A Second Inscription from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh): Dhammasena's Donation

Oskar von HINÜBER (Freiburg)

Shortly after the publication of the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription in the last issue of this journal¹, a second longer inscription from Phanigiri commemorating a donation made by Dhaṃmasena was discovered by chance when searching the inter-net. A brief note published electronically by the Archaeological Survey of India under the headline "Important Discoveries in the Recent Past in Andhra Pradesh" gives the following summary of the content of the inscription, which is repeated in *Indian Archaeology*—A Review 2003-04 [published 2011], p. 341: "It records the installation of a chakra (Dharmachakra) at Sadhivihāra (name of the monastery) and also registers a number of gifts in the form of land, cows, etc. by Vinayadhara Dhaṃmasena along with his elder brothers named Budhisiri and Dhaṃmasiri, certain other members of the family, friends and relatives. Further it records the gift of 4 kahapana (gold coins) probably for a perpetual lamp by monks (bhikhusamgha). And it refers to a Mahanavakammika (chief superintendent of works), a Mahadandanayaka and an achariya (sculptor)." An accompanying rubbing allows to read the inscription and to recover the content in detail (Plate 1).

Previously, the inscription was briefly mentioned in the report on the ongoing excavations at Phanigiri in Ancient India — A Review 2002-03 [published 2009], p. 16: "On a monolithic limestone pillar, was found a pillar inscription of ten lines with highly artistic letters of typical Ikshvaku period Brahmi characters with Prakrit language. This was unearthed at a depth of 1.1/2 m from the surface level at the courtyard. One more 92 x 14 cm slab with inscription was found containing eighteen lines of Brahmi characters in Prakrit language. It states the Sangha with instructions to the monks (sic!)." The first item mentioned here certainly is the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription in spite of the fact that it is mostly in Sanskrit. Moreover, the number of lines is correct².

Peter Skilling and Oskar von Hinüber: "An Epigraphical Buddhist Poem from Phanigiri (Andhrapradesh) from the Time of Rudrapuruṣadatta". *ARIRIAB* XIV, 2011, pp. 7-12. On two minor points the translation of the inscription could perhaps be improved upon: verse 2: *sadharmmajena* rather "(by the wheel), which originated together with the law," and in verse 4: *arcciṣā* is of course "flame," not "spark." The inscription is also mentioned now and a rubbing published in *Indian Archaeology* — *A Review 2003-04* [2011], p. 342 with plate 263. Moreover, the text of the inscription without translation, but with some incorrect readings and wrong word divisions appeared in the meantime published by K. V. Ramesh and K. Muniratnam: "Phanigiri Inscription of Rudrapurushadatta". *EI* 43.1. 2011, pp. 75-77. However, the year is erroneously given as "16" in Skilling/ v. Hinüber, but correctly as "18" in *EI*.

² More inscriptions were found and are duly mentioned here together with the Rudrapuruṣadatta and Dhaṃmasena inscriptions. Neither photo nor more detailed information about these partly probably important inscriptions is available as yet.

The measurements of the Dhammasena inscription are unusual, and it is not easy to imagine, where this stone might have fit in any building.

The lines are complete, although they seem, at first sight, to be cut off at both sides (Plates 2 and 3). At the beginning at least one line is missing, as visible traces of three *akṣaras* indicate. At the end the inscription is also damaged. However, the traces of line 20, which break off well before the end of the line is reached show that this concludes the text. The script points to a date during the reign of the Ikṣvāku dynasty without ruling out the time of Rudrapuruṣadatta.

The inscription is difficult to read in some places, but the overall meaning can be ascertained as far as the text is extant.

```
1: p./l./h.-gh.-k./r.+++++++++
```

2: vinayadharena dhammasenena + +

3: thāpitā saha apano jethabhātūhi

4: budhisirinā dhammasirinā bhātupute

5: na (n)ā(bu)dhinā bhagīnīya ca pāvajitikā

6: ya dha(m)masiri ca bhātuputihi bodhā

7: ya budhāya ca evam savehi nātimita

8: bamdhavehi sadhivihārinisavihāribhi

9: ekato hātūna th(ā)pitam sasatakālikam

10: imam deyadhammam bha(sa)khulasamthapasa

11: ca anuvasikam ca pavāranāmahapu(pha)

12: chatanasa kāraṇāya gāvīnam diyadhasa

13: tam taridelānam 100 50 (? or: 100 7?) sampadattam tato anu

14: vassikam bhikhusamghana(v)ātavāpupham-e(vam)

15: kāhāpana(v)a 6 dīpatelasa ca sāni(kā)

16: yo ca (sitavata) ca tam anisa(m) va(d)amtena anu

17: vatetava etam ca mahānavakammikena mahā

18: $+ + kena \ acariya \ budhisirin(\bar{a}) \ pu \ +$

19: + + + + + + (ma) bhagavato sakāni bamdhan(ā)

20: [ni]

Only the bottoms of the first three aksaras of the presumed line 1 are still visible. The first one could be pa, la or ha, the second is almost certainly gha, and the third could be ka or ra. The only vowel excluded is the subscript -u. Moreover, an uncertain number of lines, but most likely only one more line could be lost. For, the content of this or these first line(s) should be a date, a place, and first of all an object to which thapita in line 3 refers. Unfortunately the traces do not allow conjecturing any name of a month or a season.

Line 2 mentions the principal donor, the *vinayadhara* Dhammasena, who erected $(th\bar{a}pit\bar{a})$ an unknown object together with various members of his family. He was a member of the Buddhist *sangha*, because he is a *vinayadhara*, a title mentioned rarely in inscriptions³. At the end of line 2 two *aksaras* are missing. The gap can be filled most

³ Keisho Tsukamoto: A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions. Part I. Texts, Notes and

likely by [paṭi]ṭhāpitā referring to a lost noun (plural or feminine), the object, which was

However, Dhammasena does not act alone. The persons associated with this donation and, consequently, sharing the merit made, are enumerated in lines 3 to 9 (first half): "Together with his elders brothers Budhisiri (and) Dhammasiri, the son of the brother, Nābudhi, and the sister Pāvajitikā, and brother Dhammasiri's daughters Bodhā and Budhā, as well as with all blood relations, friends, relatives, living together or separately, all taken together (i.e. united)".

This part of the inscription is well understood in spite of some minor difficulties. The names of the family members are very Buddhist such as Pāvajitikā "the little girl that has left home" or Bodhā and Buddhā. These immediately recall names such as Namobuddhāyā, Vajrapāṇī or Māyādevī mentioned in an inscription commemorating the donation of a Buddha image made by the Palola Ṣāhi Jayamaṅgalavikramādityanandi and his queen Śāmāvatī in the year 82 (Laukika)⁴. Consequently, the son of the brother should also bear a Buddhist name. However, his name is not easily read. Only the end -dhinā is certain. The preceding akṣara is not clear, but might be a damaged character -bu-, which would result in a name ending in °-buddhi⁵. The first character should be $n\bar{a}$ -, much less likely $t\bar{a}$ -. Neither makes sense, and the name remains obscure at present°.

In line 6 dhammasiri ca bhātuputihi seems to be a split compound⁷ replacing dhammasiribhātuputihi "with the daughters of the brother Dhammasiri."

The sequence of names indicate that Buddhisiri was the eldest, Dhammasiri the second and, as stated expressly, Dhammasena himself the youngest brother. Then, Nābuddhi and (his) sister Pāvajitikā should be the children of Buddhisiri, and finally Bodhā and Buddhā are the daughters of Dhammasiri.

Next, three groups of anonymous persons are enumerated, who are separated from the immediate family members by *ca evam* to mark a new paragraph in the text.

Japanese Translation. Kyoto 1996. Part II. Indices, Maps and Illustrations. Kyoto 1998 [Rev.: G. Fussman, BEFEO 88, 2001, pp. 383-385] lists only two inscriptions mentioning a vinayadhara, one from Bodh Gayā and a second one from Amarāvatī: I: BoGa 18.1; II: Amar 82.1. Moreover, there are another three references, one Kuṣāṇa inscription published by Gauri Parimoo Krishnan: "Museological Challenge in the 21st Century: The Making of the South Asia Gallery at the Asian Civilizations Museum Singapore", Lalit Kalā 30. 2004, p. 74 figure 7 and read by Harry Falk, Berlin, and one inscription on a Buddhapāda from Nandalur (Kadapa District) in Andhrapradesh communicated and read by Peter Skilling, Bangkok, as Jnayasa vinayadharasa budhino deyadhama. I am obliged to Peter Skilling for the last two references. A third vinayadhara is mentioned in a Kuṣāṇa inscription dated in the year 79: ... bhikṣusya vinayadharasya sandhikasya dānam, Satya Shrava: The Dated Kushāna Inscriptions. Delhi 1993, p. 109, no. 134.

⁴ O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Ṣāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan 5.) Mainz 2004, p. 33 f. (inscription no. 12).

⁵ This reading was suggested by I. Strauch, Berlin-Würzburg, who kindly invited me to talk about the Dhammasena inscription in Würzburg on 26th January 2012. The article profited from the subsequent discussion in many respects.

⁶ A mistake for the not particularly Buddhist personal name $n\bar{a}[ga]buddhi$ seems rather unlikely. A reference to the obscure name $n\bar{a}s\tilde{s}ga$ ($n\bar{a}simgha$?) found in Thalpan 29:6 is not helpful, D. Bandini-König: Die Felsbildstation Thalpan I. Kataloge Chilās-Brücke und Thapan (Steine 1-30). (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans Band 6.) Mainz 2003, p. 117.

Thomas Oberlies: *Pāli. A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka*. Berlin 2001 [Rev.: Kenneth Roy Norman, *OLZ* 97. 2002, pp. 623-628; Steve Collins, *JAOS* 123. 2003, pp. 911-913; Ulrich Pagel, *BSOAS* 66. 2002, pp. 101-103; George Cardona, *Kratylos* 49. 2004, pp. 187-189; Ole Holten Pind, *ZDMG* 154. 2004, pp. 508-512], p. 122 foll.

These are first blood relations ($n\bar{a}ti$, Skt. $j\bar{n}\bar{a}ti$), followed by friends (mita, Skt. mitra), and persons related by marriage (bamdhava, Skt. $b\bar{a}ndhava$). It seems as if the friends were given preference over the relatives by marriage, which, however, most likely is a deception. The sequence of members of the compound is dictated rather by rhythm: 2+2+3.

The following compound sadhivihārinisavihāribhi* can be understood as an equivalent to Skt. *sārdhamvihāri-niḥ-sa-(or saṃ)-vihārin. Although not attested elsewhere, it seems, the compound is easily understood as "living together" (sadhivihārin) used here in a non-technical sense and not meaning "pupil (living together with a Buddhist monk)" and "not living together" (niḥsavihārin). The latter refers most likely to friends and relatives by marriage.

Because the text mentions neither father nor mother, it can be assumed that they were no longer alive when the donation was made.

The paragraph is concluded by the remark *ekato hātūna* "all taken together" (*ekato hṛtvā*)⁹: "and also with all blood relations, friends, and relatives (by marriage), living together or separately, (all) united."

The content of the donation is introduced in the next paragraph in lines 9 and 10 by "erected is this pious donation for all times," which is expressed by sasatakālikaṃ (Skt. śaśvata-kālika), a slightly unusual wording. The word deyadhaṃma is used as a neuter here as occasionally.

The first object of the donation is *bha(sa)khulasaṃthapasa*. At the end of the compound the genitive of °-saṃthapa is easily recognized, which is parallel to *khaṇḍap(!)ulla-saṇṭhappasa* "for repairs of what is broken" used in the Pāṭagaṇḍigūḍeṃ inscription¹º and corresponding to Skt. °-sthāpya. Consequently, it can be assumed that here, too, repairs are meant. If so, *bhasa*- can be read as *bhassa*- corresponding to Skt. *bhraṃśa*-, which develops into both, *bhaṃsa*- and *bhassa*- in Pkt. The remaining *khula*-can be explained in the following way. The Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo lists a rare word *khulia* as an equivalent of *khuḍia* "truṭit, khaṇḍit, vicchinna" that is "broken", which fits the context perfectly, if it is assumed that *khula* is the corresponding noun so far unattested¹¹¹. Therefore, *bhassa-khula-saṃṭhappa* is another, so far not attested word to express the concept of repairs, particularly in Buddhist monasteries besides the more usual wordings such as Pāli *khaṇḍa-phulla-paṭisaṃkhāra* or in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya khaṇḍaspuṭa-pratisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla-paṭisaṃskārāya* at Gilgit Manuscripts III 4.191,5 = Divy 22,11 or *khandap(!)ulla*

The distribution of the endings of the obliquus plural -hi and -hi is remarkable with the former being used after a long vowel in $bh\bar{a}t\bar{u}hi$ where the long $-\bar{u}$ - is indicated as in $h\bar{a}t\bar{u}na$, and \circ - $put\bar{t}hi$ (here, -ihi instead of correct $-\bar{t}hi$ is written, if the $-\bar{t}$ - in $bhag\bar{t}n\bar{t}ya$, line 5, or $g\bar{a}v\bar{t}nam$, line 12 are compared) against \circ - $vih\bar{a}ribhi$ after the short vowel of the -in-stem, cf. O. v. Hinüber: Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Wien 22001 , § 331, 356. This inscription is most likely the oldest evidence for this distribution.

⁹ For hātūna refer to Mittelindisch, as preceding note, § 498, cf. Pāli ekato katvā, CPD s.v. ekato 3.(i).

¹⁰ H. Falk: "The Pātagaṇḍigūdem copper-plate grant of the Ikṣvāku King Ehavala Cāntamūla". Silk Road Art and Archaeology 6. 1999/2000, pp. 275-283.

See also Ralph Lilley Turner: A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London 1960, no. 3892 *kuṭati "breaks." References of khanḍaphuṭṭa etc. are listed in O. v. Hinüber: "Eine Karmavācanā-Sammlung aus Gilgit". ZDMG 119. 1969, pp. 102-132, particularly p. 128 foll. = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 1-31 and p. 128 foll. and BHSD s. vv. pratisaṃskāra and sphuṭa.

santhappa as mentioned in the Pāṭagandigūdem inscription¹². This and the next genitive depend from kāraṇāya: "for the purpose of making repairs of what is broken."

The description of the donation continues in lines 11 and 12 (first half). The next item, also a genitive dependent from $k\bar{a}ran\bar{a}ya$, is connected to the first one by ca: "and for the purpose of making a flower-canopy every year (on the occasion of) the Pavāranā festival."

A festival on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā that is the special the Uposatha at the end of the rainy season can be traced in Buddhist literature only with difficulties¹³. The Sāratthadīpanī explaining the Samantapāsādikā says¹⁴: pavāraṇanakkhattan ti pavāraṇapūjadivasaṃ ... gāmanigamavāsino tayo satta vā divase nakkhattaghosaṇaṃ katvā yathāvibhavaṃ alankatapaṭiyattā bhoge bhuñjantā nakkhattaṃ kīļanti, Sp-ṭ Be II 379,11-14 "the Pavāraṇā festival means the day of the Pūjā on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā ... the inhabitants of villages and towns having announced a festival for three or seven days, being dressed and adorned according to their means and enjoying themselves celebrate a festival." This refers to ussavesū (Vin III 187,12) ti āsāṭhīpavāraṇanakkhattādīsu mahussavesu, Sp 631,18 "on the occasion of festivals means on the occasion of major festivals such as the full-moon of Āsāṭha or the Pavāraṇā festival¹5." The festivals are not specified in the Vinaya¹6.

Therefore, the Dhammasena inscription seems to be the oldest reference to a major festival accompanying the Pavāraṇā, because this inscription can be dated at about 300 AD, at any rate earlier than the anonymous Samantapāsādikā, which was most likely composed only by 400 AD¹⁷. However, there is a possibly still older reference in a Brāhmī inscription from Ceylon, which mentions the donation of money (20 kahāpaṇas¹³) for the purpose of hearing the Dhamma on the Pavāraṇā-Uposatha

On these expressions cf. also O. v. Hinüber: "Verwischte Spuren. Der Gebrauch buddhistischer Texte nach dem Zeugnis von Literatur, Inschriften und Dokumenten", in: W. Reinhard (Ed.): Sakrale Texte. Hermeneutik und Lebenspraxis in den Schriftkulturen. München 2009, pp. 153-173 (notes: pp. 325-334), particularly p. 163 foll.

¹³ On the Pavāraṇā cf. also Wilhelm Geiger: *The Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*. Stuttgart ²1986 [Rev.: O. v. Hinüber, WZKS 31. 1987, p. 208; Richard Gombrich: OLZ 85. 1990, pp. 83 foll.], § 189, 193. — For interpreting this inscription it was easiest and sufficient to check only the Theravāda literature. Further material will almost certainly come to light, as soon as the search is extended to other traditions, cf. also note 16 below.

¹⁴ Texts are quoted following the system laid down in the *Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: A Critical Pāli Dictionary (CPD)*. Vol. I. Copenhagen 1948 with a supplement in Vol. III. Bristol 2011, pp. XV-XXIV.

The āsāļhī festival of course marks the earlier of the two possible dates, on which the monks can start their retreat during the rainy season, the latest date being one month later: dve ... vassupanāyikā, aparajjugatāya āsālhiyā purimikā upagantabbā māsagatāya āsālhiyā pacchimikā, Vin I 137,25-28.

Various festivals are enumerated in the *Bhikṣunī-Vinaya*: jātimahā vā bodhimahā vā dharmacakramahā vā Ānandamahā vā Rāhulamahā vā pañcavārṣikā vā mahāpañcavārṣikā, BhiVin § 282 (314,26-28); cf. further Gregory Schopen: "Separate but Equal: Property Rights and the Legal Independence of Buddhist Nuns and Monks in Early North India". *JAOS* 128. 2008, pp. 625-640, on festivals p. 626, 629 (toyikāmaha), 632 (mahāmaha), and idem: "Taking the Bodhisatva to Town: More Texts on the Image of the Bodhisatva' and Image Processions in the Mūlasārvāstivāda-vinaya". EW 55. 2005, pp. 299-311 aptly remarking in note 5 "... the Pañcavārṣika ... appears not to have been fully understood or documented," which is almost generally true for our present state of the knowledge on Buddhist festivals.

O. v. Hinüber: A Handbook of Pāli Literature. Berlin 1996, § 209.

¹⁸ Obvioulsy, it is the intention of the donor that the interest is used to pay for the preaching, which he intends to hear year after year.

(mahapavarana-pohoyahi dhamasamana) in no. 165 B Veherakema rock-inscription dated to the third century¹⁹.

Dhammasena, on the other hand, provides for flower canopies to be spread yearly. According to a reference in the Apadāna flower canopies are used when doing homage to the Buddha as described in the *Adhi*(or: *Ati*)*cchattiyatthera-apadāna*:

kālena kālam āgantvā namassim lokanāyakam pupphacchadanam katvāna chattamhi abhiropayim, Ap 170,21 foll. "From time I came and venerated the Lord of the World. Having prepared a canopy of flowers, I raised (it) on the umbrella (on top of the Stūpa)."

The Visuddhajanavilāsinī explains: pupphacchadanam katvānā ti vikasitehi sugandhehi anekehi pupphehi chadanam chattūpari vitānam katvā pujesin ti attho, Ap-a 439,26 foll. "The meaning is: 'having prepared a canopy of flowers' means having prepared a canopy of flowers (pupphacchadana) from various fully blossomed fragrant flowers, a conopy (vitāna) above the umrella, I paid homage." This almost reads like a commentary on the inscription, where chatana instead of chadana is due to Dravidian phonetics as is inversely pādita for pātita in the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription.

To achieve this purpose "a hundred and a half" (diyadhasatam), i. e. 150, cows and 150, or perhaps only 107 — the figures 7 and 50 are difficult to distinguish — taridelas are donated (sampadattam). The meaning of taridela (or: taridela) is obscure. There seem to be three options: It might be a name for other animals besides the cows given, or a monetary unit, or a measure of land. The use of sampadattam "granted" is remarkable, particularly because only here a geminate consonant is written. The reason may be that this was felt to be a Sanskrit form used instead of the true Middle Indic dinna²⁰.

In the next lines 13 (end) to 16 (first half) the sentence is continued by tato, before a new paragraph starts with evam as in line 7. The text is not fully understood as yet: tato anuvasikam bhikhusamghanavātavāpuphame(vam) kāhāpaṇava 6 dīpatelasa ca sāṇi(kā)yo ca (sitavata) ca. The beginning is easily comprehensible "moreover every year ..." and bhikhusaṃgha is clear, too. However, the second part of the compound beginning with bhikhusaṃgha-° (reading a separate word bhikhusaṃghe or bhikhusaṃghena seems much less likely) still defies both, certain reading and interpretation²¹. Instead of the still obscure navātavā (or vātavā, if bhikhusaṃghena is preferred) also pātavā (only tavā is certain) seems to be a possible reading. Neither makes any sense. Again, pupham is a certain reading, however the singular is puzzling, if °-puppham-e(vaṃ) is correct; °-pupphamo(vaṃ) seems to be an obscure alternative. As kāhāpaṇava 6 is separated from the preceding text by evaṃ, the money is meant to buy oil for lamps (dīpatelasa). Although all this can be understood, the ending -va in kāhāvaṇava stands as unexplained. The long -ā- in kā- corresponds to, e.g., Ardhamāgadhī kāhāvaṇa.

Senarat Paranavitana: *Inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. II, Part II ed. by Malini Dias. Colombo 2001, p. 264 foll. Similar regulations all dating from the 10th century are mentioned in *Epigraphia Zeylanica* I. 1904-1912 (repr. 1976), inscription no. 2 III, p. 25 line 14 (cf. p. 28), inscription no. 7, p. 94, slab B line 2 (cf. p. 107); *EZ* III 1928-1933 (repr. 1994), inscription no. 107, p. 16.

²⁰ Cf. Mittelindisch, as note 8, § 492.

²¹ Neither the segmentation *bhikhusaṃgha-nava-ātavā-*(Skt. *ātapa??)-puppha*, nor *bhikhusaṃghena vā tavāpupha* nor reading *bhikhusaṃgha-pātavā-puppha* yields any satisfactory result.

Although the use of $ca \dots ca \dots ca$ holds together the last three items donated, only the genitive $d\bar{\imath}patelasa$ is construed with the "six Kāhāpaṇas," while the following nominatives are not. The next object could be understood as "hempen cloth". As oil for lamps is mentioned, it does not seem unlikely that these small pieces of hempen cloth $(s\bar{a}nik\bar{a}yo)$ are to be used as wicks for the lamps". If so, it is tempting to read and understand the following sitavata as "white wicks" corresponding to Skt *sitavarti". However, no trace of an -i is visible, and *vatta instead of vatti besides vatti does not seem to occur neither in Pkt. nor in new Indo-Aryan languages".

Equally puzzling is the following sentence in lines 16 and 17 tam a(n)isa(m) va(d)amtena anuvatetava "this should be followed, continued (anuvatetava, Skt. anuvartayitavyam) all times (Skt. aniśam) by ...". The reading of what seems to be the instrumental of a present participle and the agent to the participium necessitatis is not certain: vadamtena, vadamtena and vajamtena (corresponding to either Skt. varjatā or vrajatā) seem possible, but do not yield any convincing translation, nor would va[m]damtena. At any rate the overall meaning seems to be that the perpetual existence of the donation is emphasized again a wish expressed earlier by sasatakālikam.

At the very end it is said in lines 17 and 18 that the "great builder" ($mah\bar{a}nava-kammika$), the master (acariya) Budhisiri should do something. This Budhisiri might be identical with the brother of Dhammasena mentioned earlier in this inscription. As repairs are mentioned, it seems appropriate that there is a builder to execute them²⁶. What exactly he is supposed to do is lost, only the beginning of the relevant word pu + being visible at the end of line 18.

Budhisiri's second title is broken off: "the great ...". The last words bhagavato sakāni bandhanā[ni] are out of context due to the loss of text "of the Lord, his own fetters(?)". In both instances, here and at the damaged end of the Rudrapuruṣadatta inscription, where only ... mānuso loko iti is extant, some general statement or blessing seems to be missing, which, however, could be recovered perhaps, if a parallel is found in an inscription or a text, which is not unlikely.

The complete inscription is understood at present in the following still fragmentary way calling for further improvement:

²² In Pāli sāṇikā occurs only once (Ja III 462,13), while sāṇi "hempen cloth" is used as a curtain or screen, frequently mentioned particularly in the phrase sāṇim parikkhipati "enclose by a screen." This is hardly meant in the inscription.

²³ Traditionally wicks were made also of hemp: Albert Neuburger: *Die Technik des Altertums*. Leipzig 1919, p. 245.

²⁴ Cf. *sappinā suddhavaṭṭiyā dīpasahassam jālesim*, Mhv XXXII 37 "I lit a thousand lamps with ghee and white wicks" said of a particularly rich donation made by King Duṭṭhagāmaṇī Abhaya.

²⁵ Turner: Dictionary, as note 11, no. 11359 várti-¹. A rare exception is Kumaunī bāto < varta, masc.

The duties of a monk, who is a navakammika are described as navakammiko bhikkhave bhikkhu ussukkam āpajjissati kinti nu kho vihāro khippam pariyosānam gaccheyyā ti khaṇḍaphullam paṭisamkharissati, Vin II 160, 10-12 "Monks, the monk who is in charge of repairs should make an effort, thinking, 'How can the dwelling-place be brought to a rapid termination?' and he should restore broken and dilapidated parts" (I. B. Horner). However, navakammika can be used also in a non-technical way as shown by Navakammika-Bhāradvājo ti so kira araññe rukkhe chindāpetvā tatth'eva pāsādakūṭāgārādīni yojetvā nagaram āharitvā vikkiṇāti. iti navakammam nissāya jīvatī ti navakammiko, Spk I 264, 21-24 "Navakammika-Bhāradvāja: He fells trees in the woods assembles larger and smaller buildings etc. there, brings them into town and sells them. In this way he lives on building. This is a builder."

"... erected by the Vinayadhara Dhammasena together with his elder brothers Budhisiri (and) Dhammasiri, the son of the brother, Nābudhi, and the sister Pāvajitikā and brother Dhammasiri's daughters Bodhā and Budhā, as well as (evam) with all blood relations, friends, relatives, living together or separately, (all) united. This everlasting pious donation is established 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 (or: 107?) Tariḍelas are given, moreover for the community of monks ... flower as well as (evam) six Kāhāpaṇas for lamp-oil, and small pieces of hemp (to be used as wicks?), and white wicks (??). This (i.e. the donation) should be continued for ever by ... And this by the Great Builder, the Great ... Master Budhisiri of the Lord his own fetters ..."

In spite of the still fragmentary comprehension of the text, some interesting information can be gathered from Dhammasena's well structured inscription²⁷ such as on the otherwise hardly known, but obviously important festival on the occasion of the Pavāraṇā, the *pavāraṇāmaha*. Moreover, unusual vocabulary such as *bhasa-khula-saṃṭhapa* as a new expression referring to repairs is used, and words rarely found so far in Middle Indic inscriptions occur, e.g., *sasatakālikaṃ*, *anisaṃ* "perpetual" or the expression *ekato hatūna* and the obscure *tariḍela*.

And finally, it is perhaps noteworthy that the content of the Dhammasena inscription as described by the ASI is rather far off the mark: There is neither a monastery (Sadhivihāra [!!]), nor a *dhammacakka* (that is presumably *eka* misread as *caka*), nor a *mahādanḍanāyaka*²⁸ nor a gift of land (unless *tariḍela* is interpreted this way). *Caveat lector*!

²⁷ Smaller paragraphs are marked by *evam* in lines 7 and 14, or *tato* in line 13, larger sections are separated by *ekato hātūna* in line 9 or held together by a series of *ca* ... *ca* ... *ca* in lines 5 to 7 or lines 15 and 16

Most likely this is supplemented by the ASI to fill the gap in lines 17 and 18 $mah\bar{a}$ + + kena, which, however, is a bit too short for inserting the four $ak\bar{s}aras\ mah\bar{a}[dan\bar{d}an\bar{a}ya]kena$.