmahe pupha
  - 12: chatanasa kāraṇāya gāvīnaṃ diyaḍhasa
  - 13: taṃ tariḍelānaṃ 100 50 saṃpadattaṃ tato anu
  - 14: (va)ssikaṃ bhikkhusaṃghe(na) dātavā puphamolaṃ
  - 15: kāhāpaṇā cha 6 dīpatelasa ca sāni(kā)
  - 16: yo paridātava etaṃ avisaṃvadaṃtena anu
- 4 (inserted between the lines)



17: *vaṭetavaṃ etaṃ ca mahānavakaṃmikenā mahā*

18: + + + *kena acariya budhisirin(ā) purā*

19: + + + + + + + + *bhagavato sākanibamdhani*

20: [+ + + + + + + + +]

With the exception of the very beginning and the end the improved text can be understood and translated as follows:

“... are erected by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena together with his elder brothers Budhisiri (and) Dhammasiri, the son of the brother, Budhi (Nābudhi?), and with the sister Dhammasiri, who has left home, and with the brother's daughters Bodhā and Buddhā, as well as (*evaṃ*) with all blood relations, friends, relatives, living together or separately, (all) united. This pious donation is established as everlasting. To make repairs of what is broken and (to make) every year a canopy of flowers on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā festival, one and a half hundred of cows, 150 Tārīḍelas are handed over. Moreover, every year the community of monks must give as the price for flowers six 6 Kāhāpaṇas, and 4 *sāṇikās* (measures or pots) of oil for lamps must be provided (or: kept ready for use). This must be respected without breaking the agreement. And this (i.e. the donation?) by the Great Builder, the Great ... Master Budhisiri, the former ..... attached to the *sāka* of the Buddha (???) ...”

The structure of the inscription can be described as follows: The monk Dhammasena and his relatives established (*paṭiṭhāpitā*) more than one object, probably buildings and columns (*thambha*), because repairs and a builder (*navakammika*) are mentioned later in the text. Probably more than one line is missing at the beginning.

Dhammasena, a Vinaya specialist and the initiator of the donation, is the youngest of three brothers. The relation of the other persons mentioned by name cannot be established with certainty, although the structure of the inscription allows the following tentative conclusions. One of the two brothers of Dhammasena, probably Dhammasiri, has a son Buddhi (or, less likely, Nābudhi). These altogether four male members of the family are mentioned first. Next comes the sister of the three brothers, strangely also named Dhammasiri as one of her brothers. She is called *pavajitīkā* and consequently has become a novice or nun. Lastly, two daughters of presumably the male Dhammasiri, the sisters Bodhā and Buddhā are enumerated. It can be assumed that the brother's son Buddhi, if this really is his name, could be the brother of Bodhā and Buddhā and all three, he and his two sisters, could be the children of the male Dhammasiri rather. For Budhisiri being named first as the eldest brother, might also have been a monk, if he is identical with the Ācārya Budhisiri mentioned at the end as the executioner of the donation and the agreement. This, of course, does not rule out that he had children before he entered the Saṃgha. Consequently, in the first generation of Dhammasena's family there were four children, three brothers and one sister. The only (?) brother, who did not become a monk, had three children, one son and two daughters, the second generation. It is remarkable that the parents, perhaps deceased at the time of the donation, are not mentioned at all in contradistinction to many other Buddhist donations. Nor do we learn about other deceased members of the family. Therefore, at the time of the donation the

family of Dhammasena was not particularly large,<sup>9</sup> but it was extremely Buddhist given the names of all its members. This must have applied already to the previous generation of Dhammasena's devout parents, who gave the Buddhist names to all their children, whom we know of.

The first part of the inscription concludes with: "This pious donation is established as everlasting." The wording *deyadhamma sasatakālika* seems to correspond to the expression *akṣayanīvi* also used in Ikṣvāku inscriptions<sup>10</sup> and particularly by the Kṣatrapas.<sup>11</sup>

In the second part cattle are handed over as property to the monks (?) to provide the means for future repairs<sup>12</sup> and for a flower-canopy during the yearly Pavāraṇā festival.<sup>13</sup> The meaning of *tariḍela* remains obscure. It is, however, interesting that the number of both, cattle and *tariḍela* is 150, first expressed in words, then by a numeral. Therefore, it seems possible that *tariḍela* is a (Dravidian?) word for a specific kind of cattle: "one and a half hundred of cows, 150 (cows of the Tariḍela-variety?)."

Most interesting is the third part, because here money is demanded by the donor from the Saṃgha which seems to be unique. The text is straightforward, because the instrumental case *bhikkhusaṃghena* leaves no room for a different interpretation: The monks have to provide six Kāhāpaṇas yearly to buy flowers probably those needed to prepare the canopy mentioned earlier. If so, Dhammasena perhaps donated means only for some sort of trestle, to which the flowers were to be fastened by strings such as those

<sup>9</sup> It would be worth while to collect evidence on families from these donations, which might help to get at least a very rough idea of the number of children and would thus provide some shadowy information on the population, about which almost nothing is known from written sources.

<sup>10</sup> In the inscription of Ehavala Cāntamūla, year 16: D. C. Sircar, "Two Inscriptions from Nagarjunikonda," *EI* 34. 1961/62, pp. 17-22, particularly p. 19, line 10 with a summary in P. R. Srinivasan and S. Sankaranarayan, *Inscriptions of the Ikshvaku Period*. Department of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Andhrapradesh, Hyderabad. Epigraphical Series no. 14. Hyderabad 1979, no. 44.

<sup>11</sup> H. Falk, "Money can buy me heaven. Religious donations in late and post-Kushan India," *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan*. 40. 2008, pp. 137-148, particularly p. 143 foll. — *deyadhamma sasatakālika* is not listed by K. Tsukamoto, as note 7 above.

<sup>12</sup> The family of Dhammasena was obliged to keep the buildings, which were constructed by using their donation, in good repair according to the *Samantapāsādikā* 1246,19-1247,9, cf. O. v. Hinüber, "Everyday life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery," *ARIRIAB* IX. 2006, pp. 3-31, particularly p. 20 foll. = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 2009, p. 886.

<sup>13</sup> On this festival see *ARIRIAB* XV. 2012, p. 7. The Pavāraṇā festival is also mentioned by I-tsing, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago* translated by J. Takakusu. London 1896 (repr. Delhi 1966), p. 87, who explicitly mentions lamps and flowers; cf. also Gérard Fussman, *Monuments bouddhiques de Termez. Termez Buddhist Monuments I. Catalogue des inscriptions sur poteries avec une contribution de Nicolas Sims-Williams et la collaboration d'Éric Olivier*. [Collège de France. Publication de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne Fascicule 79,1.2]. Paris 2011 [rev.: C. Scherrer-Schaub, R. Salomon, S. Baums, "Buddhist Inscriptions from Termez (Uzbekistan): A New Comprehensive Edition and Study," *IJ* 55. 2012, pp. 139-170; O. v. Hinüber, "Französische archäologische Forschungen in Afghanistan. Rückblick und Ausblick," *StI* 27. 2010, pp. 141-145], p. 41. — On Buddhist festivals cf. also Ulrich Pagel, "Stūpa Festivals in Buddhist Narrative Literature," *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 66, Wien 2007, pp. 369-394.

mentioned in the inscription “Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b” discussed below.

The fourth part is just one sentence to underline that the agreement must be kept by using the negative present participle of the verb *vi-saṃ-vad* meaning explicitly “to break one’s word or promise.” This again points to a donation combined with contract agreeing that the donee, here the Saṃgha, has to share the costs and to contribute some money as well. Consequently, the donor, who is a monk himself and from an apparently quite wealthy family, makes an agreement with his brethren. Whether or not Dhammasena owned the money, from which the donation was made, himself as a monk remains an open question.<sup>14</sup> He may have only given some spiritual guidance to his brother Dhammasiri, who most likely was a layman. Moreover, in his capacity as a *vinayadhara* he might have been responsible for formulating the document, and, if this assumption is correct, this would also explain the phrasing of the sentence *etaṃ avisamvadamtena anuvāṭetavaṃ*, which sounds like legal *vinaya*-language. His brethren, who were expected to contribute, very obviously had immediate access to the necessary financial means belonging to the Saṃgha.

In spite of the loss of a major part of the fifth and last part of the document, the general meaning can be inferred. The Ācārya Buddhīśrī is entrusted with the execution of the donation and the supervision of the agreement. His qualification as *navakammika* again points to buildings mentioned as the central part of the donation in the lost beginning of the inscription.

— — —

The inscription of Dhammasena is not the only one found at Phanigiri. In the Interim Report mentioned above there is a fragment which runs to a certain extent parallel to Dhammasena’s text, and which thus helps to elucidate certain points otherwise difficult to understand:

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment b (Fig. 2):

1. + (ma)titatho bhikhu(saṃ)[ghena]
2. a]nuvasikaṃ dātavaṃ pavāraṇāma
3. he puphamaulaṃ kāhāpaṇa cha 6
4. gaṇṭhanasutasa palāni paṃca
5. [5] divatelasa ca kuḍo e(ko)
6. [1] + + + + (dh.rā/e) + + +

The beginning of the inscription (*ma*)titatho (or °-*tha*?) does not immediately yield any

---

<sup>14</sup> On the possible access of monks to money cf. Gregory Schopen, “On Monks and Menial Laborers. Some Monastic Accounts of Building Buddhist Monasteries,” in: *Architetti, capomastri, artigiani. ... Studi offerti a Domenico Faccenna ... a cura di Pierfrancesco Callieri*. Serie Orientale Roma C. Rome 2006, pp. 225-245, particularly p. 236, but cf. also the pertinent remarks by Jean-Philippe Vogel, “Epigraphical Discoveries at Sarnath.” *EI* 8. 1905-06, pp. 166-179, particularly p. 173.



meaningful interpretation. A segmentation ]*mati tatha* seems possible, and if *tathā* “and” is meant, this could correspond to *tato*, line 13 of the Dhammasena inscription.

The the wording of the sentence *bhikhu(saṃ)[ghena /2/ a]nuvasikaṃ dātavaṃ pavāraṇāma/3/he puphamaulaṃ kāhāpaṇa cha 6* is very similar to the corresponding part in the Dhammasena inscription, but the syntax differs. Here, the *participium necessitatis* *dātavaṃ* refers to °-*maulaṃ*, unlike *dātavā* referring to the Kāhāpaṇas in the Dhammasena inscription. The word *pavāraṇāmahe*, which runs from line 2 into line 3, shows that lines 3 and 4 are complete. This allows a safe reconstruction of lines 1 and 2 on the basis of the Dhammasena inscription.

The word *gaṃthana-suta* in line 4 corresponds to Sanskrit *granthana-sūtra* “a string for tying (a wreath of flowers).” There is no parallel to this gift in the Dhammasena inscription. In line 5 *kuḍa* corresponds to Sanskrit *kuṭa* “a vessel, a pot.” The expression “one pot of oil for lamps” helps to understand *sānikāyo 4* in the Dhammasena inscription as an either otherwise unattested word for a vessel or as a derivation from Sanskrit *sāṇa* “a weight of four *māsas*.” This measure might correspond to one *kuḍa*, because the sum of money mentioned in both inscriptions is also the same. The exact amount of oil cannot be ascertained.

The missing *akṣara* at the beginning of the line 5 should be the numerical sign for “5,” because *paṃca 5* would correspond to *cha 6* and later to *eko* [1].

The traces of the upper part of the last *akṣara* in line 5 point to a vowel -*o* and thus allow for a reconstruction *eko*, which makes much sense. Consequently, the first character in line 6 should have been the numeral “1.”

Only the heads of three *akṣaras* are recognizable in line 6. The first is almost certainly *dha* (or, of course, *dhā* or *dhū* being equally possible) followed by what could be interpreted as *rā* or *re* and by the head of an *akṣara* allowing for *ka*, *ta*, *na* with all vowels except for -*ī*.

The fragment can be translated in the following way: “... and by the community of monks must be given yearly on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā festival as the price for flowers six 6 Kāhāpaṇas, for strings to tie (wreaths) five 5 Palas, and one 1 pot of oil for lamps.”

It is difficult to understand the relation between the Dhammasena inscription and this fragment. The Dhammasena inscription was excavated “from the courtyard” while it is not clear, where this fragment was found. The obligations of the Saṃgha are almost identical but wording and syntax are different in both inscriptions, which are most likely written by two different persons, if, e.g., the *akṣaras mo* in *puphamolaṃ* or the *la* in *divatela* written *divatela* in the fragment are compared. Perhaps the lamps and the flowers were to be used to decorate two different buildings,<sup>15</sup> which were donated by different families, in a very similar, if not identical way for the Pavāraṇā festival. If this is correct the inscriptions should have been attached to those two buildings originally. Furthermore, it is not unlikely that both inscriptions commemorate donations made during comprehensive renovations of the monastery as described in the Interim Report, p. 29.

<sup>15</sup> The Interim Report mentions two apsidal Caitya halls, two assembly halls, and six *viḥāras* of various size with altogether 40 cells.



Moreover, two fragments have been joined in the Phanigiri Interim Report mentioned above:

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment c (1) (Fig. 3a):

1. ]mata[
2. [s](v)[ā]mi śrī cāntamūla
3. ṣayasya ripuyuvati
4. (go)sanasya svāmi

This fragmentary Sanskrit inscription is important, because the Ikṣvāku king Cāntamūla is mentioned. It is, however, impossible to guess if the inscription dates from the reign of Cāntamūla, or whether his name is mentioned in the genealogy of a later Ikṣvāku ruler. The word *ripu-yuvati* “young women of the enemies” points to a context speaking of victory in battle.

Phanigiri Interim Report, p. 25, fragment c (2) (Fig. 3b):

1. ḥ vāsa.ṭha + + (s)ya
- 1a. rañe
2. .i .i ghatādhivāsasya
3. varṣaśatā[ni]

The image of the second small fragment of a Sanskrit inscription, which might contain some lines continuing fragment c (1), is published upside down in the Interim Report. The very fragmentary text cannot be interpreted. Only single words can be recognized: *adhivāsasya*, *varṣa-śatā[ni]*. The traces read as *rañe* seem to have been inserted between lines 1 and 2.

According to the Interim Report altogether 42 Brāhmī inscriptions were recovered during the excavations at Phanigiri (pp. 32-38), of which two inscribed Buddhapādas<sup>16</sup> and one inscribed panel are shown on p. 25 in addition to the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription.<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, the small size of the images does not allow any certain reading, and the suggestions offered in the Interim Report mostly do not make much sense, which is a strong indication of errors in the laudable efforts to decipher these inscriptions. Hopefully, a full report with good photos of all inscriptions will be available

<sup>16</sup> An image of the Buddhapāda “Interim Report p. 25 fragment e” is also available in the internet under “Important Discoveries in the Recent Past from Andhra Pradesh” ([asi.nic.in/asi\\_epigraphical\\_sans\\_andhra.asp](http://asi.nic.in/asi_epigraphical_sans_andhra.asp)). Comparing both images, the reading suggested in the Interim Report p. 33 seems to be correct: *sidham bhaya[m]ta + + + sa (natu)kasa bodhikasa deyadhama pādasaghāḍa* “Success! The pair of feet is the pious gift of Bodhika, the grandson of the venerable + + +.” The last word is confirmed by the inscription on a Buddhapāda from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, no. 51 in Srinivasan and Sankaranarayan, as note 10 above, = *EI XXXIII. 1960/61, p. 250: pādasamghāḍa*.

<sup>17</sup> O. v. Hinüber and P. Skilling, “An Epigraphic Buddhist Poem from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh) from the Time of Rudrapuruṣadatta,” in: *ARIRIAB XIV* 2011, p. 7-12, Plate 3–6.

not too far in future granting access to the evidently quite interesting and important epigraphs of this Ikṣvāku site.