

*bhishita-* | *sha* [*De*] *vanampiyasha Piyadashine* | *lājine* | (Hultzsch, *C. I. I.*, Vol. I, p. 45). In our inscription, however, it seems to have been properly employed to punctuate divisions or sentences.

The transcript of our record is as follows :—

1. nena Sa[m\*]va[m\*]giy[ā]nam [Galadanasa] | Dumadina-[mahā\*]
2. mâte | sulakhite Puḍanagalate | e[ta]m
3. [ni\*]vahipavisati | Saṁva[m\*]giyānam [cha di\*]ne [tathā\*]
4. [dhā\*]niyam | nivahisati | da[m\*]g[ā\*]tiyāy[i\*]k[e] d[evā\*]-
5. [tiyā\*][yi]kasi | su-atiyāyika[si] pi | gaṁḍa[kehi\*]
6. [dhāni\*][yi]kehi esa koṭhāgāle kosam [bhara\*]-
7. [niye]

We have seen that the inscription is a fragmentary one. We cannot therefore entirely do without some amount of conjecture while interpreting it. The record, however, can be treated best by considering it line by line and word by word. The fragment begins with the two letters *nena*. The word originally must have been either *sāsanena* or *vachanena*, more probably the former. If we carefully examine l. 1, at the most one letter could have preceded *nena* with which our fragment opens. Thus whether this word was *sāsanena* or *vachanena*, the first letter of it could not have been engraved in the present l. 1 of the fragment but rather in the line preceding it which has now been lost. Similarly, the words [*sāsa\**]*nena Sa[m\*]va[m\*]giy[ā]nam* [*Galadanasa*], punctuated by the *virāma* of l. 1, make no complete sense as they stand. They surely must have been preceded by some words in the line previous which is now broken and which told us what was the exact nature of the *sāsana* and who the ruler was that issued it.

The next word is *Savagīyānām*, as it stands. The same word occurs in l. 3 as *Samvagiyanām*, where the *anusvāra* after *sa* is distinct. The word may be equivalent to the Sanskrit *Samvagiyanām*, which, however, yields no good sense. It may stand for *vargīyānām*, 'of the class-fellows, or the clansmen', with *saṁ* prefixed to it. But this prefix *saṁ* remains meaningless and inappropriate. Besides, what is meant by saying that something was given by *sāsana* to 'Galadana of the clansmen'? Who were these clansmen? Why is their name not specified? It will be better to insert another *anusvāra* this time after *va*, and read the whole word as *Samvamgiyanām*, 'of the Samvamgiya (tribe)'. The insertion of an *anusvāra* after *va* cannot be unjustifiable in view also of the fact that in l. 2 we have *Puḍanagalate*, which obviously stands for *Pumḍanagalate*. That *Vamgiya* is, like the *Vajjis*, the name of a tribe can scarcely be doubted. And just as the confederation of the different *Vajji* clans is sometimes called *Samvajji*, it is not impossible that the various *Vaṅga* clans were similarly summed up under the name *Samvamgiya*. We shall dilate upon this point later, but what we have here to note is that the second word in l. 1 is in all likelihood intended for *Samvamgiyanām* which yields good sense and which can also be read as such, having regard to the fact that in old inscriptions an *anusvāra* is not unfrequently omitted.

The third word in l. 1 cannot be read with certainty as the upper part of its letters is damaged. It reads like *Galadanasa*=(*Sk.*) *Galārdanasya*. It seems that *Galadana* was a leader or chief of the *Samvamgiyas*, to whom something was granted by *sāsana*. The next word, though a little damaged, is pretty certain and reads *Dumadina*. Then followed two letters, the first of which is partially preserved and the second completely lost. Thus first is either *s* or *m*. These two letters together with the first two, namely, *mâte*, of the second line formed one word, which is marked by a *virāma*. Thus the letters intervening between this and the preceding *virāma* may be read either as *Dumadina[sa]* (*a*)*mâte* or *Dumadina-mahāmâte*. The former alternative is less preferable, because the force of *sa* after *Dumadina* is undetermined. Is it a genitive termination, or a part of an individual's name, whatever that may mean? If the former is the case, it makes no

The next batch of interpunctuated letters is *su-atijyāyikasi pi*. But these two words by themselves do not form a clause, and have therefore to be taken along with those that follow. Of these only *gamḍa* has been preserved in l. 5. At least two more were originally incised in this line, but they have now been destroyed. The next line, which is the last preserved one, has lost at least two letters at the beginning and three at the end, but those that have been preserved can be clearly read as *[y]ikehi esa koṭhāgāle kosaṃ*. The lacunae may be tentatively filled up as follows : *gamḍa[kehi\*] [dhāni\*]yikehi esa koṭhāgāle kosaṃ [bharuṇīye\*]*. The whole may thus be rendered into English : "when there is an excess of plenty, this granary and the treasury may be replenished with paddy and the *gamḍakas*". Here two things are mentioned, (1) *koṭhāgāle*=*koshthāgāraṃ*=granary, and (2) *kosa*=*kośa*=treasury. Corresponding to *kosa* we have the mention of *gamḍaka*, which means "a coin of the value of four cowries". The *yikehi*, with which the last line begins, can thus be easily restored to *[dhāni\*]yikehi*=*dhānyakāh*, as it corresponds to *koṭhāgāle* and as we know it has already been mentioned as being distributed among the *Saṃvaṃgīyas*. What we have thus to understand here is that as soon as the time of superabundance returned, they were to remit *gamḍaka* coins into the royal treasury and paddy into the royal granary.

Ll. 3-4 refer to the doling out of paddy to these people. It is thus perfectly intelligible why at the end of the record they have been asked to return the corn. But why should there be any mention of *gamḍaka* coins at all at this place, as they have not been referred to above? Were the *gamḍaka* coins anywhere mentioned as being distributed among the *Saṃvaṃgīyas*, which they were expected to pay back into the treasury with the return of prosperity? We have said above that the first original line of this inscription has been lost, which told us about the nature of the *sāsana* granted to Galadana (Galārdana) of the *Saṃvaṃgīyas*, who is mentioned in l. 1 of the preserved portion. And it is not at all unreasonable to surmise that this *sāsana* referred to the *gamḍaka* coins which were handed over to Galadana for disbursement among the *Saṃvaṃgīyas* and which they were asked to refund as soon as the day of plenty dawned upon them.

The inscription may thus be briefly summed up as follows : It appears that some ruler of the Mauryan period, if not of the Mauryan family, had issued an order to the Mahāmātra stationed at Puṇḍranagara with a view to relieve the distress caused, apparently, by famine to the people called *Saṃvaṃgīyas*, who were settled in and about the town. Two measures appear to have been adopted to meet this contingency. The exact nature of the first is not clear as the first original line of our record has not been preserved. But it may be surmised that this measure consisted of the advance of a loan in *gamḍaka* coins to Galadana who, presumably, was a leader of the *Saṃvaṃgīyas*. The Mahāmātra of Puṇḍranagara was entrusted with the execution of this order. The second measure consisted of the distribution of *dhānya* or paddy from the granary. A wish is then expressed that as soon as these measures are carried out, the *Saṃvaṃgīyas* will be able to tide over the calamity. With the restoration of profusion and affluence they have been asked to return the coins to the treasury and the corn to the granary, in other words, to pay the State back in kind and cash.

We may therefore translate the text as follows :—

"To Galadana (Galārdana) of the *Saṃvaṃgīyas* . . . . . (was granted) by order. The Mahāmātra from the highly auspicious Puṇḍranagara will cause it to be carried out. (And likewise) paddy has been granted to the *Saṃvaṃgīyas*. The outbreak (of distress) in the town during (this) outburst of superhuman agency shall be tided over. When there is an excess of plenty, this granary and the treasury (may be replenished) with paddy and the *gamḍaka* coins."

We now turn to other matters revealed by the critical consideration of our epigraph. The inscription stone, Mr. Chandra told me, was originally picked up near a tank not far removed