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Coins of the Muhammadan Kings of Gujwrő.—By E. E. Oliver, Esq.

(With 3 Plates.)

Looking over a large number of coins belonging to Mr. Furdoonjee, an enthusiastic numismatist of Bombay—in which Presidency he had exceptional opportunities for collecting the coins of the old Muhammadan dynasty of Gujwrő—I find a good number that do not appear in the British Museum Catalogue, nor in the list given by Thomas, and that, so far as I am aware, have not yet been described. Supplemented with some from my own cabinet, I have filled two or three plates, which may be interesting in continuation of those described by Mr. Poole from the National Collection.

It is unnecessary to attempt any sketch of the dynasty, that for over a century and a half, ruled the destinies of Gujwrő. One of the principal of those Muhammadan States that sprung from the ruins of Muhammad ibn Tuglaq’s declining empire; and maintained more or less of splendour and of power, till they were once again reduced to provinces of Dehľ by Akbar. A useful general outline of the leading events is given in Mr. Stanley Lane Poole’s introduction to the volume in the British Museum series above referred to, treating of the minor Muhammadan States; and the late Sir Edward Clive Bayley in his volume on the history of Gujwrő, has brought together the more inter-
estling particulars as told by the native historians in the Mirat-i-Ahmadî and the Mirat-i-Sikandari.

In both, however, there is a little blank between the assassination of Mahmud III., and the final incorporation of the State into the Mughal Empire. This is a period regarding which most historians are silent; probably for the very excellent reasons, that there are no very accurate materials, and the accounts of native writers are somewhat conflicting, while it is perfectly accurate and more easy to sum up the whole, as being "thirty years of anarchy."

Briefly, the outline of those thirty years of anarchy is somewhat as follows: Mahmud III was murdered by a slave named Burhan in Mahmudabad, on the 12th Rab'î'û-l-awwal, 961 H. (the eve of the 13th according to the Mirat-i-Sikandari), which slave in addition entrapped and killed some twelve of the chief Gujarât nobles. Among those sagacious enough not to fall into Burhan's trap was one I'timâd Khan. Originally a Hindû servant, this I'timâd, whose name may be taken to signify "trusted," had risen under Mahmud to a most confidential position. His master even allowed him to enter the harem, and had put him in charge of the women. He had been made an Amir, and is spoken of as "prime minister." The morning after the murder, I'timâd collected a few followers, killed Burhan, managed to pacify the city and restore order. It was to him that the court of Mahmudabad instinctively looked, to act as regent and to set about finding a successor to the throne. There seems little doubt, however, that whoever might be the nominal successor, I'timâd determined to retain the substance of power in his own hands; and for the whole thirty years he was really the "king-maker" in the back-ground.

The accounts as to the actual arrangements made by him vary somewhat. According to the Ain-i-Akbarî, he raised Ra'ziu-l-Mulk, "a son of Suljan Ahmâd, the founder of Âlmaudâbûd," to the throne. But Suljan Ahmâd the first died in 846 H., 115 years before; and Ra'zi is spoken of as "very young!" The more probable version is given in the Mirat-i-Sikandari, the author of which, Sikandari ibn Muhammad, was born in 961 H.; and relates that the nobles having concerted together, asked I'timâd Khan, who was acquainted with the Suljan's domestic affairs, whether the Suljan had left any son, or if any of the Suljan's wives were expecting a child; if so, they would wait till the child's birth before deciding on any arrangements regarding the kingdom. I'timâd said no; the Suljan had not left any son, nor were any of his wives expecting a child. As he was well acquainted with the Suljan's affairs, and denied the possibility of any direct heir, they then asked him if there was any relative of the late Suljan who was fit to
succeed to the throne, whom they might select. I'timâd Khân replied that there was a relative of the Sultân at Ahmadábd, whose name was Ahmad Khân; they might send for him. Accordingly they sent Amîr Razî-i-mulk to fetch the boy. When Razî came to Ahmad Khân's house, the boy was standing at a grain-dealer's shop close by his own door, and was bringing away in the skirt of his dress some grain which he had bought for his pigeons. Razî-i-mulk recognised him, got out of the cart, carried him off, and placing him in it, turned it round, and drove off, with very fast horses, to Maḥmûdâbd. The Khân's nurse wept, and made a disturbance, saying: "What is this? Where are you going to take him?" Razī-i-Mulk called out: "I am going to take him to a place where all the world will to-morrow crowd round his house, and where he will not find one friend."

The Amir's prophecy proved true. The boy king's career was a short and a sad one. He was placed on the throne on the 15th Rabî‘u-l-awwal 961 H. as Ahmad II.; the affairs of state meanwhile remained entirely in I'timâd's hands. On the coins he calls himself "Qâthu-d-dîn, the son of Maḥmûd," titles also adopted by the succeeding puppet. Five years later Ahmad is described as flying from his capital for refuge with one of his courtiers, but as brought back defeated. On another occasion he tried other means to get rid of his powerful minister, when the latter, beginning to feel insecure, decided to get rid of the king. One account says I'timâd killed him, another that Ahmad was found murdered outside the Palace walls on the 5th Sha'ban 968 H.

Having got rid of Ahmad, I'timâd now raised a child named Nathû to the throne, "who did not belong to the line of kings," but who he swore was a son of Maḥmûd's. The mother, when pregnant, had been handed over to him to make her miscarry, but, the child being five months old, he had not carried out the order. The nobles had to swallow this new variety of the story, and Nathû was placed on the throne as Muẓaffar III.

It was the old story of a nominal king under a powerful minister, who was the real head of the Government, and who, though several of the Amîrs had secured portions of the country and declined to recognise his authority, had become practically independent. In the account of the divisions and revenues of Gujarât, given in the Mirât-i-Aḥmadi, I'timâd's establishment and income is shown in 979 H. as all but equal to the nominal kings; he having 9,000 horse and 30 krops of "tank­chahs," against Muẓaffar's 10,000 horse and 33 krops of tankchahs; the remainder of a total of 30,000 horse and 90 krops of tankchahs, being divided amongst some half dozen nobles. The result was incessant feuds. In 980 Akbar was invited by I'timâd to occupy Gujarât, and
took possession of the capital on the 14th Rajab of that year. From then both the minister and king figure frequently in the accounts of campaigns under both Akbar and his generals. Itimámad and other Gujarát nobles proclaimed Akbar's accession from the pulpits of the mosques, and struck coin in his name, for which loyalty Baroda, Champánír, and Súrat, were given to the former as tuyúl, but subsequently he fell into disgrace and was made a prisoner. In 982 H. he had been released and was in charge of the imperial jewels. Two years after he went to Makkah, and on his return obtained Patan as a jágír. In 990 H. he was put in charge of Gujarát as governor, in succession to Shihábú-d-dín, but the latter's forces rebelled, and went over to Múzaffar, who in Itimámad's absence took Aḥmadábád, and set up as ruler again in 991 H. Shortly after Itimámad went to Patan, where he died in 995 H.

Múzaffar abdicated in favour of Akbar in 980 H., when he was in the first instance sent to Agra, but subsequently remanded to close confinement. Some nine years after he escaped, and returning to Gujarát, collected a respectable force, defeated and slew Akbar's general Qutbu-d-dín Khán, and reascended the throne 991 H. (1583 A. D.). Akbar then deputed Mírzá Khán Khánán, the son of Buirám, to retake Gujarát. Múzaffar was defeated the same year in a couple of pitched battles, and fled to Júnágaikh in Kattywár. There he was pursued by another of Akbar's generals Mírzá Khán-i-'A'zam, who hunted him down and captured him in Kachch in 999 H. No sooner was Múzaffar handed over to the Mírzá than he asked permission to retire for a minute, and took the opportunity to cut his throat with a razor. With him terminated the dynasty of the Muhammadan kings of Gujarát, the kingdom then becoming a province of Dehli. The coin No. XXXI is especially interesting as having been struck during the year in which, for a brief period, Múzaffar managed to re-establish himself in Gujarát.

In the British Museum Catalogue there is a coin of 963, ascribed to Múhammad, a pretender, and No. XXVIII of the series now published would seem to have somewhat similar titles and dates and also claim to be struck by a son of Múhammad, viz. on the Rev. Qutbu-d-dín Muhammad Sháh, (bin) as-Sultán x 63, and on the Obv. Náhiru-d-dunya-va-d-dín Abu-l-Fath Muhammád Sháh. On the other hand it is very similar in character to No. IX of Múhammád Sháh I, the son of Múhammad, and the reading might be reversed, x being 8 instead of 9, but Múhammád I. called himself Chuyágu-d-dín and not Qutbu-d-dín. I have not been able to trace any historical reference to the so-called "Pretender."

In order to facilitate comparison of dates, descent, or contemporary rulers, I add a genealogical tree of the Gujarát kings, and a table showing the contemporary rulers in Málwá, Jaunpúr, Kandaish, the Dekkan.
and Dehli, taken from Poole's very handy graphic scheme of the Muhammadan dynasties of India.

(See Plates I—III.)

Of Ahmad Shah I. I noticed in Mr. Furdoonjee's collection similar coins to the British Museum No. 408, but with the mint Ahmadabad for the years 832, 6, 842, 3*, and similar to No. 411 also with mint Ahmadabad, years 830-1-7. Of Ghiyāšu-d-dīn Muḥammad Karūm Shah the Museum list gives no dated specimens. Thomas records 849, 850 and (?) 856. The three now figured are 852, 3 and 5, the last named having the same inscription as in Thomas. The Museum catalogues no silver representative of Maḥmūd Shāh Bīgārā, the famous Sultan of the moustachios. Thomas refers to three, of 891, 903 and 911. Neither give any mints: in fact, with one doubtful exception, none of the Gujarāt series in the Museum catalogue are minted. In the list now given are silver coins of 864-7 (8)70, 909; Ahmadabad, 900, 903, and 911. In some cases the date is in words. The Museum list has two gold coins of Muẓaffar Shāh II. Thomas's copper coins are dated 921-3-4 and 8. The one now figured is dated 929. Two others have no name but may perhaps be put down to him (?), Ahmadnagar (9)17 and 922.

The inscription on No. XVII of Bahādur Shāh appears to agree with No. 427 of the Museum, but I note the years 938 and 939. Maḥmūd Shāh III. bin Laṭīf is unrepresented in the Museum catalogue. Thomas gives the years 946, 7 and 9. Among these now figured are the years 945, 7 and 960. The suppositions king Ahmad II. is represented in the Museum catalogue by one copper coin; Thomas gives the dates 961—8. In the present list are the dates 961, in silver, x x 2, 963 and 8. Maẓaffar Shāh III. in the Museum and in Thomas is represented by the dates 969, 971-7-8-9 and 930. The present list adds 991.

It is also worth while adding that among Mr. Furdoonjee's dated Bahmani coins, I notice, Ahmad Shāh I. like the Museum No. 454, the years, 836 and 838. Like the Museum No. 461, the years 843-5-6, 850-2-6. Like No. 467, the years 839, 842-3 and 850. Muḥammad Shāh II. like No. 474, the years 863, 877 and 875, and a fine silver coin of (?) Aḥsanābād of x 77 figured in the present list as No. XXXIV. A coin of his, figured as No. XXXV, also appears a novelty.

* The above dates are all A. H.
Genealogical tree of the Muhammadan Dynasties of Gujarat.


4. Qutb-u-d-dín, Ahmad Sháh, 6. Maḥmúd I., Bigará, 863 to 917. 855 to 863. The most famous of the line, founded Mahmu-

5. Muzaffar II., 917 to 932.

6. The most famous of the line, founded Mahmu-

7. Muzaffar II., 917 to 932.


12. Maḥmúd III., 944 to 961.

13. Ahmad Sháh II., 961 to 968.

14. Muzaffar Sháh III., 969 to 980, when Gujarat submitted to Akbar, but Muzaffar ruled for a short time again in 991.*

Contemporary Rulers in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. H.</th>
<th>Gujarat</th>
<th>Málwá</th>
<th>Jaunpur</th>
<th>Kandaish</th>
<th>Dekkan</th>
<th>Dehli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maḥmúd II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khwájah i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jahán</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Mużaffar I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The above dates are all A. H.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shamsu-d-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dín.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Táju-d-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mubárak.</td>
<td>Násir.</td>
<td>Maḥmúd II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibráhím.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diláwar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hashang.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Almád I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad I.</td>
<td>'Adil.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad.</td>
<td>Mubárak I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>Ml. Kásim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>Qutb-d-dín.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad.</td>
<td>Ghání.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Dáud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humáyún.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>Muḥammad I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghíyáś Sháh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maḥmúd II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becomes split up into small provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sikádar II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Násir Sháh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dáud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A’zam Hímáyún.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>Muṣṭafá II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibráhím II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>Sikádar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bábár.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>Muḥammad II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>Bábádur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becomes part of Gujarat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humáyún.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. H.</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>Mâlwa</td>
<td>Jumnapur</td>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>Dekkan</td>
<td>Dehli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>Muhammad Fârûq.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>Muhammad III.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>Ahmad II.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Magâffar III.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Becomes a province of Dehli.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ghiâgu-d-dîn Muhammad Karîm Shâh.

I. Æ. 65 64 grains. No mint. 855 H. 

Compare Thomas, page 353.

II. Æ. 70 140 grains. 8 (5) 2 H. 

III. Æ. 65 72 grains. 853 H. 

Maḥmûd Shâh I.

IV. Â. 80 165 grains: (?) Ahmadâbâd. 911 H. 

In square "سردار" "شاھ" "کھمند" و "الاکمل" "ناصرالدین و "الدین" 

margin "دو هم" "گرم" "بن" "کھمند" 911 "..."

V. Â. 65 88 grains. 

The same as No. IV, but without margin.

VI. Â. 70 87 grains. Ahmadâbâd. 900 H. 

Obv. same as No. IV. 

In lozenge "سردار" "شاھ" "کھمند" "ابن" "معاون" "شاھ" "سال" "عمران" "کھمند" "سنہ" 900.
1889. E. E. Oliver—Coins of the Muhammadan Kings of Gujarat. 9

VII. AR 70 85 grains. Ahmádábád. 903 H.
Obv. same as No. IV. [سُلطان || محمد شاه] margin
[صر] [صرف] 903
حمراء [عمره] 903 103
909 H.

VIII. AR 70 88 grains.
Obv. as No. IV, with 909 H. Rev., variety of No. IV.

Ditto. AR 50 42 grains. No date or mint Mr. Furdoonjee.

نَامِرَالدَّنِیا || والدین ابّ || الغفل

Obv. as No. IX. In circle margin

XI. Æ 85 250 grains.

XII. Æ 85 245 grains.

XIII. Æ 75 160 grains.

XIV. Æ 65 140 grains.

XI. Æ 75 160 grains.

XV. Æ 70 169 grains.

* XVI. Æ 75 160 grains.

Muzaffar Sháh II.

* Doubtful coins.
E. E. Oliver—Coins of the Muhammadan Kings of Gujardt. [No. 1,

*XXVII. Æ·65 143 grains, (?) Ahmadnagar (9)17 H.

.. مرنغی احمد | نام | شهور سنه 917

Bahádur Sháh.

XXVIII. Æ·75 175 grains.

.. سنتر شاہ | بن | بهادر شاہ

Compare No. 427, British Museum Catalogue.

Mahmúd Sháh III.

XIX. Æ·80 180 grains.

.. مصعود | لطيف | شاہ | مصعود

Mr. Furdoonjee.

XX. Æ·70 142 grains.

.. صرخنیا | والدین | ایزغر

Ditto.

XXI. Æ·80 159 grains.

.. مصعود بن | لطيف شاہ | السلطان

945 H. Ditto.

XXII. Æ·70 137 grains.

.. ایزغر |卫浴 | السلطان

960 H. Ditto.

XXIII. Æ·55 69 grains.

.. مصعود بن | لطيف

XXIV. Æ·55 71 grains.

.. لطيف

Aḥmad Sháh II.

XXV. AR·85 164 grains.

.. مصعود بن | لطيف

961 H. In double lozenge

* Doubtful coins.
1889. | E. E. Oliver—*Coins of the Muhammadan Kings of Gujurät.*  

**XXVI.** \( \text{AE} \cdot 55 \) 73 grains.  
968 H. Mr. Furdoonjee.  

**XXVII.** \( \text{AE} \cdot 70 \) 140 grains.  
1162. Ditto.  

**XXVIII.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 70 \) 144 grains.  
Ditto.  

Mugaffar Sháh III.  

**XXIX.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 60 \) 73 grains.  
978 H.  

**XXX.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 70 \) 73 grains.  
Obv. Inscription as No. XXIX.  

**XXXI.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 50 \) 36 grains.  
Ditto.  

**XXXII.** \( \text{AE} \cdot 75 \) 179 grains.  
977 H.  

Muhammad Sháh (?), Pretender.  

**XXVIII.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 144 \) grains.  
Ditto.  

**XXXIII.** \( \text{AR} \cdot 95 \) 166 grains.  
(?) Ahsanábád.  
Ditto.  

Compare copper coins 437—9 in B. M. Catalogue.
Unlike Upper India, studded with monuments of ancient history, the Delta of the Ganges presents few places of interest to the antiquarian. Lower Bengal is generally as devoid of picturesque scenery as of objects of antiquarian interest. We have all heard of Saptagrama and Suvarnakāragrama and their once flourishing commerce with the West, but what remains to show their ancient greatness? No Colossus, no Forum, not even a Hindū temple. Still there are a few places here and there, such as Gauḍī and Nadiyā, which cannot fail to be of interest to the diligent antiquarian or the student of history, and Rāmpāl is one of them. It is not so widely known as it deserves to be. It is now a straggling hamlet, situated approximately in Lat. 23° 38' and Long. 90° 32' 10", being about four miles to the west of Munshīganj, the head-quarters of the subdivision of that name in the district of Dacca (Dhākā), corresponding with the old fiscal division of Vikrāmpur. It was the seat of the old Sen kings of Bengal, and notably of Ballāl Sen, whose name has been handed down to posterity as the founder of Kulinism in Bengal.

Such is the case with Rāmpāl and the dynasty that reigned here. The ruins, as the sequel will show, are not so important and interesting as in Gauḍī and a few other places in Bengal. But there is abundant evidence to show that Rāmpāl was once a royal city. The large Rāmpāl Dighi or the artificial lake of Rāmpāl, the huge mound, to which tradition points as the Bāri or the palace of Ballāl Sen, the very broad roads and the existence of innumerable bricks which can be found buried under the earth wherever you dig in Rāmpāl and its environs, are unmistakeable indications of a ruined city of palaces. Old bricks of small size were found in such abundance in and around Rāmpāl, that they were carried in vast quantities to Dacca for build-

* [Compare with this paper General Sir A. Cunningham's account of the same sites and legends, in his Archaeological Survey Reports, vol. XV, pp. 132—135. The two accounts differ in some minor details. Ed.]
Three castes. Not summarily rejected. Theory Senas seat or man the much down Rajas:—members Kaikish Sen advanced, tho some of the Sena in ‘Abdullāhpur.

Rāmpāl appears to have been the only seat of the Sen kings up to the death of Ballāl Sen, but the later kings of the dynasty lived at Suvarṇakārāgrāma, Gauṛ and Nadiyā. Suvarṇakārāgrāma, locally called Shonārgāon, is also in the district of Dacca, being about four miles from the existing Bandar of Baidya Bazar on the river Meghnā. Lachhman Sen, son of Ballāl Sen, generally lived at Gauṛ, which, according to the Muhammadan historians, he greatly embellished, and called after his name Lakhunātī or Lakshmānāvātī. Nadiyā was the seat of the last Sen king of Bengal, when the Muhammadans conquered the country. It was in his time that Rāmpāl attained the highest pinnacle of its glory. The principal works, the ruins of which still exist in some form or other, are attributed to him. Rāmpāl seems to have been neglected, if not altogether abandoned, after the death of Ballāl Sen. Lachhman Sen, his son and heir, lived principally at Gauṛ.

I now approach the solution of a problem which has already evoked much animated discussion. I mean the question of the caste of the Sen Rājās of Bengal. Before submitting my own opinion on the subject, I will briefly examine the different theories that have been advanced, and the evidence on which they are based. I have obtained much assistance from the two articles of Rājā Rājendralāla Mitra on the Sen Rājās of Bengal, and the Bengali work on the same subject by Kailāsh Chandra Sinha, to which Mr. Beveridge, one of the honoured members of the Asiatic Society, very kindly referred me, and also from the Bengali book by Mahimā Chandra Majumdar called ‘Gauḍe Brāhmaṇa’. Three theories have been advanced about the caste of the Sen Rājās:—(1) that they were Kayasthas, (2) that they were Vaidynas or of the medical caste and (3) that they were Kṣatrvāyas. The first theory is that of Abu-l-Fażl and the Muhammadan historians. It is not supported by any evidence other than the statement of the Muhammadans, who are likely to hold erroneous views on the subject of Hindū castes. It was never seriously entertained by the Hindūs and may be summarily rejected. The second theory is supported by tradition handed down from generation to generation not only in Vikrāmpur, the old seat of the Sen Rājās, but throughout Bengal, and was universally believed, till Rājā Rājendralāla Mitra in 1865 tried to establish that the Senas were Kṣatrvāyas. This third theory is the most recent one. It was first propounded by Rājā Rājendralāla Mitra, a very high
authority in matters antiquarian and supported by others. It is based on some epithets of the Sen kings found in the inscriptions discovered in Râjshâhi, Dinajpur and Baqargaunj, and also in the Sanskrit work Dânasâgara of which Ballâl Sen himself is the reputed author. These I will consider in the two following paragraphs.

Tradition must give place to reliable material evidence if the one is really inconsistent with the other; but before discarding a universal belief, the evidence should be most carefully interpreted. The evidence on which the theory of the Sen Râjâs being Kshatriyas is based is the following. In the inscriptions, found in the districts of Dinajpur, Râjshâhi and Baqargaunj, the Sen Râjâs are described as descendants of the lunar race, and as only the Kshatriyas have a right to trace their descent from that race, it is held that the Senas must be Kshatriyas. In the inscription discovered by Mr. Metcalfe in Râjshâhi, Sâmanta Sen is described as a Brahma-Kshatriya. The original Sanskrit is य स्रक्ष्रविबिधानमजिनि कुठमिरोदास समस्मावः। Dr. Mitra's rendering of ब्रह्मविविधान कुठमिरोदास is 'a garland for the head of the noblest Kshatriyas.' According to him, the word ब्रह्म therefore here means 'noble' or 'exalted.' With due reference to so great an authority, I am of opinion that this meaning is not the correct one here. We have various Sanskrit words compounded with ब्रह्म such as ब्रह्मचारी, ब्रह्मराज, ब्रह्मदेव, ब्रह्मवादी, ब्रह्मदेश, and so forth, and in in all of these the word ब्रह्म retains its original radical meaning of Brahmá or Brahma. I therefore see no reason why it should not have the same or a similar meaning in the present instance. Dr. Mitra has not assigned any reason why he takes ब्रह्म to mean 'noble,' which is certainly not the commonly accepted meaning of the term, and cannot be found in the ordinary Sankrit dictionaries. At any rate this meaning would be a far-fetched one. The word ब्रह्मविवि occurs in the Yajur Veda, and is explained by the annotator as meaning ब्रह्मन-चकनी or 'knowledge of the Brahma or the Vedas and heroism of the Kshatriyas.' It is therefore not a caste epithet, and following the analogy, we can take ब्रह्मचारिण to mean 'a person who has the knowledge of the Brahma or the Vedas and the heroism of the Kshatriyas,' that is, one who combines both these qualifications; and the clause in question may mean 'a garland for the head of those who have the wisdom of the Brahma or the heroism of the Kshatriyas,' without any reference to race or caste. The word ब्रह्म also occurs in Adhyaya 21, part IV, of the Vishnu Purâna, and is explained by the annotator Śrîdhara Śvânu in to mean 'that race from which Brahmaas and Kshatriyas sprung.' The meaning seems to be obscure. The word probably means a mixed race of Brahmaas and Kshatriyas—a race
sprung from Brāhmaṇas on the father’s side and Kshatriyas on the mother’s. We have it from the Mahābhārata that when the Kshatriya race was being exterminated by Parāṣārāma, the women of that caste began to marry Brāhmaṇas, and Vaśishṭha himself is credited with having married Kshatriya women. From that time the race of pure Kshatriyas is said to have become extinct. In Adhyaya 24, part IV, of the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, Mahāmāṇandī is said to be the last king of the Kshatriya race. His son Mahāpadmānanda was born a Śūdra mother, and from him began the reign of Varṇasankara kings or ‘kings of mixed castes.’

The above will I think be sufficient to show that Dr. Mitra’s interpretation of the word Brāhma-ksatriya is most probably not the correct one. I have now to consider the description of the Sen Rājās as descendants of the lunar race. It is a well-known fact that all the princes of India, whether real Kshatriyas or not, have tried to trace their descent from the solar or lunar race of that caste. Even the Rājās of Chuṭjīyā Nāgpur, whom Colonel Dalton very rightly thinks to be of the aboriginal Cole or Munḍa origin, claim to be real Rājputās, and following their lord, the inferior landholders, who are undoubtedly aboriginal Munḍās, are gradually setting up claims to be Hindū Rājputās.

I found this process in full operation when I was in Chuṭjīyā Nāgpur three years ago. If the Sen kings belonged to the Sankara race or any of the mixed castes, is it not very likely that they would aspire to be Kshatriyas and trace their descent from the lunar race, and their panegyrist Umāpati Dhar, a poet and a famous adept in the art of exaggeration, would exalt them into members of the race of the moon? Even now the Śūdras of Bengal are looking up. Some time ago there was a movement among the Kayasthas for taking the yajnopāvita or ‘the sacred thread,’ on the assertion that they were originally Kshatriyas; and at the present moment there is a similar movement among the Suvāraśvarṇikas, who now claim to have been originally Vaśyas.

In the Baqarganj plate, found by Mr. Prinsep, the title of Sankara Gauḍēśwara is repeatedly applied to the Sen Rājās. The word Gauḍēśwara, no doubt, means the king of Gauḍ or Bengal, but it is not easy to explain the real meaning of the word Sankara here. It is said to be written with palatal ʃ. Dr. Mitra takes it to mean ‘excellent,’ but he has not shown any reason for assuming this meaning, which cannot be found in the ordinary Sanskrit dictionaries and is certainly not the commonly accepted import of the term. According to the dictionaries and the common usage of the word, it is, when a substantive, a synonym for Siva or Mahādeva, and when an adjective, it means ‘auspicious.’ I find Mr. Prinsep translating the
phrase as 'the auspicious lord of Gour.' It is well known that the Sen Rájás, at least some of them, were Sáivas, or worshippers of Siva, and the phrase may mean 'the lord of Gaur, a worshipper of Siva (Sankara).'

But none of these interpretations seem to me to be appropriate. I am of opinion that the word Sankara here is an euphemism for Sankara, with a dental ś, and then it must mean a mixed race, a suggestion which has been noticed in Dr. Mitra's paper. This meaning will be a very appropriate one. Mistakes of a palatal ś for a dental one and vice versa are not uncommon in the old inscriptions, and when we remember that the inscription in question was written in the Tirhút or Gaur type, which represents an intermediate stage of orthography between the Kúṭila and the modern Bengali character, the commission of such an error is all the more likely. Srídhara Swámin, the annotator of the Bhágavata, mentions the commencement of kings of the Varña-sankara or the mixed castes in India in his time.

In his own work the Dámaságama, Ballál Sen does not call the Sen dynasty Kshatriya, but applies the epithet Gaurívaráh, which means 'following the practices of Kshatriyas'. So in the 6th stanza of the inscription in the copper-plate found in the Sundarbans, the epithet of राजस्यमान, which virtually means the same thing as Gaurívaráh, is applied to Lachhman Sen. It therefore appears that the Sen Rájás are never distinctly described as Kshatriyas. Does not this show that they were not pure Kshatriyas but belonged to a mixed caste? If they were Kshatriyas, why is it not so stated in unequivocal terms? There is a legend current in Vikrámpur that Ballál Sen was born of a Bráhmaṇa father, the river-god Brahmaputra, who visited his mother in a dream in the form of a Bráhmaṇa. Does not this indicate the mixed nature of the Sen race?

I will now briefly consider the evidence on which the theory that the Sen Rájás were Vaidyas is based. In the various Kulapanjikas or genealogies of the Ghaṭaka as well as in the Laghubharata, Adisúr, Ballál Sen, and other Rájás of the Sen family have been distinctly described as members of the Vaidya caste. It is very likely that Devatá-yra Ghaṭaka, Kavikauṭthahára and other Ghaṭakas of the Varendra Bráhmaṇas, who lived about four centuries ago and composed the genealogies, knew the true caste of the Sen Rájás.

My contention is that the inscriptions of the Sen Rájás are not...

* [In his Book of Indian Eras, p. 77, General Sir A. Cunningham ascribes this work to "Haláyudha, the spiritual adviser of Lakshmana Sena," referring as his authority to Rájá Rájendralála Mitra, in his paper on the Sena kings, in the Journal A. S. B., vol. XXXIV (1865), p. 137. But this is an error, Dr. Mitra there quotes a Sanskrit verse, ascribing the work to Ballál Sen. Ed.]
inconsistent with the genealogies of the Ghaṭakas and are therefore not opposed to tradition. I think the inscriptions support the view that the Senas were of the Varṇa Sankara or mixed caste. Mana recognises three classes of mixed castes: (1) Mādhlavasikta, or those born of Brāhmaṇa fathers and Kshatriya mothers, (2) Ambashṭha, those of Brāhmaṇa fathers and Vaiśya mothers, who are identical with the modern Vaidyas, and (3) Māhishya, born of Kshatriya fathers and Vaiśya mothers. There was no practical difference between the Ambashṭhas and Māhishyas, and Vidyābhūṣāṇa, the author of Laghuḥaṭarata, called the Māhishyas Vaidyas. He calls Vīra Sen or Adisūra, the founder of the Sen family, a Māhishya. Remembering that they were Kshatriyas on the father's side, the Māhishya or Sen Rājas of Bengal naturally traced their descent from the lunar race of Kshatriyas, and this explains the epithets in the inscriptions recently discovered. Probably the Māhishyas and Vaidyas became gradually amalgamated, and the Sen Rājas came to be regarded as Vaidyas. I am finally of opinion that the Sen Rājas were never pure Kshatriyas, nor originally Vaidyas, but were Mādhlavasikta or Māhishyas, who were both allied to the Vaidyas. The distinction afterwards wore away, and the Senas became gradually amalgamated with the Vaidyas.

I will now proceed to describe briefly the principal ruins and objects of interest in Rāmpāl. I have visited them several times during my incumbency as subdivisional officer of Munshiganj, and carefully collected all the traditions and legends by which they are enlivened. First of all, I will take the Masjid of Ba-Adam* or the mosque consecrated to the Muhammadan faqir of that name. It is a pretty large, strong, brick-built mosque with a high arched dome. The bricks are of the same small size which characterize old Muhammadan architecture. The mosque has two massive stone pillars which are apparently snatched from a Hindū temple, and which tradition identifies as the gadās or clubs of Ballāl Sen. It is in a dilapidated state, but is worth preserving. It has a stone tablet in front which bears an Arabic inscription, a reduced facsimile of which is herewith published (see Plate V). It will be observed that it states that the mosque was built by Bādshāh Fath Shāh bin Sulṭān Maḥmūd in 880 Hījri or 1475 A. D. It is therefore 414 years old. The faqir to whose memory it is dedicated died, however, in 1106 A. D., (supposing Ballāl Sen to have died after a reign of forty years) or 369 years before the mosque was erected.†

* [The real name of the faqir is Bābā Adam, of which Ba-Adam is a mere vulgar corruption; another corruption, Bābardam, is mentioned in Arch. Survey Rep., vol. XV, p. 134. Ed.]
† There is a similar mosque with a somewhat similar inscription in Qāḍi Qa-
There is the following legend about the death of the faqir and the fate of Ballal Sen. There lived a Muhammadan family in Kanai Chang, a village south of 'Abdullahpur and not far from Rāmpāl. The master of the house had no children. One day a faqir came and begged alms of him, but he refused alms, saying, "I will give no alms, when Allah has not given me the boon (child) for which I am praying so long." The faqir predicted that he would beget a child and asked him to sacrifice a bull to the altar of Allah when his desire was fulfilled. He then went away without any alms. In course of time the man had a son born to him, but the Hindūs would not allow him to sacrifice a bull. He therefore repaired to the lonely jungle, south of Kanai Chang, and secretly sacrificed a bull. Taking as much meat of the bull as he and the members of his family would be able to consume, he buried the remainder under the ground and returned home. A kite, however, snatched a morsel of the flesh from him, and another kite trying to snatch it the morsel fell down in front of Raja Ballal Sen's palace. On enquiry the king learned the whole story and ordered the child, to commemorate whose birth the bull was sacrificed, to be brought before him and killed the next day. The Muhammadan learned the king's decree and at night escaped with his wife and child and as much property as he could carry. He fled to Arabia and, meeting Ḫazrat 'Adham, a faqir, at Mecca, told him all that had happened. Learning that there was a country in which there was no religious toleration, and people were not at liberty to practise their own religious rites, Ḫazrat 'Adham came to Rāmpāl with six or seven thousand followers. Ba-Adam is only another name for Ḫazrat ‘Adham. He began to sacrifice bulls and cows on the spot where the mosque dedicated to him now stands. Raja Ballal Sen sent his ultimatum, asking him either to leave the country or fight with him. The faqir chose the latter alternative, and a protracted warfare took place between his followers and the king's army. The battles were indecisive for many days, and the loss of men on both sides was heavy. At last the faqir's followers were reduced to only one hundred men. One day Raja Ballal Sen's men, while going to the market, saw the faqir alone reading Namāj (saying his prayers). The king marched to kill the faqir at this juncture, but as he was deficient of success, he constructed, before leaving his palace, a large agnikūṇḍa or funeral pyre (literally 'a pit of fire'), which still exists in the form of a large pit, and asked the women of his household to kill themselves by throwing themselves into the fire, if he was vanquished and killed. He exiled, two miles from Rāmpāl. It is described in page 76 of Blochmann's Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal, (Jour. A. S. B., vol. XLII, p. 284.) [See the note at the end of this article. Ed.]
took a pigeon in his coat and proclaimed that the bird's return to the palace without him would mean his death and serve as a signal for the females of the house to perish in the flames to save their caste and chastity. Ballâl Sen came to the faqîr and struck him with the sword, but the faqîr was invulnerable and the sword would not cut his skin. After concluding his prayers, the faqîr asked Ballâl what brought him there. "To kill you," replied the king. The faqîr asked him whether he would embrace the Muhammadan faith or not. The king of course answered in the negative. The faqîr said: "It is so ordained that I shall die at your hands. But no sword other than my own will cut me. So take this sword and kill me." Ballâl took the sword thus offered and killed the faqîr at one stroke. His body was cut into two parts. His head flew to Chittagong, where there is still a prayer-house consecrated to him. His body was buried at Râmpâl, and the mosque was subsequently erected over his remains by the Bâdshâh after the Muhammadan conquest of Bengal. After the death of the faqîr, Ballâl went to the tank to bathe and purify himself. As he left his gory clothes on the bank, the pigeon, unobserved, flew to the palace, and at this signal the females of the royal household threw themselves into the fire and perished. Soon finding that the pigeon had flown away, Ballâl rode to his palace, but it was too late. Finding that all his family was killed and life was not worth living, he threw himself into the fire and perished in the flames.

Such is the legendary account of the death of Ballâl Sen and the fall of Râmpâl. The city appears to have been abandoned after his death, and I think there is a substratum of truth in the legend. It is a historical fact that the Arabs were the first race of Muhammadans who invaded Hindûstân, and it is not unlikely that their missionary expeditions penetrated as far as Bengal in the eleventh century and fought the Sen kings who had no standing army. The Pâl kings regained their ascendancy in this part of Bengal after the death of Ballâl. It has been asserted, and not without some show of reason, that Lakshmamija, after his flight from Nadiyâ, took refuge in old Vikrâmpur, and he and some of his descendants lived in Râmpâl or Samârgîon, and maintained their sway in this part of Bengal during the early years of Muhammadan rule. It is mentioned in the Bengali book on the Sen Rájás of Bengal by Kailash Chandra Sinha, that probably there was a second Ballâl Sen who reigned after the Muhammadan conquest. It first struck me that if there was a second Ballâl Sen, he must be the prince who reigned at Râmpâl and killed the faqîr Ba-Adam and afterwards himself perished in the funeral pyre, thereby putting an end to the Sen dynasty. But the theory is not based on any reliable evidence, while tradition distinctly says that the Ballâl Sen who killed the faqîr
was the founder of Kulinism and the most distinguished prince of the Sen dynasty.

The next object of importance is the Rámpál Dighí* or the artificial lake of Rámpál. Formerly it was about a mile long and about 500 yards broad. It is now fast silting up and remains dry for nearly half the year. Cultivators have now broken up parts of the lake and grow boro paddy in it. The following is the traditional account of the origin of the lake. Rájá Ballál Sen once promised to excavate a lake, as long as his mother would be able to walk in one direction without stopping, and this he undertook to do in one night, namely, the night immediately following the pedestrian performance of his mother. So one afternoon the queen-mother walked out of the palace and proceeded towards the south. After she had walked some distance, the idea suddenly crossed the king's mind, that if she walked much further, he would be unable to cut such a large lake in one night and keep his word, and if he once broke the promise he made to his mother, he would be doomed to eternal hell. After a short reflection he hit upon a dexterous device. He asked his servants to suddenly touch his mother's feet and paint them with red pigment (alaktaka), giving out that a leech bit her and was sucking blood. The servants did so, and the stratagem had the desired effect. The queen-mother stopped, and the point whence she returned homewards became the southernmost boundary of the lake. On that very night the king collected innumerable men and excavated the whole lake. It was so large that one bank was not visible from the other. But for a long time the lake remained dry. Guided by a dream, Rámpál, an intimate friend and, according to another account, maternal uncle of Ballál Sen, one day rode into the lake, and assembling a large number of men on its banks, asked them to call it after his name, when it was filled with water. As soon as he entered into the lake, water streamed up from beneath and filled it in a moment. But Rámpál vanished. Everybody cried: 'Rámpál, Rámpál,' but he could no more be seen. Since that time the lake is called Rámpál Dighí.

This explanation of the genesis of the lake's name never satisfied me. Rámpál is also the name of Ballál Sen's city. Is it not very strange that Ballál's city and the largest lake he excavated should be named after an obscure person unknown to history? Rámpál is certainly the name of a person and is analogous to the names of Bhím Pál and other Pál kings of Bengal. I conjecture that he was a king of the Pál dynasty which reigned at Rámpál after the death of Ballál Sen, and that it was he and not Ballál who excavated the lake, and the city and the lake have been named after him. To the north of the Búghi-

* Rámpál Dighí or the artificial lake of Rámpál.
Gangá there are still many ruins to show that the Pál kings reigned in that part of Bengal, and it is a historical fact that they flourished both before and after the Sen dynasty. But as they were Buddhists ruling over a population, the mass of which were Hindús, their names have not been handed down to posterity with that halo of glory which surrounds the Sen kings, who were orthodox Hindús and great patrons of Bráhmans and Brahmanical learning. Again, it is a well known fact that one of the characteristics of the Pál kings was to excavate large lakes and tanks wherever they lived. The Mahipáñ Dighí, still existing in Dinájpur, is perhaps the largest lake they cut in Bengal. For all these reasons I am of opinion that the prince who gave his name to the city and lake of Rámpál was a king of the Pál dynasty.

There is another but smaller lake in Rámpál. It is called the Kodál-dhoá (the spade-washing) Dighí. It is about 700 cubits by 500 cubits, and is still very deep. Tradition has it that when the excavation of the Rámpál Dighí was over, each digger scooped out a spadeful of earth from a place close by, and thus the Kodál-dhoá Dighí was made. The story of course is fiction pure and simple, invented to show that myriads of men were engaged to excavate the Rámpál Dighí.

The next object of interest is Bári Ballál Sen or Ballál Sen’s palace. It is a very large and high mound of earth, surrounded by a deep moat, about 400 yards by 300 yards. No architectural remains are visible. The cicerones point to a large black pit inside the ruins as the Agníkunda or funeral pyre in which perished Ballál Sen and his family.

Another object of interest in Rámpál is the everlasting Gajariyá tree. It is a large living tree standing on the north bank of Rámpál Dighí. It is about 100 cubits high and has two large straight stems. Trees of this species abound in this part of Bengal, and there is nothing peculiar in its appearance; only it shows no signs of age or decay, though it is undoubtedly very old. It is said to be immortal and existing from the time of Ballál Sen. Respectable men of seventy and eighty years of age, whose testimony I am unable to disbelieve, have told me that they saw the tree in its present state of growth from their very boyhood. The tree is certainly a botanical curiosity. It is held in high veneration by the Hindús, and various stories are current about its virtues and sanctity. It is worshipped by the women, particularly by the barren ones, who besmear it with oil and vermilion in hopes of being cured of barrenness. A faqir is said to have violated its sanctity by cutting a root, but he instantly vomited blood and died. No one would now venture to tear a leaf or lop off a branch. A small fair is annually held under the sacred tree on the eighth day of the moon in the month of
Chaitra, when it is worshipped by pilgrims from various parts of the subdivision.

The following legend explains the origin of the Gajariyá tree's immortality. It was at first in a decayed state and was used for tying Ballal Sen's elephants. One morning some hermits (Rishis) presented themselves before Ballal Sen's gate to confer a boon on the king as a reward for his piety. They sent their message to the king by his door-keeper. The man went in and returning said that the king was smoking and was unable to come out that instant. After awhile he was again sent in. This time he returned with the news that the king was besmearing his body with oil. The door-keeper was sent in again and again, but he always returned with some excuse or other for the king's inability to come out and receive them. Once the man found the king bathing, and again taking his noontide meal, and the third time taking his siesta. He never communicated the message to the king, but only went in to observe whether he had leisure to come out. Disgusted with the king, the hermits left the palace, but at the time of departure they blessed the Gajariyá tree and conferred on it the boon of immortality which was originally intended for the king. Instantly the tree showed signs of vitality. Leaves and blossoms sprouted forth in every direction, and the people were struck with awe. The king came out shortly afterwards and, being apprised of the news, immediately sent for the hermits. But it was too late. The hermits had vanished.

There is a comparatively small tank in the south-west part of Rámpil, which deserves a passing notice. It is called Rájá Haris Chandra's Dighi. It is overgrown with trees and shrubs which are flooded over with water for a week once a year at the time of the full moon in the month of Mágh. Before and after this period the tank is dry. I have as yet received no satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon. The tank is said to have been excavated by Rájá Haris Chandra, probably one of the kings of the Pál dynasty.

There is a mosque called Qázi's Masjid not far from Ba-Adam's. It is an ordinary plain-looking prayer mosque, which was certainly erected after that of Ba-Adam. It boasts of no inscription, but has several stone idols of Hindú gods and goddesses in its verandah, which the proprietors have evidently preserved as trophies of Islám. The present Qázi of the mosque showed me a firman of the Emperor 'Alamgír, granting lands for the benefit of the institution; but I cannot vouch for its genuineness.

There are two roads the construction of which is attributed to Ballal Sen. The one connects the river Dhaleswari on the north with the Padma on the south, and the other goes in a different direction from
Rámpál right up to the Padma. The latter is called Kaehki Dwarja. The roads are now overgrown with trees and shrubs, and have in many places been broken up by the cultivators' ploughs, but what still remains clearly shows that they were once spacious roads as wide as thirty cubits. I once proposed to utilize the first mentioned road in constructing one from Munshiganj to the Police outpost at Rájabári, a distance of about twelve miles, but it was found impracticable. The Kaehki Dwarja is named after the fish of that name. The astrologers had predicted, so the story runs, that Rájá Ballád Sen would die of bones of fish sticking in his throat. To avoid such an unnatural and painful death, the king refrained from eating any fish, except the kaehki which was devoid of bones. He therefore constructed the road to the Padma, to enable fishermen to supply his table daily with the boneless fish.

[Note by the Editor.—The inscription, of which a reduced facsimile, based on three ink impressions, is published in Plate V, reads as follows:

Line 1: 

\[\text{قَالَ اللَّهُ ثُمَّ أَنَّ الْسَّاجِدِ اللَّهَ فَلَأَنتُمْ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَّاٰ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم مَنِينَ مِنْ بَني مُسَيْدَةٍ فِي الْدِّينِ أَنَّ اللَّهَ كَثِيرٌ يَقُولُ فِي اَلْجَعْلِ بَنيَةً أَنَّمَا هذَا الْمَسْجِدُ}

Line 2: 

\[\text{إِجَامَ المَلِكِ الْمَجْمَعُ مَلِكَ كَافُورُ فَيْزُرُانُ السَّلَطَانَ إِبْنِ السَّلَطَانِ جَالِلً—}

\[\text{الْدِّينِ وَالَّذِينَ أَبْرَأَوْا مَعْطَرَ فَقَصَّدَ السَّلَطَانَ إِبْنِ صَحِيِّحُ شَاهَ السَّلَطَانِ فِي تَأْرِيفٍ أُوْسَطِ شَهَرِ}

\[\text{رَجْبِ سَنَةٍ ثُلُّثُينِ وَثُلُّثِينِ ثُمَّانِينِ}

It is dated “in the middle of the month of Rajab in the year 888 A. H., during the reign of Jalálu-d-dín Fath Sháh.” Mr. Gupta reads the date as “the 2nd day of Rajab 889,” on the authority of a Maulávi of Dacca, who deciphered the inscription for him. But this is certainly wrong. The date can be quite clearly read. It is expressed in words: above \(\text{sanát} \) there is \(\text{samá́} \) \(\text{saámá́} \); by the side of \(\text{sanát} \), to the left, there is \(\text{samánín} \); above \(\text{samánín} \) again is \(\text{samánámiyát} \) (sic); below the latter word is one \(\text{wa} \) \(\text{waw} \), and below \(\text{samánín} \) is the other \(\text{waw} \) of the date. Thus the whole reads \(\text{sanát} \) \(\text{samá́} \) \(\text{wa} \) \(\text{samánín} \) \(\text{wa} \) \(\text{samánámiyát} \), i.e., eight and eighty and eight hundred. Nor does the date specify “the 2nd day,” but simply says \(\text{ausá} \) or “the middle.”

On comparing this inscription with that published by Blochmann in this Journal for 1873, Vol. XLII, p. 234, there can be no doubt that the two inscriptions are identical. There are, indeed, three slight divergences. In the date Mr. Blochmann reads \(\text{samán} \) but the inscription has only \(\text{saámá́} \) (without the final \(\text{nún} \)). This is apparently a mere blunder.
of the engraver, who seems to have forgotten to incise it. Possibly the wrong reading of the date as 880 may have been caused by this faulty legend. He also reads النامية whereas in the inscription the word is really spelt النامية (without the first alif). Again Mr. Blochmann reads الله لله متله في whereas the inscription really has الله لله قصرًا في. But there can be no doubt that these three divergences are the mere result of an oversight. As may be seen by referring to the numerous similar inscriptions, published by Blochmann in vol. XLII of the Journal, it is the word قصر (not متله) that is uniformly used in them; and there is no difficulty in recognising it on the facsimile of the present inscription.

Mr. Gupta, in his footnote (pp. 17, 18) says: "There is a similar mosque with a somewhat similar inscription in Qazi Qasbah, two miles from Rampal," and he is disposed to identify this inscription with that published by Blochmann. This identification is quite untenable. I have obtained four impressions of this second inscription, three through Mr. Gupta, and one through Maulavi Abul Khair Muhammad Siddiq, the Superintendent of the Dacca Madrasah. Unfortunately the inscription is too badly preserved to be wholly read, but luckily the date is sufficiently legible to show that the month is Zil-Qa'dah, and that the year is expressed in figures as well as in words. The figures are 976. This is quite sufficient to preclude the identification of this inscription with that published by Blochmann. Moreover this inscription is incised in three lines, while that of the Adam Shahid mosque, published by Blochmann and now republished by Mr. Gupta, occupies only two lines. In fact, Mr. Gupta was misled by an error in Blochmann's account, or rather by an error of Dr. Wise, whose account Blochmann quotes. Dr. Wise says that "the Masjid of Adam Shahid is in Birkampur, at a village, called Qazi Qasbah, within two miles of Balabari, the residence of Balabari Sen." But this is quite wrong; the mosque is not "two miles from the Balabari," but only "about half a mile to the north of it," as General Sir A. Cunningham, from whom Blochmann received the inscription, distinctly states (see his Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. XV, p. 134). It, therefore, occupies the precise position described by Mr. Gupta. Dr. Wise, in his account,—it is clear,—confused two mosques, one of Adam Shahid at Rampal, and another placed by him and Mr. Gupta at Qazi Qasbah. The exact locality of the latter mosque, however, would seem to be the Rikabi Bazir, to judge from Maulavi Abul Khair's letter, quoted below. There are four mosques in or near Qazi Qasbah, and these four mosques seem to have been more or less confused by the several writers on the subject; and the confusion probably arose from the circumstance that Qazi Qasbah is a name applied to a large area, apparently including the localities of all four mosques.
In order to clear up the matter as much as possible, Maulâvi Abul Khair, at my request, was good enough personally to visit the different localities and himself procure impressions of the two inscriptions. I subjoin the substance of his interesting letter.

"As arranged I went yesterday to Munshíganj to see the mosque at Qâzi Qâshab. I took with me as my guide a man who proved to be not so well acquainted with the locality as I expected. He had informed me that there was another old mosque at Rikâlibazar [No. I] which was close to the ghâl where we were to land from the steamer. We landed at about 11.00 Cl. and proceeded to the latter mosque. We found it to be in a dilapidated condition, though there were signs of its being used as a prayer-house. It appeared to have been an edifice of elegant structure with a floor, 15 cubits square, and one dome. The bricks are all polished and carved, and the corners and edges are so neat that from a distance they seem to be stones. The cement used is a whitish substance, not ordinary súrkhi and lime, but perhaps powdered stone and lime, or something else. There was no inscription in the mosque, but on enquiry we learnt that the stone was removed and placed in another mosque [No. II] in the neighbourhood recently built. There we repaired and found the inscription. The stone not being good many of the letters are corroded, and are not decipherable. I have taken an impression, however, which I send to you in a separate cover for whatever use you may think fit to make of it. It is dated seven hundred and odd, which I could not read. The name of the month is Zi-l-Qa'dah.

"We then proceeded towards Qâzi Qâshab, and after a tedious journey reached the mosque [No. III]. My disappointment was great when I found that the mosque, though old, did not present any interesting feature, the construction being of an ordinary type, no ornamentation or elegance having been attempted. Besides there was no inscription; the stone I was informed had been removed by the Collector of Dacca, during the proceeding of a lawsuit between rival claimants to some land belonging to the mosque. The only interesting thing that we found there was a Hindú idol, carved out of a block of stone, lying with the face downward and forming a step to the verandah of the mosque. I had become so fatigued that I feared I would not be able to return to the ghâl without some sort of conveyance. But none was available. I was, however, informed that the route we had taken was a circuitous one, and that the ghâl would not be very far from that place by a short-cut through Râmpîl. I further learnt that we would pass by the mosque of Bâbâ Adam [No. IV]. This news somewhat enlivened me, and I was on my legs again. We passed by the famous Balkâlbâî, of which I saw the ditch about a hundred yards wide. The Balkâlbâî or palace of
Ballal Sen seems to have been an entrenched fortress of which only the trench and some ruins now remain as a memorial. Not far from this I found the tomb of Adam Shahid or Baba Adam and the mosque [No. IV]. This edifice is also in ruins, but presents an interesting view to the archaeologist or antiquary. The structure is of the same style as that of the mosque at Rikabibazar [No. I], but more exquisite and ornamental. The cement is of the same nature, the bricks polished and carved. The roof consists of six domes supported by two stone pillars in the middle of the hall. One of the domes does not exist, and another has partly fallen down. The pillars are monoliths of a whitish stone, which always "perspire," and lead ignorant people to associate superstitious ideas with them, as they see water flow down on their surface, and feel them very cold. I saw marks of red pigment on the pillars, which I heard were put there by Hindu women, (and I believe by Musalmán women too, though the Khádím denied this) on making vows for the attainment of some object. The stone bearing the inscription is placed very high, so that it could not be distinctly read. I discovered, however, that the copy I have sent to you was only of one line, there being another line above it of which no impression was sent to me. As it was already very late in the afternoon and I could not wait for a scaffolding being put up, I could not obtain an impression. The inscription published by Blochmann is, I believe, of this mosque, and he was not very wrong in giving the name of the place as Qázi Qaśbah; for Qázi Qaśbah extends over a large area, and the place where this mosque stands is also included within it. This fact decides the dispute as to the name of the place being given by Blochmann as Qázi Qaśbah and by Bábú Asutosh Gupta as Rámpál. It may be called by four different names, viz., Qázi Qaśbah, Rámpál, Bahálábári and Durgábári. The inscription is quite legible, no letters have been destroyed or mutilated, the stone being jet black and well polished, not liable to corrosion. The Khádím showed me twelve places in the interior of the mosque, where, they said, lay twelve stones of great value which were removed by Mags during an incursion into Bengal in remote ages. These stones, they said, shone in the darkness of the night and illuminated the hall! Some things have been dug out of the walls, no doubt, but whether they were stones of great value which shone in darkness I cannot vouch. This mosque at any rate is an object of interest to the antiquarian."

From another letter of his, I may quote the following passage:

"The mosque at Qázi Qaśbah [No. III] is not known as the mosque of Bábú Adam or Adam Shahid. It is called Qázi Bári mosque. Ballálábári is situated near the mosque [No. II] of Adam Shahid and not near Qázi Qaśbah; and Ballál Bári and Rámpál are only two names of the
same place. There is no one's tomb near the mosque of Qāzī Qāshbāh. As for the inscription, no one can say what it contained. The other mosque, of course, is called after Bábā ʿAdam or ʿAdam Shahid and is situated in Durgābāpī, which is close to Rāmpāl or Ballālbāpī, at a distance of about half a mile. And Ballālbāpī and Durgābāpī both stand at a distance of a mile from Qāzī Qāshbāh. The tomb and the mosque are lying unrepaired. Some religious man has the charge of the mosque, and prayers are said therein. The mosque has two domes between which there are two stone pillars one on each side. There is no courtyard outside the mosque. The mosque of Qāzī Qāshbāh [No. III] also has two domes but no courtyard and pillars. There are stones at the threshold carved into images and placed overturned."

I have numbered the mosques in the above quoted extracts by corresponding numerals.

No. I. Mosque of Rikābī Bāzār; a beautiful structure, similar to the mosque of ʿAdam Shahid at Rāmpāl (No. IV); with only one dome; its inscription, dated in the month Ẓīl-Qaʿdah 976 A. H., removed to mosque No. II. It is the mosque referred to in Mr. Gupta's footnote (p. 17), as situated "in Qāzī Qāshbāh, two miles from Rāmpāl;" it is also apparently the mosque, said by Dr. White to be "within two miles of Ballālbāpī at a village called Qāzī Qāshbāh" and erroneously called by him the ʿAdam Shahid mosque (No. IV).

No. II. A mosque recently built near mosque No. I; contains the inscription belonging to No. I.

No. III. An ordinary plain mosque, with domes, but with no pillars, also with Hindū carved images in the floor of the verandah; its inscription removed to Dacca; referred to by Mr. Gupta towards the end of his paper (p. 22).

No. IV. Mosque of ʿAdam Shahid, close to Rāmpāl, at the distance of about half a mile; a highly ornamental structure, resembling the Rikābī Bāzār mosque (No. I) with the inscription (Plato V) dated "in the middle of Rajab, 888 A. H., in the reign of Jalālū-d-dīn Fath Shāh;" described by Dr. White (quoted by Blochmann) in Journal A. S. B., Vol. XLII. p. 285, General Sir A. Cunningham in Arch. Survey Reports, Vol. XV, p. 135, and Maulawī Abūl Khāir, as possessing six domes, of which, according to Dr. White, three, but according to Maulawī Abūl Khāir only two have fallen in, while General Sir A. Cunningham does not notice the destruction of any of them. On the other hand, Mr. Gupta, who describes it as a "brick built mosque with a high arched dome," would seem to allow it only one dome. In that case, he would seem to have confused it with the mosque (No. I) at Rikābī Bāzār, which Maulawī Abūl Khāir states to have only one dome.]
The Namuchi-myth; or an attempt to explain the text of Rigveda viii. 14. 13.—By Charles R. Lanman, Professor in Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

The fact has been recognized, ever since the earliest days of Vedic study, that the myths of the Veda are the poetic outgrowth of certain natural phenomena. The fact appears, for example, from the work of Yáska, when he quotes the opinion of his predecessors. And the natural basis of any given myth is usually not difficult to ascertain. Such, however, is not the case with the one now in question. The text cited above reads:

\[ \text{अध्यायः फेनेन नमचेः; मिर रख्स्डोद्वत्थः।} \\
\text{विश्वा वदुयः गङ्गः।} \]

It is commonly understood and rendered as follows: 'With the foam of the waters, Namuchi's head, O Indra, thou didst cut off, when thou wast conquering all thy foes.'

There is no doubt about the incorrectness of this interpretation. Nevertheless it is an exceedingly ancient one, as appears from the legends into which this brief allusion of the Vedic Samhita is expanded in the Brāhmaṇas. From the Brāhmaṇa-passages* and from the explicit language of Sāyaṇa†, it is clear that the water-foam was conceived as the actual weapon with which Indra cut off the demon's head. The fable says that Indra used this most remarkable weapon because he had sworn to Namuchi, saying, "Neither by day nor by night will I slay thee, neither with the mace nor with the bow, ... neither with the dry nor with the wet." And so, in order to slay him, without perjuring himself, Indra smote the demon at twilight, which was neither day nor night, and with the foam of the water, which was neither dry nor wet. 'He cast the water-foam into (the shape of) a thunderbolt'—अध्यायः फेनेन वचमनिधितन—literally, 'The water-foam he made by pouring or founding (as molten metal) to be a bolt.'

All this is quite in keeping with the style of the Brāhmaṇas; and it follows naturally enough from the text of the Saṃhitā, provided we misunderstand it as did the authors of the Brāhmaṇas. But to my mind there is no conceivable natural phenomenon of which this may be re-

* See Čatapatha Br., xii. 7. 3; Tāttirīya Br., i. 7. 1. These passages, with one from the Mahābhārata, are conveniently assembled by Muir, in his Sanskrit Texts, iv. 201.

† फेनेन तस्य गङ्गादिचिदृश्यम्, अध्यायः फेनेन वचमनिधितन।
garded as the mythical reflex. We are therefore led to inquire, did not the words of the sacred text mean something different from what even the ancients themselves supposed them to mean? I believe that they did and that the misunderstanding can be accounted for.

I suggest that the Vedic text be translated: 'With water-foam Namuchi’s head, O Indra, thou didst cause to fly asunder, when thou wast conquering all thy foes.' This appears to me intelligible if we assume that the natural phenomenon to which it refers is a waterspout (‘trombe’) on an inland lake. How, now, does this view accord with the natural facts in question and with a strict verbal exegesis of the text?

Major Sherwill has given a description of Bengal waterspouts in the Journal of this Society for 1860, volume XXIX., p. 366 f., along with some excellent pictures. And in a German work of Th. Reye, entitled Die Wirbelstürme, p. 17 f., further information and pictorial illustration may be found. The waterspout is of course an object of terror, and it is most natural that it should be personified as a demon. The verb वाचित्वस्त्रु means ‘cause to rotate,’ and the motion is qualified as upward and outward motion by the preposition अव्य. The compound अव्यद्यनेय means accordingly, ‘thou didst cause to move upward and outward or to fly asunder with a gyroratory or centrifugal motion.’ It is not possible to express by one simple English phrase the ideas involved in the compound; but they seem to me to be quite simple in themselves and to follow unforced from the Sanskrit and to be thoroughly suitable for the not infrequent phenomenon of a waterspout as seen by unscientific eyes. The head of the column is twisted and made to burst asunder and scatter itself ‘with foam’ (पानी, as an instrumental of accompaniment), i.e., in abundant foamy masses. Then, with the dispersion of the column, often comes (see Sherwill, p. 370, Reye, p. 32) a heavy rain. This is all in entire accord with the usual representations of gracious Indra’s deeds of prowess.

In particular, also, it accords most strikingly with the quite differently expressed idea of Rigveda v. 30. 8b (= vi. 20. 6b), where Indra is spoken of as ‘twirling (like a stick of attrition or like a churning-stick) the head of the demon Namuchi,’

\[ निरी द्रास्का नम्बकेदायस्य \]

and that, immediately after the couplet in stanza 7,

\[ खच्छि द्राम्भका नम्बकः निरी यथू \]

This explanation of the stanza in question, moreover, harmonizes well with the succeeding stanza, Rigveda, viii. 14. 14,
in which Indra is praised for hurling down the demons that were striving with magic wiles to creep up and to scale the heights of heaven. To the poetic fancy, nothing would suggest more naturally the idea of demons trying to scale the heavens than the sight of this strange magical ladder betwixt earth and sky.

In this connection, the discussion of Borgaigne, *La religion védique*, ii. 346-7, should be compared. The language of the sloka at Mahábhárata, v. 10. 37 = 328 seems also to favor my view. The whole epic passage is a reminiscence of the Namuchí-story.

The false interpretation of the ancients, finally, rests simply upon the ambiguity of the instrumental case form जीन. The case might denote the relation of accompaniment—as it really does here; or it might denote the relation of means—as the authors of the Bráhmapas supposed it to do.

---

On some new or rare Muhammadan and Hindu Coins.—By
Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle.

In July and September last I received from the Deputy Commissioner of Hoshangábád, in two instalments, a hoard of 477 gold coins, which had been found in a field in the Sohagpur Tahsil of the Hoshangábád District, by some ploughmen while ploughing their field.

This hoard was carefully examined by me, and a detailed report published in the *Proceedings* of the Society for December 1887.

Among the 477 coins, there were 451 belonging to different (so-called) "Pathán" emperors of Dehli; 4 belonging to the Mughal emperors Aurangzéb and Farrukh Siyar, 1 belonging to the Bengal king Sikandar bin Ilyás, and 21 silver-gilt forgeries.

The "Pathán" emperors of whom there were coins, are Ghiyásu-d-dín Balban (1 specimen), Muizzu-d-dín Káiqobád (1), Jalálu-d-dín Fírúz (1), ‘Aláu-d-dín Muḥammad (391), Ghiyásu-d-Tughlák I. (3), Muḥammad bin Tughlák (24), Fírúz Sháh (19), Fírúz Sháh and Fath Khán (2), Fírúz Sháh and Zafár (2), Ghiyásu-d-dín Tughlák II. (2), Abá Bákhr bin Zafár (1), Muḥammad bin Fírúz (1), Māḥmúd bin Muḥammad bin Fírúz (1), and Māḥmúd bin Muḥammad bin Tughlák (1).

Most of these coins belong to more or less well-known types, which have been already published in Thomas’ *Chronicles of the Pathán Kings*
of Delhi. See details in the report above referred to. It will be seen from that report, that in the present hoard there are several types of coins which were still noted as “unique” in Thomas’ book; e. g., the coin of Jalálu-d-dín Firúz (Chrour. No. 120), several of Muḥammad bin Tughaq (Chron. Nos. 172, 179), one of Firúz Sháh (Chron. No. 226), one of Firúz Sháh and Zafar (Chron. No. 245). There are in it also some coins, which are not to be found in Thomas’ Chronicles, though they have been published elsewhere: thus two of Mahmúd bin Muḥammad bin Firúz (with Abu-l-Muzaffar, as published by myself, in this Journal, vol. LII, p. 213, for 1883), and one of Mahmúd bin Muḥammad bin Tughaq (published by Mr. Delmerick in this Journal, vol. XLIII, p. 97, for 1874).

The most important in this collection of “Pathán” coins, however, are five, which, to the best of my knowledge, are unique, or at least have never been noticed or published. These are the following (see Plato IV):

1, One coin of Muḥammad bin Tughaq (Plate IV, No 1). It reads as follows:

Obv. رضي الله عن أحمد
Rev. أبو الابن

The reverse seems to bear a date, consisting of two numerals. One of them, 5, is distinctly seen by the side of abu; but the other above the s of 'Abbas is obscure. As the Khalif Abu-l-Abbas Ahmad reigned from 741-753, the date of the coin can only be 745. This coin has some similarity with Muḥammad bin Tughaq’s copper coin, No. 218 in Thomas’ Chronicles.

2, Two coins of Ghīyāṣu-d-dín Tughaq II. He is mentioned in Thomas’ Chronicles, as the twenty-first king (A. H. 790-791 = A. D. 1388). He reigned only a few months, as the rival of Muḥammad bin Firúz and Abu Bakr. Thomas’ Chronicles only notice “silver and copper” coins of his (p. 302). The present collection contains two gold coins of his, of two different types. The first (Plate IV, No. 2) reads as follows:

Obv. السلطان الأعظم
فیات الدنيا والدين
تغلب شاه
سلطاني
Rev. زمن الامام
كبار الموحدین
ابي عبد الله
خالد خلافته

Margin: on reverse; [ 1 1 دهلي ]
It was struck at Delhi, in the year 791. The mint is distinct on the margin, but the date is only partially preserved. There can be no doubt, however, of its being a coin of Tughlaq II., and not of Tughlaq I., on account of the mention of the Khalif Abi 'Abdulláh. This Khalif only ascended the throne in 763 A. H., while Tughlaq I. died already in 725 A. H. Abi 'Abdulláh's Khalifat lasted, with interruptions, down to 808 A. H. This identification I owe to Mr. Chas. J. Rodgers, of the Archaeological Survey, to whom I showed the coin.

The second (Pl. IV, No. 3) reads as follows:

Obv. نبيت إلذنيا و الدين ناصر
Rev. اللة أبو البلطر
Module, on reverse: illegible.

This coin is also shown to be one of Tughlaq II., by the mention of the Khalif Al Mutawakkal 'Ali Alláh, who is the same as the above mentioned Abi 'Abdulláh. The execution of this coin is rather crude, especially of the word Abu-l-Muzaffar.

3, One coin of Abú Bakr, the son of Zafar Khán and grandson of Fírúz Sháh. He succeeded Tughlaq II., but only reigned for a little more than a year, from 791 to 792 A. H. In Thomas' Chronicles (p. 303) he is noticed as the twenty-second king, but only copper or silver copper coins of his are described. The present collection contains one gold coin, which reads as follows (Plate IV, No. 4):

Obv. الساطان الأعظم
Rev. زعيم الإمام
ابن زعيم
السلطاني
There are faint traces of a margin on the reverse, which probably gave the mint and date.

4, One coin of Sikandar bin Ilyás, one of the independent kings of Bengal. For some account of him, see this Journal, vol. XXXVI, p. 58, and vol. XLII, p. 256. So far as I am aware, only silver coins of his have hitherto been discovered; they have been described and figured by E. Thomas, in vol. XXXVI. The coin in the present collection is of gold, and reads as follows (Plate IV, No. 5):
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There was a margin on the reverse, which probably contained the mint and date, but it is quite mutilated. The readings are identical, and their arrangement nearly identical, with those on Thomas’ type No. 4 (or coin, No. 22) in vol. XXXVI, p. 64. The mint, accordingly, would seem to have been Firúzábád.

To these five coins I add another which is not new, as it has been already described by Thomas in his Chronicles, p. 298. But I am not aware that it has ever been figured; and the present specimen has the further advantage of having preserved a portion of the margin on the reverse, giving the mint and date. It is a coin bearing the joint names of Firúz Sháh and his son Fath Khánum, and reads as follows (Plate IV, No. 6):

Obv.

 함께.argmax
al. تامار
الله المسماء
شاعر
شاه

Rev.

١
الله المتعهد
إياد المومدين
worth
خالد

Margin: on reverse: ....... ك ... في سنة إحد ... ....

Fath Khánum was made co-regent in 760 A.H., and the Khalif Abu-l-Fath whose name appears on the reverse, reigned from 753-763 A.H. It follows that the date of the coin, of which only the numeral 1 is preserved, must be 761. The name of the mint I am unable to read.

I take this opportunity to publish figures of two copper coins of Saifu-d-din al Hasan Qurlag. They belong to the well-known “Bull and Horseman” type, already noticed by Thomas in his Chronicles, p. 96 (No. 82). They show on the obverse a horseman with the legend, in Nágarí characters, शी चलीर: S’rı Hamirah; and on the reverse a humped bull, also with a Nágarí legend. The latter, as given by Thomas, is शी कुरक्क S’rı Isanap Kurala; and this is, no doubt, the style in which it is met with in by far the greater majority of specimens. But occasionally the name is found in full कुरक्क Kurala. Among a number of 100 of these coins, discovered not long ago in Sháhpur in the Panjáb, and examined by me, I found about a dozen giving the full name (see
Dr. Hoernle—New or rare Muhammadan and Hindu Coins. [No. 1. Proceedings for December 1888). On Plate IV, I give the reverses of four specimens (Nos. 7—10). No. 7 shows the usual form कुराल kurala, but No. 8 has distinctly कुरालक kuralaka (the l is slightly injured); No. 9 reads वी चक्र व S'ri Hasana Ku, and No. 10 has वी चक्रण kurala S'ri Hasana Kurala.

I also take this opportunity to publish two gold coins (Plate IV, fig. 11, 12) which I found among a lot of 506 coins collected by Bābū P. C. Mukherji, on special duty with Archeological Survey, and forwarded to the Indian Museum in Calcutta. They belong to the class commonly known as ‘Kanauj coins.’ Coins of this description were issued by the Kuhachuri kings of Chedi, the Gaharvār (Raḥor) kings of Kanauj and the Chandel kings of Khajurahā. As the two coins, here published, are said to have been found in Khajurahā, I think it most probable that they are Chandel coins, though I feel uncertain as to their exact attribution.

No. 11—I propose to read.

को मत रमादि रामादि देव

Sūrī Mat Pa-

No. 12—may be read.

को मद्वि ओ रा वार्ममा ओ देव ओ देव

Sūrī Mat Bā-

ra Varmma* Devī* Devī*

* देवी देवी

The final long i of devī seems clear; but it is puzzling.

The king to whom No. 12 belongs, I take to be the 20th of General Sir A. Cunningham’s list of Chandel kings (Archeological Survey Reports, Vol. XXI, p. 80), viz. Vīra Varmma, who reigned from about 1240—1280 A. D. Or it might be Bāla Varmma, mentioned by Mr. V. A. Smith in his paper on the “History of Bundelkhand” (Journal, B. A. S., Vol. L, p. 19); but he appears to have been only one of the younger scions of the regal house, and would not have been entitled to issue coins in his name.

No. 11 I take to belong to the well-known Paramārdī Deva (the 18th of Gen. Sir A. Cunningham’s list), who reigned from about 1165—1203 A. D., and fought with the famous Prithvī Rāj and Qutbuddīn Aibāk.

If my attributions are correct, both the coins now published would appear to be unique. For the only Chandel coins hitherto known and published, so far as I am aware, are those noticed by Gen. Sir A. Cunningham in his Archeological Survey Reports, Vol. X, pp. 25—27 (see his Plate X). They belong to the following five Chandel princes: Kirti Varmma (12th of the list), Hallakshaṇa Varmma (13th), Jaya Varmma
(14th), Prithví Varma (16th), Madana Varma (17th). Then follows Paramarddi Varma (18th), a coin of whom is now published for the first time. I may note, however, that Gen. Sir A. Cunningham’s coins, Nos. 15 and 16 on his Plate X (Vol. X), appear to show some resemblance to my No. 12. They too seem to read deví. They are marked on his Plate as “unknown.”
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Life of Sum-pa Khan-po, also styled Yešes-Dpal-hbyor, the author of the Rehumig (Chronological Table.)—By Babu Sarat Chandra Dās, C. I. E.

This great Lama was born in the year 1702 A. D. (Tree-monkey of the 12th cycle of 60 years) at a place in the neighbourhood of the Dgon-lun monastery of Amdo in ulterior Tibet. He is better known by his family name of Sum-pa, which means one from the country of Sum, a province in Western Tibet. In his infancy he is said to have given indications of his identifying himself with the spirit of his predecessor. While very young he learnt to read and write with extraordinary facility. He became well known by the name of Sumpa-Shabs-dru. He was admitted into the monastery of Dgon-lun in the 9th year of his age. He received instruction in the sacred literature of the Buddhists under Lohan skyā Rinpo-cheh Nag-Dvān chhos ldan and Thu Kwan chhos kyirgya-mtsho and other great Lamas. From Lohan-skya he received the vows of monkhood, who gave him the name Yešes Dpal-hbyor. He studied metaphysics, logic, rhetoric, poetry, Buddhist liturgy, ritual, and the dogmatical and theoretical differences of the various Buddhist schools. He also learnt arithmetic, medicine, the science of vocal music, the works on Sutras and Tantras, and the art of sacred painting. With the acquisition of all this learning he was occupied till the twentieth year of his age. In addition to acquiring all the virtues and talents of his predecessor, he gained the highest proficiency in astronomy, astrology and the science
of figures. His fame of learning surpassed that of all other Lamas of his age in Tibet, China, and Mongolia. In the twentieth year of his age he visited Tibet proper, and took his admission as a student in the monastery of Hbras-iPāū (Dapāū). In the year 1725 he visited Ğtsanī, where he took the final vows of monkhood from Panchhen Blo-Iissan Yešes. In the 22nd year of his age he went on a pilgrimage to Lhokha with a view to visit Sam-yea, and the famous sanctuaries of Yar-lū, where he was very much pleased with an interview with Rgya lma Rinpochhe (Nag Dvañ Hjigs med). Rgyal-sras is said to have explained to him in a prophetic manner what he was destined to achieve and how he should proceed to Amdo, for the purpose of founding monasteries and temples there, and also for diffusing Buddhism in China. In his 23rd year he was appointed MKhanpo (abbot) of Sgo Māñ in Hbras spuñ. In the following year, when a dispute arose between the two provinces Dvāas and Ğtsanī, he persistently declined to allow the monks of his college to take up arms against their enemies, as it was an act prohibited by the laws of Buddhism. The monks of other colleges followed his example and desisted from fighting. He filled the chair of Sgo-mañ for a period of five years, after which he returned to Amdo. In the 30th year of his age, in pursuance of the prediction of Rgyal-sras, he founded the monastery of Bshad Sgrub-gliā with about eighty monks. He brought the recluse hermitage of Bsam-gtan-gliā ri-krod with fifteen monks, which was founded by Dpal Udan hod sser, under his own monastery, and afterwards called it by the name of Sum-pa rikrod. At the age of thirty-four, at the command of the emperor Chhin-lū (divine protector), and in the 2nd year of his reign, he visited China. Both Lchan skyā Rol-pāñ rDorje and he were presented to the emperor, who asked them many questions on religious matters. Sampa Khanpo is said to have answered all of them without any difficulty whatever. Pleased with him the emperor commanded that he be appointed the spiritual guide of all the chiefs of Mongolia, and he also conferred on him a high sacerdotal rank by letters patent, and authorized him to bear the title of Huthogtu (saint). The Lama respectfully accepted all the imperial favours, with the exception of the title of Huthogtu which honour he respectfully declined, according to him it being intended for those who aspired to worldly glory. The emperor was struck with the Lama’s indifference to such a high honour, and remarked that within his vast empire he did not know one who like him could look with indifference at such an exalted distinction. Henceforth he rose high in the esteem of the emperor and was declared to be a real Lama. He resided in China for nine years. The emperor occasionally used to call him to his presence. The Lchen skyā, who presided at the head of Labrang (church), commanded that all
the Tibetan books on Buddhism extant in China should be revised by Sumpa, which he did to the great satisfaction of all. He therefore gave him the clerical title of Ertenö (precious) Pundita. He presented him with a diploma inscribed on a yellow scarf. Once on every month the emperor used to give him audience and converse with him on religious matters for several hours. He resided for five years in Peking, during which time he enjoyed the esteem and the veneration of the Manchu and the Mongol residents and the pilgrims of Peking. At the time of his return to Amdo, which he performed via Dolonor and Khar lhampo he received considerable presents from the emperor, Ocha-skya and the great Wangs (chiefs) of China and Mongolia. At Rivo-rtse lha (Woo-thai) he stayed one year in order to perform religious worship in the great sanctuary of Manju Ghosha. In his northward journey he visited Alaksha, receiving immense presents from the Mongols, whence he proceeded to D gon-lun. Being indifferent to worldly comforts, he did not like much ostentation, and consequently kept few retainers and servants. In the 43rd year of his age he was appointed to the headship of D gon-lun monastery. Out of the immense wealth he had acquired in China and Mongolia he used to send large presents to the Panchhen and Dalai Lamas, to the great monasteries of Sera, Hbras-spun, Dgah ldan, Bkra’is lhampo, &c. He also set up innumerable Buddhist images, inscriptions and chhortens &c. His works are voluminous and many. Being dissatisfied with the existing works on astronomy, astrology and chronology of Tibet, he wrote a dissertation on them after collating 20 works by different authors. He found the works of Mkhas-grub rjo and Bu-ston to be more correct than others. He died at the age of 73. The following are his principal works:

Kun-gsal melö (on arithmetic, astronomy and astrology) a large volume written in very small characters.

Ddud rtsi thig-pa (drops of nectar) on medicine.

Lag-len (practice) of medicine, &c.

Sel-dkar melö (crystal mirror) on diagnosis.

Cso-dpyad.

Sku-gsan thug-rtan dkyil thig tshad (structure, proportion and form of images, diagrams, symbols, &c.).

Sgra, Sphan-hag and sslos gar (rhetoric and poetry and drama).

Rgya-Bod and Hor Chhos lbyun (Ljon-bssah), i. e. the history of Buddhism (rise and progress of Buddhism) in India, China and Tibet. This work was completed in the year 1747 A. D., and also contains the "Rekhmiig (chronological table)."

A work on Buddhist charms to enable men to work miracles.

Hdsamglin Spyi bsd (general account of the world) on the geography of the world.
A work on Yoga.
A work on fortune telling and divination.
A work on meditation.

REHUMIG.*
(Translation)

CYCLE†—I
A. D. 1026.

The twelfth Kula emperor, called Surya, ascended the throne of Sambhala. Dge bses Potova Rinchhen gsal was born. Gyi-jo Lo-chava translated the Kalachakra system of astronomy for introducing it into Tibet. The year of the Buddha's Nirvana being fixed in the year called Fire-hare, this year (1026) was the 361st year of the period of Adhikaprishti. According to the calculation of those who place the Buddha's death in the year Iron-dragon, this was the 408th year of Adhikaprishti. According to some writers the work, called Dus-hkhor hgrel-chhen, was translated in Tibet by Gyi-jo Lochava in the year 1026.

Se-ston Kun-rigs, the spiritual teacher of Ma-chig Shama Icbam Sriñ and pupil of Brog-uni Lo-chava, was born. Phu chhuñ-va gshon-rgyan was born. Rinchhen sün-po of Stod luñ, the pupil of Spyan-sña-va was born. Spyan Sña-tshul khrims hbar was born. Hkhon Dkon-nachhog rgyal-po of Sa-skya was born. La-chchen (Lama Chhenpo) DGoöga-pa rab gsal proceeded to the mansion of purity (died). Rñog Chhos-rDorje, the disciple of Marpa, was born. Jowo rje Dpal ldan Atisa arrived at Mña'h rigs. Rje-bsuns Milara-pa was born. Bari Lo-chava Rinchhen-grags was born. The Shalu monastery was founded. Náo Pan-chchen died.

Ye-ses hbar of Sneju ssur, the eldest son of Dgonpa-pa was born. Mña sgom brtson hgrus hbar of Snying rum, who was the pupil of Spyan sña-pa, was born. Atisa visited great Tibet (according to some) in the 61st year of his age. 1041

* The italics in the proper nouns are not pronounced.
† The Vrihaspati Cycle of 60 years was introduced into Tibet by the Indian Pandit Chandra Natha in the year 1025 A. D.
The monastery of Myu-gu lun was founded by II brogni Lo-chavá.
Machig Sha-ma’s husband was born. Rma-Lo-chavá Chhos hbar of La-stod was born. II Brom met Atísa in the 41st year of his age.

II bruñ Ston of Rgyal was born. Ssla-va grags-pa, the son of Lehe dal sgañpa, was born.

Chhag-khri mchhog met Atísa.
Rgya-hdul lasin dwañ phyug tshul-khrims hbar was born. Atísa miraculously witnessed the religious service performed by Maitreya (Byams-pa) and Manjuśri (Hjam-dbyañs) at sNe-thañ. Ma-dra-va founded the monastery of E-dgon.

Gñal chhos hbar was born. II brom made his first presents to Atísa.

1044
Bgya-hdun Adsin rZwaii phug tshul-khrims 7ibar was born. Atisa wrote his work on the Buddhist chronology.

1046
Mu-dra-va founded the monastery of E-dgon.

1048
Onal chhos 7tbar was born.

1049
Atisa wrote his work on the Buddhist chronology.

1050
Machig Lab-sgron of Kham-pa Lun was born. Machig yumo became the pupil of Sba-sgorn ye-byan and others of the later Bnifi-ma school.

1051
Dbarma Bodhi was born.

1052
Sdin-po snubs Chhos 7tbar was born.

1053
Atisa died at the age of 73.
Pá-tsha-va Lochavá called Nima Grags-pa was born. Rma-sgom chhos gás of the Shi-byed school was born. Shini ston chhos hbar was born. The celebrated Machig Lab-Sgron was born. Rinchhen bssañpo the great Lochavá died.

1054
Trephonmchhogs, the spiritual teacher and Mkhano of Rñog legs, was born.

1055
Schd-hod of Shañ Kama was born. The monastery of Rva sgrañ was founded by II brom ston-pa.
Chhag-khri-mchhog, one of the disciples of Atísa, died.
Rñog BIO-dran sès-rab was born. Dol bu sër-rgya-ma was born. Rog-dmar-shur was born.

1058
Rma-byia Tña-ra-va of rGyal was born. Sna-nam rdor dwañ of Shañ died.

1059
Machig receives spiritual instruction from A-ston.
Skhor-chhun of Phyag ehken school was born. Ma-chig Shama, the pupil of Se-ston Kun-rigs, was born. So-chhun Dge- khun hbar of the Shi-byed school was born. Kun-dgah, the second of the Shi-byed school, was born.
Se-mkhar-chhuñpa (of Lam-kbras-pa) held the monastery of Lhógm-khar-chuñ. II brom ston died.
Rnal-hbyor Ame held the headship of Rwa-Sgren.
Rgya-sgar Phyag-na visited the Ye-ran monastery in Nepal.
Padma byan-chhub of Sa-po sgañ, the pupil of Phuchhun-pa, was born. Byan-chhub yešes of Rgyal-tsha was born.
IIJam-Dpal and Skyi khhun-pa Hab-jo, the two disciples of the Grub thob Yumo, were born. Hāsdal Dharma met Pha-dampa Sans rgyas. Lche-Sgom Nañ-pa unearthed the concealed scriptural treasures of Lche-b tsun, the Rñī-ma Lama.

Chhos kyi Rgyal-po of Hkho-n-pu, the brother of Machig Sama, was born.
Sarava Yontan Grags, the disciple of Potova, was born.
Hkho-n founded the grand monastery of Sa-skya, and Rñog legs šes founded the monastery of Gsañ-phu. Rma-Chhos šes met Pha-dampa.
Sgro-phrag-pa, the pupil of Ssur-chhun and disciple of Dkñā-bahi, was born. Hbrog-mi Lochāva died. Ser-grags, the Rñī-ma Lama of Ssur-chhun, died.
Sprul-sku Gshon-hod of Bya-yul, the disciple of Spyangs-ha, was born. Ses-mb Brtson of Khu was born. Brtson gyuñ Khu-chhen died.
The great religious institution of king Mñāh bdag rtse sde was founded. Rdog Lochāva visited Kaśmir.
Gtsañ-pa Rin-po chhe, the disciple of Bya-yul-pa, was born.
Nam kha rdorje was born Pātshab sgompa, the disciple of Kun ḏgañ of the Shi byed school was born. Milaraspas proceeded to study under Marpa Lochāva.
Hbro-m-ston of Rgyal was born. Sgro-chhos brtson, the pupil of Sgom of the Shi-byed-pa school, was born.
After the death of Amo, Mdsod dgon-pa became the abbot of Rva-sgren.
Blo-gros grags Lha-rje sgampopa of Dwag-po was born.
Rgya-hdul hdsin practised the ascetic vows of vinaya at the monastery of Dgah-va-gdoñ.
The foundation of the monastery of Gra-thaṅ was laid by Gra-pa mñon šes chan (a certain monk who was possessed of foreknowledge).
Potova Rinchen gsal died, after discharging the functions of abbot at the religious seat of Rwa-sgren for one year or (according to some) three years. Mdsod dgon-pa died.

Henceforth for many years there prevailed a religious anarchy at Rv-sgren.
Byañ ehhub dge-mdses, the pupil of Sne-hu ssur-pa, was born. Ras ehhub rdor grags, the pupil of Milaras-pa, was born at Guñ thañ. Milaras-pa performed asceticism to attain sainthood.

Sami sgom-pa Smun lam bbar, the pupil of So-ehhuñ-pa, was born.

**CYCLE—II.**

Sarava attended on Potova as his pupil.

Ma Lochava Chhos-bbar died of poison.

Dgyer Sgom chheupo Gshon-grags, the pupil of Bya-Yul, was born. Rñog-mdo-ste, the spiritual son of Rñog Chhos-rdor, was born. Tshul-hphags-dan lapa, the Buddhist scholar, was born. Rog ses-rab blama, the spiritual successor of Rgyalwa rten-nas, was born. Gra-pa mñon ses-rab chan died.

Brtsan hgrus bbar, known as Bya-hdun-va hdsn-pa (the Vinayic priest of Bya), was born.

Sa-ehhen Kun siññ, the son of Sa-skya Dkon rgyal, recognised as the 9th spiritual emanation of Chanrassig, was born. The saint Pha-dampa visited Tibet. Rñog Lo-chava returned to Tibet.

The Glañ-thañ monastery was founded by Glañ-ri-thañ-pa. Milaraspa, after the completion of his ascetical propitations (attainment of sainthood), proceeded towards Tesi &c.

Niñ phug-pa Chhos grags, the saint of Shañ who was the pupil of Byañ-sems Ssla rgyan, was born.

The Riññ Lama, called Rgya-nag-pa (the Chinese), was born. Ras-ehhuñ-pa met Milaras-pa.

The monastery of Lodgon was founded.

Tshul-khriins dpal, the red cap Lama, was born.

Ukra sîs rdorje of Shañ Ston, a Riññ-ma Lama, was born.

Marpa Chhos blo was born.

Hod asser seh-ge, the disciple of Bya-yul-pa, was born. Dva gu-po Chhos gyuñ, the chief spiritual son of Sgampo, was born.

Ye-rdor of Hchhad kha, the disciple of Sarava, was born.

Pha-dampa visited China.

On the demise of Hkhon-ston Dkon-mChhos rgyal-po, Bari Locháva ascended the throne of Sa-skya.

On the death of Glau-tshuñ byañ, Hbriñ ston succeeded to the headship of RGYal (became abbot of Rgyal).

Rñog Chhos rdor died.

Stab ka-va Darma grags, the disciple of Sarava, was born.
Khyuṅ tshaṅ Thod-dmar-va was born. Stod luṅ-pa founded the monastery of Btson-gro dGon-pa. Spyau sṅaṅ tshul ḡbar died at sNāg-rūṃ. Sgroṅ Sgom, the pupil of Sgampo, was born.

Sgam-po-va received the final vows of monkhood.

Potova rinchhen gsal died.

Gtum-ston Blo gros grags, the pupil of Sarava, was born. Phu-Chhūñ-va died at the monastery of Poto dgon.

Stön-pa Lo chāva who brought the Kaśmirian Pandit Al-anāka Deva was born.

Chhos-sen of Phya-pa was born. After the death of Rnog Lochāva Shaṅ-Tshe sṅiṅ Chhos kyi bla ma held the headship of Gsaṅ-phu for thirty-two years. A succession of twelve lamas occupied a period of 139 years. Śāṅg-rūṃ-pa chhenpo died.

Rdo[rje rgyal-po (Phagmo-grub-pa) was born. Karma dus gsum mkhyanpa was born. Sgampo served Milaras-pa as his pupil.

Kun-sūṅ ascended the throne of Sa-skya. The Gva-gor-dgon-pa was founded by Gnal Chhos ḡbar.

At Chhu-bar Milaras-pa triumphed over a troop of demons. Sgampo performed ascetic propitiations at Hol kha. Gnal Chhos ḡbar died.

The final visit of Pha-dampa to Tibet. The incarnations of Las chhen Kun-rgyal, &c., founded monasteries in Bya-yul.

Khyuṅ tshaṅ yeṇes bla ma, the disciple of Ras chhuṅ, was born. Jo-tshul Sès, the spiritual son of Rnog mdo-sde, was born. Kham luṅpa Chheupo, the pupil of Hgrom, died.

Sgompa tshul Khurims of Dvag-po was born. Rgyal-va ye-grags dmar-va was born. Stod Luṅ-pa Chhenpo died. Se-ston Kun rīg died.

JChhus dar brtson, the disciple of Sgro (of the Shi byed school), was born. Some of the Gter-ston of the Sūṅ ma sect discovered hidden books. Pha dampa died.

Ma Khrö-phu Rgyal-tsha, the disciple of Panchhen Sākya śri, Rnog-mdo-sde and Phag-gru, &c., was born. Yeṇes ḡbar of Sṇhū Ssur died.

Dgyer sṅgom founded the monastery of Rgya-ma Rin-chhen sgaṅ-ṛiṇi.

Hbriṅ-ston died. Skam yo-rgyan of the Shi-byed school died.

Thog-med grags, the spiritual son of Rnog mdo-sde, was born. Rma Rna-ra-va became the abbot of Rgyal. The age of Samādhi commenced.
Chhos rgyan of Se-skyilbu, the disciple of Hchhad kā, was born.

The monastery of Sgampoi dgonpa was founded by Dvags po Lha-rJe.

Thogs med Hod of Rňog was born. Btson-grags of Shañ was born. When Skor-chhuñ died, his body received animation. The resurrection was due to the Indian saint Nirupa having entered it in a miraculous manner.

Sla-hod, the spiritual son of Hkhon-plu-pa, was born. Gyu brag pa was born. Gshon-brtson of Glañ-luñ, the pupil of Bya-yul Locháva, was born. Rje Milaras chhen died.

Irito-rje scûge of Glañ than died.

Jo Hbum, the father of Ika-ston Jo-ye and Jo-bsod of the Rhñû-ma school, was born The later Kun-dguk of the Shi-byed school died.

Karma dus mkhyen was admitted into the order of monk-hood by Tre-po wclhog blama. Ačhârya Abhayakara died.

Mal Kupa chuñ, the disciple of Sama, was born. Lecho-ston yon-tan gsuñs of Se-brag was born.

The Kasmirian Pandit Sâkya Sûri was born.

Jig-rten Graigs-pa Rgya-va rten, who became the disciple of Pâ-tshab sgom-pa of the Shi-byed school, was born. Udod kIo gshon-nu yontan was born.

The 13th Rigs-idan (Kulika), called Sna-tshogs gssungs (Viṣvâ-rûpa), a cended the throne of Sambhala.

Dge-ûces glan of Rgyal was born. Pâima-rdorje Ras-pa (ho with locks) of the Hbrug-pa school, was born.

Karma dus mkhyen visited Dvus. So-chhuñ dék bhar died.

Shal-to Dgra chhom-pa, the saint of Baltî, was born. Jo hod gehuñ, also called Rňog jo va-soû, was born. Rña Narava died.

Ses rab Byañ-chhub, also called Dvag po Sgom-Chhuñ, of Dvags-po was born.

Rgyal tsha Byañ yeñes became abbot of Rgyal gdansa. Sunbs chhos kbar died.


The red cap Lama Tshul khrims kbar died.

Nam-mkhuñ hod of the red cap school, who was the re-embo-diment of Shva rmar Tshul dpal, was born.

Dus mkhyon received the final vows of monkhood from Mal hdul hdsin.
Sgampo bdul bsin was born. Sgro-phugpa died.
Mhaṅ bdag =$('#aral, king of Tibet (recognised as the 11th
icarnation of Chanrassig'), was born.
Hod sser Seṅge founded the monastery of Khrom Kang
dgonpa at Khrom Oshe.
Saṅg rgyas dpon-pa, the younger brother of Rgyama dgyer
sgom, was born. Shon-lbyun was born. Rog bkra grags, the
spiritual son of Rog S'es-rab bla ma, was born. Gshon-hod of
Bya-yul died.
Dus Mkhyen visited Sgampo at Dvagpo. Khyun-po died.

Cycle III.

Rje-brtsun Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan, the spiritual son of Sa-
chhen, was born.
Kun-ladan Ras Chhun, the younger brother of Khro-phin
rgyal-tshas, was born.
Rhin-ma Rgya-nag-pa, the disciple of Sgro-phug Rhin-ma
Lama, died.
Shig-pa bṣad rtsi, the disciple of Rhin-ma Se-brag, was
born. Machig Sama died.
Rog S'es-rab bla ma, the religious and ministerial successor
of Rgyal-va-rten-na, was born.
Dvagpo sgom-tshul held the abbotship of Sgampo. Dpal-
ychen Hodpo chhe, the son of Sa-chhou, was born.
Phagmo grub-pa interviewed Rje-Sgampo-va.

Rdor-seṅ, the younger brother of Rñog Chharmo, was born.

Sgro chhos brtson died.

Chhag Locháva, also called Dgra-bchom Rthedu rava, the disciple of Steṅ-pa Locháva, was born.

Gro-bdud-rtsi grags of Snarthan was born.

Stum-ston founded the monastery of Snarthan.

Dag-pa of Nan lam became abbot of Rgyal gdansa.

Dvagpo Sgampo-va died.

Rdorje tshuZ khrims of Hbri ga was born. Dvags-po Sgom-tshul founded the monastery of Mtshur-lha lha at Stod-lha.

Dus mkhan pa founded the Karmapa monastery of Gsha mtshur Lha lha at Gshu bshis Lha lha.

Thogs med grags of Rñog died.

Kun dgak rdorje, the spiritual son of Rñog jo-tshul, was born.

Dvaṅ-phyug byaṅ rin of Lha lha, who was the disciple of Se-spyi-pa, was born. Bsaṅ mo, the spiritual son of Saṅs rgyas dpon ston, was born.

Niṅ akhom, the son of Rñiṅ-ma saṅs-ston, was born. Pā-tshul sgompa died. Sa-chhen Kun-shiṅ died. Rñog jo-tshul died. Phag gru-pa founded the monastery of Gdansa mthil.

Bsdod nams rtse mo became the grand hierarch of Sa-skyas.

Dge-bēs Namlampa died. Dus mkhyen founded the monastery of Mtshur-phu.

Saṅs-rgyas sgompa rdor gshon of Bya-yul was born. Dge-bēs losma niṅ rib was born.

Rma Locháva and Yaṅ dnenpa, the immanations of Machig Sama, were born.

Yeses rdorje (also called gtsaṅ-pa Rgya ras pa), the disciple of Hbri-pa ghun raspa, was born. Gtsaṅ riūpoche Naṅ rdorjo died. Ras-chenpa died.

Chhiṅgis Kháñ, the conqueror, who turned the wheel of might, was born.

Skor Nirta tava died.

Rta ston jo yešes, the Rñiṅ ma Lama, was born.

Gños Rgyal-va lha naṅva Saṅs rin, the disciple of Skyob-pa, was born.

Dus mkhyen founded the monastery of lower Kam-po gnas nāṅ. The monastery of Holhald-ka gshar ma was founded by Se-skyil-pa. Khynuṅ-shaṅ Thod dan became abbot of Rgyal-gdansa. Hab jo Sras, the disciple of Yumo, died.
Bya-khaps-ka founded the monastery of Malgro Bya-kha. The two Gliur-pas of Stagluṅ interviewed Phag-gru.

Ser-hod, the son of Rog bkra-grags, was born. 1164

Gtum-ston died at Chhos-ru. Rdor-ston. Ser grags became abbot of Snarthaṅ.

Rñog mdo-sde died. Ser hod, the spiritual son of Rog-bkra Grags, was born. 1165

Mñahri dge-mdsas died. Shaṅ ston bkra rdor, the Rñiũ-ma lama, died. The abbot of Hbrig-goṅ became the disciple of Phag-gru.

Jo-bod of Dvus, who was the younger brother of Rta-ston-jo-ye (Rñiũ-ma Lama), was born. 1166

Hdod Dharma-vod died. 1167

Gyam bsaṅ Chhos smon lam, the disciple of Ssa-ra-va Skal-ye, the son of Phag-gru, was born.

The Kashmirian Pandit Sakyā Śrī took the final vows of monkhood. The monastery of Hdod spaṅ phug was founded by Dus-mkhyen. The monastery of Skyor luṅ was founded by Spal-te. Dvaṅs-ge so-gom-tshul died, after which the abbotship remained vacant for two years. Phya-pa Chhos seng died. 1168

Bsod rdor of Sbom-brag, the disciple of Karmā snaṅ rgyas Ras-chhen, was born.

Rgyal died at Phag-gru, and the abbotship of Sdan-sa remained vacant for six years.

Khrom gs'er died at Kam kam. 1169

Rin-chhen S'srab, the younger brother of Rog S'erab hod, was born.

Sami smon lam Ḥbar died. 1170

Grags rgyan-pa ascended the throne of the Sa-skya hierarchy. Ser byaṅ was appointed to the abbotship left vacant by Sgampo.

Khro-phu Lo-cháva Tshul-ses byams dpal, who was a nephew of the Khro-phu Rgyal tsha brothers, was born. Rog S'esrab lama died. 1171

Darma grags pa of Stabs-ka died. Jo-kbum, the Rñiũ-ma lama, died. 1172

Rinchhen Hod, the disciple of Phag-gru, was born. The monastery of Tshal was founded. Bya-khaṅ kapa died. 1173

Chhos rje Sgaṅ-pa was born. Khyaṅ tshaṅ yes'es Lama died. 1174

Dpon ras dar seng of the middle Hbrug school was born. The Skyob-pa (hierarch) of Hbrig-goṅ received the final vows of
monkhood. Shaṅ Lo-cháva grub-dpal died. Dvags-po Chhos gyuṅ died.  
Sans rgyas sgompa of Snarthaṅ was born. Ye-grags ḏmar became the abbot of Rgyal-gdan sa.  
Gshon ṛdor of Mgar dampa Chhos sdzin, the disciple of Skyob-pa, was born. Ḍhob dgon Śesrab dpal, the disciple of Stag luṅ-pa, was born. The monastery of Stag luṅ dgon was founded by Lama Stag luṅ-thaṅ-pa.  
Sa-skya Paṇchhen, the son of Dpal-hod sroṣ, was born. Bsod rgyan of Ko-brag was born.  
The monastery of Rgyama Rin sgaṅ was rebuilt by Sans rgyas ḏvon-ston.  
Bsod nams rtsho of Sa-skya died. Lha-btsun ssha Ḍod of Ḍkhoṅ-pa phu died.  
Rdo ston ḍhor ḍharma died.  
Ssaṅ tsha bsod rgyan, the younger brother of Sa-skya Paṇchhen Kun ḏgan rgyal-mtshan, was born.  
The monastery of Karma lha sdeṅ was founded by Dus mkhyen-pa.  
Rdo ston śer ḍgrags died at Snarthaṅ and was succeeded by Shaṅ btsum ṛdor ḏod who was born in the year iron-horse.  
The venerable Ḍgro-vaṅ tsha ḍvaṅ ḍphyug Ḍod Lha-luṅ ḏpon sras was born.  
Grags rgyal, of Kharagpa, who was the spiritual son of Ḍgod-tshaṅ the Ḍbrug-pa Lama and disciple of Bhuriba, was born. Niṅ phug-pa died. Rog Ḍkra śis ḍgrags died.  
Dvon sśer kbyun, the disciple of Skyob-pa, was born. Bloras ḍvaṅ brtsoṅ of lower Ḍbrug, who was the disciple of Glsan rgyaṅ, was born. The monastery of Tshal guṅ thaṅ was founded by Lama Shaṅ brtsoṅ ḍgrags. The image Lhachhen was constructed. Ḍgyal-va yeśes died at Grags ḏmar.  
 Ḍbrug-pa gliṅ ras pa Padma-dorje was born.  
Bsam gliṅ-pa, the disciple of Gāṅ-ba and spiritual son of Karma dus mkhyen, was born.  
Rgoz tshaṅ mgon-po ṛdorje of upper Ḍbrug, who became the disciple of Ḍgya ras, was born.  
Dge-bṣes Glan rgyal became the head of Gdan-sa (chief seat of the hierarchy).  
The monastery of Mishur-phu was founded by Dus ṭmkhyen-pa.  
Hor Chhiṅ-gis became king of the Mongols. Se-spyiṅ len-pa died.
The king of upper Mo-rtse Rgyal-po presented the Lord Buddha's image with a golden crown.

Helhod-ka monastery was governed by Lhaluñ dvañ phyug of Se-spyil.

King Chhiñgis conquered Man-churia. Steñ-bal Lo-cháva (Tshul-khrim lhyin gans) died.

Ssim rinpoche of Bya-yul (Sans-rgyas Ston-pa grags) was born. Riu mgon sku yal-va of Stag luñ dvon kar was born.

Glan died and was succeeded by Dge-bes dri-adnl at Rgyal Gdansa.

King Chhiñ-gis conquered Solon country. Mélhns dar brtson died.


Henceforth Chhiñ-gis became emperor of China. Snas-thañ Sháñ btsun-died and was succeeded by Groma chhe-be who was born in the year water-bird.


Jo bhar, the son of Ņima-hbum (Rañi-ma Lama), was born. Chhiñ-gis subdued the Danmag.

The latter Chhos rje dpal Chhg was born.

Skyob-pa and Stag liñ-bal built temples at Phag-gru. Khro Lo-cháva invited Mitropa to Tibet who after a staying there for 18 months returned to India. Chhiñ-gis conquered Khemñ. Jobsod (Rañi-ma Lama) died.

Dvags-po grol-sgom died. Shva-dmar nam hod died.

Rañi-ma-pa Shig-po died.

Sgam-po sni sgam-chhen-po was born. Ńkra-Grags, the re-embodiment of the red-cap Lama called Nam-hod who was a disciple of Dus mkhyen, was born. Gshon-scñ of the middle Hbrug-pa school was born. Khro-Lo-cháva brought Buddha Śri to Tibet. Chhiñ-gis subjngated Nañimapa Ta.ge.

Dge-besñes lchañ-ri held the abbotship of Rgyal gdan-sa. Sans rgyas sgom-pa protected the Lo-cháva of Bya yul. Gssi brjid Grags, the spiritual son of Rñog kun rdor was born.

Sspyan sñña Rinchen Lun, the disciple of Ko-brag-pa and Ynñ dgon-pa, was born. Chhiñ-gis conquered the whole of Hor.
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*Rgya Lo-cháva* (Raam *rgyal* Rdorje) of Roñ was born. Phag-gru Thog-r dung pa was born. Sans *rgyas* yar byon Ses rab blama of Stag lhá was born.

Sans *rgyas* ras pa Rinchhen smonlam, the disciple of Shih-yeD pa Rog shig-po, was born.

Sa-skya dpal-chhen Hod died.

Karma Bakshi Chhos klsin, the disciple of Sbom-brag-pa and pupil of Karma Ras ehchen, was born. Khro Lo-cháva brought the Kashmirian Pandit Sakya Śrī to Tibet.

Chhiñ-gfis subjugated Harilīg. Dgyer-tshul Señ died.

*Rgyal-po* dgañ, the younger brother of Rñog Gssi-brjidd, was born. The monastery of Bde-va-chan at Sñe-thañ was founded by Rgya-hchhiñ rnpa, the disciple of Gñal sañ.

His nephews, Sañs *rgyas* dpal and others, managed the monastery after his death.

The monastery of Gyan bssañ dgon-pa was founded by Chhos Smou lam of Gyan bssañ.

Chhiñgis visited Tibet and subjugated all its provinces with the exception of Mi-fag.

**CYCLE IV.**

Ssvara-yescañ, the pupil of Phag-gru, died.

Spyan-sna grags bbyuñ became the abbot of Phag-gru Gdanssa which dignity he held for twenty-seven years. Saskya Paññita received the final vows of monkhood from Sakya Śrī Paññita.

*Dvon* dkarva occupied the abbotship vacated in consequence of the death of Stag lhá thañ-pa. Rgya-ma Sans *rgyas* dvon ston died.

Tilla rdor grags, the younger brother of Hbri-goñ-pa, was born.

*Dvon-po* Dar señ became abbot of Hbrug Ralnñ after the death of Gtsañ-pa *rgya-ras.* Mal-ka-pa-chan died.

Hgurn Chhos dyañ, a Rñiñ-ma gter-ston was born. Khro-Locháva constructed a gigantic image of Maitreya, eighty cubits high, which he also consecrated.

*Rgyalva,* the eldest spiritual son of Hbrug-pa Bgod-tshañ-pa, Yañ dgon-pa and Rgyal-mtshan dpal were born.

The Kashmirian Paññita Sakya Śrī returned to Kashmīr. The monastery of Gññtháñ Chhos-sde was founded.

Gshon-nu yon-tan of Hod jo-va died. Rñiñma Nima lbum died.
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The pupil of Hs'am-gser called Chhos Sku-houl sser, who became the disciple of Semo-chhe the professor of Das thkhor, was born.  

Khublai (emperor Se-chhen) Khán of Hor was born.  

Spa-lte Dgra-bchod died.  

Shva-dmar-tshul dpal, the disciple of Karma Pakshi, was born.  

Sê-nê-mdo thams chad mkhyen-pa, the eldest son of Smar-seêgo, was born.  

Chhag rgyan of Sa-sky died.  

Rdo-rje tshul-khrims became the heirarch of Hbri-goê.  

Skyob-pa Hjig-rten mgon-po died.  

Khro-phu kun-ldan-ras-pa died.  

Rgyal-va Rten nas-pa died.  

Rin-chhen Rdo-rje his younger brother, who was the 12th (in succession), was born.  

Dge-bsé les êêa riêa died.  

Glañ ston sêsrab Sêñ became abbot of Rgyal-gdan sa.  

Rêng rdo-rseñ died.  

Rdo-rje tshul Khriêms of Hbri-goê died.  

Dvon Sêsrab byêa became heirarch of Hbri-goê. Buddhism was first introduced in Hor (Mongolia).  

Chiñ-gis annexed Sar-tha-gya-êêen.  

Rdo-rje yeÊes (Chhos go-ba of Hbri-goê) was born.  

Shig Darma seêgo, the disciple of Rog-mchhad gaun, was born.  

Dvon dkar commenced building the grand hall of worship at Stag luê.  

Ghôs Lha nêa-va died.  

Bêle-legs rgyal-mtshan of Neraê, who became the pupil of Orgyân Rînchen dpal, was born.  

Shañ ston ktham-pa became abbot of Rgyal-va gdansa.  

The monastery of Dge-lûn sgañ was founded by the two disciples of Sakyê Sêri PaÊqita named ByaÊ and Rêdor. They also founded the monastery of Sêñemo tshag-mig.  

Sakyê seêgo founded the monastery of Namriê in ByaÊ (north) after which he died.  

Rîn Sêñ of Thog-kha of Hbriêgoê was born. The fourteenth Kalika ascended the throne of Sambhala. Chiñ-gis subjugated Miñag in Tibet, after which he died.  

Ogêti, the son of Chiñ-gis, who was born in the year fire-sheep, assumed the sceptre of the Mongol-China kingdom.  

Sgampo Sêcêa jo sras was born.  

Sans rgyas sgom-pa died.  

1213  

1214  

1215  

1216  

1217  

1218  

1219  

1220  

1221  

1222  

1223  

1224  

1225  

1226  

1227
Orgyan Sênge rinchen dpal, the pupil of Rgod tsho-n pa of Stod Hbrug, was born.

Rta-ston jo-ye, the Rña-ma Lama, died. 1228

Bkra-sis blama of Stag lu-n was born. Jo-śbed, the Rña-ma Lama, died. 1229

Rin-śeṅ of Kham lu-n in Bya-yul was born. Sams rgya-po dgo phyung gshon-nu of Bya-yul was born. Grom-po of SNar thar died. Lha-lu-n dgo phyung died. 1230

Chhos sems lam of Gyan-ba-tha died. Rog Sèsrab blama was born.

Ogoti died. Guru Chhos dgo phyung recovered concealed religious books from the rock of Gnam-skas brag. 1231

Saṅs ston tsul mgon of the Saṅs-pa school was born. Sse-go phyun died at Hbrug. Gto-n, who was born in the five-tiger year, ascended the throne of Hor. Rñog kun-rdo and Rtoṅs ldan bsaṭa died. 1232

Phags-pa, the son of Saṅs-kyi Saṅs-tsha, was born. Sênge-sgra, the son of Rñog rgyal-dgaṅ, was born. 1233

Dvon dkar skyal-ma of Stag lu-n died. Sgam-po Sñi sgon-chen died. 1234

Dar Seṅ, the disciple of Rgya ras of Gtsaṅ, died at Hbrug ra lu-n. Gshon-saṅ succeeded him. 1235

Rin-rgyan and Ye-hbyun, the sons of Saṅs tsha of Saṅs-kyi, were born. 1236

Phyangla rdro, the younger brother of Hphags-pa of Saṅs-kyi, was born.

Saṅs tsha Bsod rgyan of Saṅs-kyi died. 1237

Grag-pa ye-ses’ of Phag-gru was born. Ggrags bsdod (Htsham bsna-pa) of Hbru guṅ was born. The Mongol chief Chhiṅga dtra, with his troops overruns Dyu (U) and Gtsaṅ, and killed So-ston and five hundred monks of Saṅs-kyi, after which he burnt Rva-sgreṅ and Rgyal-khaṅ monasteries. 1238

Chhos kyi blama died at Snaṛthaṅ. Dvon-Ser-hbyun died. 1239

Rin bsaṅ, the younger brother of Rñog Seṅ go sgra, was born. Meso’ Rdro, the pupil of Rña-ma jo śbed and disciple of Seṅ-ge rgyab-pa, was born. Jonaṅ kun-spaṅ Thungs brtson-hgrus rje, the pupil of Chhos sku hod sser, was born. 1241

Hphags-pa and Phyangla, the two nephews of Saṅs-kyi Paṇḍita, proceeded to Mongolia. Rog-ser hod died. Hbom dgo-pa of Stag lu-n died. 1242

Rog-śigpo Rin-chan Sèsrab died. 1243
Chhos kyi rdorje, the younger brother of Rñog Rin-chhen lsa-sñ-po, was born.

Sa-skya Paññita arrived at Lan-ju (Lan-chau).

1244

Sa-skya Paññita interviewed the Mongol king Gotan.

1245

She-mdor señ died.

Sa-skya Paññita’s saintly powers were tested. Having found him to be a sage and saint, the king imbued faith in him.

1246

King Gotan sent a proclamation to Tibet making a present of the provinces of U and Tsañ to the Sa-skya hierarch.

Gya-pa gañsa-pa, the disciple of Dus-mkhyen, died. Shom-grags-pa died.

1247

Grags rin gñis mchhoñ-pa of Phag-gru was born. Se-Spyil Kha-va yñes of Lhobrag was born.

1248

Shañ dkon dpal was born. Lo-cháva Rñas died at the capital of the Hbrug-pa hierarchy. Sans-Sgom of Sñas thaññ died.

1249

Mññima nang grags became abbot of Snarthan. Sa-skya Paññita died at Sprul-sde in Mongolia. King Gotan died.

1250

Mññ-khe, who was born in the year fire-hare, ascended the throne of Mongol-China. The Mongolian army suppressed Mon mññar mgonpo gdoñ in Tibet.

HPhags-pa of Sa-skya became prince Khbhlai’s spiritual guide. The Sa-skya-pa hierarch took possession of the thirteen provinces of Tibet, called Khri-skor beyn-gsum.

1251

The Mongolian king went at the head of an army to Gama lñañ yul and returned to his capital in the following year.

1252

Grags sññ of Mun-mebrag kha-va, the pupil of Jonañ kun spañ, was born.

1253

Sñyn sna grags lbyaññ died.

1254

Bakahi became the spiritual guide of the Mongol king Mññ-khe. Sñem grags sññ of Bya-yul died. Guru Chhos dvañ unearthed the six Rñañ ma scriptures.

1255

Sansrgyas dpal lsa-sñ (Stag luñ dpal-po) was born. Phorog mdo-sde died.

1256

Señge rinchhen of Spañ-skya and of the middle Hbrug-pa school was born.

Kun dpññ lsa-sñ-po of She-mdor, an incarnation of Rñog-tshanña-pa, was born.

1257

Rñyal-va yaññ dgompa, the son of Thams chas mckhyenpa, died. Rñog tshanña mgon rdor of Stod Hbrug died.
Bde-legs rgyal mtshan founded the monastery of Ssan ssañ nerah. Lha hgro mgon dvan phug died. 1258

Mun-khe, the Mongol king, died. Yon rgyam, the pupil of Jonan kun spañ, was born. Karma 1259
Bsam-gliñ Rinchhen died.
Rgyal mtshan ḥbum of Hjag, who became a leader of the Sañspa school, was born. Karma Bakshi, during the years fire-serpent, iron-monkey and iron-bird, made miraculous religious demonstrations. Bsod rgyan of Go-brag died. 1260
Bdag-chhen bssañpo dpal, the son of Sa-skya Ye-kbyun, was born. 1261
Sakya bssañpo, well-known by his other name Stag luñ Lo-cháva, was born. 1262
Ssur-phu-va, the pupil of Spyan-sna rin ldan, was born. The great shrine of Mtshur-phu was built by Bakshi No ldan sgom.
Saus rgyas ston tshul Khri msênge of Bya-yul was born. Chhag chhos tʃe dpal died. 1263
H Phag-pa of Sa-skya returned to Tibet from Mongolia. Kumára, the son of Melon rdorje (of the Bñiñma school), was born. 1264
Gshon-señ died at H brug-Ralñá.

CYCLE V.

Thog rdug-pa died at Phag-gru. Phyagna of Sa-skya died. 1266
Dharmañá Rakshita, son of Phyagna of Sa-skya, was born. 1267
Hphag-pa again returned to Hor (Mongolia). 1268
Emperor Sa-chhen (Khubialis), the grand son of Chhiñ-gis was engaged in building Peking and three other cities, from the year wood-mouse up to this year.
Kharag grags rgyal of H brug died. 1269
Gshon-nu Smon lam of Bya-yul and Spyi-ther pañ Dvonpor Grags-pa of Dvagpo were born. 1270
Saus rgyas yar-byon of Stag luñ died. 1271
Guru chhos dvan died. 1272
The monastery of Tharpañliñ was founded in the confines of Nepal and Tibet.
Ye-kbyun of Sa-skya died in Ljañ-yul. 1273
Sakyas bstan-po of Sa-skya became the viceroy of the thirteen provinces of Tibet, called Khri-skor bcuh gsum.

1274

Hjam-avya’s don-rgyan of Sa-skya and Dvañ-bo brtan Blama of Bsoñ rgyan were born.

Sans rgyas dvon grags dpal of Stag-luṅ founded the monastery of Byams rinpo-chho.

Ssur-kha-pa dval ye of Se-spyil was born. Grags-pa bsod dpal of the Bkah-brgyud school was born. Sñe-mdo Thams chad mkhyen-pa died.

Rdroje rinchen of Hbrigon was born.

Yešes bla ma of Stag luṅ was born. Sgampo chhos brgyan was born.

Rinchen rgyal mtshan of Sa-skya died. Behun Tilli died at Hbrigon.

Rinchen Chhos rgyal of the Shi-byes school, who was the grandson of Hphrul shig-dar sen, was born. Hphags-pa of Sa-skya died. The twelfth Gchuṅ died.

Sansrgyas Ras-pa of the Shi-byes school died.

Dharmapāla became hierarch of Sa-skya. Bya-rag Rdsoṅ (jong) was captured. Rñog Gssi-brjul Grags died.

Bya-yul Khams luṅ-pa died. Rga-Lo-cháva of Miñagag died. Ekra-grags, the red-cap Lama, died.

Chhos rgyan, the son of latter Rinag Chhos rdor, was born.

Shva dmär Grags sen, the first incarnation of Ekra-grags the red-cap Lama, was born.

Rdor rgyan of Roṅ, the first disciple of Ser sen, was born. Karma Bakshi died.

Sans rgyas Sgompa of Bya-yul and Tshul khims Seṣrab were born.

The third Karma-pa hierarch Raṅ byuṅ rdorje, an incarnation of Karma Bakshi, was born.

Rdor-rgyal, the 28th hierarch of Hbrigoṅ, was born. Rñog rgyal po dgaḥ died.

Lha-blo hod of Se-spyil was born. The Hbrigoṅ-pa authorities burnt Bya-yul.

Saṅs rgyas Gehuṅ Ston died, and the abbotship remained vacant for five years.

Thog kha-va died at Hbrigoṅ.

Lha brag kha-va died.

Gyūn-ston Rdor dpal, the pupil of Ssur-byams senge (the Rñiṅ-ma Lama), who was Karma Raṅ byuṅ’s spiritual guide, was born.

1287

Seṅgo rgyal-po of middle Ḫbrug was born. Mehkim nams grags of Snarthaṅ died.

1288

Bu-ston Rin-chhen grub was born. Rūṁā Lama Leg-dan was born.

The Sa-skya-pa authorities sacked Ḫbrigu. Tshul-mgon of Bya-yul was born.

1289

Oser-gliṅ Ḫkra śis dpal, a follower of Sans-pa, was born. Dol bu Ser-rgyan, a disciple of Jonan yon-rgyan, was born. Kun-mkhyen chhos sku Hodser died.

1290

Grags rgyal of Phag-gru, who had acquired the fourfold Rūṁā perfections, was born.

Urgyan mgonpo ser dpal of Stag luṅ died. Mkhan-chhen Jiāna Prajñā was born. Sa-chhen’s (Khub-la’s) grandson Olchadhithu, who was born in the year wood-ox, became the emperor of Mongol China.

1291

Rgbal-sras Thogmed bsaṅ po dpal was born. The Rūṁā Lama Gyūn-ston Ssla-va Ḫjam dbyaṅs bsaṅ-hgrub rdor je was born.

Mehkim karma bloṅ-chhen-pa was born. Sgam-po Sūi-va Jo-sras died.

1292

Sans rgyas dpun-grags of Stag-luṅ died. Emperor Khublai died.

Ukraṅs bla ma died at Stag-luṅ. Karma Jinṅ Lama Gyūn-ston visited Hor.

1293

Tīṣri Kun-blo, son of Dpal bsaṅ of Sa-skya, was born. Gyag-sde Panchhen (Brtsom-hgrus Dar rgyas), the pupil of Shva-dmar Graga-seṅ, was born.

1294

Ratnākara of Stag-luṅ was born. Tīṣi situ Byaṅ rgyan of the Phag-gru dynasty was born.

1295

Dvaṅ lo-chāva Byaṅ-chhub rtsemo, also called Blo-brtan dpun-po, was born. The monastery of Lha-steṅ was founded by Raṅ-byuṅ rdorje. Ḫkhrul shig Darseṅ of the Shī-bhyed school died. The Rūṁā Lama Meloṅ rdorje died.

1296

The venerable nun Legs blo rgyan, a disciple of Bsaṅ dpal of Sa-skya, was born. Jonan Phyogs las rnam rgyal, a native of Mnaṅ ris, who was the pupil of Dol-bu ser rgyan, was born.
Emperor Ochealithin of Hor died.
Kloñ Chhenpa, the disciple of Kumára (the Rñúñ-ma Lama),
was born. Another grandson of the emperor Sa-chhen, named
Khulug who was born in the year iron-serpent, became emperor.
The Sage Sañs ston Tshul mgon died.
The saint Orgyan pa seāge died.
Tisri kun rgyan, the son of Bssañ dpal of Sa-skya, and
Hjam-dvyāṅs don rgyan were born.
Rgyal-mtshan Dpal bssañ of Sañs lhañ-ra, who became
the disciple of Sañs-phuva, was born. Gsar-ma Grags-ses, the
twelfth Phag gru hierarch, was born. Hjag-chhen Byams
dpal of the Sañspa school was born.
Gñis-mehhoñ died at Phag-gru. Dpal-bssañ of Stag-luṅ
died.
Gshon nu rgyal-mtshan of Ri-pa, the disciple of Sañs-phuva,
was born. Rñog chhos rدور phyi ma died.
Emperor Khulug died. Bhama Dampa bsdod nams rgyal
mtshan, the son of Bssañ dpal of Sa-skya, was born. Sañs rgyas
jowo of Bya-yul died.
In Hor, Pauyanthu (born in the year wood-bird), the
youngest brother of the emperor Khulug, ascended the throne.
Yeñes Lama of Stag-luṅ died in India.
Sasñ-rgyas Rin-chhen died at Hbrug Ralñ. Jonañ Kun
spañ died. The metaphysical theory of “Luñ thig” was in-
culcated by Tshul rدور, an incarnate Rñúñ-ma Lama.
The sage Hjam dpal yeñes was born. Hjam dvañs Kun
dgāṅ seāge of middle Hbrug was born.
After the death of Rñorje Rinchhen, Rñorje rgyal-po be-
came abbot of Hbrigoñ and built the grand shrine of Hbrigoñ.
Serab Señhe of Roñ died.
Kun-dgāṅ bssañ-po of Sñe-mdo died.
Dkon-mehho dpal of Shañ died.
The (astrological and astronomical) work, called Rñiñ Kun
bsañ, was composed by Rññ-byun-pa.
Sgampo Sañs-rgyas Chhos Señ was born. The sage
Gshon-nu Grub, the disciple of Sañs-rgyas ston of Sañs, died.
Rñog Rin-bssañ died.
Orgyan wgon-po of Stag-luṅ erected a large shrine and
furnished it with images and religious books. Emperor Pau-
yan-thu died.
Gegen khan, the son of Pau-yanthu, who was born in the
year water-hare, ascended the throne.
1889.]

and his Chronology of Tibet.

Blo gros Rnam dag was born in Bya-yul. Bu-ston wrote the historical work called Chhos lhun rin mdsod. Dshaâ dpal of Sa-skya died. Emperor Gegen Khan died in Hor.

Ye-sun-the-mur, the great-grandson of Sa-chhen (Khublai), who was born in the year water-serpent, became emperor.

Rdorgyan of Roñ died. Sañs-rgyas-ston of Bya-Yul died.

Señ-rgyal died at Hbrug Raluñ.

I am mkhah rgyaZ of Lho-brag, who was Tson-khapa’s tutor, was born.

Mthak-yus (Ananta’), the fifteenth Kulika, ascended the throne of Sambhala. Kuu-blo of Sa-skya died. Yon-rgyam, the Jonan Lama, died.

Emperor Ye-sun-the-mur died.

The two sons of the emperor Khulug, namely Rinchen Hphags (born in the year iron-mouse) and Kaus’alí (born in the year water-tiger), successively became emperors, and each died after a few months’ reign. Pan-yanthu’s son Chi-yú-thu (born in the year wood-dragon) became emperor.

The abbot Yeses bsod nam rgya-mtsho was born.

Don-grub dpal, the son of Señge-khum, the spiritual son of Rñog Chhos rdor, was born.

Rañ-asha Rдорje visited Hor.

Ta-dven blo-rgyan and Ta-dven Chhos rgyan, the sons of Tisri Kun-rgyan of Saskya, were born. Emperor Chi-yá-thu died. Ratna Sri, the son of Kausalí, born in the year fire-tiger, became emperor. After one month’s reign he died.

Nam-mkhaâ dpal of Stag-luñ was born. The monastery of Gnas nañ was founded by Mtshur. Tho-gwan themur the son of Chi-yá-thu, born in the year earth-horse, became emperor.

Rgyan khum of Sañs jag was born.

Hbri goñ Chhos rgyal, who became Tsoñkhapa’s tutor, was born. Se-spyil-pa Rinchenhen Señ was born.

Sgampo Chhos rgyan died.

Se-spyil Lha of Sanr-khañ died.

Sañs-rgyas Sgom Phyi-ma died in Bya-yul.

Ratna Guru of Stag-luñ died. Karma Rañ byuñ rdorje died in Hor.

The fourth Karma hierarch Rolpañi rdorje Dharma Kirti was born in Koñ-po.

Bsod nam bsañ of Smyañ-gnas was born.

Bsod nam rgyal-mtshan (Kun-spañ chheupo) was born.

Se-spyil-pa Sañya bsod was born.

Man-Me brag Kha-va, the J’onañ abbot, died.  

According to the chronology of Rgya-Ston the Sutraánta vyákarana was introduced.  

Sakya bsnañ the Lo-cháva of Stag-lun died.  

Blo gros Sejase of the middle Hbrug-Ralun school was born. Lho-rin-poche Grags you of the Bkahrgyud school was born. Kun Señ died at Hbrug-Ralun.  

Rje-btsun râñ hdañ-pa Gshon was born. Theg-chhen chhos rgyal kun ókra, the son of Chhos rgyan of Sa-skya, was born. Tahi Situ Byañ-chhub Rgyan became the ruler of the entire Dvás (or central Tibet). Shva-dmar Grags soñ died. The Shi-byed-pa abbot Rinchen Chhos rgyal died.  

Rin rgyan Dus kkor-va, the pupil of Hj'am-dvyâns Chhos vggon Dolbus, was born. Gyang-pruru Sans was born.  

Mkha-spyod dvañ-po Ye-dpal, the second red-cap hierarch, an incarnation of Grags-soñ, was born. Sans rgyas rin-rgyan, the disciple of Hjam-dvyâns bsam grub the Rin-in-ma abbot, was born. Se-spyil-pa Lha blo hod died.  

Chhos kbyun rin-chhen, the disciple of Hjag-chhen Byams-dpal, was born. The town of Ritse-thañ (also called Rtsis-thañ) was founded by Tahi Situ. R dor-rgyal died at Hbru-gon.  

Bsod nams Ihun-grub of Se-spyil was born. The sage Jñâna-prajña died.  

Karma Rol pañ rdoñ-rje entered monkhood. A great earthquake took place in Tibet.  

Sâr-rin-poche (of the Bkah rgyud school) of Khams was born.  

Byañ-pa Tahi dven, with the permission of Ser-rgyan, repaired the monastery of Nam riñ. Tahi Situ brought the whole of Gtsan under his power.  

Blo gros Sen ge of Rgyal-lha khañ and others commenced the Mhion-pa (Abhidharma).  

Hjam dpal rgyu-mtsho, the adept, was born. Chhos bshi gsgarma Grags byañ of Phag-gruñ, who became Tson-khapa’s spiritual guide, was born.  

Tson-khapa was born at Tsoñ-khañ. His disciple Sakya bsod was born. Spyan sña-va Bsod nams Grags was born. Grub-pa S’esrab of Snar-thañ was born. Karma Rol-pañ rdoñ-rje received the final vows of monkhood.
Talii Sri Kun-rgyan of Sa-skya died.  
1357

Ibsahnam Grags of Phag-gru was born. Skra-slas dpal by thsegs of Stag-lun was born. Gyag-sde pan chchen founded the monastery of E-bam. Rhog chhos rgyan died.  
1358

Blo-gros bsa-sa-po of Gtsa, the pupil of Hba-hri, was born.  
1359

Byan dpal, the son of Rhog don-dpal, was born. Chhos bshi lhii ma died at Phag-gru.  
1360

Ratuakara, the abbot of Stag-lun, died.  
1361

Jonam Lo-chava S'er-rgyan died.  
1362

1358

Blo-gros Ztsafi-po of (rtsan, the pupil of ilbari, was born.  
1363

Byam, the son of inog don-dpa', was born.  
1364

Chhos Bma died at Phag-gru.  
1365

1359

Ratuakara, the abbot of Stag-lun, died.  
1366

Yeses rin chhen of middle Hbrug was born. Bu-ston Thams chus mkhyen-pa retired to the mansion of purity (died).  
1367

Gser-glii-pa bkra-dpal of Sa'iis died.  
1368

Byan-Sems kun bsa-sa', a pupil of Rje (Tso'n-khapa), was born. Orgyan mgon-po of Stag-lun died. Bs'am-gtan dpal of the Bkah-rgyud school died.  
1369

Ston S'akya rgyan of Khams rgyal-mo ro'n was born. The monastery of Ro'i-Byams chchen was founded by Sems-dpa' gshon rgyal.  
1370

The Mongol emperor Tho kwan themur, having lost the throne, fled to Mongolia which he ruled over. Hu'n-Wu, the founder of the Tamin dynasty, became emperor of China. Gya'i slon, the predecessor of Mkhas grub, died.  
1371

The great Tai Mi'u invited the sage (sthâvira) Chhu-gram-pa to China.  
1372

Rgyal sras thog med was born.  
1373

The twelfth Gsarma died.  
1374

Sgom-po chhos dva'n phyug was born. Ser-se'n of middle Hbrug was born.  
1375

Rje-blama (Tsou-khapa) proceeded to Dvus and Gtsa (Tibet proper).  
1376

Hor ston nam mkah dpal, the abbot of the Byan-rtse division of Dgahldan, was born.  
1377

Rje-blama (Tsou-khapa) visited Hbri-gon and Bde-va chan.  
1378

The Vinaya teacher Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan was born.  
1379

Sha-lun Legs rgyan (Khri-chhen) was born. Bo-do'nl chhos
rgyen Phyogs las rnam rgyal was born. Blo grags died at Snar-thaṅ. Ilama Dampa bsod rgyan was born.

Rje-blama collected the first series of his religious discourses. Hjam bsam rdorje, the Rin-pha Lama, died.
Grags don-pa of Snarthaṅ was born.

The monastery of Stag-rtse rnam rgyal sgaṅ was founded by Mkhah spyod dvaṅ-po (a red-cap Lama). Gyag-sde Pan-chhen died.  

Hjam-dvyāṅs chhos rje ḫkraṣis dpal ldan was born. Stag luṅ Nam dpal died.  
Spyan sīm bsod bsaṅ of Phag-gru was born. Mkhā-po Yeśe bsod rgyam died. Dvaṅ Lo-chāva Byaṅ-rtse died. 

Dpal ldan Don grub, also called Stag-phru-gu Śri, a disciple of Rje (Tsoṅ-khapañ), was born. Chog-ro Nor-pa Kun-bsaṅ of Sa-skya was born. Kun-rgyan of Sa-skya rdson was born. 

Byams chhen-chos rje of Sera was born. Spyan sna dpal bsaṅ of Phag-gru was born. Guṅ Ru rgyan bsaṅ of Sera was born. 

Karma Rol rdorje died. 
The Indian Pandit Pan-chhen Nags Rin was born. De-bshin gs'e-gs-pa, the fifth Karma hierarch, was born. Sakya rgyal-po, the Rin-pha Lama, who was the abbot of Yaṅ rtse-ra, was born. 

The red congregation hall of Stag luṅ was erected by Dpal rtsegs. 

Dge legs dpal bsaṅ (Khri-chhen mkhas grub-thams chad sakhryenpa) was born. (He was the first of the line of Pan-chhen Rimpoches of Taši-lhunpo). Thaṅ-stoṅ rgyal-po, the physician, was born. 

Ku-jo rtogs ldan was born. Karma Smraś sen rtog ldan was born. Bsod rgyan, the twenty-second Phag-gru hierarch, was born. 

The shrine of Mamo in Dgah ldan was founded by Mkhah spyod-pa. The Bshipa gsar-ma of Phag-gru died. Jonaṅ Phyogs legs rnam rgyal died. 

CYCLE VII. 
The monastery of Se-pyiṅ was governed by the earlier Sakya bsod nams. 

Mus-chhen kun mchhog rgyan, the disciple of Dorpa Kun bsaṅ, was born. 

Khri Dlogros chhos skyoṅ was born.
Mkhan chhen Hjam-ye died. Blo seâ died at Hbrug Ra-luñ. Ripa gshon-nu rgyal mtshan died.

Dge-lhun grub, the first of the line of the (rgyal-va Rinpo-chhe) Talai Lamas, was born. Bsod nam rgyal-mtshan of Se-spyil-bu was born.

Hjag-chhen Byams dpal of Sañ died. Sañ Hbah-ra, the pupil of Ssur-phu and disciple of Spyan-sa Rin ldan, died.

Byañ-sems blo rgyan, the disciple of Rje blama (Tson-khapa), was born. Hgos Lo-cháva (yid bsañ rtse gshon-nu dpal), the Karma-Raiñ abbot, was born. Rje blama, after being miraculously visited by Hjag-byed, proceeded to Bya-brul in Holkha. Ser seâ died at Hbrug Ra-luñ.

Râsîn-phyi was repaired by Rje-blama Tson-khapa chenpo. He was miraculously visited by Hjigs-byed at Rgya sog phu. Gshon-nu yeâes died in Bya-yul.

Byañ-sems ser bsañ of Smad was born. Rje blama (Tson-khapa) met Lho-brag-pa.

Rje blama founded the educational college of Chal.

Rin-señ of Se-spyil-bu died.

Nam-mkhâb dpal of middle of Hbrug was born.

Bsod nam mchhog grub of Snarthañ, who became Mkhan-grub's disciple, and Mkhan-chhen grub ser's nephew were born.

The second Miñ emperor Huñ-wu tsha ascended the throne of China.

Grags-pa dpal ldan of Spas and Hdul-kdsin Blo-gras, the disciple of Dge-lhun grub, were born.

Bsod-pa dpal grub of Snarthañ was born. Bsod nam rnam rgyal of Byams gln, who taught asceticism to Rje blama Tson-khapa, was born. Lama kun died at the monastery of Snarthañ. Nam-mkhâb rgyal mtshan of Lho-brag died.

Baso chhos kyi rgyal mtshan, the younger brother of Mkhas grub rje, was born. Khri Blo gros brtan-pa was born. Spyan sna blo-gros rgyal mtshan was born. Dpal ldan bsañ-po of Hdul nag was born. Sras rgyas chhos kyi sen-ge of Sgampo died.

Byañ-chhub rgya-mtsho of Stag-luñ, the red-cap Lama, was born. Ratna gln pa of the Rñiñ-ma school was born. Yunglo became emperor of China.

Chhos dvañ grags-pa of Shañ Shuñ was born.

Ser-abs Rin chhen, called Stag Lo-cháva, was born. Mkhas grub rje took the final vows of monkhood. Dge-lhun grub entered monkhood. Mkhan Spyod dvañ-po, the Shva-mar (red-cap) Lama, died.
Chhos dpal yes'e's, the third Shva dmar Lama and incarnation of Mkhah dva'n, was born.

Mkhas grub Thams cu'd mdkhyan-pa became a disciple of Rje Tson-khapa. The fifth Karma-pa Lama proceeded to China. Spyan sna dpal bsa'n of Phag-gru died.

Bkra-sis dpal hod of Stag-lun was born. Emperor Tai Ming (Yunglo) invited Byams chen chhos rje, abbot of Sera, to China. Grags bsod uams died at Phag-gru. Chhos khyu'n Rinchen, the saint, died.

Dpal bsa'n of Se-spyil-bu was born. Tson-kapa founded the grand prayer meeting of Lhasa, called Monlam chhen-po, and founded the great monastery of Rivo Dgah ldan rnam-par rgyal vahi gliin. Kunspa bsod rgyan died.

Pauchhen bsa'npo bkra sisa of Bkra sisa lhun-po was born. Sakya Sris of Tsan was born. Dge-hdu nams took the final vows of monkhood. Sakya bsod nams of Se-spyil-bu died.

Sfa'gs rgyas 'shel, the Rab khyams-pa (doctor of divinity) of Byams chhen, was born.

Rje-btsun Re'n hda'i-va died at Shi'n shun.
Ye-sos rinchen died at Hbrug-Ralun.
Khri Smon Dpal legs blo was born. Gyag phrug sa'ns dpal of Sa-skyia died. Lho Rin-po chhe grags yon died.
Khri Yes'e's bsa'npo was born. Karma De-bsin gsags-pa died.

Mtho'nya don-ltan, the sixth Karma hierarch, was born. Hjam dbyangs Chhos rje dpal founded the great monastery of Hbras spu'n. Da-pu'n bsod bsa'n of Phag-gru died.

Dge-hdu bsa'npo of Gtsan gi khyu'n-po bya-bral, the pupil of Baso, was born. The twenty-second hierarch of Phag-gru succeeded his predecessor. The historical work, called Chhos khyu'n bstan-pa Gtsal byed, was written by Don grub dpal of Kam-kam. Ruii-n ma Rin gliin recovered some concealed religious works from underneath the rock of Khyu'n tsha'n brag.

Nag dva'n grags of Stag-lun was born.
Kun dga'h don-kgrub, who founded Rgyud stod, was born.
The monastery of Sera theg chhen gliin was founded by Sakya ye'ses. Dharma Rinchen became Tson-khapa's successor on the grand hierarchical throne of Dgah ldan. Rje Tson-khapa returned to the presence of Maitreya Bodhisattva.

Ser rgyan of Snarthan was born. The monastery of Gsan stags mkhar was founded.

Rje-nor bsa'n rgya-mtsho was born. Rgyan-Bde founded the monasteries of Gnas than and Ssa'n-man of Me-rtoq ldan.
1889] and his Chronology of Tibet.

Gtsan blo-gros, the pupil of Dpah ra, died. Grub Serabs of Snartha died.

Chhos dva-phug of Sgampo died. Grags ser (the second) of Snartha was born.

Lo-chava Bsod nams rgyam was born. He wrote thirteen volumes. Bka’ sis dpal rtsags died at Stag lha.

Mkhan-chhen Dus Hkhor-va Rin rgyan was born. Karma Mtshur-phu-pa composed Byed rtsis and Sa-byar Sgrub rtsis and Gsas gnas drug.

Hunshi, the fourth Ming emperor, ascended the throne of China. Nam dpal of Hbrug Ralnu died.

Panchhen nags kyi Rincheheu first visited Tibet. Bsson-te became the fifth Ming emperor of China.

Dpal-hbyor lhun grub of Sera (a native of Gnal-ston) was born. The sixteenth Kulika, named Bhupala, ascended the throne of Sambhala. Dpal ldan blo-gros of Sera was born.

Sar Rinpoche died.

Sakya mchog ldan was born. Rgyal dva ahchos rje dpal of middle Hbrug was born. Rto la ldan Hjam dpal rgya-mtsho died.

Blo bsa na grags-pa of Hdar-ston was born.

Hjam dbya’ns Dgah blo (Legs-pa chhos hbyor) was born. Ser bsa na of Byan-rtsac was born. Mchog lha of Rva stod was born. Goram bsod sen was born. Rto la ldanpa’s incarnation, Rgyal sras sobs rab lpel, was born. Bsa na dor kun-bsa na of Sakya founded the monastery of E-bam. Se-spyil bsod lhun died.

Bka’ sis dpal hod-pa became abbot of Staglu. Bsod rgyan of Se-spyil-bu died.

Mkha’e grub rje became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Sa-na rgyas rinchen rgyal mtsan, the Tiin-ma Lama of Ye-rtses, died.

Kun-dgah rnam rgyal of Thon-mi, the disciple of Panchhen Byams gli, was born. Hbum phrag gsam-pa of Sakyapa and Kun-dgah chhos bsa na were born.

Panchhen Ye-rtses of Bkra’is lhunpo was born. Se-spyil-pa Snen grags was born. The monastery of Rgyud smad was founded by Rje-sen. Bsod bsa na of Snyin Gnas died.

Mkha’e grub rje wrote a commentary of the Kalachakra system. Idal lasin grags rgyan died.

The monastery of Nalendrak was founded by Roh-ston.

The possession of Gtsan passed to Rin-spun from the lands of Phag-gru.
The monastery of Stag mo gling was founded by Muschhen Dkon mchhog rgyan. The sixth Ming emperor Ting-thun ascended the throne. Kun rgyan of Säskya Joung died.

The monastery of Byams-pa gling in Chhab ngor in Khams was founded by Smad S’es rab bsañ, the disciple of Tsoñ-khapa.

The monastery of Mdo Shags gling was founded by Bña Sems kun dgañ. Mkhasgrub Chhos rje died.

Blo bsañ Ņima, the Dvon-po (disciple) of Tsoñ-khapa, was born. The first Hphag-pa-lha of Khams was born. Rje Nag dvañ of Phag-gru was born. The great chhorten of Dpal lphor chhos-šo of Gyañ-tse was built.

Chhos skyen bsañ-po (Shvalu Lo-cháva) was born. Bña Sems S’akya bsod nams of Rva-sgrén died. You tan rgyan-mtsho of Thon-pa was born. Bdag-chen Blo Rgyan of Säskya was born. Bña sems kun dgañ bsañ died.

Don yod dpal ldan of Sera was born. S’esrab senga of Snarthaṅ, who founded the Rgyud grva tshañ of Gtsaṅ and Dvus, died. Gu-jo rtogs ldan died.

Kun dgañ bde legs rgyan bsañ of Gnas rün, who became Baso’s disciple, was born. Lhariba of Rgyud stod was born. Lha dvañ dpal lhyor was born. Tḥog byañ dpal died.

CYCLE VIII.

Rinchhen Chhos rgyen (Chhog Lo-cháva) was born. The monastery of Dkra-šis Lhun-po in Gtsaṅ was founded. Nam mkhañ dpal (Hor-stou, the Lama of the Mongols) died.

Bña Chhub rgya-mtsho (of the red-cap school) of Stag luñ died.

Chhos rgyal bstanpa (Rab lbyams-pa or doctor of divinity) of Dragpo, who was S’ans rgyas hphel’s disciple, was born. Kun bsañ Chhos ŋan of Rdo-rañ was born. The monastery of Skyid tshul of Hbra-gyu in Sa-skya was founded by S’ans hphel, the Rab lbyams-pa. Hjam dvyauṅ chhos rje died.

Roñston died.

Khri S’is dar legs blo was born. The seventh Ming emperor Tsing-the ascended the throne. Legs rgyan of Shvalu died. Guñru rgyeu bsañ died. Bodo phyogs las rnam rgyal died.

Grages rgyan Sgam Smyon of Sqampo died.

Bsod nams mChog grub of Snarthaṅ died. Shva dmar Chhos dpal yešes died.
Khri-pa Chhos bses was born. Khri-pa Rin chod was born.

Chho Grags Yešes, the fourth Shva-dmar Lama, was born. Panchhen Nagš rin visited Tibet. Karma Mthoṅ-va Don lbdan died. Rimi ḥbab-pa died.

Sgampo bsod rgyan was born. The seventh Karma hierarch Chhos Grags rgya-mtsho was born.

Phyogs las rnam rgyal and Chhos dvaṅ Lhun-grub were born.

Kun-bsaṅ of Ōr was born.

Grub Chhos rdorje was born.

Bkra-sis dpal, the Tantrik saint of the Karma school, was born. The eighth Ming emperor T'hen-srun ascended the throne of China. Byaṅ sems ser bsaṅ of Smad died.

Chhos ldan blo gros of Rgyud stod was born. Panchhen Ņag dvaṅ grags-pa was born at Śišuṅ.

The second Sakya bsod nams of Se-spyil was born. Bkra śis dpal of Stag luṅ died.

The second Bkra dpal of Stag luṅ was born. Sāṇ grags of Se-spyil died.

Baso Chhos rgyan became the grand hierarch of Dgah-ladan. Khrī Blo gros Chhos skyoṅ died.

The monastery of Goṅkar Rдорje Gdan was founded by Thyom-ne kun ḥgah.

The monastery of Skyo mdah dgoupa was founded by Ḫgro mgon Blo gros bsaṅpo of Skyo mdak in the eighth year of his age. The ninth Ming emperor Hwa ascended the throne of China.

Bḥlogros rgya-mtshan founded the monastery of Ņi-stiṅ.

Stag Phraṅgu Śri died. Lo-chhuṅ Dkaṅ bshi-va died.

Grags don of Snarthaṅ died.

Panchhen Nags rin died at Palpo in Nepal.

Btsun-pa Chhos rgyan of Scra was born. Bnam rgyal Grags-pa of Stag-luṅ was born. The monastery of Ōser-mdog chau was founded by Sakyu mchhog. Mas-chhen Dkon rgyaṅ died.

Rje druṅ Chhos dvaṅ Grags of Shaṅшуṅ died.

Bsaṅ dpal died at Snarthaṅ. Blo rgyan (Sems-Dpaṅ chhen-po) of Ḫdmoc thun died.

Smon lam blo gros, the first embodiment of Sems dpal of Ḫdmoc thun, was born.

Bṣod nams dpal bsaṅ of Stagluṅ was born. The monastery of Grva Byams gliṅ was founded by Thumi Lhan bkras. Spyan Śiṅ blo rgya-mtsho died.
Khri Chhos Skyoṅ rgya-mtsho was born. Lha Chhos bsaṅ of Se-spyil was born, Blo .btan became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. The monastery of Thub-bstan rnam rgyal was founded by Karam-pa. Baso Chhos rgyan died. Hdl nag-pa of Snar thaṅ died.

Dgo ldun grub died, and Panchhen Bsaṅ-po bkra śis became abbot of Bkra śis lhunpo. Rni-a-ma S'akya rgyal died.

Dge ldun rgya-mtsho, the second embodiment of the Rgyal-va Rin-po-chhe, was born.

Blo gros Grags dpal (Hdl hdsin) died. Byams pa Gliṅ-pa died.

Ssla-va rgyal mtshan of Stoṅ skor, an incarnation of Hdl hdsin grags rgyaṅ, was born. Kun dpal of Hbrug-pa school died. Kun dgaṅ legs blo of Ñgom-rum was born.

Khri-pa Panchhen bsdod Grages, an incarnation of Bu-ston, was born. Bsaṅ bkra having died, Luṅ rig rgya-mtsho became abbot of Bkraśis lhunpo. Ko-ram bsdod Seṅge founded the monastery of Thub-bstan rnam rgyal glin. Khri Blo .btan died.

Ssur-maṅ Byaṅ btaṅ-pa was born. At the sixty-first anniversary of Tsag khapa, a religious controversy took place at Rite-šar.

The Rite-šar controversy having terminated, Smon lam dpal became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan.

The Lama Shva dmar led the Tsan army to Dvus. Hgos Lo-cháva Gehon-dpal died at Yid rite.

Ng-dvaṅ 7iṅg smed Grags of Rin spuṅ was born. Lo-cháva bsdod rgyan was born.

In the sacred chronology of Nor bsaṅ rgya-mtsho the 712th year of the second age expired.

Byams Ochen Rab 7byams died.

Talai Lama Dge-lldun rgya-mtsho entered monkhood. Grags sEs rab became abbot of Snarthaṅ. Kungrul of Rgyud stod died.

Dpal bsaṅ of Se-spyil died. Hphags-pa lha of Khams died.

Sgam-po bsdod lhun died. Huṅtī, the tenth Ming emperor, ascended the throne of Chima. Sgam-po bsdod rgyan died.

Lo-cháva Rinchen bsaṅ of Shvalu was born. The monastery of Ńan yod saṅs chhos sde of Sa-skya was founded by Hbum phrag gsam-pa. Gor rampa Bsdod Seṅ of Sa-skya died.

Blo bsaṅ 7īma became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. The
monastery of Thub-bstan Yaña-pa-chan was founded by Rab kbyams-pa Thug-rje dpal of Mus.

Khri Mi ŋag rdorje bssaṅ-po was born. Khri Smön lam dpal died.

Khri-pa Dvon-po Blo bssaṅ Ñima died.

Khri Chhos grags bssaṅ-po was born. Khri Dge-lhdun bstan-dar was born.

The work, called Bkaḥ gdams Chhos lbyun Gsal sgron, was written by Las Chhen kun dgah rgyud mtshan.

Kun dgah Grol mechhog, the head of the Jonan school, was born.

Thonmi Kundaṅgr nman rgyal died. Kundaṅgr bde legs of Gnas rnīṅ died. Ņag Grags of Stag-luṅ died.

Khri rgyan bssaṅ was born.

Rinchen Spun-pa of Gtsaṅ, after taking Snehu rdsoṅ, took possession of Spyid Saṅ.—At the grand annual prayer meeting (Monlam Chhenpo) of Lhasa the Lamas of the Gsaṅ-phu and Karma schools humiliated those of the Sa-skya-pa and Ḥbras spuṅ schools. Khri ve bssaṅ died.

Karma Grub thob Bkra dpal of Gāṅ founded the hermitage of Orgyan Rikrōd.

Hdarston became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Panchhen mechhog Lhapa died.

Khri ņag dvaṅ Chhos Grags was born.

Blo gsal rgya-mtsho of Tshar-ehchen was born. Sgom- smyon died.

Ḥjam dgah blo died. Kun dgah Chhos bssaṅ, the abbot of Skyid tshal, died. Dpah-po Chhos dvaṅ Chun Grub died.

The second Dpah-po Gtsang-lag phreṅ-pa, the astrologer and chronologist, was born. Ḥbum phrag, Gsum-pa of Sa-skya, died.

Khri Dge-legs dpal of Hol dgah was born.

The third incarnation of the Panchhen Rin-po chhe, named Blo bssaṅ don grub, was born.

The sage Phyogs las rnam rgyal was born. Tiṅ-te, the eleventh Ming emperor, ascended the throne.

Karma Chhos Grages rgya-mtsho died.

**CYCLE IX.**

Mi bskyod rdorje, the eighth Karma hierarch, was born. Saṅs rgyas dpal, the second incarnation of Ḥphags-pa lha Khams, was born.
Ser-bsaṅ died at Byañ rtse. Sakya mechhog of Sa-skya died.
The second Bkra dpal of Stag-luṅ died.
Dge-hdun rgya-mtsho founded the monastery of Chhos 1khor-rgyal in the plain of Rgyal Metog than. Chos ldan blo gros of Rgyud stod died. Khri Hdar Ston blo bssaṅ grags-pa died.
Llama rinpoche Dge-hdun rgya-mtsho became the grand hierarch of Bkra 1sis lhumpo.
Panchhen Bkra 1sis rnam rgyal of Sgampo was born.
Mkhas grub Nor bssaṅ rgya mtsho was born.
Dpal blo of Sera died.
The Panchhen died at Sāṅg. Khri Byams-pa rgya-mtsho was born. Bsodnams Dvaṅ rgyal of Sgampo was born. Lharipa of Rgyud stod died.
The grand Lama Dge-hdun rgya-mtsho became abbot of Hbras spuṅs. Khri Rin hod-pa wrote a treatise on the chronology of the Buddhists.
The power of Gtsan-pa, having waned since the year fire-mouse, the monasteries of Sera and Hbras spuṅ recovered their place in the Monlam Chhenpo, the grand prayer assembly of Lhasa.
Thub dvaṅ bstan 1ldsìn of Sgampo was born. Kun-dgah dpal of Naṅ, who was born in the year fire-ox, became abbot of Chhab-mdo. Khri Tahe-ltson rgya-mtsho was born. Bsod dpal of Stag luṅ died.
Grub-chhen Chhos rdorje made over the book of miraculous revelations of Tsoṅ khapa to the Talai Lama Blo-bsaṅ Don grub. Thon-pa Yon-rgya-mtsho died. Grub thob of Gūn, having died, was re-born in the same year.
Kya-Jiṅ, the twelveth Ming emperor ascended the throne of China.
Khri dam Chhos dpal 1bars was born.
Hjam dBYANs mkhyen brtse dvaṅ phyug was born.
Rnam rgyal bkrā 1sis of Stag luṅ was born. Don yod dpal ldan of Sera died. Chhos kyi Nima of Rdo-roṅ died. Bab bbyams-pa of Dvags-po died. Chhos Grags Yešes of the Shva-dmar school died.
Mkhas grub Sans rgyas Yešes was born. Dkon mechhog yanlag, the fifth Shva-dmar hierarch, was born.
Khri Dpal lhyor rgya mtsho was born. Metri Dongrub rgyal mtshan of Bod mkhar was born.  

_Bsod names Chhos khpel of Dgon Gsar was born. Hbrug-pa Padma dkarpo, the great antagonist of Tsöñkhaps, was born. The sixteenth Kulika (fabulous emperor), named Dpal skyoñ (S'ri-pala), ascended the throne of Sambhala. The great Shaln Lo-chåva was born._  

_Bsod Grags-pa became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan, and wrote the Buddhist historical work called Bka' gdan Chhos lhyuñ._  

Khri S'esrab legs blo died. _Ruaam rgyal Grags-pa of Stag lun died._  

The foundation of the monastery of Phan bde dgon was laid by Sans rgyas bkra sîs, the father of Hphags-pa lha the second.  

Khri Dge ldun rgyal mtshan was born. Sgom lde rnam rgyan of Rgyud stod Sar-va was born.  

_Rgyal mtshan bssañ-po became abbot of Rgyud-smad._  

_Spañ dkar Rinpocho was born._  

Tharpâk rgyal mtshan, also called Naga grub-chhen, was born.  

Chhos rgya-mtsho became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan.  

_Kun-bkra of Stag lun was born. The work on astrology and astronomy, called Rtsis gshnâ, was composed by Gtsngla phrun-va._  

_Rje-druñ Lha dvañ Chhos rgyan, the incarnation of Baso Chhos rgyan, was born. The abbotship of Sera was filled by Rje btsun-pa. The Hbrugnâ authorities dispossessed the Dge ldan-pa hierarch of eighteen communitie., Hod sna &c. _  

_Rdor bssañ of Miñag became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Khri Chhos skyoñ rgya-mtsho died. Karma Hphrin las pa died._  

Khri Sans-rgyas Rinchhen was born. Khri-pa Chhos bses died. Khri-pa Rin hod died. Bya btañ of Ssn man died.  

_Ruaam rgyal Dpal bssañ of Rgyud Smad was born. Mkhan chhen nam rgyam was born. The monastery of Miñâk riz Grva-tshanâ was built on a hill near Rtsø-thañ._  

_Tho Talai Lama Dge-lbdun rgya-mtsho died._  

_The third Talai Lama Bsod names rgya-mtsho was born._  

_The monastery of Phan bde Gliñ was founded. Kun legs of Sgom rum died._  

Khri Chhos s'er Giags was born. Khri Blo rgyam of Stag
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Khri Damehchos dpal was born. Rje btsun-pa died. The monasteries of Tshal Guńthaṅ and Stag lha khaṅ were destroyed by fire.

Rje-drun S'er dvaṅ founded the monastery of Dar rgyas in Khams. Nag dvaṅ Chhos Grags became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan.

Rje bsod nams rgya mtsho entered monkhood. The monastery of Bshad sgrub glin in Khams was founded by Baso sprul sku. Rnam rgyal Phun-tsho became abbot of Stag lha khan.

Khri Nag-dvaṅ Chhos Grags died.

Chhos Grags bssañ-po became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan.

1547

Mi Gyo Săiñ-po (Rje-drun tsha-wa-pa), who was born in the year fire-serpent, was appointed to the abbotship of Chhab-mdo. Sems dpal Sim Ian Blo gros died. Sgam-po bsod nams Dvaṅ-rgyal died.

1548

The second incarnation of Sems-Dpal, named Nag dvaṅ Grags rgyan, was born. Khri Bsod nams Grags-pa died. Khri Miñag Edor bssañ died. Karma Mi bskyos rdorje died.

1549

Khri-pa Grags-pa rgya-rtsho was born. Khri-pa Grags-pa rgya-rtsho was born. Kun-bkra Locháva filled the abbotship of Stag-luṅ. His father Sāṅs bkra died.

1550

The ninth Karma incarnation, named Dvaṅ-phyug-rdorje, was born. The first incarnation of Bsod nams Grags-pa, named Bsod nams ye dvaṅ, was born. Stoṅ skor Ssla rgyan died. Yontan rgya-rtsho of Stoṅ-skor was born.

Dge-lhdun bstan rgyam, the incarnation of Rje-drun Shags ram-pa (Dge-Bkraša), was born.

1551

Dge-legs dpal of Hol dgaṅ became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Dvaṅ phyug rab-brtan of Gnas gsar was born. Bsod nams rgywmtsho became the abbot of the Sera monastery.

1552

Dkon-mehhog rgya-rtsho of Sre (Hre) rgyud monastery was born. Bdag Chhen Bsod dvaṅ was born. Khri-pa Chhos Grags bssaṅ-po died.

1553

Rje drun Séerab dvaṅ-po of Rgyaṅ Sod held the abbotship of Chhab-mdo.

Khri-pa Tahul Khrim Chhos lphel was born.

Thub-dvaṅ bstan kgsin of Sgam-po died.

1554

1555

1556

1557

1558

1559

1560

1561

1562

Shva In Locháva Rīṅ-bssaṅ died. Rnam Bkra of Stag lha khan died.
The incarnate Lama Sansrgya chhos kāśin was born. Bsdod nams rgya-mtsho took the final vows of monkhood. Dge-ldrun bstan dar became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. 1563

tshe brtan Rdo rje pha gu s of Gtsaṅ became master of the province of Gtsaṅ. Panchhen Blo-bssaṅ Don Grub died. 1564

Sesrab Phun-tshogs of Rgya ma was born. Gtsug-lagEurova died. Kun dgah Grol Chog died. Hphags-pa Sans rgyas died. Panchhen Rnam tharma Blo-bssaṅ Don Grub died. 1565

CYCLE X.
The third incarnation of Hphags-pa Lha, named Mthoṇva don ldan bsdod nams rnam rgyal dvaṅ po ki sde, was born. The eighteenth Ming emperor Hwaṅ-ti ling Chhing ascended the throne of China. Khri Dge legs dpal died. Tshar-Chhen blo gsal died. 1566

The third Dpal-vo Karma Stang lag rgya-mtsho was born. Tshe-rten rgya mtsho became grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Khri Dge kḥdm bstan dar died. 1567

Chhos rgyan of the Gnas rūni monastery became abbot of Bkra śis lhunpo. The fourth Panchhen (Taši Lama) Blo bssaṅ Chhos kyi rgyal mtshan was born Ser dvaṅ became abbot of Chbaḥ mo for the second time. A dispute between Hbri Grāṅ and Stag laṅ took place. 1568

According to his biography Panchhen Blo bssaṅ Chhos rgyal mtshan was born in this year. Sgampo Khri-pa Bkra śis kun Grags was born. Mkhonpo Ńag dvaṅ Chhos Grags was born. At Skyid Soṅ the Phag-gru dispute took place. Sems dpal sprul sku Grags rgyan died. 1569

Khri Dkon mchhog Chhos lḥpel of Gliṅ Śmad was born. The third embodiment of Sems dpal sprul sku Ńag dvaṅ Chhos rgya mtsho was born. 1570

The fourteenth Ming emperor Wan li Śiā kyā ascended the throne of China. Sar-va nam rgyan-pa governed Rgyud stod. Tahā Lama Bsdod nams rgya-mtsho founded on Potala the monastery of Rnam rgyal Grva-tsbaṅ which afterwards was converted into a Rūni ma institution. 1571

Gsāl kḥaṅ sprul sku Chhos rgyan, who was an incarnation of Khri Dng-saṅ Chhos Grags, was born. Lama Tārānātha Kun Śiā of the Jonāṅ school was born. Byam-rgyam became 1572
the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. The armies of Rin spaṅ, after invading Dvus, returned to Gsaṅ.

Khri Tsho brtan rgya-mtsho died. Talai Lama Bsod nams rgya-mtsho proceeded to Mongolia.

Bs tan hdsin phun tshogs of Mgag dam was born. The monastery of Sku-kbum (Kumbum) was founded at the birthplace of Tsoṅ-khapa. Althan Khan received the Talai Lama Bsod nams rgya-mtsho, who in the following year founded the monastery of Thub-chhen Chhos lkhor glin.

Basa Lha dvaṅ became abbot of Chhab mdo. According to the directions of the Talai Lama Bsod nams rgya-mtsho, the incarnate Lama Bsod nams ye dvaṅ founded the monastery of Thub-chhen Chhos lkhor of Shom Ḥbor in Lithaṅ.

Talai Lama Bsod nams rgya-mtsho visited Chhab mdo. Internal disputes raged at Ḥbrigun.

Sans rgyas yeśes gave the vows of monkhood to Panchhen Rinpoche. Dpal khyor rgya-mtsho became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Guśi Khan of Hor was born.

Dkon mchod yan lag the Shva-dmar Lama died.

The sixth Shva-dmar Lama, named Gar dvaṅ Chhos kyi dvaṅ phyug, was born.

The abbot of Stag lhaṅ, named Ṇag dvaṅ rnam rgya, became abbot in the 15th year of his age.

Mkhas grub Ḥphags-pa Ṣakya lha dvaṅ was born.

Ṣgam-po Ḥgrañs rnam rgyal died. Bod mkhar Don-grub died.

Hḥam dvyāns rgya-mtsho and Ygyal-va rgya-mtsho of Stod skor were born. Talai Lama Bsod nams rgya-mtsho died.

The fourth Talai Lama Yon-tan rgya-mtsho was born in Mongolia. The Dgah ldan abbotship was held by Dam-chhos of Dpal Ḣbar, and the Rgyud smad hierarchial chair was filled by Ḫnam rgyal dpal bsaṅ.

Blo bsaṅ rgya-mtsho, the physician of Gliṅ Stod in Gṣaṅ-phu, was born. Khri Byams rgya-mtsho died. Mkhas Grub Sans rgyas Yeśes of Dven-sa died.

Dge-ḥdun bsaṅ rgya-mtsho, the incarnation of Khri Byams, was born. Blo bsaṅ Ṇag dvaṅ of Ṣgo-maṅ was born at Ḍsam grub sgaṅ.

The Panchhen Rinpoche took the final vows of monkhood.

Yeśes rgya-mtsho, the first incarnation of Sans rgyas Yeśes of Dven-sa, was born. Sar-va Nam rgyan of Rgyud Stod died.

The incarnate Lama Bsod nams ye dvaṅ died.
The **H**brug-pa Lama **Dpa**q bsam dvaṅ-po was born.  

**Bso**d nams dge-legs, the second incarnation of **Bso**d nams Grags-pa, was born. **Hphags-pa** mthoṅ-po don ldan held the abbotsip of Chhab-mdo. Guṣrī of Hor overrun Mgo dkar.  

Blo mChhog rdo-rje of Sman luṅ was born. Dpon (Governor) **Bso**d nams Chhos ḍϕel, also called Rab brtan, was born.  

Da-yan Khan, son of Guṣrī Khan, was born. Sans rgyas Rinchhen filled the grand hierarchical throne of Dgaḥ ldan.  

Kun dgaḥ bsod nams the Bdag chhen (hierarch) of Sasāky was born.  

Khri ḍpal ḍbyor rgya-mtsho died. Khri Dam chhos dpal ḍbar died. The abbot of Sgampo, ḍbra sīs Kun grags, died. Kun bka of Stag luṅ died.  

The Panchhen ascended the throne of ḍbra sīs-ḥunpo. Mkhan chhen nam rgyan died.  

Chhos ḍbyor rgya-mtsho, the incarnation of Khri ḍpal rgyam, was born at Thaṅ-riṅ. Karma Dvaṅ phyug rdorje died.  

Khri Nam dag rdorje blo bsaṅ don yod was born. Dkon mchhog yar ḍϕel of the Sre rgyud-pa monastery was born. **Bso**d nams mchhog grub of Shvalu was born. Rnam rgyal dpal bsaṅ of Rgyad smad died.  

Mkhan-po **Bso**d nams mchhog grub was born. ṇag rgyan became grand hierarch of Dgaḥ ldan. The Talai Lama Yontan rgya-mtsho was brought to Tibet from Hor, and being given the vows of monkhood by the retired hierarch of Dgaḥ ldan, presided over the monasteries of ḍbra s paṅ and Sera.  

The tenth Karma hierarch Chhos dvyins rdorje was born.  

Chhos dvyins raṅ Grol, the Raṅ-ṇa Lama, was born. Rgyal sras Don rgyan-pa founded the Dgon-lun monastery of Amdo. Sems ḍpaṅ ḍag dvaṅ Grags rgyan died. Yeṣes rgya-mtsho, the incarnate Lama of Dven-sa, died. Baso Lha-dvaṅ died.  

**Hphags-pa** mthoṅ-po don ldan died.  

Ngag dvaṅ phun-tshogs rnam rgyal, the incarnation of Sems ḍpaṅ, was born.  

Blo bsaṅ bstan lḥsin rgya-mtsho, the second incarnation of Dven-sa, was born. Chhos kyi rgyal-po rnam Rgyal rgya-mtsho, the fourth incarnate Hphags-pa of Khams, was born. Baso-Rje-drmā (Lha-dvaṅ chhos dvaṅ phyug) died. The fort of Skyi-sod sgar was destroyed by the Karma armies. Chhos rgyan, the incarnate Sems ḍpaṅ, died.  

Guṣrī Khan effected a reconciliation between the Oe-loth and Khalkha Mongols, who were quarrelling on account of a
question of precedence between the grand hierarchs of Dgah ldan and of Stön skor shabs drun named Rje-bsun dam-pa. For this service he received the title of Gušrl.

The fourth incarnation of Sems dpal Nag dvaṅ phun-tshogs rnam rgyal was born. The grand hierarchical throne of Dgah ldan was filled by Chhos ṭen, also called Bsos guen grags. Khri Dge-rgyan died.

Táránátha wrote his Rgya-gar chhos hbyun “Rise and progress of Buddhism in India.”

Spaṅ ḏkar Rinpochhe died.

Dkon-mchhog rgyal mtshan, of the monastery of Sre-rgyud near Bkra-sis lhunpo, was born. Dam chhos rgya-mtsho of Pa-chhe, the teacher of Sumpa, became abbot of Stag-luṅ. Nag dvaṅ rnam rgyal of Stag luṅ wrote the work, called Chhos-hbyun (history of Buddhism).

Bkra-sis grags rgyam of Sgampo was born. Don yod chhos kyi rgya mtsho, the incarnation of Rgyal sras, returned to Dvus. The armies of Gtsan invaded Dvus and withdrew.

The Grva-tshaṅ monastery of Amdo was founded by Likya Ser mchhog.

Hdul-po chhos rje hod rgyam-pa reduced the monastery of Sku-kbum into a Gtsan institution. The Karma hierarch Phun-tshogs rnam rgyal became the lord temporal and spiritual of Gtsan. Khri Sans rin died.

The Panchhen Rinpo-chhe presided over the Monlam chhenpo (prayer congregation) of Lhasa between this and the year earth-horse.

Talai Lama Yonton rgya-mtsho took the final vows of monkhood from the Panchhen Rinpo-chhe.

Blo rgya-mtsho of Stag brag filled the grand hierarch’s chair of Dgah ldan. Phun-tshogs rnam rgyal of Gro-tshaṅ ka rijaṅ became abbot of Dgon lhā Byams gliṅ. The incarnate Lama Bsdod namg legs dpal died.

Talai Lama Yonton rgya-mtsho died.

Talai Lama Nag dvaṅ blo bsaṅ rgya-mtsho was born. The Panchhen Rinpo-chhe became abbot of Hbras spāṅ.

Bkra-sis Phun-tshogs, also called Lha-pa chhos rje, held the abbotship of Dgon lhā. Yap Sans rgyas chhos ḏzin died.

Khri Byams bdkra was born. The incarnate Yap Lama Sans yo was born. Dam chhos dpal filled the grand hierarch’s chair at Dgah ldan. The Gtsan army besieged Sera and Hbras spāṅ, and killed many thousand monks. Khri chhos ṭen grags died. Khri Blo-rgya-mtsho died.
The third incarnation of Bsdod grags, called Grags rgyan of Gsims khna gon-ma, was born. Chhos khyor rgya-mtsho, the incarnate Lama of Tha-nri, died. 1618

Bsdod nams chhos kphel filled the grand hierarch’s chair at Dgah-ldan.

The Mongol and Gtsan armies fought with each other at Rkyan tsha sga, where many Tibetans fell. 1619

Chhos dpal died.

Sampa slo-dpon-pa chhe-va a second time held the abbotship of Dgong-lun. The fifteenth Ming emperor Then-chhi ascended the throne of China. The Mongols defeated the Gtsan armies at Rkyan tsha sga, and thereby restored lost territories to Dge-grags-pa. 1620

The Mongol Hphrin las hun-grub, also called Smin grol Nomen khan, was born. Talai Lama Blo bsañ rgya-mtsho became abbot of Hbras spuñ.

The Panchhen Rinpoche erected the golden spire of the shrine of Bshang-chig-shal. Grags rgya-mtsho became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. After his death the hierarchical chair was nominally filled by Nag dvan chhos rgyan. 1621

Khri-Tshul Khriims chhos-kphel died. 1622

Talai Lama Blo bsañ rgya-mtsho took the final vows of monkhood.

Dkon mezhog chhos kphel became the grand hierarch of Dgah ldan. Panchhen became the abbot of the Byan rtse college. 1623

CYCLE XI.

The eighteenth Kulika emperor ascended the throne of Sambhala. Hjam-pa chhos rje (Chhos rgya-mtsho-va) became abbot of Dgon lun. 1624

This year a little decrease was observed in the solar brightness, and there being an entire eclipse of the moon, the whole phenomenon was considered as ominous by Dpal lhun of Pha bon kha. The sixteenth Ming emperor Khun-tin ascended the throne of China. Dkon mezhog rgya-mtsho of the Sre rgyud monastery died. 1625

Panchhen chhos rgyan built a gilt dome on the monastery of Dgah ldan.

Lecha skya Chhos rje grags-pa hod sser became abbot of Dgon-lun.

The monastery of Roñ-po was founded by Skal ldan rgya-
mtsho, also called Roṅ-po grub chhen of Amdo. The Shva dmar Lama Gar-dvaṅ died. Dpal-vo Gtsug lag rgya-mtsho died.

The seventh Shva-dmar hierarch was born.

Khri Chonas-pa was born. Rgya-ra S'esrab Phun-tshogs died.

Sumpa Slo-öpon-pa Dam-chhos rgyal mtshan became abbot of Dgon-luṅ. The incarnation of Sgampo, called Nor rgyan, died.

Khri Blo gros rgya-mtsho was born. Blo bsaṅ bstanpaṅ rgyal mtshan was born.

Sgampo Bkra ṣis grags rgyam died.

Ldan-ma smon lam rab hbyor-pa (Tshul-khrims rgya-mtsho) became abbot of Dgon-luṅ. Gušri chhos rgyal entered Kokonur, and defeating the armies of the Khalkha tribes who were inimical to the Dgelug-pa school, proceeded towards Dvus, from which place he returned to Kokonur.

Khron-ston rZpaZ lhun died.

Bstan 7idsin leg* &sarZ of Kon-po became hierarch of Dga7i Zdan, but he could not long hold the office and was obliged to resign it. Rje-Dge rin succeeded him. The Talai Lama and the incarnation of Gssim khan Goṇma took the special vows of Smad ēdul dge sloṅ from Panchhen thams chad mkhyen-pa.

Nag-dvaṅ betan Hdsin Hphrin las (Skyid śon shabs drun) was born. Rnam rgyal dpal hbyor (Chhos-bsaṅ sku goṅ-ma) became abbot of Dgon-luṅ. Gušri chhos rgyal subdued Beri, the chief of Khams, and annexed his possessions.

S'akyā lha dvaṅ wrote the historical work, called Chhos Hbyūn. King Beri of Khams, being a follower of the Bon religion, was declared a common enemy of the Buddhist religion. He was thrown into prison and punished with death.

Mkhan-po Nag dvaṅ chhos grags died.

Loḥaṅ skya Nag dvaṅ chhos ldam dpal bsaṅ-po was born. Hphags shi-va bsaṅ-po, in the 44th year of his age, became abbot of Chhab mdo. Gušri khan entered Gtsaṅ and captured the king of Gtsaṅ and annexed Gtsaṅ kōṅ to his dominions. He was proclaimed king of Tibet. The governor Bsod nams chhos phel became regent.

Blo-bsaṅ bstan hdsin Hphrin-las of Khalkha was born. Bstan-pa rgyal-mtshan of Dvags-po became hierarch of Dgah-ldan.

Hphags-pi chhos rgyal died.
Rgyal-va rgya-mtsho, the fifth incarnate lPhags-pa of Khams, was born. Six great nobles of China conspired against the emperor Khruñ tin, and their leader usurped the imperial authority for a fortnight, after which the Manchu chief Sun-t'i Chhi-the tšuñ took possession of the imperial crown.

The famous palace of Potala was built.

The monastery of Ma-mgur in Amdo was founded by Lamo sprul sku Blo-gros rgya-mtsho and Hod sser bkra šis. Khri dkon mechhog-chhos kphel died. 1645

Khri Drags po died. 1646

The spiritual teacher of the author (Sampa mkhanpo), named Hjam-dbyañ-bshad-pa (Nag-dvañ btson grus), was born. Dkon-mehhog chhos bsañ filled the hierarchical throne of Dgah ldan. Hor Don grub rgya-mtsho became abbot of Dgon-luñ. 1647

The abbot of Sgo-man, named Bsam grub Sgañ-pa Nag dvañ blo bsañ dbyiñ chhos, became abbot of Dgon-luñ. He afterwards accepted the abbotship of Rva-sgroñ in Dvus, in consequence of which Don yod rgyal mtshan of Hor duñ succeeded him in the Dgon luñ abbotship. 1649

Legs rgya-mtsho established a Tantrik school in the monastery of #ku-btbum. The monastery of Dgah ldan Dam chhos gliñ of Btsan-po was founded by the retired abbot of Dgon luñ at Sser khog. 1650

The Talai Lama visited China (Peking), and was there decorated with the insignia of Tai Srí by the emperor Shun-t'i. 1651

The Sde-srid (viceroy) Sanergyas rgya-mtsho was born. Hod Sser Bkra šis held the abbotship of Dgon luñ. The Talai Lama, on his return journey from China, visited the monasteries of Dgon-luñ, &c. 1652

Dpal ldan rgyal mtshan filled the chair of the grand hierarchy at Dgah ldan. 1653

Gusri khan died. 1654

Emperor Khang-shi (Dde-skjyd), known to the Tibetans as an incarnation of Grags rgyal mtshan, was born. Sakya Lha Dvañ died.

Tharpa Chhos rje (Bkra šis rgyal mtshan) became abbot of Dgon-luñ. 1655

The Rañ-ma Lama (Ssur-chhos dbyiñs Rañ-grol) died. 1656

Gusri's son Ta-yan khan became king of Tibet. lPhrin las rgya-mtsho became Sde-srid (viceroy). 1657

Don-yod chhos grags of Lu-hukya became abbot of Dgon-luñ. 1660
Blo-blsaṅ rgyal-mtshan filled the throne of Dgah ldan.

The second Manchu emperor Kang-shi (Shiṅ-tsu) ascended the throne of China. Panchhen Blo-blsaṅ chhos rgyan died at Nag-selā.

The fifth Panchhen Rinpoche (Blo-blsaṅ yeṣes dpal bsaṅ), who was Sumpa mkhanpās spiritual guide, was born. Sgo-maṅ bsam grub sgan-pa died at 1661.


The incarnation of Rgyal sres, named Blo bsaṅ bstan ḍam, arrived at Dgon-luṅ. The abbotship of Dgon-luṅ was held by Dpal ldan rgya-mtsho of Bde rgyun-chha-va. Hor Dkaṭ bshu, being invested with the title of No-men khan, returned to Btsan dgon from Dvns and established Hechhad ūnā. The period of Tshul khirim (śla) commenced.

Ngag dvaṅ Hphrin las, who was born in the fire-sheep year, and who had previously filled the abbotship of Chhab-mdo, died this year. Sprul sku grags rgyan died. Blo-blsaṅ Don yeñ filled the hierarch’s chair at Dgah ldan. Ta-yan khan died. The Sde srid (vicerey) Hphrin las died. Mechho dpon sde-ba became Sde-srid (vicerey). Talai khan Ratna became king of Tibet. Blo-mchhog of Sman-luṅ died.


Ngag dvaṅ Blo-bsaṅ rgya-mtsho took the vows of the Stod lḥul Dgechōn of Tibet for individual emancipation. Khri Blo-bsaṅ of Don yeñ died.

The layman Saṅs rgya-mtsho, who was born in Groṅ-smad, became vicerey of Tibet. The abbottship of Dgon-luṅ was held by Rinpoche Bstan pahi rgyal mtshan (chhu-bsaṅ sprul sku). The monastery of Lamo Dde-chhen was founded by Chha-kwan Nomen-khan.

The Talai Lama Tshaṅs dvyans rgya-mtsho was born. The astronomical work of Sde-srid, called Baidurya dkarpo, was compiled.

Khri Byams-pa bkra śis died.

After the return of Blo gros rgya mtsho to China, Tshul khrim de dar rgyas of Chones became hierarch of Dgah ldan.

Lama Rinpoche Pud dkar lobsin-pa Yeşes rgya-mtsho was born. The left branch of the Oeloth Mongols and the Khalkhas, being on the verge of going to war with each other, Khri Blo-rgya mtsho reconciled them to each other.

CYCLE XII.

Khri chhen Blo-bssan rgya mtsho of Lamo of Dgah ldan proceeded to Peking.

Lehaṅ skya Tākāu Śrī Nag dvaṅ Blo bssan became abbot of Dgon-luṅ. Bla-ma Blo-gros rgya-mtsho died at Hloog khog.

Betan pahi Nima (the 4lobje slo-dpon of Sumpa mKhanpo), who was an incarnation of Khri Blo-rgyam, was born.

Rdo pa Rab Byams-pa (Dpal ldan rgya-mtsho) became abbot of Dgon luṅ.

Bsam-blo sbyin-pa rgya-mtsho of Bkaḥ hgyur became hierarch of Dgah-ldan.

The Bde-rgyu chhuṅ-va, named Kun-dgaṅ rgya-mtsho, became abbot of Dgon-luṅ.

The Sde-srid (viceroy) Sans rgya rgya-mtsho built the nine storied palace of worship (Pho dran-dmarpo) of Potala. The annual prayer congregation called Tshogs-mchhoṅ Smon lam was established by the Sde-srid to commemorate the anniversary of the accession of the Talai Lama Nag dvaṅ blo bssan. Chone Tshul-dar became hierarch of Dgah-ldan.

Blo-bssan Nag-dvaṅ Hjigs med, an incarnation of Rgyal sras Rinpoche, was born.

The Sde-srid (viceroy) Sans rgyag rgya-mtsho wrote the work, called Boiser shva ser chhos khbyuṅ, i. e., history of the rise of the yellowcap school.


Hjam dvyas bshad rdor became abbot of Sgo-man. Don-yod rgya-mtsho became hierarch Dgah ldan.

Stag-luṅ shabs drun Chhos kyi Nima became abbot of Dgon-luṅ.
The Sde-srid (vicecy) Saňs rgyas rgya-mtsho resigned his office. The Mongol prince Lha-bssan became king of Tibet. 1702

Sampa mthaupa was born. 1703

Pad dkar hdsin-pa was identified as the real incarnation of the Talai Lama. Lha-bssan, the son of Rahá rgyal-po, fought with the Sde-srid (vicecy) Saňs rgyas rgya-mtsho. The latter was killed, and with him four hundred Tibetans were slain. Lha-bssan declared himself the absolute monarch of Tibet. The Talai Lama Tshaň-dvyäns rgya-mtsho was ordered to China. He died near lake Khokonur. 1704

Pad dkar hdsin-pa Yešes rgya-mtsho was placed on the throne of Potala. 1706

The Talai Lama Skal bssan rgya-mtsho was born. 1707

A great earthquake took place in Tibet. 1708

The new Talai Lama and Hjam-dvyäns bshad rdor were invested with the insignia of an imperial order. Hjam dvyäns bshad-pa founded the monastery of Bkra šis bkhyil in Amdo. At Dgon-lun the Dampa gsam (three incarnate Lamas) established the Rgyuḥ Grva (Tantrik school).

Chhun-bssan Rinpo-che, a second time, held the abbotship of Dgon-lun. Sampa mthaupa became a monk of Dgon-lun. 1709

Hjam-dvyäns bshad-pa wrote the work called Hjig-byc chhos khyi. Lchä skya Ngan dva chhos ldan died. 1711

Hjam dvyäns bshad-pa established a Tantrik class at Bkra šis bkhyil, and wrote a chronology of Buddhist events. 1713

The incarnation of Lchañskya Yešes bstan-pa Sgron-me was born. 1715

The armies of Chuňgar, or the left branch of the Mongols, slew king Lha-bssan. 1716

The Chuňgar armies sacked the Rün monasteries of Raam rgyal gliṅ, Rдорje brag, Smiṅ grol gliṅ, &c., and made the Dga'-lugs-pa church predominant all over Tibet. 1717

Under the command of the emperor of China the Talai Lama Bkal-bssan rgya-mtsho was brought to Tibet from Sku-lban by Thu-bkwan Rinpo-che chhos rgya-mtsho and placed on the throne of Potala. Hbyin rgan became abbot of Bkra šis bkhyil. Hjam-dvyäns bshad rdor died. The emperor Khang-shi died. The third of the Manchu line, called Shih-tsu yun-ting, became emperor. 1721
The Oeloth Mongols of Khokonur fought with the imperial forces and were defeated. The Chinese killed upwards of seven hundred monks of all classes, including the abbot of Gser khog dgon, called Chhu-bsaṅ rinpocche, and destroyed many religious objects, and burnt down several shrines and congregation halls. They also demolished three great monasteries of Shva-vo khog as well as many hermitages. Many aged monks of Sku-hbum were also killed. Sumpa mkhanpo proceeded to Tibet.

The Chinese, under their generals Kâng and Yo-u the-u, destroyed the temples and grand congregation halls of the Dgon-luṅ monastery, and burnt thirteen sets of Bkah-kyur, and killed many monks. The monasteries of the Hju-lag Sem-ūi dgon schools, recluses cells, &c., were destroyed by them. In the autumn the three hermitages of Dgon-luṅ and Shva-vo khog, and the monasteries of Hju-lag were rebuilt.

Sumpa mkhanpo was appointed abbot of Sgo maṅ. The nineteenth Kulika Rnam-gnon sen (Vikrama Simha) became emperor of Sambhala. When the demon like ministers (Bkah blo) killed the viceroys (Sde-srid) Shaṅ khaṅ chhenpo who was a devout advocate of Buddhism, Phola Theje Bsdol nam Žtobs rgyas (king Mivaṅ) returned to Dvus from upper Tibet with troops of Ladag, Mānihrī, and Gtsaṅ. He slew upwards of one thousand troops of Dvus and Keṅ-po, &c., and entirely suppressed the enemies of the Government.

When the Dvus people rose in rebellion, Phola Theje, being reinforced by the Chinese troops, killed the three rebel ministers and removed the Talai Lama to Hkaṅ-dag. Ṛgyal sres sprul sku became abbot of Ḫbras spnaṅ Blo-gsal gliṅ. Phola Theje became viceroys of Tibet, and was also invested with the title of Chun-vāṅ.

Dgon luṅ, Btsan dgon and other monasteries having been restored to their former condition, the author’s predecessor Sum-pa chhos rje Phun-tshogs nam rgyaṅ and Bhu-chhos rje Blo-bsaṅ dpal became abbots of Dgon luṅ and Btsan-dgon respectively.

The author (Sumpa mkhanpo) returned to Amdo from Dvus in Tibet.

The author founded the monastery of Bshad sgrub gliṅ. The author accepted the abbotship of Bsam-gtan gliṅ. Vaṅ chhos rje-grags-pa dpal ābyor became abbot of Dgon luṅ.

At the command of the emperor of China the Lchaṅskya
Rinpo-chhe brought back the Takai Lama from Ika-w Kang to Dras, and restored peace and prosperity to Tibet and Khams. Lehna skyi Rinpo-chhe became famous for his excellent exposition of the work called Rtan-śhrel stad-pha.

Emperor Yung-ting died and was succeeded by his son Chhin-lung.

The incarnate Tha-kwan of Dgon-luṅ, named Blo-bsaṅ chhos kyi ņima, was born. At the command of the emperor the author proceeded to China. ņag ḍvaṅ rnam rgyal, also called Khyuṅ tsha shabs druṅ, became abbot of Dgon-luṅ.

A great earthquake took place at the walled city of Nĩb-sa mKhur, near the mountain called Glaṅ-ru, and destroyed the city.

Panchhen Blo-bsaṅ yeṣes died.

The sixth incarnate Panchhen Dpal ldan yeṣes was born. Bde-rgyu shabs druṅ (Dge-legs rgyal mtshan) held the abbotship of Dgon luṅ.

Rgyal sras ye grags died.

Blo-bsaṅ dpal, ldan the incarnation of Rgyal sras, was born.

Rgyal tig Rab-ḥbyams-pa (Blo-bsaṅ don-grub) became abbot of Dgon-luṅ.

A very long comet was observed in Tibet.

The author (Yeṣes Dpal ḍbyor), in the forty-third year of his age, was called upon to fill the abbotship of the Dgon-luṅ monastery.

---

Inscribed Seal of Kumāra Gupta.—By V. A. Smith, Esq., C. S.

(With a Plate.)

The first announcement of the discovery of the seal, which forms the subject of this paper, was made by an article entitled "An Archaeological Find" in the Pioneer newspaper of the 13th May, 1889. The article attracted my attention, and I published certain remarks on it in the issue of the same newspaper for the 28th May, 1889. A few days later Mr. G. J. Nicholls, C. S., Judge of Cawnpore, entered into correspondence with me, and informed me that he was the owner of the seal. He has very kindly allowed me to examine and describe the original.
The seal (see Plate VI) is oval in shape, slightly pointed at each end, and is \( 5 \frac{1}{2} \) inches long by \( 4 \frac{1}{2} \) wide. The edge varies slightly in thickness, but is generally about \( \frac{3}{8} \) th of an inch thick. The surface is protected by the rim being raised above the face of the plate about \( \frac{1}{8} \) th of an inch. The metal is whitish grey, and is thought by Mr. Nicholls to be base silver. The back of the plate is fitted with two solid buttons, each more than half an inch in diameter, by which it could be attached to another object. It probably was attached to an inscription engraved on metal.

The upper section of the face of the seal, being slightly less than one half of the surface, is occupied by a quaint figure of the mythical monster Garuda, executed in tolerably high relief. He is represented standing on a base composed of two parallel lines, facing front, with outspread wings. His face is that of a man, broad and full, with thick lips. His hair is arranged exactly like the wig of an English Judge. A snake is twined round his neck, its head projecting above his left shoulder.

A circle, intended doubtless for the discus of Vishnu, who rides on Garuda, is faintly indicated in the field to the proper right of the figure, and a corresponding dim mark on the proper left is probably intended for the eoneh shell of the god.

A space an inch in length is left blank at the bottom of the plate. The interval between this space and the parallel lines on which Garuda stands is occupied with eight lines of prose inscription. The alphabet is that used by the Gupta kings both for coin legends and inscriptions on stone in Northern India. The letters, though minute, are well and clearly cut in moderately high relief, the vowel marks being fully expressed. Most of the inscription is easily legible, but it is damaged in places, especially in the middle of the second and third lines.

The seal was presented to Mr. Nicholls (who accepted it on behalf of Government) by a member of a very old and respectable Muhammadan family residing at Bhitari near Sayyidpur in the Ghazipur District, N. W. P. It was found at some date previous to 1886, when the foundations for a new building were being dug. It is certainly genuine.

The fact that the tablet is a seal is readily proved by comparison of it with similar objects.

The only other known seal of the Early or Imperial Gupta Dynasty is that which is fused on to the spurious copper plate grant from Gaya, purporting to have been made by Samudragupta. That seal is of copper, and is described as follows by Mr. Fleet:—"On to the proper right side of the plate, there is fused a seal, oval in shape, about 2\( \frac{1}{2} \) by 3\( \frac{1}{2} \). It has, in relief on a countersunk surface—at the top, Garuda, represented
as a bird, standing to the front, with outstretched wings; and, below this, a legend in five lines, which, being also in relief, is so worn that nothing of it can be read except a few disconnected letters here and there, and Sam[u]drag[u]p[ta], very faintly, at the end of line 5. It must have contained a succinct recital of the genealogy, after the fashion of the Asirgadh seal of Sarvavarman, No. 47 above, page 219, and the Sonpat seal of Harshavardhana, No. 52 above, page 231. The legend on the seal of this grant is in characters which present a very different appearance to those of the body of the inscription; as also does the copper of the seal, as compared with the substance of the plate; and the seal is in all probability a genuine one of Samudragupta, detached from some other plate."

The copper seal of Harshavardhana, above referred to, is even larger than the one now under examination, measuring 5½" by 6⅞. It weighs three pounds six ounces. "All round it there runs a rim, about ⅛" broad; and inside this there are, in rather shallow relief on a slightly countersunk surface,—at the top, a bull, recumbent to the proper right; and below this the inscription,"† in thirteen lines.

The Garuḍa device recurs on the seal of the copper plate inscription of Rāja Tivara Deva (circa A. D. 800), found at Rājim in the Central Provinces. "The top of the seal is circular, about 3½" in diameter. It has, in relief on a rather deep countersunk surface, across the centre, a legend, in two lines; ...... in the upper part a figure of Garuḍa, facing full front, depicted with the head of a man, and the body of a bird, with his wings expanded, with, apparently, human arms hanging down between the wings and the feet, and with a serpent with expanded hood, standing up in front of and over each shoulder; on the proper right of this, a chakra or discus, the emblem of Vishnu; and on the proper left a śankha or conch shell; in the lower part, a floral device."‡

The device on the upper portion of a royal seal was invariably the emblem used by the dynasty concerned as its special cognizance. The seal under discussion and the Gayā one of Samudra Gupta settle definitely that the image of Garuḍa was the family cognizance of the Early Guptas, and so explain the phrase Garumad-anka in the posthumous inscription of Samudra Gupta at Allahabad, the bird-headed standard of the Gupta gold coins, and the reverse device of the copper coins. No doubt can now be felt that in all these cases the mythological significance of the bird-like figure is the monster Garuḍa, the vehicle of Vishnu. The

† Fleet, ibid., Vol. III, p. 231.
form of the Garuda-headed standard on the gold coins was, I am confident, borrowed from the Roman eagle, and the form of the device of the copper coins may have been imitated from a Greek original, that is to say, from the owl of Athene, especially as represented on coins of Pergamon.*

Sometimes Garuda is represented with human arms, as on the Rajim seal, and sometimes without them, as on the seal of Kumāragupta. The same variation of detail is observable in the case of the copper coins.†

The inscription on Kumāragupta's seals, is, as usual with seal legends, purely genealogical; and the greater part of the record gives the particulars of the Gupta genealogy in the standard form of words employed in the Bhitari pillar inscription and other Gupta inscriptions.‡

In the beginning the seal omits, between the words apratīrthaṣaya and mahārīja-sṛl-Gupta, a string of epithets given in the pillar inscription, but, from the words mahārīja-sṛl-Gupta down to the name of Kumāragupta in the fifth line, the record is identical (except by omitting Kumān’s title of paramahāyavato), word for word, with that incised on the Bhitari pillar. The rest of the newly discovered inscription does not seem to be quite identical with the wording of any known record. A son of Kumāragupta is certainly mentioned, and the name of Kumār’s queen, Anattadevi (?), is stated, but I am doubtful whether the name Skanda occurs or not. I can read only partially the 6th and 7th lines. The first four characters of the concluding 8th line are indistinct, but the remainder is easily legible, and shows that the seal belongs to the reign of Kumāragupta, circa A.D. 414–452.§

The antiquities at Bhitari, near Sayyidpur at the eastern extremity of the Gházipur District in the North-Western Provinces, about half way between Benares and Gházipur, have long been known to archaeologists. The site was carefully explored more than fifty years ago by Sir Alexander Cunningham and his friend Mr. Vincent Tregear. The latter became the possessor of a valuable collections of coins, many of which are now in the Bodleian cabinet.

The most notable relic is the monolith pillar bearing an inscription of the reign of Skandagupta. A translation of this record, made from Sir A. Cunningham’s copy, was published by Dr. Mill in the Journal of this Society in 1837. Certain minor corrections in this translation were

† Smith, ibid., Plate IV, figures 8–15.
‡ Fleet, ibid., Vol. III, p. 53, etc.
§ Smith, ibid., p. 6.
subsequently made, but the inscription was never edited properly until it came into the hands of Mr. Fleet. That scholar has now published (No. 18 in volume III of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum) an accurate facsimile, transliteration, and translation of the document, which I have made use of in writing the above notes.

"The inscription," observes Mr. Fleet, "is one of the Early Gupta kings Skanda Gupta. It is not dated. It belongs to the Vaishnav form of religion; and the object of it is to record the installation of an image of the god Vishnu, under the name of Sārāgī or 'the wielder of the bow of horn named Sārāga,' and the allotment, to the idol, of the village, not mentioned by name, in which the column stands."

The site is marked by large brick mounds, and numerous bricks inscribed with the name of Sri Kumāragupta were found in the fields by Sir A. Cunningham, who also describes certain sculptures which seem to belong to the Gupta period.

The presence of Indo-Sassanian coins of the 8th or 9th century A.D. is an indication that the site continued to be occupied after the fall of the Gupta dynasty.†

There can be no doubt that it was a place of importance in the reigns of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta, circa A.D. 414—480.

Remarks on the above. (With a chronological table).—

By Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle.

The seal is a far more important one than would appear from Mr. Smith's statement of its contents. The fact is that it is not a seal of Kumāra Gupta I., but of a Kumāra Gupta II.; and that we have in the inscription of the seal, for the first time, a genealogy of the Early Gupta dynasty that enumerates nine generations, instead of only the seven hitherto known.

The last three lines of the inscription which Mr. Smith failed to read really contain the most important portion of the record, and contain entirely new information. Nor are these lines more doubtful to read than any of the preceding ones; and most fortunately the names of the kings occurring in them are very fairly distinct. The following is a complete transcript of the record, in Nāgarī and Roman. In the latter transcript the less legible portions are enclosed in round, and the illegible portions in straight brackets. It should be remembered, however, that on account of the stereotyped formulas employed in such records, the reading even of these portions is perfectly certain.

* See Fleet, ibid., Vol. III., p. 53.
Nágari Transcript.*

1. सच्चाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षक-पीलक्ष्मा

2. राजाधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षक-

3. श्रीसुब्रह्मसूक्ष्मपुलक्ष्यशीर्षद्विद्विधिश्यमहाराजाकुमारण-राजा

4. मवेसच्चाराधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण-मुख्यमहाराजाकुमारण-

5. ज्ञानाधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण-

6. ज्ञानाधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण-

7. राजाधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण-

8. श्रीसुब्रह्मधिराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण्यप्रतिरक्षकमहाराजाकुमारण-

Roman Transcript.†

1. [Sar] (vva)-rajochchhetthu prthivyam aprathirathasya Mahá(rá-

2. [rágá]dhirája-S'ri-ghatotkachapattra(sya) Mahárája-S'ri-Ghatotkach-

3. [Sr]-[Sa]mudraguptasya puttras (tat-parigrihito Ma)[háde-

4. [vato Mahá]rájádhirája-S'ri-Chandragupta-(prayá-ma)[háde-

5. [jádhirája-S'ri-Kumáragupta]-upttas tasya pu[ttras tat-

6. [já]dhirája-S'ri-Puragupta-[pita]s tasya pu[ttras tat-pá-

7. [já]dhirája-S'ri-Naragupta-[pita]-upttas tasya pu[ttras tatt-

8. v[YÁ]m u(tpannah parama-bhá)gavat(o) Mahárájádhirája-

* From the original seal; see Plate VI.
† The portions enclosed within straight brackets are entirely rubbed away; those within round brackets are more or less damaged, but sufficiently legible. The upadhmadmya is represented by h.
Translation. *

(Lines 1 and 2.)—The son of the Mahārājadhirāja, the glorious Samudra-Gupta, who was the exterminator of all kings; who had no antagonist (of equal power) in the world; who was the son of the son's son of the Mahārāja the illustrious Gupta; who was the son's son of the Mahārāja, the illustrious Ghoṭotkacha; and who was the son of the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Chandragupta (I.), (and) the daughter's son of Lichchhavi, begotten on the Mahādevi Kumāradevi,

(Line 3.)—(was) the most devout worshipper of the Divine One, the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Chandragupta (II.), who was accepted by him (i.e., Samudragupta); who was begotten on the Mahādevi Dattadevi; and who was himself without an antagonist (of equal power).†

(Line 4.)—His son (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Kumāragupta (I.), who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Dhruvadevi.

(Line 5.)—His son (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Puragupta, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Anantadevi.

(Line 6.)—His son (was) the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Narasimhagupta, who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Śrīvatsadevi.

(Line 7 and 8.)—His son (was) the most devout worshipper of the Divine One, the Mahārājādhirāja, the glorious Kumāragupta (II.), who meditated on his feet, (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Śrīmatidevi.

All the names of the kings are quite legible on the original seal: quite sufficiently so, to identify them satisfactorily.‡ Of the names of the two last queens, Śrīvatsa and Śrīmata, the two first syllables respectively (Śrīva and Śrīma) are legible; but the terminal ones (īsa and ī) can only be faintly seen.

Before discussing the information of this record, some of its techni-

* I follow Mr. Fleet's translation (*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, p. 54) as far as it goes.
† Or, "who was himself an antagonist (of equal power to all his enemies)," if we read svayaṃ cha pratirathaḥ; see below.
‡ The photographic plate unfortunately is not quite as distinct, as one would wish. The original plate requires to be held in various lights, and to be examined with a large magnifying glass; but with these helps there is really not much difficulty in reading the whole of the record, with the exception of those small and unimportant portions (in straight brackets) that are entirely rubbed away (apparently during the process of cleaning the plate.)
calities may be briefly noted. Firstly, the uniform use of the upadhmānīya, in 1. 1, rájochechhettuḥ prithivyām; 1. 3, apratirathāḥ paramaḥ; 1. 8, uppanaḥ paramaḥ; and secondly, of the doubling of t and dh when followed by r and y respectively, as in 1. 1, pratirathasya and pauttrasya; 1. 2, putrasya and dānāntratasya; 1. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, puttras; 1. 4, 5, 6, 7, pāḍānvuddhyāḥ; thirdly, the assimilation of the visarga to a following s, in 1. 3, utpānasa-svayām; fourthly, the reading svayam ch' apratirathāḥ in 1. 3. The same phrase is read by Mr. Fleet* in the Bhitari stone inscription (1. 4) svayam apratirathasya. The phrase also occurs in Kumāragupta I.'s Bilsād stone inscription and in Skanda-gupta's Bihār stone inscription* but in the former it is illegible, and in the latter it is cut away and lost. There are, therefore, only two records (the seal and the stone of Bhitari) to establish the reading; and the exact point is whether the akṣara that follows svaya should be read ma or cha. Now in the Bhitari stone inscription (at least, as shown in Mr. Fleet's plate) the akṣara is too indistinct to be definitely identified; while on the Bhitari seal it is quite distinctly cha. Moreover the seal has a distinct anusvāra over the ya of svaya, which anusvāra is apparently also present on the Bhitari stone; and the anusvāra only agrees with the reading cha or rather chā. The vowel mark over cha is hardly distinguishable in the present state of the seal; and the reading cha pratirathāḥ would also give sense, but a sense not quite so suitable to the context (see the translation, above). It is preferable, therefore, to read svayam ch' apratirathāḥ.

The record gives the names of nine kings, viz., 1, Gupta, 2, Ghaṭotkacha, 3, Chandragupta I., 4, Samudragupta, 5, Chandragupta II., 6, Kumāragupta I., 7, Puragupta, 8, Narasimhagupta, and 9, Kumāragupta II.; and it states distinctly that each of these kings stood in the relation of son to the preceding one. It further gives the names of six queens, viz., 1, Kumāradevi, the wife of Chandragupta I. and mother of Samudragupta; 2, Dattadevi, the wife of Samudragupta and mother of Chandragupta II.; 3, Dhruvadevi, the wife of Chandragupta II. and mother of Kumāragupta I.; 4, Anantadevi, the wife of Kumāragupta I. and mother of Puragupta; 5, Śrīvatsadevi, the wife of Puragupta and mother of Narasimhagupta; and 6, Śrīmatidevi, the wife of Narasimhagupta and mother of Kumāragupta II.

The two longest genealogies of the Early Guptas, hitherto known, are those on two stone pillar inscriptions, both of Skandagupta,† one at Bhitari, the other at Bihār. That at Bihār is greatly mutilated and

* Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, p. 53; also pp. 43, 50.
† They are given by Fleet in Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, pp. 47 and 52.
of subordinate value. They mention only the following seven kings: 1, Gupta, 2, Ghatotkaupha, 3, Chandragupta I, 4, Samudragupta, 5, Chandragupta II, 6, Kumāragupta, 7, Skandagupta. Here again each king is expressly stated to have been the son of his predecessor. They further name the following three queens: 1, Kumārādevī, wife of Chandragupta I. and mother of Samudragupta; 2, Dattadevi, wife of Samudragupta and mother of Chandragupta II.; 3, Dhruvadevi, wife of Chandragupta II. and mother of Kumāragupta I.

In the main these two records agree with that of the seal; and this proves that the seal is that of a member of the great Early (or Imperial) Gupta family. This is shown also by the use of the imperial title Mahārāja. But there are two important differences. The first is that the seal calls the seventh member of the line Puragupta, while the other two records call him Skandagupta. The second is that the seal carries the line down to the ninth generation, to another Kumāragupta, and traces it through Puragupta, instead of through Skandagupta. This proves two things: 1, that the Early Gupta dynasty did not terminate, as it has been hitherto believed, with Skandagupta, but that it lasted for, at least, two generations longer (i.e., down to about 550 A.D.); and secondly that there was a second Kumāragupta among the Early Guptas. The latter discovery may possibly necessitate a reconsideration of all those chronological and other speculations which were based on the (hitherto uncontradicted) belief, that there was but one Kumāragupta in the dynasty.

The chief difficulty is that with respect to the relation of Puragupta to Skandagupta. Are they but different names of the same person, or was one the (younger) brother of the other?

One point may be noted with regard to these two kings. The inscription on the seal states that Puragupta’s mother, and, therefore, Kumāragupta I.’s queen, was named Anantadevi. The two stone inscriptions do not name Skandagupta’s mother or Kumāragupta’s queen, though they speak of her. In the Bhitār inscription it is related, how Skanda restored the imperial power of the Guptas, which appears to have suffered a serious reverse during his father Kumāragupta’s time; and how he afterwards visited his mother to report to her his victories; but the mother is not named. In the Bihār inscription, it is stated that Kumāragupta married the sister of some person, whose name, however, as well as that of his sister are unfortunately lost in the mutilated record. But from a subsequent equally fragmentary portion of the record (see i. 13 in Fleet’s transcript) it would seem that the brother’s name may have been Anantadesa. In that case, his sister would probably have been named Anantadevi; and this would agree with the record on the seal. In that case, further, Skandagupta and Puragupta would have had not only the same
father Kumāragupta, but also the same mother Anantadevī. It may be further noted, that while the seal names Srīvatsadevī as the queen of Pura-рагупта, the queen of Skandagupta is nowhere either named or even mentioned. So far as his records are concerned, he might not have been married at all.

The question still remains, are Skandagupta and Puragupta the same persons, or are they brothers? It seems hardly probable that in such genealogies the same person would be called by different names. The probability, as I shall show further on, would seem to be, that Puragupta is a (younger) brother of Skandagupta, and succeeded the latter, who died without issue. There would still be a difficulty in the fact, that Skandagupta is entirely omitted from the list on the seal. But such omissions are not without precedent in lists which are rather intended to record the line of descent than the line of succession.* The term pūānudhyāta, however, no doubt, properly indicates Puragupta as having been the immediate successor of his father rather than a remoter successor of him after his brother Skandagupta.

The discovery of this seal solves another mystery. Among the gold coinage of the Early Guptas, certain coins have been found, bearing the name of Nara (or Narasagupta) and the title Bālāditya.† That they belong to the proper Gupta class of coins, has never been seriously doubted; their resemblance to them is too thorough. But the difficulty was, where to place them; as no member of the Gupta family, called Nara, was known to have existed. It can hardly be doubtful now, to whom these Nara-coins belong. They are clearly issues of the Narasimhagupta of the new seal.

This, however, suggests a further consequence. Mr. Smith, in his Coinage of the Early Gupta Dynasty, has shown (pp. 40) that certain specimens of the Gupta coinage show an exceptionally heavy weight. Some of these coins belong to Nara (simhagupta); others to a king of an unknown name who has the title of Prakāśāditya; others again to a certain Kumāragupta. The obverse of the Prakāśāditya coins would (as usual) give the proper name of the king; but unfortunately in all the specimens hitherto found the name is lost. It may now be suggested

*A very curious, though not quite analogous, case of a similar omission occurs in one of the Valabhi grants (No. IX, in Indian Antiquary, Vol. VII, p. 60), where Guhasena's father Dharmapata is omitted, and he is placed immediately after his uncle Druvasena I. It is not impossible, that Dharmapata never reigned; if so, the record is one of the line of succession rather than of the line of descent.

†Mr. Smith denies the occurrence of Gupta; see his Coinage of the Early Gupta Dynasty, p. 118. But see fig. 22, on Pl. XVIII of the Ariaun Antiqua. The fact, however, whether the coins do or do not bear the word Gupta, does not affect the argument.
that these coins perhaps belong to Puragupta. The heavy coins of Kumáragupta, with the special title of Kramáditya, should probably now be ascribed to Kumáragupta II., the last of the list on the seal, and not to the Kumáragupta who is numbered the fourth in the list of the Later Gupta dynasty of Magadha.*

It is impossible to identify the Kumáragupta II. of the Bhitari seal with the Kumáragupta of the Later Guptas, although their periods probably coincide. For all the other names do not agree. The later Kumáragupta was the fourth of his line and was preceded by three princes, viz., Krishnagupta, Harshagupta, and Jivitagupta I., standing in the relation of father to son. It would, then, be necessary to assume that Jivitagupta I., Harshagupta and Krishnagupta were identical respectively with Narasípnagupta, Puragupta and Kumáagupta I., which is clearly inadmissible. Or supposing Krishnagupta to have immediately followed Skandagupta of the early dynasty, and even assuming Puragupta and Narasípnagupta to be identical with Krishnagupta and Harshagupta, there would Jivitagupta still remain to be accounted for, and the Kumáragupta II. of the seal would fall one generation earlier than the Kumáragupta of the later dynasty. Further, the Kumáragupta II. of the seal bears the well-known imperial titles equally with his predecessors of the early dynasty; while the Kumáragupta of the later dynasty, as shown in the Apíasa stone inscription,† lays, equally with his predecessors, no claim even to the subordinate title of Maharájá. They designate themselves merely nípa or bhýpati. It was only the fourth of Kumára's successors, Adityasena (preceded by Dámodaragupta, Mahásenagupta and Mádhavagupta), who was the first to lay again claim to the imperial title of Maharájádhiráj.‡ The seal, thus, decides a hitherto open question and proves that the Later Guptas of Magadha were not direct descendants of the Early Guptas. For the first three members of the Later Gupta line, Krishna, Harsha and Jívita I., must practically have been contemporaries of the three last members of the Early Gupta line, Pura, Narasípa and Kumára II. And as Narasípa Báláditya is also called a king of Magadha (e. g., by Huien Ts’ang, see below), it is clear that Krishna and his immediate successors can only have been small princes or chiefs in Magadha, by the side of their imperial relatives. Similar remarks apply to the Later Guptas of Eastern Málava, Budhagupta and Bhánagupta.

There are two other references to Narasípnagupta, under his title of Báláditya, in two inscriptions of much later times. The first is the

* See the list in Fleet's volume III. of the Corpus Inscr. Ind., p. 205.
† See ibid., pp. 202, 203.
‡ See ibid., p. 212.
Deo-Barnaárk inscription of Jivitagupta II. of the Later Gupta dynasty. In this inscription Narasimhagupta is referred to as an emperor (par-

mesvara) who ruled long previously. The distance in time between Jivitagupta II. and Narasimhagupta would be about 200 years. The second is the Sáruñáth inscription of a certain king, Prakáñáditya of Benares, of the end of the seventh century A. D. Here Narasimhagupta is referred to as one of Prakáñáditya's early ancestors, and as the ruler of Madhyadeśa or the central portion of Northern India. This description would not be unsuitable to the ancestral portion of the dominions of the Early Guptas.

The historic truth of the new seal is also proved by the inscriptions on the copper-plate grants of the so-called Parivrájaka Mahárájjas, which were all issued during "the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings." The seal shows that the line of the Early Guptas was continued down to Kumáragupta II. The latter must be placed about A. D. 530-550, and the latest of the Parivrájaka grants is dated in A. D. 528. The earliest is dated in A. D. 475; therefore already in the reign of Puragupta (see below). They all fall within the period of the great decadence of the Gupta power; and this fact may possibly account for the circumstance, that in those grants the Guptas are simply designated by the vague term nripa 'king.' At the same time, Mr. Fleet's observation, * that "they show that ........... the Gupta dominion still continued, and the name of the Gupta kings was still recognised as a power, down to A. D. 528," is fully borne out by the new seal.

I add to these remarks, for ready reference, a synchronistic Table of the probable reigns of the Early Guptas and their contemporaries or immediate successors. The numbers within angular brackets give the known dates, derived from inscriptions and other sources. Various observations suggest themselves by this table.

For an approximate determination of the period of Puragupta and Narasimhagupta we have the following data. Hiuen Tsang relates, how Mihirákula was defeated and taken prisoner by king Báláditya of Magadha. † This reference,—there can hardly be a doubt,—is to Mihirá-
kula’s final overthrow in India; for, on being released by Báláditya, he is said to have retired to Kashmir. The credit of this great over-
throw, however, is ascribed to a king Yaśodharman in one of the latter’s Mandasar stone pillar inscriptions. ‡ In it it is stated that, at some time previous to the setting up of the pillar, Yaśodharman had subdued and extended his dominion over countries which even the Guptas and Húnas

---

‡ No. 33, in Fleet’s Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, p. 142.
had not possessed. This inscription is not dated, but its date cannot have been very different from that of another Mandasor stone inscription of Yasodharman,* dated in A. D. 533-534, because they were both engraved by the same person Govinda. In this inscription, it is stated that Yasodharman, who was originally only a tribal chieftain (jivendra or narādhīpātī), succeeded in conquering the countries around him and thus founded an empire, after which he took the name of Vishnuparvadhana and the imperial titles of rājadhirāja and parameśvara. Of these two inscriptions, the latter would seem to be—if anything—the later in date. In any case Mihirakula's overthrow would fall some time previously to A. D. 533; and it may be set down in A. D. 530, or perhaps even a little earlier.† It follows, that Bālāditya, in whose reign Mihirakula's overthrow took place, must have reigned down to about A. D. 530. The circumstance, that the overthrow is ascribed to both Bālāditya and Yasodharman, would seem to be best explained thus, that Bālāditya was, at least nominally, the paramount ruler or Emperor (Mālādhirāja), and that Yasodharman, at that time a mere 'tribal chieftain,' was one of his feudatories or lieutenants, who actually accomplished the defeat of Mihirakula, but thereupon took advantage of his great success to found an empire for himself. In fact, it was probably Yasodharman (rather than the Hūnas) that supplanted Kumāragupta II., some time after 530 A. D., thus finally breaking up the Early Gupta empire, and building up his own empire on its ruins.

On the other hand Skandagupta's earliest recorded date is A. D. 455. From this date down to A. D. 530 there are 75 years; and for this interval we have three names Skandagupta, Puragupta and Narasimhagupta. The interval can be more easily filled up by two generations including three reigns, than by two generations including only two reigns; i. e., by assuming that Skandagupta and Puragupta were brothers, succeeding one another and being themselves succeeded by Narasimhagupta. Skandagupta is known to have been still reigning in A. D. 466 or 468. He may have been succeeded by his (younger) brother Puragupta c. A. D. 470, and the latter, c. A. D. 485, by his son Narasimhagupta. This would give to Narasimhagupta the long reign of about 45

* No. 35, ibid., Vol. III, p. 150.
† In these calculations I follow, in the main, Mr. Fioe't's remarks, in Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 10-12 (Indrod.), 146, 152. But I do not agree with his view about Vishnuparvadhana, ibid., p. 151. (See Proceedings for August, 1889.) It seems to me better to accept the words, in l. 5 of the inscription, in their obvious sense that Yasodharman is identical with Vishnuparvadhana, and to suppose that Yasodharman assumed the title Vishnuparvadhana after (and perhaps in commemoration) of his great victory. It is most improbable that the imperial titles of rājadhirāja and parameśvara should be ascribed to a mere feudatory.
years, if he was still reigning in A. D. 530. There is, however, nothing at all improbable in this supposition.

Further, Narasimhagupta calls himself Bālāditya on his coins. We have seen that the Bālāditya of Hiuen Tsiang’s account reigned down to c. 530 A. D.; and that it is quite possible that the Narasimhagupta of the seal reigned down to that date. It may, therefore, be concluded as most probable that the Narasimhagupta of the seal is identical with the Nara Bālāditya of the coins as well as the Bālāditya of Magadha, by whom, or rather in whose reign Mihirakula was overthrown by Yaśodharman.

A curious glimpse of Narasimhagupta is afforded in a passing allusion, in connection with the Valabhi king Dronasīṃha, to his suzerain power, the Early Guptas. The early Valabhi rulers, as is well known, were vassals of the Early Guptas. The third of the Valabhi line was Dronasīṃha, a younger son of the founder of that line, Bhāṭārka Senāpati. Regarding this Dronasīṃha it is mentioned in the Valabhi genealogies that he “was anointed in the kingship by the paramount master (parama-svamin) in person” Mr. Fleet* has suggested that this “paramount master” was Yaśodharman, who defeated Mihirakula c. 530 A. D. Now Dhruvasena I. was reigning in 526, as shown by his inscription. Dronasīṃha was his predecessor; and his accession must, therefore, be placed c. 520 A. D. It is not probable that Yaśodharman was already in 520 A. D. an ‘emperor’ whose sway extended over the Valabhis. In fact, as I have tried to show, it is more probable, that in A. D. 530 he was still a mere ‘tribal chieftain’ and lieutenant of the emperor Narasimhagupta, and that his great power only dated from that victory over Mihirakula. On the other hand, about A. D. 520, Narasimhagupta must have still enjoyed the imperial dignity of the Guptas; and however much it may have been shorn of its ancient splendour, it was clearly still so much recognised by the Valabhis, that Dronasīṃha got himself “anointed” by the still existing representative of that power. It may be added that the simple reference to the parama-svamin or “paramount master” is more easily explainable if applied to the old accustomed suzerain power of the Guptas, than to a new emperor like Yaśodharman.

That notice about Dronasīṃha’s “being anointed by his paramount master” is a rather curious one. His two predecessors enjoyed only the title of senāpatī; he was the first of his house who bore the title of mahārāja (equal to mahāsenāpatī). The notice about his ‘anointment’ would seem to refer to his elevation to the higher rank of a Mahārāja.

The special occasion or reason for this elevation by the paramount power we are not told. But putting together the scattered historical indications of that period, it would seem that the distinction was due to a striking recovery in the fortunes of the Imperial Gupta dynasty which was mainly brought about by the exertions of the Valabhi feudatories. The circumstances are these. There are three inscriptions at Eran in Eastern Málava,* referring themselves respectively to the times of Budhagupta, Toramáña and Bháŋgupta. Budhagupta and Bháŋgupta were mere second rate rulers of Eastern Málava; but Toramáña possessed Eastern Málava as a portion of his imperial dominions; and his inscription is dated in the first year of his imperial power.† It may be concluded, that in that year neither Budhagupta nor Bháŋgupta possessed Eastern Málava. The dates of the inscriptions of these two Mahárájás are 484 A. D. and 510 A. D. The first year of Toramáña cannot well fall after 510 A. D.; for it can be shown‡ that Toramáña was already succeeded by his son Mihirakula c. A. D. 515, and possibly even a little earlier. Again it cannot fall before 484 A. D., because in that year there were living two princes Mátrivishña and his younger brother Dhanyavishña, the former of whom was dead in the first year of Toramáña. Nor can it fall before 494 A. D., because that is the last recorded date (on his coins) of Budhagupta. It follows that not only the first year of Toramáña’s imperial power, but also his loss of that power (so far, at least, as Eastern Málava was concerned) must fall within the period A. D. 494-510. Now this is just about the period of the Senápati Bhatarka, the first of the Valabhi dynasty, who must have ruled from c. 495-515 A. D. With regard to him it is expressly stated, in the Valabhi genealogical records,§ that he fought with and defeated the “Mátrakas,” that is, the Mihiras (a tribal designation of the Húnas) to whom Toramáña belonged. It may be concluded, therefore, that it was mainly owing to the Valabhi victories that Toramáña was beaten back and lost his imperial power. The immediate consequence of this success of the Valabhis would naturally have been the revival of the imperial power of the Guptas, that is, of Narasíŋhagupta who was on the throne of the Guptas at that time. The first year of Toramáña, say A. D. 495, would be the date of

* See Fleet, Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 88, 91, 158.
† See Fleet, ibid., Vol. III, p. 158. The first year, named in the inscription, is not the first year of Toramáña’s accession to rule over the Húna tribe, but of his assumption of the imperial dignity (mahádrájádhirajá) after his Indian conquests. See Fleet, ibid., Introd., pp. 10-12.
‡ See Fleet, ibid., Vol. III, Introd., p. 12; also Indian Antiquary, Vol. XV, p. 252.
the temporary subjection of the emperor Narasimhagupta, and of the assumption of the imperial dignity by Toramāṇa; and A. D. 510 may be taken as approximately the date of the liberation, by the Valabhi senāpati Bhūṭārka, of Narasimhagupta and the resumption by the latter of the imperial crown. And I would suggest, that the subsequent elevation, by Narasimhagupta, of the Valabhi Dronasimha, c. A. D. 520, to the rank of Mahārāja, was in some way an acknowledgment of the signal service rendered by the Valabhi family to the imperial house of the Guptas. Toramāṇa must have died soon after the great reverse he suffered at the hands of the Valabhīs. He was succeeded, c. A. D. 515, by his son Mihirakula, who undertook to recover his father's conquests, or, as Hiuen Tsang puts it in his account, "to punish the rebellion" of Narasimhagupta. For fifteen years, as shown by the Gwalior inscription,* he was successful in his operations, till at last, c. A. D. 530, he was totally defeated by the emperor Narasimhagupta's great vassal Yaśodharman. According to Hiuen Tsang, Mihirakula was taken prisoner in the battle and brought to Narasimhagupta. On the advice of the latter's mother, he was restored to liberty, but finding his chances in India utterly gone, he retired to Kashmir. This seems to me to have been the course of events in that troubled period of the irruption of the Huns into India.†

I should like to throw out another suggestion. In the list of kings of the Rājatarangini, there are five reigns enumerated between Matrīgupta and Durlabha I., if we omit the fabulous king Rāpalītya with his reign of 300 years. Durlabha I.'s accession may be placed in 626 A. D., allowing a probable adjustment of 30 years in the calculations of the Rājatarangini.‡ Calculating a reign at the usual average of about 18 years, we obtain for the accession of Matrīgupta about the year 530 A. D., i.e., the probable year of Mihirakula's retirement into Kashmir. I would suggest the identity of Matrīgupta and Mihirakula. There are many points in favour of the suggestion: 1, the epochs of the two kings coincide; 2, the name Matrīgupta means "protected by the mother," and according to Hiuen Tsang, Mihirakula owed his life to the intercession and protection of (Narasimhagupta) Bālāditya's mother; the name, therefore, would fit him admirably; 3, Matrīgupta is said to have

† It may be worth noting in connection with the irruption of the Huns into India in the 5th century, that it followed, by nearly a century, their irruption into Europe. The latter is said to have begun in 375 A. D., under their leader Balamir, and it was most successful under their leader Attila, A. D. 445-453. Their power was finally broken in the great battle on the Catalanian fields, A. D. 451; corresponding to the great victory of Yaśodharman (or Yaśovarman) in A. D. 550.
‡ See Sir A. Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, p. 92; also Jacobi in Gelehrte Gehleite Anzeigen for 1888, No. 2, p. 70.
been a stranger to Kashmir; so was Mihirakula; he is said to have been imposed on Kashmir by a king Vikramaditya, also called Harsha, of Ujjain, who is said to have been a powerful king who subdued the whole world and destroyed the Sakas, a Mlecchha tribe. This I take to be a confused version of the fact, that during the time of Narasimhagupta Bâlâtîyi, who afterwards allowed Mihirakula to proceed to Kashmir, the Hûnas (a Saka tribe) were defeated by Yasovarman, who afterwards made himself an “emperor.” Vikramâditya was a common title in the Guptâ family; Chandragupta II. and Skandagupta bore it; and the similar title Kramaditya was born by Skandagupta and Kumâragupta II. In the Râjatârangini either Bâlâtîya or Kumâragupta II. Kramaditya is referred to by Vikramaditya; and this Vikramâditya is said to have died before Mâtrignupa’s resignation of his kingdom. As Mâtrignupa is said to have resigned after a reign of about four years, and as on the assumption of his identity with Mihirakula, he became king of Kashmir about A. D. 530, Bâlâtîya must have died very soon after that year. According to the Râjatârangini, Vikramâditya had a son, Pratâpa-Sîlâditya, who was expelled by the people of Mâlava, but reinstated by king Pravarasena of Kashmir. Here, again, there is a confused version of certain facts. I take this Sîlâditya to be identical with the king Sîlâditya of Mâlava, who, according to Huen Tsiang, had lived 60 years before his own time, and who had reigned for 50 years.* As Huen Tsiang was in Mâlava in A. D. 640, the period of Sîlâditya’s reign is fixed as from about A. D. 580-589. He is commonly identified with the unnamed ‘monarch’ who is, by Huen Tsiang, said to have succeeded Vikramâditya of Srâvasti; and this Vikramâditya himself is commonly identified with the Vikramâditya of Mâlava, above mentioned.† According to Huen Tsiang, Vikramâditya “lost his kingdom” and was succeeded by the unnamed “monarch”, i. e., by Sîlâditya. I would suggest that Kumâragupta II. Kramaditya is intended by Vikramâditya, who lost his kingdom by the usurpation of Yasodharman; and that Sîlâditya is one of the surnames of Yasodharman. The latter, in his inscription (see above) is called, at first, only a vârajihpâti, which would agree with the “monarch” of Huen Tsiang. The times also agree; Yasodharman Sîlâditya must have usurped the imperial dignity soon after A. D. 530. He would then have reigned about 50 years, down to about A. D. 580. Throughout the whole of his reign (compare columns 5 and 8 of the synchronistic table), he had rivals for his claim of the imperial dignity in the Maukharî Varmans, till the dignity was finally secured by Prabhadhara Vardhana who had

the surname of Pratápaśila. According to Hiuen Tsiang the Valabhi king Dhruvasena II. (or Dhruvapata),* who became king about A. D. 625, was his nephew (i. e., probably sister's son). All this agrees well enough. That Vikramáditya (i. e., Kumáragupta II.) is described as "king of Srávastí" need be no difficulty. Kumáragupta's seal was found at Bhitarí, in the Gházípur District of the N.-W. Provinces; and Srávastí may well have been the favourite residence of that emperor. Of course, if my suggestions are accepted, the narrative in the Rája-
tarangíñi is a confused, and even grotesque, perversión of the real facts. Síláditya is said to have been a son of Vikramáditya; this is a confused reminiscence of the fact, that Báláditya (i. e., Narasimhagupta) had a son Kumáragupta II. Kramáditya;—Síláditya is said to have been ex-
pelled by the people of Málava; but it was Kumáragupta that was "expelled," i. e., rebelled against by Yaśodharman (Síláditya);—Síláditya is called Pratápaśila; but the latter was the surname of Síláditya's rival, Prabhákara Vardhana;—Síláditya Pratápaśila is said to have been seven times subdued by the king of Kashmir; very possibly the king of Kashmir had to carry on several campaigns against both Síláditya (Yaśodharman) and Pratápaśila (Prabhákara Vardhana), both of whom aspired to be "emperors" or "rulers of the whole world." The Rája-
tarangíñi's account of Mátirigupta is still more grotesque. It makes Mátrigupta to be a poor "poet,"† and finally resign his kingdom and retire to Benares, like a good Hindú! But it hardly needs an excuse for charging the "history" of the Rája-
tarangíñi with grotesqueness. The utter untrustworthiness of it down to the time of the Karkota dynasty (Durjábha Vardhana I.), is, I believe, now generally acknowledged. Its treatment of Mihirakula, who under that name is placed at B. C. 707,‡ and of Toramáña and Hirayakula, is the most glaring evidence of it.

I add a sketch of what seems to me to have been the fortunes of the imperial dignity during the periods immediately before and after the Húqa troubles. I have shown them in the synchronistic table by printing in red the names of those princes that bore the imperial title of Mahá-
rájádhíraja. From Chandragupta I. down to Kumáragupta II., c. A. D. 300-533, the imperial dignity remained with the house of the Early Guptas. Under Narasimhagupta, c. A. D. 495, it was disputed by the Húqa chief Toramáña. About 533 A. D., under Kumáragupta II., it passed away to Yaśodharman.§ From him, it passed, for a period of four

* See íbid., Vol. II, p. 207.
† Perhaps a confusion with the poet Meṣṭha (or Mátirmeṣṭha?) who is said to have lived at his court.
§ Evidence of Yaśodharman's or Yaśovarman's imperial power are his coins

N
reigns, from c. A. D. 540 to 585, to the Maukhari dynasty, under Iśāna-varman, Sarvavarman, Susthitavarman and Avantivarman. Three of these Varmans, Iśāna, Sarva and Avanti, receive the imperial titles, mahārājādhirāja or paramesvara in two inscriptions.* Susthita is named in an inscription of the Later Guptas without any particular title;† but if he is not identical with Avautivarman—which is quite possible—he must, in all probability, have been a Mahārājādhirāja, as the intermediate ruler between two Mahārājādhirājas (see column 8). That Susthita does not receive that title in the Gupta inscription is no objection; for neither does Iśāna receive it; the inscription, being one of the Later Guptas, who were a rival family, probably denied the imperial title to the Maukharis as usurpers.‡

From the Maukharis the imperial dignity passed to the Vardhana dynasty of Thanesar and Kanauj, for three reigns, under Prabhākara, Rājya and the great Harsha, from c. A. D. 585 to 648, though at some time between A. D. 613 and 634 it was disputed by the Early Chalukya king Pulikēśa II.§ After Harsha Vardhana the imperial dignity appears to have been held simultaneously in the West by the Valabhīs of Gujarāt (commencing with Dharasena IV., c. A. D. 645) and in the East by the Later Guptas of Magadhā (commencing with Adityasena, c. A. D. 648). In the case of the Valabhīs, the assumption of the imperial dignity would seem, at first, to have been a temporary one. For after Dharasena IV., who enjoyed it from c. A. D. 645-650, it lapsed again, for about 20 years, during the two following reigns of Dhruvasena III. and Kharagraha II., neither of whom seem to have borne any imperial titles, perhaps owing to the rival emperor's, Adityasena's, ascendency. About A. D. 670, however, Sīlāditya III. again became emperor of the West, and henceforth the imperial dignity remained with these two.

with the legend of kida (see Proceedings for August, 1888). Kida would appear to be a tribal designation of the Hānas.

* See Fleet, in Corp. Insr. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 218, 221.
† See ibid., p. 206.
‡ It may be a question whether Yasovarman or Yasodharman did not himself belong to a branch of the Maukhari family of Varmans. There is nothing in Yasodharman's inscriptions to prove that he belonged to the Mālava tribes. His relation to the four imperial Maukhars requires further elucidation. If, as above suggested, he is identical with the Sīlāditya, who according to Hien Tsang reigned 50 years, he must have been a contemporary and rival of the four imperial Maukhāras. The contemporary inscription of Asphand would certainly seem to show, that the latter did not enjoy an undisputed title to the imperial dignity.
§ He assumed the imperial title paramesvara after a thorough defeat of Harsha Vardhana; see Indian Antiquary, Vol. VII, p. 164. He had not done so before A. D. 613, nor was it after A. D. 634; see ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 210.
dynasties of the Later Guptas and the Valabhīs, apparently, till their respective extinction. Perhaps the coincidence of Jīvita Gupta II., the last of the Later Imperial Guptas, with the Nepalese king Sīva Deva II., who assumed the imperial titles, may have a deeper significance. For it may be noted, that about A. D. 648, at the time of the disruption of Harsha’s empire, the Nepalese king, Aṃśuvarman, also laid claim to the imperial dignity in the North.

Tho Devagupta, placed in the third column of the synchronistic table, under the Later Guptas of Mālava, is mentioned in the copper-plate grant of Harshavardhana,* as having been conquered by that king’s brother and predecessor, Rājyavardhana II. He cannot be the Devagupta of the Later Gupta dynasty of Magadha (2nd column), as Harshavardhana himself was a contemporary of MālHAVAGUPTA, the grandfather of that Devagupta. Moreover it is distinctly stated in the Harsha-charita of Kiśa, that the prince whom Rājyavardhana conquered, was a king of Mālava.†

In the seventh column of the Uchchakalpa Mahārājas it will be seen, that Sārvanātha reigned up to A. D. 533. His line, including himself, consists of six members; and the founder of the line, Oghadeva, was married to a queen Kumāradevi. Six reigns at an average of 18 years, would make Oghadeva (c. A. D. 425-445) a contemporary of Kumāragupta I. of the Early Gupta dynasty. It appears, probable, therefore, that Oghadeva’s queen, Kumāradevi, was a sister or daughter of Kumāragupta I.‡

* See Epigraphy Indica, Part II, p. 74.
‡ Mr. Fleet in the Corpus Insr. Ind., Introd., pp. 9, 16, suggests that the Uchchakalpa dates may have to be referred to the Kalachuri era. I do not understand how this could well be. Mr. Fleet says: “if the Uchchakalpa dates were referred to the Kalachuri era, with General Cunningham’s epoch of A. D. 249-50, Sārvanātha’s latest date, the year 214, would be equivalent to A. D. 463-64, or Gupta Saṃvat 144; and we should have to add on twenty-one years at the end of his known period, in order to make him the contemporary of Hastin in Gupta Saṃvat 163.” But the crucial year appears to me to be not Gupta Saṃvat 163, but Gupta Saṃvat 180 (see ibid., p. 110). For the joint-grant of Hastin and Sārvanātha was issued in the latter year. It follows, therefore, that we should have to add on, not twenty-one, but forty-five years; or if the epoch of the Kalachuri era be A. D. 248-49, even forty-six years. On the other hand, if the Kalachuri epoch be placed, as Mr. Fleet suggests, about 25 years later, let us say at A. D. 273-74 (i.e., 248-49 + 25), then Sārvanātha’s latest date 214 Kalachuri Saṃvat will be equivalent to 169 Gupta Saṃvat; and in that case we should have to add on twenty-one years, in order to make Sārvanātha contemporary with Hastin in the year 180 Gupta Saṃvat. I assume, that when Mr. Fleet (ibid., p. 111) says: “the choice lies only between Gupta Saṃvat 180 and 201,” he means, that the only two years within the known period of Hastin’s rule
The question may arise whether the Kumáragupta referred to in the Mandasor stone inscription of Bandhuvarman,* may not be the Kumáragupta II. of the Bhitari seal, rather than the Kumáragupta I., the only Gupta emperor of that name hitherto known. If it be Kumáragupta II., the three Varmaus, Nara, Višva and Bandhu, would have to be brought down nearly a century, so that Bandhuvarman would be the immediate predecessor of Yaśodharman (or Yaśovarman). I am disposed to think, however, that it is really Kumáragupta I. who is referred to in that inscription.

The metal of the seal has been tested by Dr. Scully of the Calcutta Mint. His analysis shows that it consists of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>62.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>36.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Trace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of its whitish grey colour, therefore, it is rather a copper than a silver seal.

The weight and dimensions of the seal have been determined by the

(i.e., between G. S. 156 and 191 or A. D. 475 and 510), with which the data of the joint-grant (i.e., the 19th day of the month Kārttika, in the Mahā-Māgha Samvatsara) can be made to harmonise, are G. S. 189 and 201 or A. D. 508 and 520. If this is so, the data of the joint-grant is practically certain: it is either A. D. 508-9 or A. D. 520-21, whether these years be stated in terms of the Gupta Samvat (189 or 201) or in terms of the Kalachuri Samvatsar (260 and 272). Upon these premises, there are these two alternatives: firstly, if we accept the year A. D. 248-49 (or 249-50) as the Kalachuri epoch, the known period of S'arvanātha begins with Kalachuri Samvat 193, equivalent to A. D. 441-42, and he must have reigned not less than 67 years, to bring him down to A. D. 508 (= K. S. 260 or G. S. 189) to join Hastin in the issue of the grant; and he must have reigned 79 years, to bring him down to A. D. 520 (= K. S. 272 or G. S. 201), if the latter be the year of the joint-grant. Neither of these two cases will be considered admissible. Secondly, if, as Mr. Fleet suggests, the Kalachuri epoch be placed about 25 years later, say A. D. 473-74, the beginning of S'arvanātha's known period will be A. D. 436-67, and he must have reigned either 42 or 54 years, according as we place the joint-grant in A. D. 508 or in A. D. 520. Either of these two latter cases is possible, especially the former, requiring a rule of (at least) 42 years. But there is no real evidence whatever for the assignment of the Kalachuri epoch to the year A. D. 473-74 or thenceabouts. The result is, that the probability of the Uchchakalpa grants being dated in years of the Kalachuri era appears to be nil. My premises may be founded on a misunderstanding; if so, Mr. Fleet will be able to explain the real facts of the case. But I thought it well to state my doubts, which may have occurred to others beside myself.

* See Fleet, in Corpus Insocr. Ind., Vol. III, p. 79.
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Section I. Introduction.

When the wearied veterans of "the great Emathian conqueror", laden with plunder and sated with conquest, refused to cross the Hyphasis and to try the fortune of war in the valley of the Ganges, the exclusive, conservative East won a victory over the intruding, progressive West, which must have appeared to the actors on the scene as final and decisive.

But it was neither final nor decisive, for, though the obstacles opposed by hostile man and nature could stop the onward march of the Macedonian phalanx, nothing could arrest the sure and world-wide progress of the ideas and culture, which constituted the real strength of Hellas and were but rudely expressed by the disciplined array of Alexander's armies.

India has not willingly sought the treasures of foreign wisdom, and, guarded by her encircling seas and mountains, she has tried, throughout the long course of ages, to work out her own salvation. She has tried, but has not succeeded. Again and again, both before and after Alexander, the barriers have been broken through, and her children, who would
fain believe that all light comes from the east, have been compelled to admit the rays of the western sun.

In the dim mist of prehistoric ages we can discern faint indications that India, in common with all regions of Asiatic and European civilization, drew supplies from those stores of Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian antique lore, which were, so far as we know or probably ever can know, the ultimate sources of the knowledge which distinguishes civilized man from the savage.

The history of those long past times is lost, and, save perhaps in some faintly sketched and dubious outlines, can never be recovered.

The Indian expedition of Alexander the Great in B. C. 327—326 was, so far as our definite knowledge extends, the first occasion of close, conscious contact between East and West. The arms of the conqueror, it is true, subdued no more than a mere corner of India, and that only for a moment, but the Hellenic culture, to the diffusion of which Alexander devoted attention, as great as that bestowed by him on his material conquests, long survived his transitory empire in Asia, and, even in secluded India, made its presence felt in many and different directions.

I shall not attempt to penetrate the thick darkness which conceals the relations between India and the western world in the ages before Alexander, but propose to consider the kind and degree of post-Alexandrian influence on the ancient civilization of India, and to invite my readers’ attention to an obscure and little known chapter in the ever-interesting history of Greek ideas.

The working of these ideas on Indian soil, although discernible in the fields of religion, poetry, science and philosophy, is most obvious in the domain of architecture and plastic art, and I shall devote the greater part of this essay to the consideration of Indo-Hellenic architecture and sculpture.

No Indian example in stone either of architecture or sculpture, earlier than the reign of Aśoka (circa B. C. 260—223), has yet been discovered, and the well-known theory of Mr. Fergusson, that the sudden introduction of the use of stone instead of wood for the purposes both of architecture and sculpture in India was the result of communication between the empire of Alexander and his successors, and that of the Mauryan dynasty of Chandra Gupta and Aśoka, is, in my opinion, certainly correct. The change from wood to stone indubitably took place, and no other explanation has ever been suggested.

I shall not, however, now discuss Mr. Fergusson’s theory, but shall proceed to examine particular cases of undoubted and incontestable Hellenistic, including Roman, influence on the Indian development of the arts of architecture and sculpture.
A brief discussion of the more prominent effects of the contact between the Greco-Roman and Indian civilizations on other departments of human activity in India will follow, and will enable the reader to form a conception as a whole of the impression made by the West upon the East during a period of seven or eight centuries. That impression was not sufficiently deep to stamp Indian art, literature and science with an obviously European character, although it was much deeper than is commonly supposed.

Section II. Indo-Hellenic Architecture.

The style of architecture, appropriately named Indo-Persian by Sir Alexander Cunningham, and obviously derived from that employed in the Achaemenian palaces of Susa and Persepolis, was extensively used throughout Northern and Western India for several centuries both before and after the Christian era. With this style of western, though not Hellenic, origin the history of Indian architecture begins. It would be more strictly accurate to say that with this style the history of Indian architectural decoration begins, for no buildings in it exist, and we know its character only from pillars and miniature representations in sculptured reliefs.

The pillars are characterized by "a bell-shaped lower capital, surmounted by an upper member formed of recumbent animals, back to back."* The series of examples in Northern India, of pillars more or less fully corresponding to this definition, begins with the monoliths of Aśoka (circa B. C. 250), and ends with the pillar of Budha Gupta at Fara in the Sāgar District of the Central Provinces, which bears an inscription dated in the year A. D. 485.† The caves of Western India offer examples apparently rather later, and specimens of intermediate dates have been found at Bhārhat, Buddha Gayā, Sānci, Beṣā, and Mathurā, as well as in the Gāndhāra or Yūṣufzai country. But there is no evidence as yet forthcoming that Indo-Persian pillars were used structurally in Gāndhāra. In miniature, as architectural decorations, they were a favourite ornament in that region.

The Indo-Persian pillar underwent gradual modifications in India Proper, with which I am not at present concerned. On the north-west frontier of India, that is to say, in the western districts of the Panjāb, in the valley of the Kābul River, including Gāndhāra or the Yūṣufzai country, and in Kāshmir, it was supplanted by pillars imitated from

* Cunningham, Archaeol. Rep., Vol. V, p. 185. [For a convenient synopsis of specimen pillars of the Persian, Indo-Persian, Indo-Hellenic (Corinthian) and Indo-Doric styles, see ibid., Plates XXVII, and XLV to L. Ed.]
† All the Gupta dates are determined in Mr. Fleet's work on the Gupta Inscriptions, Corpus Inscrip. Indicarum, Vol. III.
Greek models. Isolated examples of Indo-Hellenic pillars probably existed in other regions also, associated with the specimens of Hellenized sculpture which occur at Mathurā and some other localities remote from the Panjāb frontier, but, as yet, none such have been discovered, and, speaking generally, the Hydaspes or Jhelam river may be assigned as the eastern boundary of Indo-Hellenic architectural forms.

The evidence does not, to my mind, warrant the use of the term "Indo-Greek styles of architecture," which is employed by Sir A. Cunningham. So far as I can perceive, the published plans of Indian buildings show no distinct traces of Greek ideas, and there is no evidence of the employment of the characteristic Greek pediment or entablatures. The known facts prove only that the Indians used, in buildings planned after their own fashion, pillars copied, with modifications, from Greek prototypes.

In the outlying province of Kāshmīr and the dependent region of the Salt Range a modified form of the Doric pillar was employed. The earliest example of the use of this form is found in the temple of the sun at Mārtaṇḍ, which was erected not earlier than A. D. 400, and perhaps should be dated two or three centuries later. Temples in a style similar to that of Mārtaṇḍ appear to have continued to be erected in Kāshmīr down to the time of the Muhammadan conquest of the valley. They are characterized by trofoiled arches, and pyramidal roofs, and were frequently, if not always, built in the centre of shallow tanks. These peculiarities are in no wise Greek. The pillars undoubtedly, as Sir A. Cunningham observes, resemble the Grecian Doric in "the great ovol of the capital, and in the hollow flutes of the shaft." It is difficult to believe that the agreement in these respects between the Greek and Indian work is accidental, but it is also difficult to imagine the existence of a channel through which the Kashmirians borrowed the Doric form of pillar at a time when every other manifestation of Hellenic ideas had already disappeared, or was on the point of disappearing, from India.

I cannot venture to deny the Greek origin of the semi-Doric pillars of the temples in Kāshmīr, although I am not satisfied that it is fully established. Even if it be admitted, the admission is hardly sufficient to warrant the assertion that the Kashmirian buildings are examples of an Indo-Doric style. The most that can be correctly affirmed is, that these buildings contain pillars which may fairly be described as Indo-Doric. These Indo-Doric pillars, if there be indeed anything Doric about them, are never associated with Indo-Hellenic sculpture, or anything else which gives the slightest indication of Greek influence. The Kāshmīr style stands apart, and the study of it throws little light either on the history of Indian architecture, or on that of the diffusion of Greek ideas. I shall, therefore, exclude it from consideration, and
refer readers who may care for further information on the subject to the discussion of it by Mr. Fergusson and Sir A. Cunningham, and to the fine series of plates prepared under the supervision of Major Cole.*

But, whether the pillars of the Kāshmīr temples be really derived from Doric prototypes or not, there is no doubt whatever that pillars, the designs of which are modifications of the Ionic and Corinthian types, were common on the north-west frontier of India during the early centuries of the Christian era.

These Greek architectural forms have as yet been found only in a very limited area, which may be conveniently referred to under the name of Gāndhāra.†

The boundaries of the kingdom of Gāndhāra, as it existed in ancient times, are known with approximate accuracy. Hiuen Tsiang, who travelled between A. D. 629 and 645, describes the kingdom as extending about 166 miles (1000 li) from east to west, and 133 miles (800 li) from north to south, with the Indus as its eastern boundary: The great city of Purushapura, now known as Peshāwar, was then the capital.‡ The earlier Chinese traveller, Fa Hian (A. D. 400—405), assigns the same position to the kingdom of Gāndhāra, though he describes its boundaries with less particularity.§

The region referred to by both Chinese pilgrims may be described in general terms as the lower valley of the Kābul river. It is very nearly identical with the territory to the north-east of Peshāwar, now inhabited by the Afghan clan, known as the Yāsufzai or Sons of Joseph, which comprises the independent hilly districts of Swāt and Bahuer, as well as the plain bounded on the east by the Indus, on the north by the hills, and on the south and west respectively by the Kābul and Swāt rivers. This plain, which is attached to the Peshāwar District, and administered by British officers, corresponds to the tract known to the Greeks as Penkelonitis (Sanskrit Pushkalivatī), the capital of which occupied the site of the modern Hashtnagar, eighteen miles north of Peshāwar.||

* Major Cole's book is entitled *Illustrations of Ancient Buildings in Kāshmīr*, (London, Indin Museum, 1869). His plates are good, but his remarks on the dates of the buildings illustrated would have been better omitted. Mr. Fergusson discusses the style in his *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*. Sir A. Cunningham described it in the Journal, Asiatic Society, Bengal, for 1848, and recurs to the subject in *Archaeol. Reps.*, Vol. V, pp. 84-90, Platos XXVI, XXVII; Vol. XIV, p. 35, Pl. XV.

† Sanskrit authority warrants either a long or short vowel in the first syllable of the name.


§ Fa Hian, *Travels*, Chapter X, in either Beal's or Legge's translation.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the name Gandhāra is applicable only to a small territory west of the Indus.

But the great city of Taxila, (Takkhasilā, or Takshasilā, the modern Shāh ki Dheri), situated three marches, or about thirty miles, east of the Indus, was undoubtedly, in the time of Alexander the Great, the chief city on the north-western frontier of India, and must have been then, as it subsequently was in the reigns of Asoka and Kanishka, included in the dominions of the government which ruled Gandhāra. Kanishka is expressly called the king of Gandhāra.*

The vast Buddhist religious establishments at Māni kyāla, about thirty miles south-east of Taxila, belonged to the same jurisdiction, and at both places remains are found of that Indo-Hellenic school of art, which attained its chief development in Gandhāra west of the Indus. The name of Gandhāra, as indicating an artistic and architectural province, may, therefore, be extended, as it was by Mr. Fergusson, so as to comprise the modern districts of Peshāwar and Rāwalpindi, including Taxila and Māni kyāla, as far east as the Hydaspes or Jhelam river. When speaking of the art of Gandhāra I must be understood as employing the name in its wider sense.

The upper valley of the Kābul river was full of Buddhist buildings, many of which have been explored by Masson and others, and was included in the dominions of Kanishka and his successors. But, so far as the published accounts show, this region was only slightly affected by Hellenic influences, and it must, for the present at all events, be considered as outside the artistic province of Gandhāra.

The Gandhāra territory, the situation of which has thus been defined, was the principal seat of Hellenic culture in India, and from one or other part of it nearly all the known examples of Indo-Hellenic art in its most characteristic forms have been obtained. Traces of Greek and Roman teaching may be detected in the remains at many localities in northern and western India, but nowhere with such distinctness as in the lower valley of the Kābul river. The Gandhāra school of art obviously deserves, though it has not yet obtained, a place in the general history of Greek architecture and sculpture, and this cannot be said of the other early Indian schools.

At Bhārhat, Sānchi, Buddha Gayā, Ajantā, and Amarāvatī proofs may be given that the local style of art was modified by contact with

* A full account of the ruins of Taxila will be found in Cunningham, *Archæol. Rep.,* Vol. II, pp. 112, seqq.; Vol. V, pp. 60, seqq., and Vol. XIV, pp. 9, seqq. Fax Hian states that Dharma Vardhana (or Vivardhana, as Dr. Leggo writes the name), son of Asoka, ruled in Gandhāra, and, according to another legend, the stūpa in memory of Asoka's son Kunāla was situated south-east of Taxila, (Cunningham, *Archæol. Rep.,* Vol. II, p. 149.)
that of the western world, but the evidence does not lie upon the surface. In the remains of the buildings and sculptures of Gándhára the merest tyro can perceive at a glance that the style of art is in the main Greek or Roman, not Indian.*

* The principal references to published notices of the Gándhára school of art are as follows:—

(1) *Notes on some sculptures found in the District of Peshwávar.* By E. C. Bayley. With several rudo lithographs. *Journal As. Soc., Bengal,* Vol. XXI (1852), pp. 606–621. The sculptures described in this paper were collected at Jamálgarhi by Messrs. Lumaden and Stokes, and were destroyed by the fire at the Crystal Palace.

(2) *Indian Antiquary,* (Bombay), Vol. III, pp. 143, 159.

(3) *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture.* By James Ferguson.

(4) *Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India,* Vol. V. *By Sir A. Cunningham.* Volume II of the same series gives information concerning Taxila. See also Vol. XIV, p. 31, Pl. XIV.

(5) *Descriptive List of the Principal Buddhist Sculptures in the Lahore Museum,* p. 11. This list, kindly supplied to me by the Curator, contains brief particulars of 93 specimens, of which 32 are marked with an asterisk, as being either "in exceptionally good preservation, or interesting from their subjects." The list is signed by Sir A. Cunningham, but is not dated. Two specimens are noted as coming from Sahri Bahol, and one is stated to have been obtained in the fortress of Ráñigat, but no other indication is given of the localities from which the sculptures were obtained.

I have not been able to procure a "Memorandum by Mr. Baden-Powell on the sculptures in the Lahore Museum," which is referred to by Sir A. Cunningham, *Archaeol. Rep.,* Vol. V, p. 55, note 1.

(6) *Catalogue and Handbook of the Archaeological Collections in the Indian Museum.* By John Anderson, M. D., F. R. S., etc. Part I, Calcutta, 1883. 201 Indo-Hellenic objects are described, *viz.,* 177 arranged under the heading Gándhára, 18 under Peshwávar, two under Mathurá, and one each under Hazárá, Kábúl, miscellaneous, and Bihár.

(7) *Memorandum on Ancient Monuments in Eusufzai (sic).* By Major Cole; being part of the Second Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India, pp. CXIV, seq. This document was separately reprinted at the Government Central Branch Press, Simla, 1883. It is illustrated by rough lithographic plates, comprising all the subjects subsequently treated by the heliogravure process, as well as by a map of the Yúsufzai country, and eleven other plans and sketches.


(9) *The Buddhist Statues of Amaravati and Jaggayapeta.* By James Burgess, C. T. E., etc, *Archaeological Survey of Southern India.* Trübner, London, 1887. This work does not describe the sculptures, but some good specimens of them are figured in woodcuts Nos. 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, 23, 24, and 26, which are copied from the illustrated edition of Sir F. Arnold's *Light of Asia.*

(10) *Alt- und Neu-Indische Kunstgegenstände aus Professor Laitners jüngster*
No indication of a knowledge of the Doric order of architecture can be detected in the remains of the buildings of Gáñdhára. With two exceptions, the only Greek architectural form used is a modification of the Corinthian pillar and pilaster.

The two exceptions both occur to the east of the Indus, outside the limits of Gáñdhára proper.

On the site of Taxila Sir A. Cunningham disinterred the remains of a Buddhist temple, the portico of which was supported on four massive sandstone pillars of the Ionic order. Similar, though smaller, pillars were found in the interior of the building. No part of the larger pillars was discovered, except their bases. The mouldings of these bases are said to correspond exactly with those of the pure Attic base, as seen in the Erechtheum at Athens, the only difference being the greater projection of the fillet below the upper torus in the Indian example.

Portions of the shafts and capitals of the smaller pillars were found. The shafts are circular in section and plain. The capitals were made of nodular limestone, and appear to have been plastered and gilded. They agree generally in form with Greek, not Roman, models, but are ruder and more primitive in style, and are specially distinguished from all


The specimens of the Gáñdhára school of art preserved in museums are very numerous. The principal collection is that in the Lahore Museum. It is very extensive, numbering many hundred objects, but seems to be badly arranged. I have not seen it. The collection next in importance is that in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Dr. Anderson's carefully compiled Catalogue gives a good idea of its contents. Major Colo intended to send spare specimens to the museums at Bombay, Madras, and some other places, which were, I suppose, sent.

In London the best collection, though not an extensive one, is that which occupies cases Nos 1—7 in the Asiatic Saloon of the British Museum. The South Kensington collection is officially described as comprising 24 sculptures in stone, and 49 plaster casts from originals in the Lahore Museum, presented by Sir R. Egerton in 1882. When I examined the specimens in 1888, they were exhibited partly in a glass case, partly on a detached screen, and the rest on a wall screen. Dr. Leitner's collection at Woking comprises some original sculptures and a considerable number of casts from the works in the Lahore Museum. It is described in the printed Catalogue above cited.

The Museum at Vienna contains some specimens presented by Dr. Leitner, and many examples of the work of the school are believed to exist in private hands both in Europe and India. Sir A. Cunningham possesses a valuable series of photographs of the more remarkable sculptures. Mr. Kipling, Curator of the Lahore Museum, informs me that he intends to arrange for the publication of a set of photographs of Indó-Hellenic art. The specimens in the possession of Mr. L. White King, B. C. S., will be noticed subsequently.
known Greek examples by the excessive weight and height of the abscons."

The employment of stucco to conceal the roughness of the limestone and to facilitate the execution of the moulding reminds us of the temple of Fortuna Virilis at Rome, where the same expedient was used to complete the decorative work on Ionic capitals made of rugged travertine.†

Sir A. Cunningham subsequently discovered among the ruins of Taxila in another temple the bases and portions of the drums of two Ionic pillars, differing slightly in detail from those above described.§

These two buildings are the only known examples of the use of the Ionic form of pillar in India.

The rude style of the capitals in the building first discovered—the only ones yet found—might suggest the fancy that the Taxilan temples preserve specimens of the primitive Ionic order in its Asiatic form, before it was developed by Greek skill. But the evidence of the comparatively late date of the temple adorned by these rude capitals is too clear to allow indulgence in such a notion. The building cannot, apparently, be earlier than B. C. 20 or 30, the approximate date of king Azes, twelve of whose coins were lifted out by Sir A. Cunningham with his own hand from their undisturbed resting place below the floor of the sanctum, and under the corner of a platform which had supported a number of plaster Buddhist statues.§ The date of the temple may therefore be assigned roughly to the beginning of the Christian era, at which time, it need not be said, the Ionic order had long been fully developed. The question of date will be considered more fully in a later section.

The Taxilan temples with Ionic pillars were, like all the known examples of Indo-Hellenic architecture, dedicated to the service of the Buddhist religion. Sir A. Cunningham gives a plan of the one first discovered, from which it appears that the whole edifice was 91 feet long by 64 feet broad, standing on a platform, which projected about 15 feet beyond the walls on all sides except the east, forming a terrace adorned with plaster statues. It is supposed that this terrace was roofed in as a cloister. The entrance was on the east, in the centre of one of the larger sides, through a portico supported on four Ionic columns. This portico led into an entrance hall, 39$\frac{1}{2}$ feet long from north to south, by 15$\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad from east to west. The sanctum or cella of the temple lay behind this, with a length of 79 feet from north to south,

† Burn, *Roman Literature and Art*, p. 204.
‡ Cunningham, *Archæol. Rep.*, Vol. XIV, p. 9, Pl. VII.
and a breadth of 23\frac{1}{2} feet from east to west. This room, except at the wide doorway, was surrounded by a bench 4 feet 8\frac{1}{2} inches broad, and 2 feet high, which supported plaster statues of Buddha, with his hands either resting on his lap or raised in the attitude of teaching. It is remarkable that the hair of these figures was rendered by the conventional curls, which are so commonly associated in later times with Buddhist and Jain art. Unluckily no drawings or photographs of these plaster figures have been published, and it is impossible to say whether they were coeval with the Ionic pillars or not. I should not have expected to find plaster statues at the beginning of the Christian era, and I suspect that the images are of considerably later date than the pillars.

Sir A. Cunningham believes that the roof was constructed mainly of wood, and that the chambers were lighted by windows in the upper part of the walls, which projected above the roof of the surrounding cloister. He conjectures that the four portico pillars “must have been intended to support a vaulted roof presenting a pointed arch gable to the front, as in the smaller chapels across the Indus.” A small room, 20 feet 1\frac{1}{2} inch long by 15\frac{3}{4} feet broad, communicated with each end of the entrance hall.

The reader will not fail to observe that the plan and elevation of this temple have little in common with those of Greek temples.

I agree with Sir A. Cunningham and Mr. Fergusson in regarding the buildings with Ionic pillars at Taxila as the oldest architectural remains yet discovered in the Gândhára province, and I shall subsequently attempt to show that a considerable interval separates them from the numerous edifices characterized by a lavish use of Corinthian pillars and pilasters.

The fact that the Corinthian pillars and pilasters were used, much in the same way as they are in many modern European buildings, for decorative purposes applied to buildings of native design, and not as members of an “order” in the technical sense, is clearly proved by the manner in which Indo-Persian and Indo-Corinthian forms are employed together. No styles can be more diverse than these, and yet the Gândhára architects felt no scruples about employing them both in the one building, or even in the one sculpture. The first plate in Major Cole’s set of beautiful heliogravures affords a good illustration of this purely decorative use of two diverse styles. The subject of the plate is an alto-rilievo of the seated Buddha embellished by numerous minor figures and architectural decorations. The latter chiefly consist of combinations of Indo-Persian pillars with plain “Buddhist railings” and ogee-shaped façades, while the pilasters at the lower corners of the slab have acanthus leaf capitals in the Indo-Corinthian style. This sculpture was probably executed in the third century A. D.
Although there is no reason to suppose that the Gândhâra buildings adorned with Corinthian pillars were Greek or Roman in plan or elevation, the remains excavated, especially those at Jamâlgârhi, prove that such pillars, both circular and square in section, were used for structural support, as well as for sculptural decoration.

No piece of Corinthian shaft has yet been discovered. The testimony of the sculptures is not conclusive, but, so far as we can judge from the miniature pillars and pilasters in the reliefs, the shafts were plain, not fluted.

The incomplete lower parts of the bases of two structural pillars have been found, and a comparison of their dimensions with those of the pillars in the famous choragic monument of Lysicrates at Athens (B. C. 334) has satisfied Sir A. Cunningham that the Indian examples differ from the Greek standard "solely in giving an inward slope to the perpendicular narrow fillet which separates the scotia and torus.

"In both the Indian examples it will also be observed that the torus, or round projecting moulding, is thickly foliated, like that of most of the Corinthian bases. Of the upper part of the base not even a fragment has yet been found; and the representations in the bas-reliefs do not offer any assistance, as they show only one large and one small torus, separated by an astragal, and altogether want the deeply marked scotia which forms the leading characteristic of the Corinthian base, and which is carefully preserved in both of the full-sized Indian specimens."

The foliation referred to is not found on the bases of the pillars of the monument of Lysicrates, and is, I think, purely Roman decoration. I shall subsequently give reasons for dating the Gândhâra pillars between A. D. 250 and 350, and for holding that all the Indian buildings adorned with Corinthian pillars were constructed under the influence of Roman art. The remains of structural Indo-Corinthian capitals, found chiefly at Jamâlgârhi and Takht-i-Bahi, are numerous, but unfortunately are never perfect, owing to the brittleness of the clay slate in which they were carved, and to the practice of constructing each capital from many pieces bound together by iron cramps. The lower portion of the larger capitals, some of which measure about three feet in diameter, was made in from two to four pieces; the upper portion always consisted of four segments.

The British Museum possesses some fine examples of these capitals collected by Sir A. Cunningham at Jamâlgârhi, and smaller specimens may be seen in the collection at South Kensington. Others are preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and in the Lahore Museum.*

* Plates XLVII—L of Cunningham's Archaeol. Rep., Vol. V, are devoted to the illustration of Indo-Corinthian pillars. The restoration of elephants on the top of a
Sir A. Cunningham, who was unwilling to recognize Roman influence on the art of Gaudhára, compares the Indo-Corinthian capitals with those of "the pure Corinthian order of Greece" as follows:

"The chief points of similarity are:

1st. The three rows of acanthus leaves, eight in each row, which are arranged round the drum or bell of the capital.

2nd. The broad, but not deep, volutes at the four corners.

3rd. The four pointed abacus with a curved recess in the middle of each side.

The most marked points of difference are the following:

1st. The wide spread of the abacus, which is equal to 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) heights of the whole capital, that of the Greek examples being little more than 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) height.

2nd. The retention of the points at the four corners of the abacus, which in all the Greek examples have been cut off.

3rd. The insertion of a fourth row of acanthus leaves which is projected forward to the line joining the horns of the abacus. The abacus is thus formed from a square having a curved recess on each side of the central projection.

4th. The placing of flowers on the abacus which are supported on twisted stems springing from the roots of the volutes. In a single instance fabulous animals are added to the flowers on the horns of the abacus.

5th. The insertion of human figures amongst the acanthus leaves, whose overhanging tufts form canopies for the figures."

I have quoted this passage in full, not because I attach much value to the comparison made in it, but because it gives an authoritative description of the characteristic features of the Indo-Corinthian capitals. Sir A. Cunningham cannot help admitting the resemblance between those specimens which exhibit human figures among the foliage and Roman capitals found in the ruins of the baths of Caracalla, but avoids the natural conclusion, and boldly declares that, if the design for these capitals with human figures was suggested by any earlier works, "the suggestion must have come from the creative Greeks of Ariana, and not from the imitative Romans."* On the other hand, I am fully convinced, as I shall try presently to prove, that the design in question did come "from the imitative Romans," and that the art of Gaudhára is essen-

capital shown in Pl. XLVIII is conjectural, and not supported by adequate evidence. Two of the Jamálgarh capitals are figured in Fergusson's History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, and a rough sketch of one specimen from the same place is given in Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, p. 142.

on the Civilization of Ancient India.
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...tially Roman in style. The Jamalgarhi carvings date, I believe, from about the middle of the third century A. D., and can be usefully compared in detail only with the similar work in contemporary, or nearly contemporary, Roman buildings. It is waste of trouble to make elaborate comparison of their details with those of the monument of Lysicrates, which was erected about six hundred years previously, but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the minutiae of architectural criticism to pursue the subject further, and must leave to others the task of accurately verifying the various differences and resemblances between the Indo-Corinthian and Romano-Corinthian styles. Probably, however, the task would not justify the labour bestowed upon it. If the Roman origin of the Indo-Corinthian style be admitted, very minute study of variations in detail may be deemed superfluous, great variation in the embellishment of Corinthian capitals being everywhere allowed and practised.

Section III.

The Gândhâra or Peshâwar School of Sculpture Described.

A specimen of sculpture, apparently Indo-Hellenic in style, and closely related to the work of the Gândhâra school, was discovered at Kabul in 1833,* but the first distinct announcement of the existence of a school of Hellenic art in India was made in 1836 by James Prinsep, the founder of scientific Indian archæology, who published in that year at Calcutta a description, illustrated by rude plates, of the so-called Silenus group procured by Colonel Stacy at Mathurâ. This group, though undoubtedly Indo-Hellenic in style, is not the work of the Gândhâra school. It will be discussed in the next following section.

The ruins of the monastery at Jamalgarhî, north-east of Peshâwar, were discovered by Sir A. Cunningham in 1848, but he did not publish any account of his discovery till many years later.

The first published account of the Gândhâra sculptures is that written by the late Sir E. C. Bayley, who printed in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for the year 1852 an account, illustrated by

* Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. III, p. 362, Pl. XXVI, fig. 1; Anderson's Catalogue, Part I, p. 261 (K. 1). The sculpture is circular, 15½ inches in diameter, and represents the seated meditating Buddha with flames proceeding from his shoulders, and surrounded by subordinate figures. It was discovered in November, 1833, in ruins two miles south-east of the city of Kabul, enclosed in a large and beautifully roofed square masonry cell, "handsomely gilt, and coloured by lapis lazuli, which is found in considerable quantities in the mines of Badakshân, twelve days' journey from Kabul." Lapis lazuli has also been found on the site of Taxila, and at Bâoti Piud in the Râwalpindi District. (Cunningham, Archæol. Rep., Vol. II, pp. 117, 141).
the roughest possible sketches, of some remarkable sculptures found at Jamālgarh. The works, thus imperfectly illustrated, were subsequently brought to England, and exhibited in the Crystal Palace, where they were destroyed by the disastrous fire which also consumed Major Gill's copies of the paintings on the walls and ceilings of the Ajanṭa caves.

Prinsep's and Bayley's description of the works of Indo-Greek sculptors failed to attract general attention, probably owing to the extreme rudeness of the illustrative plates. Dr. Leitner, who brought to Europe in 1870 a considerable collection of works of art, to which he gave the name of Greco-Buddhist, is entitled to the credit of being the first to interest the learned world in the existence of a school of Indo-Hellenic architecture and sculpture.

Though the Greek influence on the style of the works exhibited by Dr. Leitner, and on the many similar objects since discovered, is now universally admitted, it is remarkable that, so late as the year 1875, at least one writer of repute denied its existence.

"It has become a fashion recently," wrote the late Mr. W. Vaux, F. R. S., "to extend a Greek influence to districts east of Bactria, for which I venture to think there is really but little evidence. Thus, we are told that certain Buddhistic figures, chiefly in slate, procured by Dr. Leitner and others to the north-east of Peshāwar, exhibit on them manifest traces of Greek art. I am sorry to say that I cannot perceive anything of the kind."*

The Greek influence on the Gāndhāra sculptures, which Mr. Vaux could not perceive, is so obvious to other critics, that a formal refutation of his ill-founded scepticism would now be superfluous. Professor Curtius has rightly observed that the discoveries of Dr. Leitner, Sir A. Cunningham, and other explorers in the Kābul valley, "open a new page in the history of Greek art."†

The new page thus opened has as yet been little read, and I venture to hope that the following description of a few of the most noteworthy examples of Indo-Hellenic art, and discussion of the sources from which it was derived, may attract both classical and Oriental scholars to the further exploration of a field hitherto very imperfectly worked.

The present section will be devoted to the description of some of the more remarkable and characteristic specimens of the work of the

* Numismatic Chronicle, Vol XV, N. S., p. 12, note.
† Abhandlung über die Griechische Kunst, as quoted in Dr. Leitner's Catalogue. I believe the paper was published in the Archivologische Zeitung for 1875, but I have not seen it.
very prolific sculptors belonging to the Gândhára school. The chronology and artistic relations of the school will be separately discussed in a subsequent section; at present I shall refer only very briefly to these topics.

The oldest known example of Indo-Hellenic sculpture in the Panjáb probably is the statuette in purely Greek style of Pallas Athéné, the original of which is in the Lahore Museum. Dr. Leitner has a good cast of this work in his museum at Woking, and Sir A. Cunningham possesses a photograph of it. It is shown in Plate VII.

The attitude of the goddess is that represented on certain coins of Azes, which show her helmeted, standing, facing front, crowning herself with her right hand, and holding in her left hand a spear obliquely across her body. The goddess of the coins carries a shield also on her left arm, but the statuette is imperfect, and the shield has been lost.*

The close relation of this sculpture to the coins of Azes proves that it must be approximately contemporary with that prince, that is to say, that it dates from the beginning of the Christian era, or possibly a few years earlier. It therefore belongs to the same period as do the Ionic pillars of the Taxila temples. The statuette is said to have been found somewhere in the Yusufzai country, but the exact locality where it was discovered does not seem to be known.

I shall explain subsequently my reasons for thinking that this statuette of Pallas is a relic of Indo-Hellenic sculpture properly so called, as distinguished from the Indo-Romau school to which all, or almost all, the other examples of Gândhára art belong.

The effigy of the virgin goddess of Athens cannot be certainly connected with any Indian religious system, and we cannot say whether the statuette above described formed part of the decoration of a Buddhist temple or not. But in all probability it did, for every specimen of Indo-Hellenic sculpture from Gândhára, the find-spot of which is known, belonged to a Buddhist building of one sort or another.

Most of the sculptures are evidently Buddhist in subject, but some of them, notably the figures supposed to represent kings, deal with secular subjects, though used to decorate edifices consecrated to the service of religion.

* Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek Kings of Bactria and India, Plate XVIII, 4. Cunningham, in his Descriptive List (No. 21), observes, "The lower right arm, which probably bore the regis with the head of Medusa, has been lost." This remark is evidently erroneous. The goddess on the coins carries, as might be expected, the shield on her left arm, and grasps the spear with her left hand. Her right arm is raised, with the hand to her head, as for the purpose of crowning herself.
Dr. Leitner and Sir A. Cunningham both consider that the most striking piece in the extensive collection at the Lahore Museum is the figure of a throned king, resting his left foot on a footstool, and grasping a spear in his left hand. See Plate VIII. The upper part of the body is naked, the head-dress is rich, and the squarely cut eyes are remarkably prominent. The work is in good preservation, the right arm alone being wanting. The king's attitude is easy, his expression is dignified, and the outlines of his figure are boldly drawn. Small figures, which have been conjectured to represent conquered aborigines, are attached to the right and left. The identity of the attitude of the principal figure of this fine group with the attitude of the Indo-Scythian kings as shown on their coins naturally suggests that the sculpture represents one of these sovereigns. I do not know where the sculpture was found.*

Sir A. Cunningham found at Jamālgārī fifteen or sixteen statues, some seated, and some standing, which he supposes to be those of kings, and observes that "these royal statues are known by their moustaches, and the numerous strings of gems worked into their head-dresses. The arrangement of the hair is different in each separate specimen, and, as the features also differ, there seems little doubt that they are portrait statues."†

In the case of one statue in the Lahore Museum, (No 6 of Descriptive List, and No. 63 of Dr. Leitner's Catalogue), which Professor Curtius compares with the Greek ideal type of Apollo, the royal character of the person portrayed is unmistakeably indicated by the presence of the regal fillet, the ends of which float loosely behind his head, in the same way as they are shown on the coins of Greek princes both of Europe and Asia.

It is hardly possible that all these so-called royal statues can be intended as ideal representations of Buddha as Prince Siddhārtha, before he adopted the religious life, though some of them probably should be so interpreted. Mr. Fergusson suggested that they should be regarded as images of Buddhist saints, and the presence of the nimbus behind the head in many cases supports this suggestion.‡

The presence or absence of moustaches proves nothing, for Buddha is frequently represented as wearing moustaches in the works of the Gāndhāra school. If the images in question were portrait statues, as suggested by Sir A. Cunningham, they would probably be inscribed. It seems hardly credible that sculptors would execute numerous portraits of Kanishka and other kings without taking the trouble of indi-

---

* Cunningham, Descriptive List, No. 2; Leitner, Catalogue, No. 73.
‡ History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 179.
eating for whom the portraits were intended. I think it more likely that these so-called royal figures are not portraits of individuals, but that they are ideal representations, in some cases of kings, and in some cases of saints.

The museums in London and Calcutta possess several examples of sculptures of this class. Two from the upper monastery at Nuttu are depicted in Major Cole's heliogravure plates Nos. 24 and 25. The statue or statuette shown in the latter plate represents a man of dwarfish figure, standing, as if preaching, with a nimbus behind his head. The legs are thick and badly executed, and the work seems to me to be of comparatively late date, probably subsequent to A. D. 300. This figure, in spite of the ornaments and moustaches, appears intended to represent a preaching saint rather than a king.

The works above described were all, so far as is known, associated with Buddhist buildings, though in themselves not obviously Buddhist in subject. I shall now proceed to describe sculptures, the subjects of which are taken from the rich stores of Buddhist mythology.

The birth-scene of Gautama, or Prince Siddhārtha, who in after days won the honourable title of the Buddha, or the Enlightened, is a favourite subject with Buddhist artists, and recurs in their works almost as frequently as representations of the Nativity are met with in Christian art.

Sir A. Cunningham, in the catalogue of sculptures excavated, chiefly at Jamālgārhi, under his supervision, enumerates four examples of this favourite subject, two of which are now in the Indian Museum, (G. I and 2).* See Plato IX, fig. 1. Major Cole gives a plate of a tolerably well-preserved specimen discovered at the upper monastery of Nuttu during subsequent explorations in the Yūsufzai country.†

According to Buddhist belief, Māya Devī, the Buddhist Madonna, was standing under a sal tree, when she gave birth to the holy infant, who sprang from her right side, and was received in a golden net by Brahmadeva, attended by the devas, or angels. This legend appears to be, like the sculptures which express it, descended from a Greek original. Mr. Beal has pointed out that, in several respects, it closely resembles the Greek myth of the birth of Apollo in Delos.‡

The details of the scene vary considerably in different sculptures, but the traditional grouping of the principal figures is never materially changed. The description of one specimen will, therefore, suffice for all.

† Seven examples of sculptures of the nativity of Buddha preserved in the Lahore Museum are enumerated in Cunningham's Descriptive List, which, as usual, gives no indication of the localities where they were discovered.
‡ Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX, p. 68.
On the slab photographed by Major Cole (Plate 11) Mayá is shown, standing, facing the spectator, with her head slightly inclined, and the weight of her body thrown on the right foot. Her left leg is crossed in front, with the toes resting lightly on the ground. In her right hand she grasps a branch of the over-shadowing tree, and her left arm is thrown round the neck of her half-sister Prajápatí, who supports her. The figure of the sister is turned in a singularly awkward posture, so as to show most of her back.* The infant Buddha, springing with outstretched arms from his mother's side, is recognizable, though much mutilated; the figure of Brahmá is almost completely destroyed. The other attendants, who are introduced in some examples, are here wanting. A harp in the upper corner of the composition indicates the heavenly music which heralded the advent of him whose mission it was to still the discords of millions of human hearts.

In this work the pose of Mayá is tolerably graceful, her figure is free from the usual Indian exaggeration, and her expression, in conformity with the belief that the Buddha cost his mother none of the pangs of travail, is perfectly calm. Her hair is richly braided, and arranged in the form of a crown or tiara.

A very finely executed statuette of Mayá Deví, standing alone, which was obtained at the same monastery, (Cole, Plate 15, figure 2), shows her in nearly the same attitude as in the birth scene, holding above her head the branch of a conventional tree, more or less resembling a palm. The drapery of this figure is specially elegant. The principal garment is a tunic (chiton) reaching to the knees, and confined at the waist, by a rich girdle of four strings, adorned with clasp and vine-leaf pendant. A scarf is thrown lightly over the shoulders, and the legs are clad in loosely fitting trousers of thin material. The dress of Mayá in the nativity group is simpler, and consists of an inner tunic or vest, and a robe wound gracefully round the body, and looped up at the waist.

Single figures like that above described are not uncommon. The slight variations in different examples indicate that they were arranged in pairs.†

Religious artists found in the deathbed of Buddha a subject scarcely less fascinating than the scene of his birth.‡

* See post, for a parallel from the Catacombs.
† So, at Cave XX, Ajañá. "Cave XX is a small Viñára with two pillars and two pilasters in front of the verandah. One pillar is broken, but on each side of the capitals there is a pretty statuette of a female under a canopy of foliage." (Burgess, Notes on the Budhá Rock-Temples of Ajaná, being No. 9, Archæol. Survey of W. India, Bombay, 1879). This valuable book is out of print.
‡ The Descriptive List mentions only one example of this subject in the Lahore Museum, but the collection there probably includes other specimens. The Indian
According to the Buddhist scriptures, he passed away at the age of eighty, surrounded by his chief disciples, shaded by the sal trees in a grove at a place called Kusinagara, which has been fully identified as the modern Kasía in the Gorakbpur District of the North-Western Provinces.*

All representations of the scene agree in showing the master lying on his right side, in a posture of perfect repose, with his head resting on his hand. The number of attendants varies in different sculptures. Plates Nos. 16 and 22 of Major Cole's volume give illustrations of two well-preserved reliefs, obtained respectively at the upper and lower monasteries of Nuttu, which vividly depict the peaceful departure of the great teacher from this troublous world.

The work from the upper monastery (Plate 16) is a sculptured panel bounded by two good examples of the Indo-Corinthian pilaster.

The dying master, fully robed, reclines on a low bedstead furnished with mattress and pillow, by the side of which a tripod is placed, supporting a vessel of cool water. A figure, identified as Devadatta, the malignant cousin, who had pursued Buddha throughout his life with unrelenting hostility, stands at the head of the couch, with an evil expression of satisfied malice.†

A form, apparently that of a female, with her back to the spectator, sits crouching on the ground, and six mourning attendants in various attitudes complete the group. Above the whole hang the boughs of the sal tree, the forest king which witnessed alike the advent and departure of the teacher.

The work from the lower Nuttu monastery, reproduced in Plate No. 22, represents the same scene, though with considerable variation in the treatment of details. In this group the total number of figures is increased to thirteen, the most remarkable addition being that of a shaven-headed monk, crawling on hands and feet, and being pulled from under the bed by another monk, who has grasped him by the wrist.

Museum, Calcutta, contains at least one (G. 27). In later Buddhist art, as seen at Kasiá and elsewhere, the subject was frequently treated. The death-bed scene has often been incorrectly referred to as the Nirváña of Buddha, but the term parinirváña may be correctly applied to it.

† The figure is that of a man holding a dumb-bell-shaped object, like a club or conventional thunderbolt, and this figure in other reliefs, for example, in that representing the scene of the elephant doing homage, must certainly be identified as Devadatta. But the appearance of Devadatta at the death-bed of Buddha appears to be inconsistent with the legend referred to in Fa-hian's Travels, which relates that Devadatta attempted to poison Gautama, and having failed to accomplish the crime, "went down to hell."
Both the compositions above described are admirably balanced, and the attitudes and expressions of all the persons concerned are rendered with vigour and truth to nature. The drapery, as usual, is Greek, or Græco-Roman, in style.

The design of these death-bed scenes is certainly an importation from the west. The recumbent figure on the bed surrounded by morning attendants is clearly copied from Greek banqueting reliefs of a sepulchral character, as imitated on Roman sarcophagi. A sculpture in the Towneley collection in the British Museum bears a very close resemblance to the reliefs from the Nuptu monastery above described. * I have no doubt that the Gândhâra sculptures were copied from Græco-Roman, and not pure Greek, models.

The figure of the founder of their religion was the decorative element most largely used by the Buddhist artists in all their works, with the exception of the earliest buildings in Bihâr, Central, and Western India, where symbols occupy the place afterwards taken by images. In the countries on the north-west frontier of India, the image of the personal Buddha had become an object of worship at least as early as the latter part of the first century A. D., when it was stamped on coins of Kanishka.†

There is, therefore, no reason to be surprised at the fact that hundreds of sculptures from Gândhâra, in various sizes, represent the seated or standing Buddha, posed in one or other of the conventional attitudes (mudrâ), either buried in meditation, or engaged in exhortation. Such figures are often executed in large numbers on the face of a single slab. Multitudes of specimens present the founder of Buddhism engaged with other persons in one or other incident of his ministry or the preparation for it.

A deeply-cut relief, found at the village of Mohammad Nari, and reproduced in the first plate of Major Cole's book, is a good illustration of the oft-repeated figure of the teaching Buddha, who is here shown seated cross-legged on an open lotus-flower, with his feet draped in a gracefully disposed robe. His right shoulder is bare, and his hair is arranged in formal conventional curls, a style which in later times became the only orthodox arrangement for the hair both of Buddhist and Jain statues.

* Engravings from the ancient marbles in the British Museum, Part V, Plate III, fig. 5, London, 1826. In this work the Towneley relief is described as being of Roman origin, but it may be Greek. Prof. Gardner informs me that the Greek works of this class are referred to the period extending from B. C. 400 to A. D. 1.
† Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India, pp. 130, 133, 175, Pl. XXVI, 8; XXVII, 2; XXXII, 14.
The central image of the composition, the lotus-throned Buddha, occupies a niche formed by a dentilled cornice resting on Indo-Persian pillars. The rest of the slab is occupied by a profusion of "Buddhist railings" and other architectural details, as well as by a multitude of small human figures, which it would be tedious to describe at length.

The bare right shoulder and formal hair might be supposed to suggest a late date, but the style of the architectural ornaments and the fine execution of the work indicate, in my judgment, that it should be referred to the first half of the third century A. D. I have already noted that this slab is adorned with Indo-Corinthian pilasters as well as Indo-Persian pillars.

One of the most elegant images of the standing, preaching Buddha is the small statuette from the Mián Khán monastery depicted in figure 3 of Major Cole's Plate 27. The expression of the face is sweet and calm, and the drapery is rendered in the best style. Both shoulders are covered, and the hair, coiled in a top-knot, is artistically and truthfully sculptured. This work seems to me to be of earlier date than the Mohammad Nari specimen, and is probably not later than A. D. 200.

The fine sculpture from the upper monastery at Nuttu (Cole, Plate 12) shows Buddha, wearing moustaches, and with both shoulders covered, seated cross-legged on a low stool under a sal tree, addressing a company of adoring disciples of both sexes.

The balanced grouping of this composition is as skilful as that of the death-bed scenes.

The three sculptures above described belong to the best period of the Gândhára school of art.

A statuette of the seated Buddha, about 13 inches in height, executed in blue slate, is shown in Plate IX, fig. 2, and is an example of the school in its decadence. A similar statuette was obtained at Ráñigat,* and is fairly good work, though not of the best style.

Another statuette of the seated Buddha, found at Sháh khí dhóri, the ancient Taxila by Mr. L. White King, seems to be of comparatively late date, having a Hindú, rather than a Buddhist appearance.

* The great fortress of Ráñigat, (also known by the names of Nográm, or Navagrám, and Bágráim), is situated sixteen miles north of Ohía, and just beyond the British frontier. Tribal feuds render the place difficult of access, and, when Mr. King visited it, he required the protection of a strong escort. The ruins have, consequently, never been thoroughly explored. Sir A. Cunningham gives weighty reasons for identifying the site with Aornos, the stronghold which resisted Alexander. The surface of the various courtyards is covered with fragments of "statues of all sizes, and in all positions." (Archæol Rep., Vol. II, pp. 90—111; V, p. 55). Major Cole in his Second Report notes the existence of seven tops or stúpas within the limits of the fortress, and gives a rough plan on a very small scale.
The foregoing descriptions prove that during the most flourishing period of Gándhára art, which I assign to the years between A. D. 200 and 350, the conventional representation of Buddha had not been finally determined, and that it was legitimate to make his imago either with or without moustaches, and with the right shoulder either bare or draped. The figure of Buddha on the Amaravatí slab No. 11 exhibited on the British Museum staircase has both shoulders draped, but in Buddhist art, as a rule, the founder of the religion is represented with the right shoulder uncovered, and without moustaches.

It has also been shown that the artists of Gándhára were at liberty to give Buddha either the formally curled hair, which in later times became an indispensable attribute, or to carve his hair artistically in accordance with nature.

The treatment of the hair both of Buddha and other personages in most of the good sculptures from Gándhára is so artistic, and so far superior to the feeble conventionalism of ordinary Indian art, that it may be well to dwell on the subject for a moment.

I agree with Dr. Anderson, in the opinion expressed by him that the woolly hair like that of a negro, arranged in stiff, formal, little curls which is characteristic of the Jain images executed in the tenth and subsequent centuries, and of many Buddhist statues of earlier date, does not indicate, as has been supposed, any racial peculiarity of the Jain and Buddhist saints, but is purely conventional.

Dr. Anderson suggests that this mode of representing the hair is merely an archaistic survival, and that "the hair of the Blessed One having once been carved in this depraved fashion, it was slavishly followed after, with a few exceptions, among which were the sculptors of Gándhára."*

The exact origin of this archaic treatment of the hair does not at present appear to be traceable, but, whether it be ever discovered or not, it is probable that the explanation suggested above, is, in general terms, the correct one, and that there is no occasion for holding with Mr. Fergusson, that "it has ever been one of the puzzles of Buddhism that the founder of the religion should always have been represented in sculpture with woolly hair like that of a negro."†

As a matter of fact he is not always so represented, nor is the woolly hair peculiar to his images. The puzzle, if it be a puzzle, is one in the history of art, not in the history of religion.

The archaic 'wiry' style of representing the hair was maintained

† Tree and Serpent Worship, 2nd ed., p. 135.
by Greek artists in bronze longer than in marble,* and this observation may possibly serve as the explanation of the woolly-haired Buddhas, which may be conjectured to have been derived from a bronze prototype.

I cannot venture on trying the patience of my readers by describing even a few of the many friezes and panels which vividly present incidents of Buddha's life and preaching, such as his visits to ascetics and Nāga kings, and his miraculous escapes from the snares laid by Deva-
datta. The compositions are like most Roman work, generally crowded with figures, which it would be tedious to describe in detail. Good illustrations of several are given in Major Cole's Plates.

A blue slate panel, about 13 inches in height, representing in high relief a chaitya front filled with small figures of Buddha and worshipping, the original of which is in the Lahore Museum, a cast being in Calcutta, is reproduced in Plate IX, fig. 3, and is a fair example of a very numerous class of works.

The sculptors of Gāndhāra were not restricted in their choice of religious subjects to the birth, death, meditation, miracles, and preaching of Gautama.

At the time when they flourished, Buddhist literature had attained vast dimensions, and offered, in the collections of Jātakas, or Birth-stories relating to the adventures of the Buddha in his previous births, an inexhaustible treasury of subjects for the art of the painter and the sculptor.

That subjects of this class frequently formed the theme of the Greco-Buddhist artists can be perceived from the mutilated extant fragments of their compositions, though the brittleness of the stone in which their works were generally executed is such that few of the innumerable friezes which decorated the buildings of Gāndhāra have been preserved in a condition sufficiently perfect to permit of their story being clearly read.

The best preserved connected series of story-telling sculptures is that which adorned the risers of the sixteen steps leading to the central stūpa of the monastery at Jamālgaṛhī, excavated by Lieut. Crompton and Sir A. Cunningham.†

* Perry, Greek and Roman Sculpture, p. 351.
† Lieutenant Crompton's report has not, so far as I am aware, been printed in full. Its substance is given in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, p. 143. The friezes of the risers are the only sculptures found in their original position at Jamālgaṛhī. All the others had been thrown down, and "in many cases large and heavy fragments of the same sculpture were found far apart." Lieut. Crompton hence concluded that the buildings had been "destroyed by design, and not by natural decay." Sir A. Cunningham's catalogue of the sculptures of the risers arranged in the order of the steps is given in Archaeol. Rep., Vol. V, p. 199.
These reliefs excited the warm admiration of Mr. Fergusson, and are certainly deserving of high praise.* Unfortunately they are far from complete. The surviving portions, however, are of considerable extent, and are available for study in Cases 1—3 of the Asiatic Saloon in the British Museum. The arrangement in the museum is arbitrary, and determined rather by the dimensions of the cases than by the order of the steps, or the subject of the sculptures.

When first discovered the series was more nearly perfect, and the discoverer was able to recognize two Jātakas or Birth-stories, the Wes-santara and the Sāma.

The latter may be read pretty clearly from the remains in the British Museum (Cases 1—3, tier No. 4). The recognizable scenes are briefly described by Sir A. Cunningham as follows:—

"1.—The young lad, son of blind parents, filling a vessel with water from a lake frequented by deer.
2.—The youth, shot accidentally by the Rājā of Benares, who aimed at the deer, is lying on the ground with an arrow sticking in his side.
3.—The Rājā in a pensive attitude, his head resting on his hand, promises to take care of the lad’s parents.
4.—The Rājā presents a vessel of water to the blind parents.
5.—The Rājā leads the two blind people by the hand to the spot where their child’s body is lying.
6.—The youth restored to life."

This story occupied the eighth step of the staircase. The Wes-santara Jātaka, which adorned the fourth step, is exhibited on the fifth tier from the top of the British Museum arrangement.

The extremely small scale of these sculptures, which are only about eight inches high, interferes with the correct proportional rendering of the several parts. The trees, for instance, are altogether out of scale. But, when allowance is made for this defect, which is unavoidable in the execution of complicated designs crowded into a space so limited, these reliefs may rightly be held to deserve much praise for their vigour of execution, and for their realistic fidelity to nature.

An exhaustive description of the various scenes and multitudinous figures in the alti-relievi of the Jamālgahī staircase would task too severely the patience of the most conscientious reader, but a brief discussion of some of their more interesting features may not be unwelcome.

The uppermost tier in the museum arrangement comprises ten small panels, divided one from the other by broad Corinthian pilasters.

* History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 173.
Six of these panels, (from the third step of the staircase), are occupied by female busts with the arms raised, and having acanthus leaves extended like wings from the waist on each side. These little figures at once remind the spectator of the angels with which he is familiar in Christian art. It is quite possible that the sculptors of Gandhāra may have picked up some hints from artists connected with the churches of Asia Minor and Syria, and I have a suspicion that they did so, though I cannot offer any decisive proof of the supposed fact. I have no doubt that a real connection exists between early Christian art and the Gandhāra school. The four remaining panels (from the fifteenth step) contain each a grotesque bust terminating in two scaly tails.

Above these panels nine remarkable Atlantean statuettes are exhibited, which form, apparently, part of a set of twenty-three obtained at Jamālgārhī by Sir A. Cunningham. He supposes that they "filled the spaces between the large dentils which supported the heavy mouldings of the stūpas,"* or, as he elsewhere expresses himself, that "they were arranged in rows to support the lowermost moulding of a building. The figures were generally separated by pilasters."†

Numbers of similar figures have been found. Most commonly they are about eight inches high, but they vary in height from four to eighteen inches.‡

The British Museum specimens range in height from about seven to nine inches. All the figures are in a sitting posture, though the attitude varies. One figure crouches like Atlas, as if oppressed under the burden of a heavy load, while the attitudes of the others seem to express repose rather than the endurance of crushing pressure. Some of the faces are bearded, and some are not. The facial expression is freely varied, and rendered with great spirit and vigour. The muscles of the chest and abdomen are fully and truthfully displayed, with a tendency to exaggeration, and a pair of expanded wings is attached to the shoulders of each statuette.

A group of wrestlers (G. 83 Calcutta), and a composition (G. 89 Calcutta), catalogued by Sir A. Cunningham as "Herakles fighting with a snake-legged giant," both of which were found at Jamālgārhī, are executed in the same style. The latter work (Plate IX, fig. 4) is

† Descriptive List, p. 2.
‡ Descriptive List, and Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, p. 144 Sixteen statuettes of this class are in the Calcutta Museum (G. 81 and 83). A feeble terracotta imitation of the design has been found far away eastward in the Boga (Bagrahā) District of Lower Bengal. (Mn., 1, in Anderson's Catalogue).
thus described by Dr. Anderson in his Catalogue (Part I, p. 240):—

“A triangular fragment, with two figures in relief, one lying on the ground with its back towards the spectator, the upper portion being the body of a human being, but the legs terminate from the hips downward in two snake-like coils; the other figure, which is quite nude, has grasped the end of the left coil with his right hand, while with his left hand he has seized the head of the monster, which swings a heavy club to destroy his foe.”

I think that it is impossible to doubt that the group last described is a Buddhist adaptation of the Greek myth of the Gigantomachia, the battle of the gods and giants, which continued for centuries to be a favourite subject of Greek and Roman sculptors and gem-engravers. In Greek and Roman art the giants are represented as winged, and snake-legged, and their figures are generally characterized by exaggerated development of the muscles.

No Indian example appears to reproduce exactly the conventional form of the Greek giant, but the characteristics of that form are all found in the Jamālgaṛhi carvings, though not all combined in a single figure.

The action of the group which Sir A. Cunningham rather rashly entitles “Heraclès fighting with a snake-legged giant” is obviously the same as that of the Greek representations of the Gigantomachia, and the very peculiar conception of the snake-legged giant cannot have been independently invented by the Jamālgaṛhi sculptors. In this case the wings seem to be wanting, but the Atlantean statuettes, which have not the snake legs, are fitted with wings, and display the exaggerated muscular development of the pattern Greek giant. The little figures with tails, from the fifteenth step, appear related rather to the Tritons than the Giants. Their tails seem to be intended rather for those of fishes than to represent snakes.

The Gigantomachia was so frequently the subject of Greek and Roman works of art that it is impossible to name the precise channel by which a knowledge of it reached India. One of the finest examples of the treatment of the subject is the principal frieze of the great altar of Pergamon, the giants of which are winged, snake-legged, and provided with enormously developed muscles.* It is quite possible that the name of this great composition may have spread through Asia, and stimulated the imitative faculties of a host of minor artists, including those of Gāndhāra, but the Gigantomachia was such a hackneyed subject that we cannot venture to name any particular example of its

* Casts of the Pergamene frieze are at South Kensington. Engravings of it will be found in many recent books, e.g. Perry’s History of Greek and Roman Sculpture.
treatment as the model of the miniature, and comparatively feeble, adaptations of it by the Indian sculptors. The influence of Rome on the sculptures at Jamálghání, and the other works of the Gándhára school, belonging to the same period, is so strongly marked that the most probable conclusion is that the Indians derived their knowledge of the artistic use of the Gigantomachia from Roman copies of Greek works.

I strongly suspect that the Indians borrowed from the Greeks the giants themselves as well as the sculptured representations of their battles. The Asuras of Hindú post-Vedic mythology are described as fierce demons, enemies of the gods, and correspond closely with the Greek giants. Recent research has proved, or at least rendered probable, the existence of so much Greek, and even Christian, influence on the development of Hindú mythology that the borrowing of the conception of giants, enemies of the gods, offers no improbability.

Whether the Buddhist sculptors of the Kábul valley intended their snake-legged or winged monsters to be images of Asuras, or merely used them as conventional imitative decoration I cannot undertake to determine.

A group, frequently recurring in Gándhára art, of which four examples have been photographed by Major Cole (Plates 1, 2, 4, and 17), and one is in the Woking Museum, can be demonstrated to be an adaptation of a famous composition by a known Greek artist. Another of the ultimate Greek sources from which the sculptors of Gándhára derived their inspiration is thus determined with certainty. I shall discuss this case with some fulness of detail.

The group referred to represents a plump young woman, fully draped, standing, held in the grasp of an eagle with expanded wings, and is reasonably conjectured to represent the translation to heaven of Máýá Déví, the mother of Buddha, in order that she might be born again, as related in the Buddhist scriptures. However this may be, it is quite impossible to doubt the correctness of Sir A. Cunningham's opinion, as quoted by Major Cole, that the composition in question is an adaptation of the Rape of Ganymede, a favourite subject of the later Greek artists, and of their Roman imitators.

The bronze work on this theme by Leochares (B. C. 372-330) was considered a masterpiece of that famous artist of the later Attic school, and was praised with enthusiasm by Pliny.

The original has unfortunately perished, but several copies or imitations of it, belonging to various periods, some executed in marble, and some engraved on gems, are extant, and have been figured in many well-known works on the history of art.
One of the marble copies is in the British Museum, another is at Thessalonica, a third at Venice, and a fourth, the finest of all, is preserved in the Museo Pio Clementino at the Vatican.*

In this composition, which most nearly corresponds with Pliny’s description of the original, the eagle is represented as supported by the trunk of a tree behind it, with its wings expanded, and neck stretched upwards, and grasping firmly, though tenderly, in its talons the beautiful youth, whose feet have just ceased to touch the receding earth. The robe of Ganymede is dexterously disposed behind his back so as to protect his body from the sharp claws of the great bird, and yet to exhibit the full beauty of the nude figure. A dog, seated below, howls piteously for his departing master.

Critics point out that the addition of the dog to this group, and the insertion of the tree, are not only in accordance with the myth as related by Virgil,† but are of artistic importance as an aid to the imagination by rendering more perceptible the soaring movement of the principal figures, and thus minimizing the objections to a plastic presentation of a pictorial subject.

The Buddhist adaptations omit the dog, and in this respect agree with the groups preserved at Venice, Thessalonica, and in the British Museum, but, in the pose of the eagle, and the introduction of the trunk of the tree, they resemble the Vatican group more closely than any other.

Three of the examples of these adaptations figured by Major Cole (Plates 2, 3, and 4) were found in the ruins at Sanghao. His fourth example (Plate 17) was obtained at the upper monastery of Nuttu, which is situated close to Sanghao. The Sanghao specimens figured in Plates 3 and 4 are duplicates, whereas the Nuttu specimen agrees with the Sanghao sculpture illustrated in Plato 2.‡

* Overbeck (Mythologie der Kunst) has pointed out that the extant Rape of Ganymede groups fall into two distinct classes. The first represents the eagle as the messenger of Zeus; the second presents the god himself transformed into the shape of an eagle. The Vatican group is the best example of the first and earlier, the Venetian sculpture is the best example of the second and later type. Engravings of the Vatican group will be found in Visconti’s Museo Pio-Clementino, Vol. III, p. 140, and in the histories of sculpture by Winckelmann, Lübke, and Perry. A figure of the Venetian specimen is given in Zanetti’s work on San Marco. The Thessalonian group is described and engraved in Stuart’s Athens, III, ch. 9, Pl. 11 and IX. The Indian adaptations seem to combine the characteristics of both types.

† “Puer ..., quem preces ab Ida
Sublimem pedibus rapuit Jovis armiger uncis;
Longevi palmas nequidquam ad sidera tendunt
Custedes, servitique canum latrinas in annis.” (Aeneid, V, 252-257).

‡ Major Cole says that Sir A. Cunningham found an example of the woman and eagle subject in a knob or plume of a royal statue at Jamúlgarhí, which is now
Both the Buddhist variations show a general agreement with one another, though differing considerably in detail. The posture of Māyā in the specimens figured in Plates 2 and 17 is singularly ungraceful and constrained. As some compensation for this defect her feet are so treated as to suggest the notion that she is really being lifted from the ground, and in this respect these examples are superior to the other two, which altogether fail to convey the idea of upward motion. In both varieties the female figure is fully draped.

The substitution of a fat, round-cheeked, young Indian woman, swathed in heavy drapery, for the nude form of Ganymede instinct with the beauty of Greek youth, destroys all the aesthetic value of the composition, which is, in its Buddhist forms, devoid of life or elegance, and far inferior to the worst Graeco-Roman example. The conversion of a Greek theme to their own uses by the Gāndhāra sculptors is more readily demonstrated in the case of the Rape of Ganymede than in any other, but, unfortunately for their reputation, they were less successful in dealing with this subject than almost any other which they attempted. Probably it would be correct to say that a purely ideal subject was beyond their powers.

A very curious panel in the Lahore Museum, of which a cast is exhibited at South Kensington, has been differently interpreted by Sir A. Cunningham and Dr. Leitner.

The former describes it as a "portion of a large sculpture, containing eleven figures. The three lower ones are soldiers armed with spears and shields; but the rest, with their animal's heads, large mouths, and sharp teeth, are probably intended for demons. As such they may have formed part of the army which Māra brought to frighten Buddha during his ascetic meditation under the Bodhi tree." (Descriptive List, 538.)

The three soldiers in the lower compartment, marching one behind the other, are certainly not Indian in style or equipment. They are Greek, not Roman warriors. Two of them carry long oval shields, the shield of the third differs in shape, having a rectangular body, and circular head, with narrow neck. Sir A. Cunningham's conjecture as to the meaning of the composition fails to explain the presence of these soldiers.

Dr. Leitner, who has seen Buddhist masquerade processions in Ladākh, informs me that he regards the monstrous forms in the upper part of the panel as intended to represent the masks of the Vices in a
procession of Vices and Virtues, and that the soldiers may be interpreted as the escort. In his Catalogue he gives a somewhat different explanation.

Whatever be the correct interpretation of this strange composition, it is certainly one of the best, and presumably among the earliest, works of the Gandhāra school. All the figures are well executed, and the aged and monstrous heads in the upper compartment are carved with great cleverness and spirit. It probably, like the Athéné, belongs to the pre-Roman period.

Inasmuch as my object in this paper is not the publication of an exhaustive monograph on the Gandhāra school of sculpture, but the presentation of a general view of the modes of Greco-Roman influence on India, though with special reference to the Gandhāra sculptures, I shall not proceed farther in the detailed description of works from the Kābul valley, which deal with subjects obviously belonging to the domain of Buddhist mythology.

Certain decorative elements, which are not peculiar to the Gandhāra school, but also occur in the earlier sculptures at Bhārhat and Buddha Gayā in the interior of India, are mythological, but not in themselves, so far as appears, specially connected with Buddhist mythology. I allude to the hippocamps, centaurs, tritons, and various winged and other monsters, which are frequently met with. These forms, which are certainly of Greco-Roman origin, so far as India is concerned, were probably used by the Buddhist artists for purely decorative purposes, without any definite symbolical meaning. Such monsters were common in Greek art, and are supposed especially to characterize the works of the followers of Scopas.

The comic friezes in which boys are shown pulling cattle by the tails, riding on lions, and disporting themselves in sundry fantastic ways, are obviously not Indian in design. Major Cole's plate 26 illustrates a tolerably good specimen from the Mián Kháń monastery of such a comic frieze, the figures in which are boys mounted on lions.

The direct model for these works was probably found in Roman art. Their ultimate source is to be traced to the Alexandrian compositions depicting the "eropogonía (love-sports, amatory poems) of the Ana-creontic school, in which Eros becomes a boy, and rides all sorts of wild animals and monsters, lions, panthers, boars, centaurs, hippocamps, dolphins, dogs, and deer."*

Among the remains of the Gandhāra sculptor's work an extraordinary abundance of detached human heads, chiefly executed in stucco, is met with.

* Perry, History of Greek and Roman Sculpture, p. 629.
The cases in the British Museum contain a series of about forty such heads, varying from life-size to very small dimensions. Most of these were obtained in the Pesháwar District, and purchased in 1861 through the late Mr. Thomas.* They are as varied in character as in size, and comprise old and young, male and female, serious and comic. Almost all are good, but I was particularly struck by the head, five or six inches in height, of an aged, emaciated, and bearded man, and the very remarkable life-size head of a laughing youth, with large straight nose, big projecting ears, and a curl of hair on his forehead.

Dr. Leitner has a considerable number of similar heads in his collection, and, as he observes, it is impossible not to notice the resemblance between them and the heads found in Cyprus, specimens of which may be seen in the British, South Kensington, and Woking Museums.

The specimens from the Pesháwar District, in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, marked P 1–18, are similar, and some particularly good examples of such heads, found in the Mián Khán monastery, are figured in Major Cole's Plate 28.

Two plaster heads of this class are figured in plate IX, fig. 5, a and b. They are about each six inches in height. The head reproduced in fig. a is very Greek in feature, though Indian in ornament. The photograph, in consequence of foreshortening, does not do the face full justice.

The great abundance of such detached stucco heads is probably to be explained, at least in part, by the following observation of Masson, who notes that at the village of Hidda, near Jalálábád in the upper Kábul valley, "idols in great numbers are to be found. They are small, of one and the same kind, about six or eight inches in height, and consist of a strong cast head fixed on a body of earth, whence the heads only can be brought away. They are seated and clothed in folds of drapery, and the hair is woven into rows of curls. The bodies are sometimes painted with red lead, and rarely covered with leaf-gold; they appear to have been interred in apartments, of which fragments are also found."†

Section IV. Hellenistic Sculpture in India Proper.

An exhaustive examination of all the known remains of early Buddhist sculpture which exhibit traces, more or less distinct, of teaching derived from Greek sources would, I fear, be extremely tedious,

* Information kindly supplied by A. Franks, Esq., F. R. S.
† *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 113.
and would certainly extend this paper far beyond the limits to which I desire to confine it. The Hellenistic influence on India Proper was slight, and no site in the interior of India contains the remains of a distinct, well-established Greek, or Græco-Roman, school of art, such as existed in Gândhára. I shall, therefore, content myself with a mere passing reference to most of the Indian cases in which the marks of western art teaching have been detected, and shall describe in detail only a few specially interesting works.

The honeysuckle ornament on the capitals of some of the monoliths of Ásoka (B. C. 250) is the earliest example of a Greek form of decoration applied to Indian work. Mr. Fergusson has suggested that Ásoka borrowed this ornament direct from its Assyrian or Babylonian birthplace, and not from the Greeks, but, considering the fact that, even in Ásoka's time, Assyrian and Babylonian art belonged to a distant past, it seems much more natural to suppose that the Ionic honeysuckle ornament was introduced into India from the Greek kingdoms of Asia with which Ásoka was in communication.

I have already alluded to the tritons, hippocamps, and other marine monsters which formed part of the ordinary Greek decorative stock-in-trade, and passed into Indian art.

The centaur, another characteristic Greek form, is found among the sculptures at Bhárhut, dating from about B. C. 150, and among those at Buddha Gayá, which are somewhat earlier.

The chariot of the sun, in Indian mythology, is drawn by seven steeds. At Buddha Gayá in Bihár, and again at Bhájá in the Bombay Presidency, we find it represented drawn by four steeds, as in Greek art. Mr. Fergusson also draws attention to the Greek look of "the figure of the spear-bearer" in the Bhájá cave temple. The same writer detects the presence of a distinctively Greek element in the well-known sculptures of Amaráváti on the Kṛishṇa river, and such an element may certainly be traced in them, though its presence is not very obvious on casual inspection.

* Cave Temples, p. 521.

† For a full descriptive account of the sculptures at Bháhut, see Sir A. Cunningham's special work on the subject. Centaurs at Buddha Gayá and Bháhut are described in Anderson's Catalogue, Part I, p. 129, where further references are given.

‡ For the Buddha Gayá sun chariot, see Cunningham, Archæol. Rep., Vol. III, p. 97; Buddha Gayá by Rájendraláí Mitra, Plate L; Fergusson and Burgess, Cave Temples, p. 521. For the Bhájá example of the same design see Archæol. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV, p. 5, Pl. VI.

§ Cave Temples, p. 521, Pl. XCVI, 5.

on the Civilization of Ancient India.

The most distinct and conspicuous remains of Indo-Hellenic art in the interior of India are those which have been discovered at the ancient city of Mathurā, situated on the Jamnā about thirty-five miles from Agra.

A group in sandstone, found at or near Mathurā, was described and figured more than fifty years ago by James Prinsep as representing Silenus with his attendants, and a second corresponding, though not identical, group has since been discovered by Mr. Growse in the neighbourhood of the same city.

The block first found is three feet broad, and three feet eight inches high, hollowed on the top into a shallow basin, perfectly smooth, and originally nearly circular, and is sculptured back and front with figures in high relief.

"In the front group the principal figure is a stout, half-naked man, resting on a low seat, with wig or vine-crowned brow, out-stretched arms, which appear to be supported by the figures, male and female, standing one on each side. The dress of the female is certainly not Indian, and is almost as certainly Greek. * * * Prinsep agrees with Stacey in considering the principal figure to be Silenus:—'His portly carcass, drunken lassitude, and vine-wreathed forehead, stamp the individual, while the drapery of his attendants pronounces them at least to be foreign to India, whatever may be thought of Silenus' own costume, which is certainly highly orthodox and Brahmanical. If the sculptor were a Greek, his taste had been somewhat tainted by the Indian beaui-ideal of female beauty. In other respects his proportions and attitudes are good; nay, superior to any specimen of pure Hindu sculpture we possess; and, considering the object of the group, to support a sacrificial vase (probably of the juice of the grape), it is excellent.'"

Prinsep's account of the purpose of the block described by him, and his interpretation of the sculptures have both been disputed. I shall not enter into the controversy on the subject, which may be read in the works cited in the note. Personally, I am of opinion, that the drunken man is an Indian adaptation of Silenus.

A third work, much in the same style, and still more obviously

* Cunningham, Archael. Rep., Vol 1, p. 243. Prinsep's original account will be found in Journal As. Soc. of Bengal, Vol. V, (1836), pp. 517, 567, Pl. XXXI. The sculpture described by Prinsep and its subsequently discovered companions are discussed by Mr. Growse, and illustrated by good plates, in the same Journal, Vol. XLIV, Part I (1875), p. 214, Pls. XII, XIII, and are further commented on by the same writer in Mathurā, a District Memoir. See also Anderson's Catalogue, Part I, pp. 170—176.
Greek in subject and treatment, was discovered in 1882 by Sir A. Cunningham, also at Mathurá, where it served an humble purpose as the side of a cattle-trough. This unique specimen now adorns the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Dr. Anderson’s careful, though rather awkwardly worded, description of it is as follows:—

"M. 17.—A figure of Hercules in alto-rilievo, 2 feet 5 inches high, strangling the Nemean lion. The latter is represented standing erect on its hind feet, but grasped round the neck by the left arm of Hercules, who is pressing the neck against his shoulder. The right arm of the statuette is broken off, but, as the axilla is exposed, the arm had been represented raised and bent on itself at the elbow, so that the hand had been brought down close to the shoulder, but hidden in the foliage behind the figure, the tree being the same as occurs in the Silenus group. The greater portion of the knotted club is seen behind the right side of the figure. The action, therefore, is not only that of strangling, but of clubbing the lion as well. The head of Hercules has been lost, and the front part also of the head of the lion. He (scil. Hercules) is represented as having worn the skin of an animal over his back, as the front limbs are tied before his chest in a loop-knot, the free ends being the paws. The beard of the lion is indicated by parallel pendants, and, on the full rounded left cheek, there is a somewhat stellate figure with wavy arms, probably a rude Swastika. The fore-limbs of the lion are raised to the front of its neck, grasping the left hand of Hercules, but they are very feebly executed. The general art characters of the figure are essentially Grecian, but, in the attitude in which Hercules is placed towards the lion, and the consequent position of his right arm, it would be extremely difficult to deal any but the most feeble blow. Although there is considerable anatomical accuracy in delineating the position of the various muscles brought into play in Hercules, the lion is devoid of action and badly shaped."

These Mathurá sculptures have very little in common with those of Gándhára, and seem to be the work of a different school. They have not the Roman impress which is so plainly stamped on the art of Gándhára, and are apparently the result of Greek teaching conveyed through other than Roman channels. It is difficult to fix their date with precision. It cannot well be later than A. D. 300, and the style is not good enough to justify the suggestion of a very early date. Perhaps A. D. 200 may be taken as an approximate date for these works, but at present their chronological position cannot be definitely determined.

* Catalogue, Part I, p. 190.
They are by no means, in my opinion, equal in merit to the best of the Gândhára Indo-Roman sculptures, which I assign to the third century A. D.

The Mathurá group of Herakles and the lion may be contrasted with the widely different representation of the same subject recently found at Quetta in Baláchistán. A much corroded copper or bronze statuette, two and a quarter feet high, discovered at that place, shows the hero standing, and holding under his left arm either the skin or dead body of the slain lion, the right arm being wanting.* This work, to judge from the published plate, has an archaic look, and bears a curiously close resemblance to the colossal figure found at Khorsábád in Assyria, fancifully named Nimrod by Bonomi, and designated the Assyrian Hercules by other writers. "He is represented strangling a young lion, which he presses against his chest with his left arm, while he is clutching in his hand the fore-paw of the animal, which seems convulsed in the agony of his grasp. In his right hand he holds an instrument which we infer to be analogous to the boomerang of the Australians," etc.†

I cannot venture to assign even an approximate date for the Quetta statuette, and can only say that it is certainly an early work.

Section V. The Chronology and Affinities of the Gândhára or Pesháwar School of Sculpture.

It is impossible to determine the affinities of a school of art until its chronological position is known at least with approximate accuracy. Apparent resemblances between the works of different schools are apt to be delusive and misleading unless checked by chronological dates independent of the idiosyncrasies of the critic. On the other hand, the style of the works of art, the date of which is in question, is in itself, when used with due caution, an essential element for the determination of the chronology, if conclusive external proof is not forthcoming. In the case of the Gândhára school its chronology and affinities are both still to a large extent undetermined. I shall quote subsequently the divergent judgments of the principal authorities on the subject. For the present I shall confine myself to the examination of the external evidence for the chronology of the Gándhára sculptures. This evidence falls chiefly under three heads, namely, (1) Epigraphic, (2) Numismatic, and (3) the records of the Chinese pilgrims. The pilgrims’ testimony, supplemented

* Journal As. Soc. of Bengal, Vol. LVI, p. 163, Pl. X.
† Bonomi, Nineveh and its Palaces, 2nd ed., p. 163, Plate X.
by scanty historical data from Indian sources, will be more conveniently
dealt with in connection with the internal evidence derived from style.
The other two heads may here be considered.

The epigraphic material in the Gândhâra region is unfortunately
meagre in quantity, and the little that exists gives but a small amount
of information.

The local inscriptions, known in 1875, are enumerated by Sir A.
Cunningham,* and comprise the following records, namely, from

(1.) Jamâlgâfhi.  (a) Certain mason's marks;
    (b) The Indian names of a weekday and a
        month on a plaster;
    (g) Seven unintelligible letters, read as Saphâ
danamukha, incised on the back of the
        nimbus of one of the statues suppos-
        ed to be those of kings.

(2.) Kharkai.  (a) Masons' marks;
    (b) Three characters, read as a, ra, and de,
        on the sides of a small stone relic-
        chamber.

(3.) Zeda.  Inscription of Kanishka dated in the year
    11.

(4.) Okind.  A fragment dated in the month Chaitra of
    the year 61.

(5.) Takht-i-Bahî.  Inscription dated in the 26th year of Mahâ-
    rája Guduphara, in the year 103 of
    an undetermined era.

(6.) Panjtâr.  Inscription of a Mahârája of Gushâu or
    Kushân tribe, dated in the year 122.

(7.) Saddo.  The Indian name of a mouth on a rock.

(8.) Sahri-Bahlol.  The Indian name of a mouth on a fragment
    of pottery.

Inasmuch as Taxila may be included for the purposes of the his-
tory of art in Gândhâra, the Taxila inscription of the Satrap Linâko
Kuslako, dated in the 78th year of the great king Moga, should be
added to the above list.

I have lately obtained an inscription on the pedestal of a statuette of
Buddha dated in the year 274.

All the inscriptions above referred to are in the alphabet variously
designated as Arián, Ario or Ariano-Pâli, or Bactrio-Pâli, which is
written from right to left, and was employed by Asoka (B. C. 250) in

his edict inscription engraved on the rock at Shāhbāzgarhī (Kapurda-giri) in the Gāndhāra country. The use of this alphabet never became general in the interior of India, and certainly died out there altogether at an early date, not much subsequent to the Christian era.

These facts have been utilized by Sir A. Cunningham as an argument for the early date of the Gāndhāra sculptures, but the argument seems to me devoid of all force. When he wrote his Report the latest known date for an Arian inscription was the year 122, recorded in the Panjtar document, and this date was then believed to refer to the era known by the name of Vikrama, B. C. 57. Sir A. Cunningham, therefore, argued "As no Indian letters have been found on any of them, I conclude that the whole of the sculptures must belong to the two centuries before and after the Christian era, as the Arian characters are known to have fallen into disuse about A. D. 100 or a little later."

No one now believes that the Indo-Scythian era is the same as that of Vikrama, and most archaeologists hold, though conclusive proof is still wanting, that the Indo-Scythian inscriptions are dated in the Saka era of A. D. 78. If this correction be applied, Sir A. Cunningham's argument will mean that all the Gāndhāra sculptures must be prior to A. D. 250.

One premise of this argument has been destroyed by the discovery of an Arian inscription dated 274, equivalent to A. D. 352, if referred to the Saka era. That inscription at the present moment happens to be the latest known, but there is no reason why one still later should not be found. The absence of Indian letters on the Gāndhāra sculptures simply proves that the Indian alphabet was not used in that part of the country, which fact was known already for an earlier period from the existence of Aśoka's Shāhbāzgarhī inscription.

The Arian character never took root in India Proper, and its early total disuse there gives no indication as to the date of its disuse in its original home in the countries on the north-west frontier. I should not be surprised, if an Arian inscription dated as late as A. D. 500 should be discovered in Afghanistan or the Western Panjab.

The Gāndhāra sculptures can be proved, on other grounds, to be earlier than A. D. 500, up to which date the Arian character may well have continued in use in the country where they occur. The fact, therefore, that the Gāndhāra inscriptions are all in the Arian character, does not help in any way to fix the date of the sculptures, much less does it prove that they are earlier either than A. D. 100 or A. D. 250.

Among the inscriptions in Sir A. Cunningham's list those from Zeda, Ohind, Takht-i-Bahl, Panjtar, Saddo, and Sabri-Bahlol, are not closely associated with Graeco-Buddhist sculptures. The valueless Saddo
fragment inscribed on a rock is the only one among these records found in its original position. These inscriptions consequently give no warrant for the assumption that the Græco-Buddhist sculptures are contemporary with Kanishka or Gondophares, who are mentioned in some of the documents.

The Arian inscriptions at Kharkai and Jamálgarghi are incised on works of the Græco-Buddhist or Gándhára school, but are too fragmentary to be of any use. Sir A. Cunningham wishes to read the characters a, ra, de, on the Kharkai relic-chamber as Aṛya Deva, the name of a Buddhist patriarch who flourished late in the first century A. D., but this interpretation is purely conjectural, and cannot be admitted.

The result of all the foregoing discussion is the negative conclusion that, with the exception of the image of Buddha dated 274, no epigraphic evidence to prove the date of the Gándhára sculptures has yet been discovered.

This unique dated inscription is of sufficient interest to deserve a particular description. I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. L. White King, B. C. S., for permission to publish it. *

In or about the year 1883, at Hashmágar, the site of the ancient Pushkalávati (Peukeloaitis), Mr. King came across a statue of the standing Buddha, which was ignorantly worshipped by the Hindús as an orthodox deity. He could not carry away the statue, but was allowed to remove its inscribed pedestal, a photograph of which is reproduced in Plate X.

The pedestal, like most of the Gándhára sculptures, is composed of blue slate, and is 14½" long by 8" high. Its front is adorned by an alto-rilievo, enclosed between two Indo-Corinthian pilasters, and representing Buddha seated, attended by disciples, who seem to be presenting offerings to him.

An Arian inscription, consisting of a single line of character, deeply and clearly cut, and in great part excellently preserved, occupies a smooth band below the relief. This band was evidently prepared for the inscription, which must have been executed at the same time as the sculpture. The record is incomplete at the end, and the lost portion, which is of very small extent, may have contained the name of the person who dedicated the image.

The extant portion was read by Sir A. Cunningham, for Mr. King, as follows:—

* I have already printed a brief notice of this inscription, accompanied by a lithograph taken from a rubbing, in Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, (1889), p. 257. The photograph is now published for the first time.
"Sam 27½ emborasmasa masasa mi panchami 5—" The record, as it stands, consists of a date, and nothing more. The month is stated to be intercalary, but is not further named. The numerals are distinct, and their interpretation seems to be free from doubt. The notation is clumsy, and may be rendered thus in Roman numerals, II C XX XX X IV, = 274.

The main question suggested by this very scanty record is that of the identity of the era referred to.

The locality in which the inscription was found suggests that the date might be expressed either in the era of Gondophares, as used in the Takht-i-Bahí inscription, or the era of the great king Moga referred to in the Taxila record of Liako Kusulako, or in the era, generally identified with the Saka era, which was employed by Kanishka. These are the only three eras, in which Arian inscriptions from the Gandhára region are known to be dated, and it is reasonable to assume, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the number 274 refers to one or other of these epochs. The initial point of no one of the three has yet been ascertained, and consequently an exact date for the new inscription cannot be fixed in any case. But the approximate beginnings of all three eras can be determined by numismatic evidence, and one of two approximate dates can be selected for the inscription.

The coins indicate that the eras used both by Moga and Gondophares must have their starting points about the middle of the first century B. C., and, so far as appears at present, the two may have been identical. For the purpose of selecting an approximate date for the inscription they may be treated as one, and as equivalent to the era B. C. 57, known to the later ages as the Vikrama Samvat.*

* Assuming that the Mahárája Guduphares of the Takht-i-Bahí inscription is identical with the sovereign whose name is variously given on coins, in the genitive case, as Undophierrou, Gondopharon, Gadapharasa, Gadaphanasa, and Gadapharasa, or, in the nominative case, as Undophares; and assuming further that all the coins alluded to were struck by one king, then the numismatic evidence indicates that he flourished in the first half of the first century B. C. (See Gardner’s Catalogue of the Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings, pp. XLIV, 103-105, Plates XXII, XXIII, XXXII). The year 103 of Gondophares would therefore fall about the middle of the first century A. D., and, for rough approximations, his era may be regarded as identical with that of Vikrama.

Assuming that Moga of the Taxilian inscription is identical with Manes, who is known from coins, his date must be fixed as about 60 or 70 B. C., which, again, is nearly synchronous with the era of Vikrama (See Gardner, pp. XXXIII, XLIX. For the Taxilian inscription see Cunningham, Archæol. Rep., Vol. II, p. 132, Pl. LIX, and Vol. V, p. 67).

I must not, of course, be understood to suggest that as a matter of fact either Moga or Gondopheras used the era afterwards known as the Vikrama Samvat. I use
If then the Hashtnagar inscription is dated in the era either of Moga or Gondophares its approximate date is $274 - 57 = A. D. 214$.

Though demonstration that Kanishka used the Saka era is still wanting, there is no doubt that the era of his inscriptions does not differ, at the most, more than about twenty years from the Saka, and for the present purpose the era of Kanishka may be taken as identical with the Saka, A. D. 78. Assuming that this era was used in the Hashtnagar record, its date is A. D. 352. The alternative approximate dates, therefore, are A. D. 214 and 352.

The style of the Hashtnagar alto-relievo appears to me to be decidedly inferior to that of most of the Mián Khán, Jamálgarhí, Nutta, and Sanghao sculptures. The figures in it are not undercut, as they are in the best specimens of Greco-Buddhist art, and the execution, on the whole, is poor. So far as I can judge, the work cannot well be older than the middle of the fourth century.

This dubious conclusion is the only assistance given by epigraphic evidence for determining the problem of the age of the Gándhára sculptures.

The numismatic testimony is nearly as scanty and weak as the epigraphic.

The undisturbed hoard of the coins of Aces buried below the Taxila temple with the Ionic pillars indicates, as argued above (p. 115), that that edifice is to be dated from about the beginning of the Christian era, and this inference is in harmony with the reasoning based on considerations of architectural style. It is, as I have already observed, impossible to decide whether the plaster statues found in the Taxila temple are contemporary with it or not, for no information concerning their style has been published. The coins of Aces found at Taxila, therefore, give no clue to the chronological position of the Gándhára school of sculpture, excepting a few of the earliest works, especially the Pallas, already discussed (p. 121). The only localities, so far as I can ascertain, where coins have been discovered in close association with remains of Greco-Buddhist, or Romano-Buddhist, sculpture, are Jamálgarhí and Sanghao.

Lieutenant Crompton in his report on excavations at the former site says nothing about coins beyond the unsatisfactory remark that "a few silver and copper coins were turned up;"* but Sir A. Cunningham

the epoch B. C. 57 merely as a short expression for any era which began somewhere about the middle of the first century B. C., and about which mere accurate knowledge is wanting. The Arian inscriptions from the Gándhára country have not yet been properly edited, and the published translations are quoted with reserve.

is a little more explicit, and records that, during the progress of the explorations, eight coins are discovered, seven of which bore the name of Bazo Deo, or Vasu Deva.*

Unfortunately no more particular account of these coins has been published. We do not know either the circumstances of their discovery, or their numismatic type, and consequently can draw no positive inference from the fact that they were found. Coins bearing the name of Bazo Deo or Vasu Deva continued to be struck for a long period, but none of them are earlier than about A.D. 150,† and all we can say is that the discovery of Bazo Deo coins at Jamálgarhí is perfectly consistent with the inferences to be drawn from the style of the sculptures found in that locality, even if it be assumed, which is not proved, that the coins are contemporary with the sculptures. The coins, for all that appears to the contrary, may have been struck in the third century.

The only other locality where the discovery of coins can be held to afford evidence for fixing the chronology of Gándhára sculpture is Sanghão. The discovery is reported by Major Cole, a good explorer and photographer, but a bad archaeologist, as follows:—

"Tho site where the sculptures were dug is perched on a steep spur, and was the first excavation done under my superintendence in January, 1883. The building revealed two distinct periods, and consists of a basement containing small tops, and of a superstructure of plain apartments, built obliquely over the basement, apparently without reference to its plan.

"The sculptures were found in the basement, and belong to the older period; coins of Kanishka, A.D. 80 to 120, were found in the superstructure, and belong to the more modern period."‡

The Kanishka coins were found along with a brass ring in the so-called ‘treasury,’ "in earthen ware jars embedded in the floors at the corners A and B," as shown in the plan.§

The sculptures referred to were sent to the Lahore Museum, and form the subject of Plate II of Major Cole’s volume of heliogravures.

A coin of Gondophares was also found somewhere in the same group of buildings.|| Gondophares reigned about A. D. 30, but the mere fact that a coin of his was found at Jamálgarhí would, at the most, prove

* Arcacl. Rep., Vol. V, p. 194. The date assigned to Bazo Deo in this passage is admittedly erroneous.
† Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings, pp. lii, 159—161 Pl. XXIX.
‡ Cole, Third Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India, for the year 1883-84, p. cx.
§ Cole, Second Report, for 1882-83, p. cxx, Pl. 3.
an early occupation of the site. It is no evidence of the date of a particular set of sculptures.

The discovery of coins of Kanishka in the superstructure of the Jamálgarhí monastery, above the basement containing the sculptures, is a much more weighty fact, and undoubtedly seems to warrant Major Cole's inference that the sculptures are earlier than A. D. 100. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the inference is a mistaken one. I fully accept Major Cole's account of what he saw, but it is quite possible that he did not see all that ought to have been observed. He is a strong believer in Sir A. Cunningham's theory of the early date of the Gándhára sculptures, and may, like many other people, have been unconsciously biased by a prepossession. It is impossible for any one who has not minute local knowledge to check the details of an observation as reported, but, while I cannot pretend to point out the seat of the error, I am fully persuaded that the discovery of the coins in question is not to be explained by the theory that the sculptures photographed are earlier than the reign of Kanishka, but should be interpreted in some other way.

My reasons for thus refusing to accept apparently clear external evidence of date will, I hope, be sufficiently established by the discussion of the internal evidence on which I am about to enter. For the present, it will suffice to say that Major Cole's plate refutes his text. The Sanghao sculptures belong to the same school as those of Natta, though they may be a little later, and they bear throughout distinct marks of the influence of Roman art of the third or fourth century. They cannot possibly be anterior to A. D. 100, no matter what coins were found above or below them.

The problem demanding solution may be conveniently stated by placing in juxtaposition and contrast the opinions expressed by the two scholars who have attacked it.

Mr. Fergusson, after giving many reasons, some strong, and some the reverse, for his opinion, came to the conclusion "that, though some of these Gándhára sculptures probably are as early as the first century of the Christian Era, the bulk of them at Jamálgiri, and more especially those at Takht-i-Bahi, are subsequent to the third and fourth centuries, and that the series extends down to the eighth century; till, in fact, the time when Buddhism was obliterated in these countries."

Sir Alexander Cunningham expresses his views as follows:—

"What I have called the Indo-Grecian style must have been introduced by the Greeks who ruled the country; but the earliest specimens, so far as can be proved, belong to the time of Azes, I saw myself twelve

* Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 182.
coins of Azes exhumed from under the temple of Maliér-ki-mora (Shál-
dheri), from which the Indo-Ionic capitals and bases were extracted.
The Indo-Corinthian examples should be equally old, at least all
the fine examples. But the oldest that can be proved, belongs to the
time of the Antonines, and is certainly older than Constantine."

[Here follow detailed references to the stúpas at Mánikyála and
elsewhere, and to the use of the Arian alphabet, which has been suffi-
ciently discussed above.]

"I would, therefore, ascribe all the greater works, both of sculpture
and architecture, to the flourishing period of Kushán sway under
Kauishka, Huvishka, and Vasu Deva—, or from 80 to 200 A. D.

Doubtless many stúpas were erected after A. D. 290; but they were
comparatively small, and their decorations rough and coarse."

[Reference is then made to the Sahri Bahol image, and the Hidda
and Bauti Piud topes, which will be discussed subsequently.]

"I notice that none of the sculptured head-dresses show any affinity
with Sasanian costume, whereas the coins (Indo-Sasánian) show it
unmistakeably, from about the time of Baharám Gor. From this I infer
that the sculptures are older than 400 A. D.

"I believe that the strong Sasanian government from A. D. 230 to
450 formed a very effectual barrier to intercourse between Rome and
N.-W. India. Roman gold coins are plentiful down to the time of
Severus and Caracalla [A. D. 217]. They then disappear until the
time of Justin [A. D. 526], Marcian [A. D. 450], Leo [A. D. 474], and
Anastasius." [A. D. 491-518].*

I am not able to agree altogether with either Mr. Fergusson or Sir
A. Cunningham, and shall now proceed to state the reasons which seem
to me sufficient to justify me in venturing to differ from such eminent
authorities.

It will be convenient to attempt in the first place to fix possible
limiting dates, and, when that has been done, to determine, so far as
may be, the approximate actual dates of the sculptures. The chronolo-
gical enquiry involves the determination of their aesthetic affinities.

As to the initial date there is practically no dispute. It is impos-
sible to be certain that "the Indo-Grecian style" was really "introduced

* My quotations are from a letter dated 8th January 1889, with which Sir A.
Cunningham favoured me in answer to enquiries, and which consequently, express
his latest and deliberate opinion on the subject. In the Introduction to Volume V
of the Archæological Reports he had long ago expressed the same opinion as to the
relation between the Kushán dynasty and the Gándhára sculptures, but the theory
which he then held as to the Kushán chronology obliged him to fix the date of the
sculptures nearly a century and a half earlier than he now does.
V. A. Smith—Greek-Roman influence [No. 3,

by the Greeks who ruled the country," as Sir A. Cunningham affirms that it must have been, because, with the exception of coins, not a vestige of Bactrian art is known to exist, and we know nothing almost about the Greeks who ruled the country beyond the names of some of them.

But, whoever introduced Greek art into India, so far as our present knowledge extends, the Taxilans Ionic temples are certainly our oldest specimens of Indo-Greek architecture, and the statuette of Athene, in the same posture in which she is shown on the coins of Azes, is our oldest Indo-Greek sculpture from the Gândhâra region. Both the temples and statuette must date approximately from the beginning of the Christian era.

It has been shown above (p. 112) that Greek art influenced Indian sculpture and architectural decoration from the time of Asoka B. C. 250, and that more or less distinct traces of its influence may be traced in the interior of India for several centuries afterwards. Greek ideas reached India by at least two routes, namely, overland through Bactria, and by sea through the ports of the western coast.

The Athene and the Taxilans Ionic pillars are, I think, to be classed among the results of this old and long-continued Hellenistic influence.

The bases of the Ionic pillars at Taxila, according to the measurements of their discoverer, correspond exactly with the pure Attic model, as seen in the Erechtheum. "The capitals differ from the usual Greek forms very considerably, and more especially in the extreme height of the abacus. The volutes also differ, but they present the same side views of a baluster, which is common to all the Greek forms of the Ionic order."* In other words, the pillars, though with peculiarities of their own, are Greek, not Roman. The Roman modification of the Ionic order was characterized by corner volutes.

At the beginning of the Christian era Roman art, as will be explained presently, had not affected India, and the fact that the Taxilans Ionic pillars are Greek, not Roman, in style, harmonizes perfectly with the numismatic evidence that they were erected soon after B. C. 30.

So far, then, as the Athene and the Ionic pillars are concerned, it must be admitted that the Gândhâra sculptures go back to the beginning of the Christian era, and A. D. 1 may be taken as the anterior limiting date. Nothing older is known in the Gândhâra region. I shall endeavour to prove subsequently that nothing else which has been found there is nearly so old.

I shall now try to fix the posterior limiting date, which Mr. Fergus-

* Arch. Rev. Vol. V, p. 71, Pl. XVIII.
son places in the eighth century, and Sir A. Cunningham at the begin-
ing of the fifth.

The extension of the Græco-Buddhist series of sculptures down to the eighth century A. D. by Mr. Fergusson was suggested by the pub-
lished accounts of the opening of the great tope at Mānikiyāla many years ago by General Ventura.

The undisturbed deposit which was found in the lower portion of that building included coins of Kanishka and Huvishka, and some-
later, and is legitimately interpreted as signifying that the structure in its original form cannot be older than A. D. 110, nor much later than A. D. 150.

The upper deposits, about the exact position of which there is some doubt, contained various coins ranging in date from A. D. 632 to about A. D. 730, and undoubtedly show that the top of the building must have been opened in the eighth century, and a deposit then made. But they prove nothing more.

We are altogether ignorant of the circumstances under which these upper deposits were made, and it is very unsafe to build any historical theories on their existence. The great tope at Mānikiyāla is adorned with Indo-Corinthian pilasters, the existing capitals of which are exec-
cuted in kunkar, or nodular limestone. Sir A. Cunningham supposes that all the original work of the tope was in sandstone, and that the kunkar mouldings date from the eighth century.* No other example of Indo-Corinthian work of that date is known, and, if the existing capitals were executed in the eighth century, I feel certain that they were mere restorations. As a matter of fact their date is quite uncer-
tain. The attempt to connect the coin of Yaśo Varma, A. D. 730, which was found in the upper deposit, with supposed repairs of the tope in the eighth century is purely conjectural.† All we really know is that somebody for some reason unknown opened the building at the top and put in a coin of Yaśo Varma. Such an adventitious supple-
mentary deposit is no substantial basis for an argument that Buddhism and Indo-Hellenic art still flourished in the Gāndhāra region in the eighth century, and, except Yāso Varma’s coin, no evidence whatever, so far as I am aware, exists to support the inference that the Gāndhāra school of art continued to exist so late as the eighth century.

In another place, Mr. Fergusson, still relying on the same poor little coin, has given an unwarrantable extension to the duration

* The great Mānikiyāla tope is discussed by Cunningham at considerable length in Arthaspārt Rept., Vol. II, p. 139, and Vol. V, pp. 76—78.
† [It is more probable that the coin is of the 6th century, of a Yaśo Varman about 532 A. D. This would admirably fit in with “the limiting date” given on p. 153. See Proceedings for August 1888. Ed.]
of Buddhism as a dominant faith in Gândhára. "There were," he writes, "probably no great Buddhist establishments in Gândhára before Kanishka, and as few, if any, after Yáso Varma, yet we learn that between these dates [i.e. circa A. D. 78 to 730], this province was as essentially Buddhist as any part of India.*

In support of the last clause of this sentence the Chinese travellers Fa Hian and Hiuen Tsiang are appealed to, but their testimony does not support the conclusion drawn from it. After the middle of the seventh century, when Hiuen Tsiang wrote, very few parts of India were "essentially Buddhist," and Gândhára certainly was not. In A. D. 730 very little Buddhism can have been left in it.

Mr. Fergusson's language is correct when it is confined to the beginning of the fifth century. Fa Hian who travelled in India in the years A. D. 400—405, found Buddhism vigorous and flourishing in Gândhára, as in a large part of India. But, at the time of the travels of Hiuen Tsiang, A. D. 629—642, a very great change had taken place, and Gândhára was very far from being "essentially Buddhist."

The capital city of Gândhára, the modern Pesháwar, is, he notes "about 40 li [= 6 to 7 miles] in circuit. The royal family is extinct, and the kingdom is governed by deputies from Kapisa [N. of Kábul]. The town and villages are deserted, and there are but few inhabitants.

At one corner of the royal residence there are about 1,000 families * * * There are about 1,000 saughárímas [monasteries], which are deserted and in ruins. They are filled with wild shrubs, and solitary to the last degree. The stúpas are mostly decayed. The heretical temples, to the number of about 100, are occupied pell-mell by heretics."

At Pushkalávatí, the modern Hashtnagar, the pilgrim found a large population, but not of the congregation of the faithful, for the Buddhist buildings, like those of the capital, were in ruins.

Taxila, east of the Indus, was dependent on Káshmir, the royal family here also being extinct. The monasteries are described as "ruinous and deserted, and there are very few priests; those that there are, study the Great Vehicle."†

The graphic and emphatic words of Hiuen Tsiang prove with absolute certainty that at the time of his visits (A. D 629—642) the Buddhist religion in Gândhára was nearly extinct. The utter decay of which he gives such clear testimony must have been in progress for a considerable time. It is not possible that the Buddhist edifices of Pesháwar could have become "deserted and in ruins, filled with wild shrubs, and solitary to the last degree" in a day.

* History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 76.
† Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. I, pp. 100, 109, 137.
It is quite safe to assume that Buddhism had ceased to be an active force in the Gāndhāra region, including Taxila, by the year A. D. 600; and it is inconceivable that new religious edifices on any considerable scale should have been erected, or works of art deserving of the name, executed in that region subsequent to that date by the scattered, poverty-stricken, and necessarily dispirited adherents of a decaying religion.

It follows, therefore, that the series of Graeco-Buddhist works in Gāndhāra does not extend, as Mr. Fergusson supposed, to the eighth century, but, on the contrary, was closed by the end of the sixth century.

As a matter of fact, the closing date must, I believe, be pushed back considerably further, but in any case, A. D. 600 *must be taken as the extreme possible limiting posterior date for any work of the Gāndhāra school in the Lower Kābul Valley*. The dates of which we are in search lie, therefore, between A. D. 1 and A. D. 600.

The above argument, based on the testimony of Hiuen Tsiang, appears to me unanswerable, but it may be well to supplement it by other arguments, in themselves of less force, which reduce the closing date to still narrower bounds. I have already quoted Sir A. Cunningham's remark that the head dresses of the Gāndhāra sculptures show no affinity with the Sāvaṇṇa costume, and that the sculptures may therefore be regarded as prior, not only to A. D. 600, but to A. D. 400.

Another observation of Sir A. Cunningham's leads to nearly the same conclusion. He observes that "all, or nearly all, Buddhist building must have been stopped after the occupation of Peshāwar by Kitolo's son in the latter part of the fifth century." The Chinese account show that "the last king of the Yuchi [Yueh-ti] mentioned in history is Kitolo, who took possession of Gāndhāra, but was obliged to return to the west to oppose the white Huns, leaving his son in charge of the new province. The son established his capital in Fo-lu-she, or Parshāwār [Peshāwar]; and the name of the founder of the Little Yuchi, as they were afterwards called, still survives in the title of Shāh Kator, the Chief of Chitrāl."*

The coins of the kings of the Little Yuchi are described as bearing Sāva emblems,† and the kings themselves, therefore, were presumably Brahmanists. It is going too far to assume with Sir A. Cunningham that the rule of a Sāva king must necessarily have put a stop to all, or nearly all, Buddhist buildings, but it must certainly have been un-

---

* My first quotation is from a private letter. The second is from Archaeol. Rep., Vol. II, p. 63. I have not verified the reference to Chinese authors, which is not given in detail.

† Archaeol Rep., Vol. V, p. 7. I have not seen any of these coins.
favourable to their erection. In another place Sir A. Cunningham speaks of "the first persecution of Buddhism by the Śāiva kings of the Little Yachi,"* but I do not know what evidence exists for this alleged persecution. Whatever may have been the precise attitude of the Little Yachi kings towards Buddhism, it is certain that the latter years of the fifth century were times of conflict and turmoil throughout Northern India. The Bhitārī pillar inscription records the struggles between the Gupta dynasty and the Huns (Hūgas), and in or about A. D. 490, on the death of Skanda Gupta, the Gupta empire broke up.† A few years later the stormy career of the Hūga chief Mihirakula disturbed the whole of Northern India from Bengal to Kāshmir.‡ In such a period of anarchy and confused struggles for dominion the arts of peace are perforce neglected, and it would be strange indeed if Gāndhāra in those days was the scene of the peaceful development of a considerable school of sculpture, as Mr. Fergusson supposed it to have been.

I doubt also if the Greco-Roman impulse retained any considerable force after A. D. 450, even on the north-west frontier. By that time it had certainly spent itself in India Proper, both in the North and West. The last faint traces of Greek skill in design are observable in the Gupta gold coinage of Chandra Gupta II, which was minted in Northern India about A. D. 400,—the later Hindū coinage is all barbarous in style. Corrupt and unmeaning Greek letters linger on the silver coins of Kumāra Gupta and Skanda Gupta struck in Western India up to about A. D. 480, but the fact that these letters are corrupt and unmeaning shows that Hellenistic culture had then dwindled down to a dead tradition, even in Gujārāt, which had been for centuries in communication with Alexandria and Rome.

In short, all that is known of early Indian history indicates the great improbability of the existence of a flourishing Hellenistic school of sculpture on the north-west frontier later than A. D. 450.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the artistic relations of the Gāndhāra sculptures, which will render the chronology more definite, one other piece of external evidence may be cited to prove that the good sculptures are much earlier than A. D. 600.

† [See, however, on the dissolution of the Gupta empire, the paper 'On an Inscribed seal of Kumāra Gupta, ante, p. 85. Ed.]
‡ For the history of the Gupta period see Mr. Fleet's work on the Gupta inscriptions, Vol. III. of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. I have given a very brief outline of it in my essay on the Gupta Coinage in the Journal Royal Asiatic Society for January 1889, to which reference may be made for the proof of the remarks in the next paragraph.
A statuette, Indo-Greek or Indo-Roman in style, wanting the hands and feet, was discovered by Dr. Bellow in the Gândhâra country, carefully enclosed in a sepulchral chamber at the level of the ground in the centre of a stûpa. The statuette represents the standing Buddha, and is characterized by Dr. Bellow as "better carved than the generality of figures met with," and by Sir A. Cunningham as "fine."*

The style of the statuette shows that it was executed during the flourishing period of the Gândhâra school, and its mutilated condition proves that it was already old when deposited in the stûpa. The form of that building indicates that it was created not later than A. D. 600, nor much earlier than A. D. 500.

It is thus evident, remarks Sir A. Cunningham, that the statuette was utilized at a time "when the zeal of first converts had long since died away, and the growing indifference of the people no longer required the manufacture of new statues. Under such circumstances, I can readily suppose that that the builders of the tope may have deposited any piece of Buddhist sculpture that came to hand, just as Brâhmans at the present day will set up and worship any statue which may be found, caring little for its state of mutilation, and still less for its possible connexion with Jainism or Buddhism."

This curious discovery thus confirms the evidence already adduced to prove the propositions that the period A. D. 500—600 was one of decay for Buddhism in Gândhâra, that few new religious edifices were erected doing that period, though their construction did not altogether cease, and that the vigorous, local school of Indo-Hellenic art belongs to an earlier time.

My contention that the history of the Gândhâra school of Indo-Hellenic art, consecrated to the service of Buddhism, was practically at an end by A. D. 450, may be met by the observation that Buddhist monuments of later date are known to exist in the upper Kâbul Valley and elsewhere in the neighbouring countries.

One of the latest stûpas, to which a date at all definite can be assigned, is that known as No. 10, at Hîdda near Jalâlâbâd. This building contained a deposit of coins consisting of five gold solidi of the Byzantine emperors Theodosius, Marcian and Leo (A. D. 407—474), two very debased imitations of the Indo-Scythian coinage, which may be assigned to the sixth century, and no less than 202 Sassanian coins of various reigns, but all agreeing in the absence of any trace of Muhammadan influence.

Masson and Wilson, arguing from these facts, reasonably came to

* Cunningham, Descriptive List, No. 165; and Arch. Rep. Vol. V, p. 42, with quotations from Dr. Bellow's Report on Yusufzâi, the original of which I have not seen.
the conclusion that the stūpa must have been constructed between the years A. D. 474 and 690, at which latter date the Muhammadan incursions had begun, and Kábul was governed by Bráhman kings.*

The Sassanian coins indicate that the monument was erected about A. D. 600.

A stūpa belonging to approximately the same period, with an undisturbed deposit of coins, was opened by Sir A. Cunningham at Baoti Pind in the Rával-Pindi District, east of the Indus.†

No stūpa of later date than those at Hidda and Baoti Pind is, I believe, known either in Afgánistán or the Panjáb, though I should be sorry to affirm that none such exist.

These examples prove, as we had already learned from Híعون Tsiang, that Buddhism, though sadly weakened at the beginning of the seventh century, was still alive, and show, which was hardly to be expected, that occasionally persons could still be found willing to spend much time and money on works dedicated to the religion of Buddha.

But these examples prove nothing in favour of the late continuance of the Gándhára school of sculpture.

I do not think that any Indo-Hellenic sculpture was found associated with the ruins of the Baoti Pind stūpa. The published information concerning the architectural and sculptured decorations of the stūpas near Jalálábád is very meagre. So far as it goes, it indicates that, whatever may be the reason of the difference, the monuments in the upper Kábul valley do not display such manifest traces of Grécó-Roman influence as do those situate in the lower Kábul valley or Gándhára. Wilson speaks more than once of "plain mouldings" on the pilasters, and does not, I think, note any example of the Indo-Corinthian capital among the ruins of the Jalálábád topes. The date of these topes has, consequently, little bearing on the question concerning the chronology of the Gándhára sculptures.

It is probable that these sculptures are the work of a special local school, working on the lines of Roman art under the patronage of the sovereigns who resided at the city now known as Pesháwar. It seems clear that the head quarters of the school were at Pesháwar, and that the special modification of Roman art, worked out by the artists of that city, never spread beyond the bounds of a comparatively small region in the vicinity of the capital. The connection between the Pesháwar school and the architects and sculptors of interior India was, I believe, very slight, if it existed at all.

I have ventured to assert positively that the Gándhára or Pesháwar

* * Arianá Antiqua, pp. 44, 110, PI, XVI, XVIII.
local school of sculpture followed the lines of Roman art, and is not the
direct descendant of pure Greek art. This proposition of course is to
be taken strictly as applying only to the Pesháwar school. It does not
apply to the case of the Ionic pillars at Taxila, nor to the sculptures
at Buddha Gáyá or Bhárhut. The Sánchi work too is probably free
from Roman influence, and I cannot perceive any very clear traces of
such influence at Amarávatí, though I am not certain that it is alto-
gether absent. The art work in some of the caves in Western India,
on the other hand, was in all probability influenced by the specially
Roman developments of Greek art.

I pass by on the present occasion the wider questions suggested by
an examination of the entire field of early Indian art, and confine
myself to the discussion of the nature and degree of Roman influence
on the local Gándhára or Pesháwar school of sculpture, which is special-
ly characterized by the use for decorative purposes of the Indo-Corin-
thian capital.

A brief outline of some of the most material facts in the history
of the intercourse between Rome and India will help my readers to
appreciate more accurately the value of comparisons between Indian
and Roman works, and to understand the bearing of such comparisons
on the chronology of the Gándhára school.

Roman influence was not felt by India until after the establishment
of the empire of the Cæsars, and the subjugation of Egypt by Augustus;
and even during the reign of Augustus, the maritime commerce be-
tween Rome and India appears to have been conducted by Arab ships.

The discovery or re-discovery of the course of the monsoon by
Hippalos, about the middle of the first century A. D., first rendered
it possible for Roman ships to reach the Indian shores.

The overland trade between India and the Roman empire appears
to have first attained large dimensions at about the same time. Pliny,
who died A. D. 79, laments, in a well-known and often quoted passage,
the heavy drain of gold from the capital towards the east, and his evi-
dence is confirmed by the large number of coins of the early Roman
empire which have been found in India.

The overthrow of the Nabatean kingdom of Petra in A. D. 105
secured for Palymra the commercial preeminence on the principal
land route between the Roman empire on one side and India and China
on the other, and that city retained the preeminence thus gained until
it was sacked by Aurelian in A. D. 273. Palymra was visited by the
emperor Hadrian about the year A. D. 130, and about A. D. 200, in the
reign either of Septimus Severus, or of his son Caracalla, was made a
Roman colony.
Active communication between the Roman empire and the far east was maintained during the third century, not only by the peaceful methods of commerce, but by the frequent oriental expeditions of the emperors. The disastrous war of Valerian with the king of Persia, A. D. 254—260, brought the armies of Rome into almost direct contact with India.

The period of Palmyra’s commercial greatness, A. D. 105—273, coincided with the period of Roman military activity in the east, and in part with the prosperity of Alexandria, the emporium of the Indian sea-borne trade. This period, accordingly, is that during which Roman intercourse with India attained its maximum. "It was during the reigns of Severus [A. D. 194—211], his son Caracalla [A. D. 211—217], and the Pseudo-Antonines that Alexandria and Palmyra were most prosperous, and that Roman intercourse with India attained its height. The Roman literature gave more of its attention to Indian matters, and did not, as of old, confine itself to quotations from the historians of Alexander, or the narratives of the Seleucidan ambassadors, but drew its information from other and independent sources."

The existence of such independent sources of information is apparent from the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, (who mentions Buddha and stūpas), Philostratus, Ælian, and other writers.*

It so happened that at the date, A. D. 273, of the cruel destruction of Palmyra, Alexandria too had fallen into comparative decay. "It would," of course, as Prianlx observes, "be absurd to suppose that the destruction of Palmyra, however much it affected, put an end to the Indian trade through the Persian Gulf." The trade continued, and part of it passed for a time to Batnē near the Euphrates, a day’s journey from Edessa.† But the Indo-Roman trade, though not stopped, was necessarily very much diminished in volume by the destruction of its overland, and the decay of its maritime emporium, and the intercourse between Rome and the far east became much more difficult and intermittent than it had been for about two centuries previously.

The Alexandrian trade about this time seems to have been abandoned by Roman ships, and to have depended on Arab vessels, as in the days of Augustus. In the reign of Constantine (A. D. 306—337) commerce with the east revived, but the Roman ships seem to have rarely, if ever, ventured, beyond the Arabian Gulf of the Red Sea.

* Prianlx, Apollonius of Tyana and Indian Embassies to Rome, pp. 132, seqq. My remarks on the course of Roman trade with India are chiefly drawn from this valuable little book and Prof. Robertson Smith’s article on Palmyra, in the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica.

† Prianlx, Apollonius of Tyana, etc., pp. 178, 233.
The known facts of the external relations between the Roman empire and India, therefore, apart from all aesthetic criticism, suggest that, if Indian art was influenced by Roman art, the influence would have been most active during the period which may be defined, in round numbers, as extending from A. D. 100 to 350. It would hardly be reasonable to expect that the partial interruption of intercourse between A. D. 273 and 306 should be traceable in Indian art history, and it is not traceable.

I have named A. D. 100 as the approximate earliest possible anterior limit for Roman influence on Indian art, but, as a matter of fact, that date is too early. The name of Rome must of course have been long known to a greater or less extent in India, but I doubt if the Oriental would know much about the Roman empire, before the reign of Hadrian (A. D. 117—138), whose expeditions to Syria (circa A. D. 130), and passion for building great edifices must have spread the fame of his power among the merchants of the east. I consider it improbable that Roman models could have affected Indian art before A. D. 150. On the other hand, Roman influence continued to be felt by the arts of India after A. D. 350, and may not have completely disappeared for a century later.

The ground has now been cleared for an examination in some detail of the Roman elements in the art of the Gândhâra or Peshâwar school. The general aspect of the figure sculptures and architectural decorations of that school is, as Mr. Fergusson perceived, distinctly Roman, but a vague assertion to that effect cannot convince anybody who has not acquired some familiarity with the art both of Rome and Gândhâra. Detailed proofs are necessary to carry conviction to the mind of the ordinary reader. I shall now proceed to give some.

"Roman architecture, as we know it, dates only from about the Christian era, and the rapidity with which it spread from that time is something marvellous. Through nearly the whole extent of the Roman empire, through Asia Minor, Sicily, Britian, France, Syria, Africa,—with one great exception, Egypt,—all was Roman in moulding, ornament, details, the very style of carving, and the construction. No matter what the country of the architect, all seem to have lost their nationality when the Roman came, and to have adopted implicitly his system of design and decoration............

"It is not uncommon to find examples of Roman architecture completely overdone with ornament, every moulding carved, and every straight surface, whether vertical or horizontal, sculptured with foliage or characteristic subjects in relief."

* Lewis and Street, article Architecture in Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th edition, pp. 418, 421.
To the list of countries above enumerated as having adopted the Roman system of design and decoration, the Lower Kábal Valley, though it never formed part of the Roman empire, must be added.

So far as I understand the published plans and elevations, the Gándbára buildings show little Roman influence in their construction, though I should not venture to affirm that careful study might not reveal the existence of Roman elements in their plan and construction. However this may be, these buildings, like those of the provinces of the empire, were "Roman in moulding, ornament, details, and the very style of carving," and were characterized, like better known examples of Roman work, by excess of ornament, and by the lavish use for decorative purposes of crowded realistic compositions in high and low relief.

Almost every frieze or panel from Gándbára is decorated with florid Corinthian pilasters, and numerous fragments of similar Corinthian capitals belonging to structural pillars have been found. No one can give the most cursory glance at a collection of Gándhára sculptures without being struck by the free employment of the Corinthian capital as an ornament. No other Graeco-Roman form of capital is used, though for a time the Indo-Persian form continued to dispute the field with its newly introduced rival.

Such extensive and exclusive use of the Corinthian form of pillar is in itself decisive proof that the school characterized by it was dominated by Roman influence, and was not a direct descendant of Greek art.

The case of Palmyra offers an exact parallel to what we see in Gándbára. "It is remarkable," observes Wood, "that, except four Ionic half-columns in the temple of the sun, and two in one of the mausoleums, the whole is Corinthian, richly ornamented, with some striking beauties, and some as visible faults."*

We find the same state of facts at the other great Syrian city of Baalbec, or Heliopolis, "which, so far as it has been known to modern travellers, is a Roman city of the second century A. D. The Corinthian order of architecture—the favourite order of the Romans—prevails with few exceptions in its edifices. A Doric column, the supposed clepsydra, is, indeed, mentioned by Wood and Dawkins, and the Ionic style is found in the interior of the circular temple;" but all else is Corinthian.

The style of the great temples at Palmyra is later and more debased than that of the corresponding edifices at Baalbec. No building of importance was erected at Palmyra after the sack of the city by Aurelian in A. D. 273, and the temples may be referred to the third century A. D.,

* Wood, Palmyra, p. 15.
having probably been erected during the reigns of Odānathus and Zenobia (A. D. 260—273.)

During the period A. D. 105—273 Palmyra was the principal depot of the overland trade between India and the west, and the caravans which were constantly passing and re-passing through it must have affected some exchange of ideas as well as of more material wares. It is, therefore, reasonable to believe that the example of Palmyra was one of the factors which influenced the Gándhára architects and sculptors in their adoption of the universally diffused Corinthian style.*

The peculiarities of the Iudo-Corinthian pillars have been briefly described in a previous page (pp. 117, 118).

Sir A. Cunningham holds that "at least all the fine examples" of the Indo-Corinthian style, such as the capitals found at Jamálgarhi, which are the finest known, should be ascribed to the same age as the temples with Ionic pillars at Taxila.

This view appears to me altogether erroneous, and inconsistent with the observed facts. The Taxilian temples date from the beginning of the Christian era, and show no trace of the domination of Roman ideas of art.

The Indo-Corinthian remains, on the other hand, bear on their face the most obvious resemblance to Roman work, and must consequently be later than the time when India and Rome came into contact. On historical grounds I have fixed the approximate date at which Roman forms of architectural decoration reached India as not earlier than A. D. 150, and an examination of the Indo-Corinthian works fully confirms this inference drawn from the known facts of external history.

It is, I venture to affirm, impossible that a florid adaptation of the Corinthian order, such as is universally employed in the buildings of Gándhára Proper, could have attained such favour except under Roman influence.

Pure Greek examples of the Corinthian order are extremely rare, while Roman examples are numbered by thousands. The Corinthian pillar, modified so freely, that no two specimens exactly agree, was the favourite architectural decoration employed by the builders of imperial Rome, and by those of the subject provinces, who followed the fashion set at the seat of government.

I think I am perfectly accurate in asserting that Corinthian capitals, at all like those at Jamálgarhi, were not produced anywhere in the world as early as the beginning of the Christian era, whereas plenty of capitals,

* Prof. Robertson Smith's articles in the Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th edition, give excellent summaries of the present state of knowledge respecting Palmyra and Baalbee.
very like these, though differing in detail, were executed in various parts of the Roman world during the third and fourth centuries.

The fact, (according to Sir A. Cunningham's measurements), that the only two Indo-Corinthian bases of columns yet discovered do not differ widely from the bases of the pillars in the Choragic monument of Lysicrates, which was erected in B. C. 334, does not render credible the supposition that capitals similar to Roman work of the Antonine period were executed at the beginning of the Christian era.

Mr. Fergusson described the Jamálgarlı capitals as being "more Greek than Roman in the character of their foliage, but more Roman than Greek in the form of their volutes and general design. Perhaps," he added, "it would be correct to say they are more Byzantine than either, but, till we have detailed drawings, and know more of their surroundings, it is difficult to give a positive opinion as to their age."*

The great critic, with the imperfect materials at his command, might have felt a difficulty in deciding whether a given specimen was to be dated from A. D. 200 or 400, but he had no difficulty in seeing the strong Roman element which exists in all the specimens. Mr. Freeman has more than once called attention to the remarkable circumstance that human figures are inserted among the acanthus foliage of the Corinthian capitals in the ruins of the Baths of Caracalla at Rome.

"The artist," he observes, "has been so far from confining himself to one prescribed pattern, either of volutes or acanthus leaves, that he has ventured to employ vigorously carved human or divine figures as parts of the enrichment of his capitals."†

Similar figures, employed just in the same way, occur in some of the Indo-Corinthian capitals from Jamálgarlı, and are described by their discoverer as follows:—

"The human figures, which are introduced in the spaces between the acanthus leaves, are all small, and do not interfere in the least degree with the treatment of the foliage. When there is only one figure, it is always that of Buddha, either sitting or standing, and, when there are three figures, the middle one is of Buddha, and the others are attendant Arhans. These figures are never obtrusive, and they are always so placed that, to my eye, they harmonize most agreeably with the surrounding and overhanging foliage."‡

* History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 174.
† The quotation is copied from Cunningham, Archæol Rep., Vol. V, p. 193, where the original is said to be in an essay by Mr Freeman published in Macmillan's Magazine; but no exact reference is given. Mr. Freeman alludes briefly to the subject in his separately published essays on Italian architecture.
‡ Cunningham, Archæol Rep., Vol. V, p. 193. On the same page the author makes an unfortunate slip, and places Caracalla "in the beginning of the first century
Whatever be the aesthetic merits or demerits of the practice of introducing human figures into the Corinthian capital, it was a Roman practice. No one will contend that the capitals in the Baths of Caracalla are imitations of those in the Gândhára monasteries. It follows that the Gándhára capitals are imitated either from those in the Baths of Caracalla, or others of similar design of the same period. The reign of Caracalla extended from A. D. 211 to 217; and the necessary inference is that the Jamálgárhi capitals with human figures are later than A. D. 217.

This inference as to the date of the Jamálgárhi sculptures derived from the character of the capitals is in complete accordance with the conclusions deducible from an examination of the style of the sculptures in relief.

Before quitting the topic of the Indo-Corinthian capitals, it is only just that I should complete the account of Mr. Fergusson's views as to their date. He argues that their form argues a date later than the reign of Constantine (A. D. 306-337), after which time "the design of the capitals went wild, if the expression may be used. The practice of springing arches from them, instead of supporting horizontal architraves, required a total change, and in the West it produced exactly the same effects that we find in Gândhára." The capitals for instance, in the churches of St. Demetrius and that now known as the Eski Jouma of Jouma at Salonica, both built in the early part of the 5th century, are almost identical in design with these, and many of the churches in Asia Minor and Syria show the same 'abandon' in design, through frequently in another direction."

I have no doubt that Mr. Fergusson is right in comparing the Gándhára capitals with those of the two Syrian churches belonging to the early part of the fifth century which he names, and that a general resemblance exists between the objects compared. Such a general resemblance is quite natural, even if there be an interval of fifty or a hundred years between the Syrian and the Indian pillars. But, if Mr. Fergusson intended to suggest that the Jamálgárhi pillars were exo-
cuted subsequent to the reign of Constantine, I cannot agree with him. They belong rather to the Antonine period, and may be referred with approximate correctness to A. D. 250, the Indian development being necessarily a little later than its Roman original.

I do not know whether true structural arches, carried on Corinthian pillars, were employed in the construction of the Gándhára monasteries or not, but it is probable that they were; for the reliefs show numerous examples of arches carried on such pillars, and used as decoration.

Mr. Fergusson’s hint that it would perhaps be more accurate to call the Indo-Corinthian capitals Byzantine than either Greek or Roman does not seem to me a fruitful one. The term Byzantine may, of course, be used with reference to any Roman art of the fourth century,* to which period some of the Gándhára sculptures must be referred, but it generally connotes the formal, hieratic, and long stationary style of later date. The good Gándhára works do not seem to me to be characterized by the hieratic stiffness which is the special note of Byzantine art, although some of them are closely related to works executed in the reign of Constantine; and when the school began to decay, the art of Gándhára passed, not into Byzantine formalism, but into Hindu barbarism.

When Mr. Fergusson wrote, the erroneous date which he assumed for the Amarávatí rails, and the inferences which he drew from the discovery of the coin of Yaso Varman in the great tope at Mánikyálā predisposed him to assign an unduly late date to the Gándhára school.

Mr. Fergusson rightly observed that some of the Gándhára sculptures might be mistaken for early Christian works, but he did not follow out the hint thus given, and the remark, though perfectly true, has not attracted much attention. He supported the observation by a cursory reference to the early Christian sarcophagi and ivories. I have examined the fine collection of ivories, original and casts, in the South Kensington Museum, and, while admitting that some have really an artistic relation with the Gándhára work, I venture to think that the relation is not very close.

The representation of Christ standing under a small arch, supported on fluted columns, with florid capitals of a modified Corinthian form, as seen on the front of the Brescia casket, dating from the fifth or sixth century, is undoubtedly akin to the Gándhára representations of Buddha; and the procession of Joseph and his brethren on the Ravenna chair recalls, though less vividly, some of the processional scenes of the

* Constantinople was formally consecrated as the New Rome in A. D. 330.
Indian relics.* But the ivories do not seem to me to be exactly con-
temporary with the Indian work.

The closest parallels to the Gândhára sculptures in relief are to be
found among the remains of early Christian art, though not among the
ivory carvings. These parallels are to be found in a place where we
should hardly expect them, the Catacombs of Rome.

It would be impossible by any number of pages of mere description
to bring home to the reader's mind the reality of the likeness here
asserted, but a comparison of the heliogravure plates of the Gândhára
sculptures edited by Major Cole with the similar plates of the sculptures
in the Catacombs in Roller's work will convince any one who takes
the trouble to make it that the connection between the two, however
it came to pass, is very close indeed.†

I shall merely give references to the plates in M. Roller's book
which closely resemble Major Cole's.

Pl. XLII. A sarcophagus, "à demi-païen, à demi-chrétien," from
the cemetery of Callixtus, and probably dating from the third century.
The arrangement of the whole composition much resembles that of
many of the Gândhára reliefs, and the posture of the figure of Psyche
is nearly identical with that of Prajápatí in the Nativity group from the
upper monastery at Nutta, described ante, p. 124.

Pl. XLIV. Sarcophagus of St. Constantia, with vintage scenes
and genii; 4th century.

Pl. XLV. Sarcophagus from the Basilica of St. Paul, with various
scenes of the life of Christ and His disciples, sculptured in high relief;
4th century. The scenes in this composition are not separated by
columns. The resemblance in general effect to some of the best Gán-
dhára sculptures is very strong.

* Westwood, Descriptive Catalogue of the Fictile Ivories in the South Kensington
Museum (1876), Pl. II, III. Compare the large Catalogue of Original Ivories in the
same Museum by Maskell (1872), and the little hand-book by the same writer,
entitled Ivories, Ancient and Medieval. Other references are given by Ferguson in
I. and E. Architecture, p. 182.

† Les Catacombes de Rome, Histoire de l'Art et des Croyances Religieuses
pendant les premiers Siècles du Christianisme, par Théophile Roller, Paris, Vve. A.
Morel et Cie.; 2 vols. large folio a. d., with 100 heliogravure plates. Readers who
cannot obtain access to this work or De Rossi's publications may verify the compari-
son made by reference to "Roma Sotterranea, or an Account of the Roman Cata-
combs especially of the Cemetery of St. Callixtus; compiled from the works of
Commendatore De Rossi, with the consent of the author. New edition, rewritten
and greatly enlarged, by Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, D. D., Canon of Birmingham,
and Rev. W. R. Brownlow, M. A., Canon of Plymouth:" 2 volumes, 8vo., London,
Longman's, Green and Co., 1879, with numerous engravings.
Pl. XLVIII. Resurrection of Lazarus, and other incidents; 4th, or possibly, 5th century. The thick, stumpy figures much resemble some of those in reliefs from Nuttn and Sanghao.

Pl. XLIX. Sarcophagus of 4th or 5th century, with a long row of worshippers.

Pl. LIV. Representation of an agapé feast; 5th century. The winged genii and other figures much resemble those seen in Gándhára art.

Pl. LVII. Sarcophagus of Constantine in the Lateran Museum; 4th century. Relief sculptures with intercolumniations and architrave. Christ is seated in the centre compartment, like Buddha in the Gándhára compositions.

Pl. LIX. The celebrated sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, dated A. D. 359. Various scenes are represented in panels divided by columns. The style is very similar to that of good Gándhára work.

Pl. LX. Five sarcophagi of the 4th century; various subjects.

Pl. LXVIII. Adoration of the magi; 4th century, compare the Gándhára representation of the four kings offering the precious bowls to Buddha. One example of this is in the Lahore Museum, No. 405 of Cunningham's Descriptive List, and another, (or possibly the same work), is figured by Major Cole.

Pl. LXIX. The Epiphany; 4th century.

Pl. LXXVI. Elijah ascending to heaven in a four-horsed chariot; 4th, or possibly 3rd, century.

Pl. LXXXI. Sarcophagus, probably of about 5th century.

Pl. LXXXII. Sarcophagus of 5th century.

Pl. LXXXVII. Worship of the labarum symbol, the cross enclosed in a circle, elevated in the centre compartment of an intercolumniated relief; 5th century.

This composition has a very strong resemblance to the representation of the worship of the Trisál, the emblem of the Buddhist faith, in Major Cole's volume.

It is, as I have said, impossible by means of mere verbal description to express the intimate relation which exists between the art of Gándhára, and these Christian sculptures from the Catacombs, which range in date from about A. D. 250 to 450; but it is equally impossible for any person to compare photographs of the two sets of objects, and to fail in perceiving the likeness, in some cases almost amounting to identity, of style and treatment. The evident analogy, too, between the representations of the Buddha and the Christ shows that there is a substantial identity of subject, veiled under difference of name, as well as in treatment. The facts invite speculation as to the possibility and probability
of an appreciable amount of Christian influence on the later development of Buddhism, but I cannot venture at present to embark on the tempting, though perilous, sea of conjecture to which such speculation would lead me.

I have shown above that no difficulty exists in supposing that Indian art may have been affected by the Palmyrene variety of the cosmopolitan Roman style. Inasmuch as that style was cosmopolitan, it is impossible to say that any given Indian adaptation of a Roman model was borrowed from the art of Palmyra or any other particular locality. If we find an Indian sculpture nearly identical with one at Palmyra, all that can be safely asserted is, that both have a common origin, and date from approximately the one period, while there is no reason why the Indian imitation should not have been copied directly from a Palmyrene model.

Bearing in mind these explanations, it is interesting to observe that a frieze from the upper monastery at Nuttu, reproduced in Major Cole's Plate 16, figure 1, is substantially identical with the Palmyrene frieze engraved in Wood's Plate 41.

The latter adorns a building which bears an inscription recording the execution of repairs during the reign of Diocletian (A.D. 284—305), who kept a garrison at Palmyra, but the building, and the frieze with which it is decorated, probably were erected about the middle of the third century.

The Nuttu design consists of a vine stem, knotted into five circles, forming small panels; the first of which, to the left, contains leaves only, the second is occupied by a boy or Genius plucking grapes, the third exhibits two boys playing with a goat, the fourth displays a rudely executed goat sitting up and nibbling the vine, and the fifth represents a boy plucking grapes.

At Palmyra, the figures of the boys and goats are wanting, but the design of the knotted vine is absolutely identical with that in the frieze from Nuttu, and the two works cannot be far apart in date. Somewhat similar scroll patterns are common in Roman art, and occur occasionally in other works of the Gândhára school.

The porphyry sarcophagus of St. Constantia, executed in the reign of Constantine (A.D. 306—337), to which I have already referred (ante, p. 165), is adorned with a relief exhibiting the pressing of grapes by winged cupids, set in scrolls of vine-stems, bearing a general resemblance to the design of the Nuttu frieze. The subsidiary garland, acanthus leaf, and animal decorations of St. Constantia's sarcophagus all have a strong likeness to the Nuttu sculptures and other works of the Gândhára school.
I venture to maintain with some confidence that I cannot be far wrong in assuming A. D. 300 as an approximate mean date for the remains of the upper monastery at Nutta. This chronological determination is of special value because the sculptures from this site, though extremely various in subject, are probably all contemporaneous, or nearly so. The whole site occupied an area measuring only about 80 by 60 feet, and 79 objects were found within this small space. Most of these are stone sculptures, which lay round two small stūpas, each ten feet in diameter, that occupied the centre of the building. Fragments of plaster figures were found at a distance of a few feet from the miniature stūpas.*

The varied collection of sculptures obtained within this small space comprises the Nativity scene, (ante, p. 123), the very elegant figure of a woman standing under a conventional palm-tree, (ante, p. 124), a specimen of the adaptation of the Rāpa of Gānayādo, (ante, p. 131), two examples of the death-bed scene or parivāra, (ante, p. 125), and numerous figures of Buddha associated with his disciples, the master being sometimes represented with both shoulders draped, and wearing moustachcs, (ante, p. 127).

It seems reasonable to suppose that sculptures obtained within such a very limited area, and belonging to one school of art, cannot be very widely separated from one another in date. It is not likely that they were all executed in a single year, but, for the purposes of art history, they may be safely regarded as contemporaneous.

If then I am right in fixing A. D. 300 as the approximate date for this group of subjects, a valuable standard for the chronology of the whole school has been rendered available, and we learn that, at the date specified, all the subjects named had been adopted by Buddhist artists as proper themes for the exercise of their skill.

I cannot attempt to indicate every instance in which the art of Gāndhāra appears to be an echo of that of imperial Rome, and shall quote but few more such instances. The representation of a long roll or undulated garland carried by boys is one of the commonest subjects treated in the Gāndhāra friezes. A specimen is thus described by Dr. Anderson;—“G. 94, a to d.—Four portions of a frieze. Children supporting on their shoulders a long undulated garland, on which are tied bunches of grapes, and other ornaments; in the drooping folds above which, in some, appear the busts and heads of winged human figures, and, in one, a bird of prey with extended wings, while, in others, the intervals are filled with floral devices.”†

* Cole, Second Report, p. cxxii, Pl. 6 (plan and elevation).
Numerous illustrations might be quoted in proof of the proposition that designs of this class are Roman in origin, but I shall content myself with referring to one, a frieze found in the Palestrina territory, probably dating from the time of Constantine, which represents a very large garland carried by boys.*

The same subject occurs repeatedly in the sculptures of Amaravati, though treated in more Indian style. A notable distinction between the methods of treatment in Gandhara and at Amaravati is that the Gandharan artists always give the roll an imbricated surface, such as is commonly seen in Roman art, whereas the Amaravati sculptors mark the surface with lines in a manner of their own. But I suspect that at Amaravati, as well as in Gandhara, the motive was borrowed from Roman art.

The Buddhist artists, following the usual Indian practice, converted the foreign motive to the purposes of their own ceremonial, and, as Sir A. Cunningham has pointed out, used the Roman garland to represent the light serpentine frame of bamboo covered with tinsel, which was carried in procession at Buddhist festivals, as it is to this day in Burma.

I have already referred to the fact that the conventional representation of the parinirvāṇa or death-bed of Buddha is borrowed from the sculptures of Roman sarcophagi or Graeco-Roman sepulchral reliefs (ante, p. 126).

I have also mentioned (ante, p. 136) that the representations of winged animals, and marine monsters, and the comic friezes of boys riding on lions and other beasts, so common in the early Buddhist sculptures both of Gandhara and India Proper, are ultimately derived from the works of the Alexandrian schools of Greek art, which are supposed to trace their parentage to Scopas.

The early examples of this class of subjects which occur in the interior of India, and are prior in date to the establishment of the Roman empire, must be imitations of Greek models. In all probability the artists of Buddha Gayá and Bhárhut obtained their knowledge of these foreign forms by means of the sea commerce conducted with Alexandria through the inland depot of Ozene (Ujjain), and the port of Barygaza (Bharoche).† At Amaravati it is possible that the channel of communication was Roman.

The Gandhara compositions dealing with similar subjects should be compared, not with Greek art, but with the representations of the

* Visconti, Museo Pio-Clementino, Vol. VII, pl. XXXV.
† See the Introduction to McRindle's translation of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.
Triumph of Bacchus, and of processions of the Genii Bacchici and Genii Circenses, many examples of which may be seen in Visconti's plates, and in other illustrated works on Roman art.

It is not easy to determine the chronological sequence of the various remains in the Yāsuftzai country.

"The principal groups of ruins," remarks Sir A. Cunningham, "are at Shāhbażgarhī, Sawaldher, and Sahri Bahlol in the plain; and at Rānīgat, Jāmalgarhī, Takht-i-Bahi, and Kharkai in the hills. There are similar remains at many other places, as at Topi, Ohind, and Zeda in Utmanzai; at Tūrli, Bakshālī, and Gharyālī in Sūdam; and at Māṭa and Sanghāo in Lānkhor."*

To this list must be added the ruins of the monasteries at Mīān Khān and Nuttu, which lie close to those at Sanghāo, and were explored by Major Cole.

The buildings and sculptures of Jāmalgarhī were the first described, and are the best known. It is very unfortunate that no accurate record has been kept in many cases of the exact site where certain sculptures were found, and the consequent uncertainty greatly hinders satisfactory discussion. But it is certain that by far the largest proportion of the specimens of Gandhāra art in the Indian Museum at Calcutta came from Jāmalgarhī, and that some of the best specimens in the British Museum came from the same locality. The Gandhāra school was in its prime when the Jāmalgarhī sculptures were executed. I have shown (ante, p. 163) that the Indo-Corinthian capitals found there are later than A. D. 217. So far as I can see at present, the Jāmalgarhī remains do not vary much in style, and their execution cannot be extended over a very long period. The best may be dated A. D. 250, and the latest A. D. 300. Of course, all such dates must be regarded as mere approximations in round numbers.

I have adduced (ante, p. 168) reasons for believing that the sculptures from the upper monastery at Nuttu are slightly later, dating from about A. D. 300. Those from the lower monastery at the same site belong to the same period.

The Sanghāo sculptures, which are fully illustrated by Major Cole, are in general contemporaneous with those at Nuttu, but some of the Sanghāo works look a little later.

Many of the sculptures from Mīān Khān, which are illustrated by Major Cole's heliogravures Nos. 23 to 30 inclusive, seem to me superior in execution to, and more Greek in style than, those from other sites. But very little difference can be discerned between the work at

Mián Khán and the best at Jamálgarhí. Some of the Mián Khán specimens may be as old as A. D. 200, though none, I should think, are older.

As to Kharkai no detailed information is available. Sir A. Cunningham merely notes that he saw a large collection of sculptures from this locality in the possession of Mr. Beckett, and that he obtained a considerable number himself "similar in all respects to the sculptures that have been dug up at other places."* Inasmuch as Sir A. Cunningham's criticisms are chiefly concerned with the objects obtained at Jamálgarhí, it may be assumed that the Kharkai sculptures are not remote in date from those procured at that locality.

"The remains at Sáwaldher, 2½ miles to the east of Jamálgarhí, are mostly covered by the houses of the village, and are, therefore, inaccessible. It is believed, however, that some of the finest specimens in the Lahore Museum were obtained at this place by Dr. Bellew."† If this belief be correct, the Sáwaldher ruins must be as old as those at Mián Khán, and it is possible that some of the buildings may have been older, and contained works tracing their parentage directly to Greek art. It is a great pity that the objects in the Lahore Museum were not properly labelled.

The excavations at Sahri Bahlol proved that the site had been occupied in very ancient times, perhaps as early as B. C. 2,000,‡ and the existence of the stópas, containing the broken statue imbedded in it, proves that Buddhist votaries occupied the place as late as A. D. 500 or 600 (A. D. ante, p. 155). The broken statue was particularly well executed, and presumably may be referred to the third century.

The information respecting the sculptura at Takht-i-Bahí is very scanty. Mr. Fergusson, from examination of photographs, judged that the remains at this place are of considerably later date than those at Jamálgarhí, and his judgment on a question of relative date is entitled to the greatest respect.

At Takht-i-Bahí, a court was excavated, surrounded on three sides by lofty chapels, each of which seems to have enshrined a colossal plaster statue of Buddha, some twenty feet, or more, in height. Such colossal plaster images do not appear to belong to a very early stage of Buddhist art, and their presence confirms Mr. Fergusson's suggestion that the remains at Takht-i-Bahí should be placed late in the series. Perhaps A. D. 400 to 450 may be assigned as a tentative date.

To sum up, I accept the numismatic evidence, agreeing as it

† Ibid., ibid.
‡ Ibid., p. 38.
does with the architectural, that the Ionic pillars found in two temples at Taxila, east of the Indus, date from about the beginning of the Christian era, and are, with the exception of a very few sculptures of the same period, the earliest known examples of Indo-Hellenic work in the Panjáb. These pillars I regard as results of the operation of Hellenistic, as distinguished from Roman, influence. Hellenistic ideas can also be traced in the early Buddhist sculptures, which were executed prior to the establishment of the empire of the Caesars, at Bhárhat, Buddha Gayá, and other places in the interior of India.

The sculptures from the Yúsufzai country, the kingdom of Gán-
dhára properly so called, which lies west of the Indus, in the immediate neighbourhood of Peshávar, are, I believe, the work of a local school, probably founded by a foreign colony, which drew its inspiration directly from Roman, and only remotely from Greek art. This local school may be conveniently designated either as the Gándhára or Peshávar school. The name Gréco-Buddhist proposed by Dr. Leitner cannot be asserted to be incorrect, all Roman being only a modification of Greek art, but the term Romano-Buddhist would be much more appropriate.

I cannot say what circumstances caused the establishment at Peshá-
war of this peculiar local school, but I do not agree with Sir A. Coun-
ningham in associating it with Kanishka and his immediate successors of the Kushán dynasty, A. D. 80 to 200. On the contrary, I am of opinion that the earliest works of the Romano-Buddhist school of Peshávar date from about A. D. 200, and that all the sculptures of any considerable degree of artistic merit were executed between that date and A. D. 350. The style probably lingered in decay as late as A. D. 450, but not later.

It follows that I hold that there is a wide interval, at present unbridged, between the scanty remains of early Indo-Hellenic work in the Panjáb, and the abundant specimens of later Indo-Roman work.

The style of the Romano-Buddhist sculpture and architectural decoration shows some affinity with the style of the great temples at Palymna and Baalbec, belonging to the second and third centuries A. D., but its closest relationship, (and the connection is very close indeed), is with the Roman Christian sculpture of the period A. D. 250-450, as seen in the catacombs.

I am well aware that the opinions above expressed are open to dispute, and that I am liable to be thought over-venturesome for expressing them in such positive language. They are, however, the result of a careful and prolonged study of the subject, and I submit them for discussion in the confidence that a distinct expression of definite opinions will bring out clearly the issues to be decided, and prepare the way for final judgment.
on the Civilization of Ancient India.

Section VI. The Indian Schools of Painting.

The mention of an Indian school of painting must seem absurd to a reader acquainted only with modern India, where no trace of the existence of pictorial art can be discerned, unless the pretty, though conventional, miniatures which a few craftsmen at Delhi are still able to execute, be counted as an exception.

The paintings exhibited in the show rooms of Rajas' palaces, and the decorations of modern temples and private houses are scarcely more deserving of the name of art than the caricatures scribbled by boys on the wall of their schoolroom. In the India of to-day painting and sculpture are both lost arts. The little feeling for beauty that survives is almost confided to small bodies of skilled artisans, and is with them rather the inherited aptitude of the members of a guild for the work of their trade, than a genuine artistic taste. This statement may seem very shocking to the amiable gentlemen who, of late years, have bestowed unmeasured praise upon the aesthetic merits of Indian carpets, shawls, vases, and so forth, but 'tis true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true.

My concern, however, is with the past rather than the present, and I must not tilt against South Kensington windmills. Whatever be the merits of modern productions, ancient India certainly produced paintings which deserve to be ranked as works of art. They do not, I believe, deserve a very high rank, when compared with the world's masterpieces—no Indian art work does—but they are entitled to a respectable place among the second or third class. The utter inability of the modern Hindú to express anything human or divine with either brush or chisel produces in the mind of the European observer in India a feeling of surprise when he finds a sculpture or painting which can be described as the work of an artist, and admits of comparison with the productions of Europe, and inclines him to exaggerate the merit of his treasure-trove. The Gándhára or Pesháwar sculptures, which have formed the principal subject of this paper, would be admitted by most persons competent to form an opinion, to be the best specimens of the plastic art ever known to exist in India. Yet even these are only echoes of the second rate Roman art of the third and fourth centuries. In the elaboration of minute, intricate, and often extremely pretty, ornamentation on stone, it is true, the Indian artists are second to none.

The stoncutters in Gándhára and at Amarávatí display the same skill in drawing elaborate patterns, and the same skill in executing them, which we now admire in the work of the modern carpet-weavers and vase-makers. But in the expression of human passions and emotions Indian art has completely failed, except during the time when it was held in Greco-Roman leading strings, and it has scarcely at any time essayed an attempt to give visible form to any divine ideal.
Such being the deficiencies of Indian sculpture, the same may be looked for in Indian painting.

The sculptures of Gāndhāra, Amarāvati, and the Western Caves frequently show traces of paint, from which it appears that the Indians adopted the common Greek practice of using colour to heighten the effect of sculpture. No Indian coloured sculpture, however, has sufficiently retained the pigment to allow modern critics to judge of the effect produced. In Gāndhāra the gilder's art was freely employed, in addition to that of the painter, in order to add to the magnificence of sculpture. Such extraneous aids, whether employed by Greeks or Indians, seem to our modern taste derogatory rather than helpful to the dignity of sculpture, and, this being so, we need not regret the loss of the pigment and gilding, which would in our eyes have vulgarized sculptures, which we can honestly admire as they stand in naked stone.

But, besides these questionable expedients, the artists of ancient India knew how to supplement sculpture by the art of painting in forms recognized by all to be legitimate. Mr. Fergusson expresses the confident belief that paintings, such as are commonly called frescoes, contributed to the decoration of the Gāndhāra monasteries. It is very probable that his belief was well founded, but no scrap of any such painting has yet been found, and at present a Gāndhāra school of painting has only a hypothetical existence.

In Western India the destroying hand of time has been a little more merciful, and has spared enough of the ancient paintings to show that during the first five centuries of the Christian era India possessed artists who could paint pictures of, at least, respectable merit.

Fragments of paintings on walls and ceilings can be detected in the cave temples of the Bombay Presidency at several sites, but the only localities where intelligible pictures have survived, so far as is known at present, are Ajaṇṭā in the Nizam’s dominions and Bāgh in the district of Rāth in the south of Mālāwā. The paintings at the latter place are known only from brief descriptions in Messrs. Fergusson and Burgess’ works, which are not sufficient to form the basis for critical discussion.*

Our knowledge of ancient Indian painting is practically restricted to the pictures on the walls and ceilings of the celebrated caves at Ajaṇṭā. No attempt has yet been made to discuss methodically these interesting

* Cave Temples of India, pp. 363-366; and Notes on Baudhā Rock Temples of Ajaṇṭā, pp. 94, 95. Recently a series of remarkable Jain paintings has been discovered at Tirumalai, 30 miles south of Vellore in the Madras Presidency. The paintings belong to two distinct periods, but their dates have not yet been determined. (Proc. Govt. of Madras, No. 503, Public, dated 11th June, 1887.)
paintings, or to determine definitely their place in the history of art. I think that any qualified critic who undertakes the study of these works will find that they are well worth attentive examination, from the points of view both of the archaeologist and the artist, but such qualified critic, competent to grasp alike archaeological and artistic problems, has not yet come forward.

I cannot pretend to write a criticism on the Ajantá paintings. I have not had time to study them minutely, nor have I the technical knowledge requisite to enable me to determine their aesthetic value. But I am fully persuaded that they are to be numbered among the fruits of foreign teaching, either by Greeks, or Roman pupils of Greek masters, and, holding this opinion, I cannot omit all notice of them from an essay which aims at giving a general, though imperfect, view of the manner and degree of Greco-Roman influence on the art and other elements of the civilization of ancient India.

At Ajantá fragments of painting exist in thirteen caves, but the principal remains are found in seven. "The Ajantá pictures are not frescoes in the true acceptation of the term. The painting was executed on a coat of thin, smooth plaster, the thickness of an egg-shell, which was laid on a groundwork composed of a mixture of cowdung and pulverized trap, rice-husks being sometimes added to increase the binding properties of the mixture."†

As regards the style of the pictures Mr. Griffiths' general criticism is to the effect that there is "little attention paid to the science of art—a general crowding of figures into a subject, regard being had more to

* The most competent account of the Ajantá paintings yet published is that given in the second work referred to in the preceding note. The full title of the book is "No. 9, Archaeological Survey of Western India. Notes on the Bauddha Rock-Temples of Ajantá, their Paintings and Sculptures, and on the Paintings of the High Caves, Modern Bauddha Mythology, etc. By J. Burgess, M. R. A. S., etc., Bombay, 4to., Printed by order of Government at the Government Central Press, 1879." This work is now out of print, and sells at double its original price. It is illustrated by twenty-nine plates, uncoloured, fifteen of which are devoted to the paintings.

Four pretty good uncoloured plates illustrate Dr. Rájendraláala Mitra's paper on the paintings in Vol. XLVII (1878) of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

The architecture and sculpture of the Ajantá caves are discussed with great fullness in Vol. IV of the Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, and are there illustrated by splendid autotype plates, but the paintings are scarcely noticed in that volume.

The volume of Notes, the full title of which has been given above, belongs to a series of minor treatises in paper covers, issued by the Bombay Government preliminary to the publication of the costly and elaborate series of Reports.

the truthful rendering of a story than to a beautiful rendering of it:—
not that they discarded beauty, but they did not make it the primary
motive of representation."*

The range of date of the Ajaŋţa paintings is very nearly the same
as that of the Gândhára sculptures, though some of the former are
earlier, and some may be a hundred years, or even more, later than any
of the latter. The earliest paintings at Ajaŋţa, those on the side walls of
Cave No. X, are referred by Mr. Burgess to the latter part of the second
century A. D. To a large extent the Gândhára and Ajaŋţa works are
certainly contemporary, and it is primá facie probable that, if the sculpt-
tures echo the ideas of the art of imperial Rome, paintings of the same
period should not have escaped the influence of the cosmopolitan canons
of taste which then determined the forms of art. I am not prepared to
prove in detail the Greek or Roman parentage of the Ajaŋţa paintings,
but I have little doubt that critical study will prove them to be more
Roman than Greek. Their realism, on which Mr. Griffiths comments,
is one of the most characteristic features of the Gândhára sculptures,
and is thoroughly Roman. Some of the panels, too, filled with elegant
floral decorations are extremely like Roman work in appearance.

The Gândhára sculptures are so closely related to the Christian
sculptures in the Catacombs of Rome, that I venture to suggest that
it would be worth while to compare the paintings in the Catacombs
with those in the Ajaŋţa caves. A hasty comparison of copies of both
led me to suppose that they might be related, but I am not in a position
to offer a definite opinion on the subject.

The neglect of years has, it is understood, in great part destroyed
the original paintings at Ajaŋţá, and, unfortunately, the fine copies in
oils, on which Major Gill spent many years, were mostly consumed by
the fire at the Crystal Palace in 1860. A few of his copies then escaped,
but, I believe, perished in a later fire at South Kensington. Mr. Griffiths,
of the Bombay School of Art, has since made a fresh set of copies of
a portion of the paintings, and these copies are now exhibited in
the Indian Museum at South Kensington. The ordinary visitor, how-
ever, can be little impressed by them, in the absence of descriptive
labels or catalogue to indicate the history, meaning, or artistic value of
the paintings. I should add that, notwithstanding his remarks on the subor-
dinate place given to beauty as compared with realism in the Ajaŋţá paint-
ings generally, Mr. Griffiths bestows very high praise on particular com-
positions, and his judgment is supported by the great authority of Mr.

* Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, pp. 25-28. So far as I am aware, Mr. Griffiths' report has not been published in full. Considerable extracts from it are given in the Indian Antiquary, and in Mr. Burgess’ Notes.
Fergusson. One of the most remarkable paintings is in the hall of Cave No. XVI, and is supposed to date from the sixth century. The subject is the death of a lady, apparently a princess. The treatment of it has elicited from Mr. Fergusson the comment that "Mr. Griffiths very justly remarks on this picture that 'for pathos and sentiment and the unmistakeable way of telling its story this picture, I consider, cannot be surpassed in the history of art. The Florentines could have put better drawing, and the Venetians better colour, but neither could have thrown greater expression into it.'"*

Mr. Fergusson also quotes with approval the criticism of Mr. Griffiths on a painting depicting flying figures in the so-called Zodiac Cave, No. XVII:—

"Whether we look at its purity of outline, or the elegance of the grouping, it is one of the most pleasing of the smaller paintings at Ajanṭā, and more nearly approaches the form of art found in Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries than any other example there. The easy upward motion of the whole group is rendered in a manner that could not easily be surpassed."†

Whether these panegyrics are overstrained or not I shall not attempt to decide, but I am fully persuaded that no art at all deserving of such praise was ever born on Indian soil.

"India, meditated, brooded, elaborated, but the originating imagination is not found in the dream-life."‡

Whoever seriously undertakes the critical study of the paintings at Ajanṭā and Bāgh will find, I have no doubt, that the artists drew their inspiration from the West, and, I think, he will also find that their style is a local development of the cosmopolitan art of the contemporary Roman Empire.

Section VII. The Art of Coinage in India.

The opinion expressed by Lenormant that the mechanical process of coining money, properly so called, was unknown to the Indians until they learned it from the Greeks after the invasion of Alexander, was vigorously combated by the late Mr. Thomas on several occasions, and, in my judgment, with success.§

* Cave Temples of India, p. 307.
† Cave Temples of India, p. 311.
‡ This quotation is taken from a letter of my friend Dr. R. Atkinson, the learned Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Dublin.
§ The question is discursively treated in Mr. Thomas' papers on the Earliest Indian Coinage and on Ancient Indian Weights in the Numismatica Chronica for 1884, and in his revised edition of the latter paper in the first volume of the International Numismata Orientalia.
The truth seems to be that, though all ancient Indian coinages with the slightest pretensions to artistic merit are ultimately of Greek origin, yet the idea of coining money, and a knowledge of the simple mechanical processes necessary for the production of rude coins originated independently in India, or, at the least, were not borrowed from the Greeks.

Although I agree with Mr. Thomas and Sir A. Cunningham in rejecting the theory of the Greek descent of all Indian coins without exception, it must be admitted that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to prove that any particular ancient Indian coin now extant is older than the time of Alexander the Great. Sir A. Cunningham has ventured more than once on the bold assertion respecting the so-called 'punch-marked' coins, that "many of them are as old as 1000 B. C., and perhaps even older."*

When it is remembered that no stone building, sculpture, or inscription anywhere in India is known to exist which is older than the reign of Ashoka, some seventy years after the invasion of Alexander the Great, it is clear that a claim on behalf of a coin to an antiquity of 1000 B. C. is very difficult to substantiate. Nothing in India exists, which can be compared with it, that is not seven and a half centuries later in date. The supposition that any Indian coins are to be dated 1000 B. C. is a mere guess, unsupported by a single fact. I cannot venture to name any other date for the beginnings of Indian coinage, for the reason that nothing really is known on the subject. It is possible that certain coins may be very old, but they cannot be proved to be so, and the independent origin of Indian coinage cannot be demonstrated by showing that any given extant piece is older than Alexander. I do not know of the existence of any Indian coin which may not possibly be later than his time.

The really valid reason for denying the Greek origin of the art of coinage in India is that several classes of early Indian coins do not exhibit a single clear trace of Greek influence, whereas they are plainly marked by special Indian characteristics.

The coinage of India in its most primitive form consisted of small, oblong, roughly rectangular plates of silver, without any impression on the surface, but struck to a definite standard of weight, namely, 32 salīs, or 58 1/3 grains. A slight improvement was made when these little plates of silver were stamped with rough devices of stars, trees, and so forth. These devices were impressed by means of small punches, not covering the face of the coin, and sometimes it appears that all the various patterns on the surface of a single piece, were not executed at once, but were impressed successively at different times by the aid of several

punches. Coins of this kind, which were struck both in silver and copper, are, therefore, known to Indian numismatists as 'punch-marked' coins. Like the blanks, which presumably preceded them, they are struck to the Indian standard of 32 ratis. This standard cannot, I believe, be in any way connected with the Greek metric system. The punch-marked coins are destitute of legends, but the purely Indian character of their devices and their Indian standard of weight render it incredible that they should be the result of Greek influence.

Other early Indian coins with a general resemblance to the punch-marked pieces were either cast in a mould or struck with a die covering the face of the coin, and some few of the oldest of such cast and die-struck coins, which follow Indian standards of weight, are inscribed with characters of the form current in the days of Aśoka. The devices of these coins are as indigenous as those of the punch-marked class.*

It is, I venture to suggest, by no means unlikely that the use of legends on coins was suggested by Greek example. The earliest inscribed Indian coins are proved by the characters used in their brief legends to belong approximately to the period of Aśoka, whose inscriptions are the earliest examples of the use of the alphabet, afterwards known as Devanāgarī. The history of that alphabet has not yet been satisfactorily traced, and the sudden appearance of long and complicated records inscribed in its characters during the reign of Aśoka is an unexplained mystery. The simultaneous first appearance on Indian soil of stone architecture and stone sculpture in the same reign is another mystery. But, however mysterious be the exact origin of all these sudden innovations, it is tolerably clear that they were in some way the result of the foreign, especially the Greek, influences which certainly affected the policy both of Aśoka and his grandfather. It seems to be a plausible conjecture that the introduction of coin legends about the same time was another effect of the same potent foreign forces.

However this may be, the various kinds of early coins, to which I have alluded above, bear no other mark whatever of foreign origin. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that the art of manufacturing

* For discussion of these early Indian coins see the above quoted essays by Mr. Thomas. In Cunningham's Archael. Rep., Vol. VI, pp. 218-220, Mr. Carlioyse has attempted a classification of the punch-marked coins, the weights of which are discussed by Sir A. Cunningham in ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 16. The classes of early coins found at Eraq are discussed and figured in ibid., Vol. X, p. 77, Pl. XXIV. See also ibid., Vol. II, p. 10; V, p. 154, Pl. XXXI, and VI, p. 167. But the numismatic history of India remains to be written. I assume 1-825 grain as the best established value for the rati, for the reasons stated in Journal As. Soc. of Bengal Vol. LIII, part I, p. 146.
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such rude coins was invented in India independently of Greek teaching. But this conclusion does not prove that any such coins should be assigned to a very remote period. It is quite impossible to say when the use of blank or punch-marked rectangular pieces of silver or copper of definite weight began, and it is difficult to say when it ended. I suspect that in out-of-the-way corners of India the old-fashioned punch-marked pieces continued to be struck centuries after coins of more regular fabric had become familiar in the more advanced parts of the country, and that specimens of the ancient, indigenous coinage long continued in circulation side by side with pieces struck in imitation of foreign models. At the present day the people of the districts between Fyzabad and Patna obstinately cling to the custom of using the clumsy, mis-shapen lumps of copper, known as 'dumpy' or 'Gorakhpuri pice,' and refuse to circulate the well-executed, and, to European notions, convenient copper coinage issued from the British mints. During the past year the Government of India has found itself compelled to make an effort to suppress by law the currency of the unauthorized 'dumpy pice.' The mere form, then, of any given punch-marked or other rude uninscribed coin is a very imperfect test of its age.

So far as I can learn, no definite evidence is producible to show that any Indian coin now extant is of earlier date than B. C. 300. The complete absence of all traces of foreign influence on the Indian coins of the most primitive form renders probable the hypothesis that some of them were struck before India entered into at all intimate relations with the peoples of the West, but that is the most that can at present be said in favour of the alleged extreme antiquity of some Indian coins. The arguments of Mr. Thomas, so far as they are based on the references to coins in the Code of Manu and other early Sanskrit books, cannot be regarded as valid, when viewed in the light of modern research into the chronology of Sanskrit literature.

The rare, but now well-known coins of Sophytes, a prince in the Panjab, who was contemporary with Alexander the Great, are rather earlier than any indigenous Indian coins can be proved to be, and are altogether Greek in device and legend, though perhaps not in weight-standard. They are modelled on the pattern of coins of the Seleucid kings of Syria.*

The extensive mintage of the Græco-Bactrian kings (from B. C. 246 to circa B. C. 25) were mostly issued in countries beyond the limits of India, but long circulated freely in the Panjab, the valley of the Ganges, and the ports of the western coast.

* Gardner, Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India, p. xx.
known coin can be determined to have been issued by the great Asoka or any member of his dynasty. The few legends found on coins of the period give no clue to the name of the reigning sovereign. Asoka must have struck coin to a large extent during his long reign, and, as not a single piece bearing his name has been found, the only possible conclusion is, that the bulk of his coinage consisted of the rude, uninscribed pieces above referred to. These coins were struck, as we have seen, to the Indian standard, and they circulated side by side with the Grasco-Bactrian issues, specimens of which are found in large numbers all over Northern India.

The general adaptation in India of Greek or Grasco-Roman types of coinage was the result of the Indo-Scythian invasions about the beginning of the Christian era. The indigenous Indian coinage consisted of silver and copper. I cannot undertake to say that gold coins were absolutely unknown in India before the Indo-Scythian invasions, but, if they existed, they were insignificant in quantity, for not a single specimen of them has ever been discovered. The earliest gold coins struck in India, which follow the indigenous scale of weights, are the heavy coins of Chandra Gupta II of the Gupta dynasty, and these are not earlier than A.D. 400. All coins of the Gupta dynasty are die-struck, and their outward form, whether they follow the Indian or the Greek weight-standard, is ultimately derived from Greek originals.*

The Indo-Scythian kings introduced a regular gold currency into India and struck vast quantities of gold coins, as well as of copper. Their gold coins combine various foreign elements, but are essentially Roman aurei, equivalent to Greek staters. The Gupta coinage is related to the Indo-Scythian, and its devices exhibit faint traces of Greek artistic power as late as A.D. 400. After the break-up of the Gupta empire about A.D. 480, the coinage of India became utterly barbarous, and lost all marks of Hellenic influence on design, legend, or standard.

As regards the origin of coinage in India my opinion, in short, is that the art of coinage in rude forms arose in India quite independently of Greek teaching. Neither the invasion of Alexander the Great, nor the example of his Bactrian successors sufficed to induce the princes of India to abandon their indigenous style of coinage. One petty chief in the Paujáb, Sophytes by name, struck coins after the Greek fashion, but found no imitators in the interior of India. Asoka and the other sovereigns of the Maurya dynasty continued to issue coins of the old native pattern, on which they did not even inscribe their names.

* For information in detail about the Gupta coinage I must refer to my paper on the Early or Imperial Gupta Dynasty of Northern India in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1889, pp. 1-158, with five plates.
The general (though not universal) adaptation of Greek numismatic forms copied from Roman coins was the work of the Indo-Scythian dynasties, whose rule in the Panjáb began a little before the Christian era, and spread over all Northern India during the three following centuries. The introduction of coins of Greek type was synchronous with the development of an extensive gold currency, which partly replaced, and partly supplemented the existing issues in other metals.

The Gupta coinage A. D. 350 to 480 is a development of the Indo-Scythian.

From the fall of the Gupta empire to the establishment of the Muhammadan power all Indian coinages are barbarous and chaotic, and completely destitute of artistic merit.*

The die-cutters of India never attained any high degree of excellence in their art. Those of Bactria, as distinguished from India, produced coins, not, indeed, approaching in beauty those of Syracuse, but possessing characteristics which entitle them to respectful consideration as works of art.

Professor Gardner observes;—"In the types used by Greek kings we find great variety, and they open to us quite a new chapter of Greek art, affording fresh proof of the remarkable originality of the artists of the Hellenistic age.

"In regard to the style we may note two points: (1). The extraordinary realism of their portraiture. The portraits of Demetrius (pl. II, 9), of Antimachus, (V, 1), and of Eucratides, (V, 7), are among the most remarkable which have come down to us from antiquity, and the effect of them is heightened in each case by the introduction of a peculiar and strongly characteristic head-dress, which is rendered with scrupulous exactness of detail.

"(2). The decidedly Praxitelean character of the full length on the reverses. The figures of Herakles (pl. II, 9; III, 3), of Zeus (IV, 4; VII, 2), of Poseidon, (V, 1), of Apollo (V, 4; IX, 10), are all in their attitudes characteristic of the school of Praxiteles."†

Some of the Bactrian coins were struck within the limits of the territories now known as India, but most of them were minted beyond the border, and the Bactrian coinage, as a whole, is foreign to India.

* My remarks must be understood as applying only to Northern India in the widest sense. The system of coinage in Southern India has always been quite distinct, and I do not profess to have studied its history. The Peninsula was never brought into really close political relations with Northern India until the establishment of the British supremacy. Even Aurangzib's protracted campaigns did little to bridge over the gulf between the two regions.

† Catalogue of Coins of Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India, p. lviii.
I do not propose to discuss its relations with the general course of Greek art, and refer to its peculiarities only to enquire how far they affected the art of coinage in India.

The realistic portraits executed by the Bactrian artists were beyond the powers of the Indian die-cutters. The Indo-Scythian coins, except the very latest, are well executed pieces of metal work, but, without exception, almost totally wanting in artistic merit. The effigies of the kings are conventional, and the whole design is stiff and formal. Some of the Gupta coins display more freedom and originality in design, but not a single example of a recognizable portrait can be found, I believe, either in the Indo-Scythian or Gupta series.

The influence of the second peculiarity of the Bactrian coinage noted by Professor Gardner can be discerned in the Gupta series, though not, I think, in the Indo-Scythian. The peculiar attitude of the standing statues of the school of Praxiteles consists in this that the weight of the body is thrown on one leg, the figure being inclined to one side, and bent in a graceful curve so that the hip on the other side is arched outwards. This peculiarity, which in the hands of a good Greek artist, added grace to the representation of the human form, was imitated by the Greco-Bactrian mint masters with considerable success. It caught the Indian taste, but, in the hands of clumsy imitators, was converted into a hideous deformity. An inartistic exaggeration of the Praxitelean attitude is characteristic of many of the Gupta coins of the fifth century, and of much Indian sculpture from an early date until the present day.

Unhappily the history of Indian art, is, as observed by Mr. Fergusson, a history of decay, and the criticism, passed by Sir A. Cunningham on Indian sculpture, applies, mutatis mutandis, to other arts:—

"It is a fact, which receives fresh proofs every day, that the art of sculpture, or certainly of good sculpture, appeared suddenly in India at the very time that the Greeks were masters of the Kábul valley, that it retained its superiority during the Greek and half-Greek rule of the Indo-Scythians, and that it deteriorated more and more the further it receded from the Greek age, until the degradation culminated in the wooden inanities and bestial obscenities of the Brahmanical temples."*

The employment of fairly well-executed Greek legends on the coins of the Indo-Scythian kings of the first two centuries of our era proves that the epithet 'half-Greek' applied to their rule by Sir A. Cunningham is not unsuitable. Kanishka and his successors would not have impressed Greek legends on their coins, unless the Greek language had considerable currency among their subjects. I do not, of course, mean

to suggest that Greek was ever commonly spoken or read in India, but it must certainly have been understood by many of the court officials. The language in the time of Kanishka and Huvishka probably occupied a position similar to that of the English language in India forty or fifty years ago, previous to the development of the existing system of public instruction.

The knowledge of Greek seems to have lingered longest in Gujarát. Corrupt Greek letters are found on the silver coins of Skanda Gupta struck in that region as late as A. D. 450, and they also occur on similar coins of his father and grandfather. The letters on these coins are unmistakably Greek in form, but meaningless, and are evidently imitations of legends, which were once significant, executed by men unable to read Greek. It is plain, therefore, that even on the western coast, where the agency of maritime commerce had for centuries maintained an active intercourse with the Hellenistic world, all knowledge of the Greek language had died out by A. D. 400. In Northern India such knowledge seems to have been lost two centuries earlier.

It is curious that not a single Greek inscription, other than coinLEGENDS, has yet been discovered either in India or in Afghanístán.

The numismatic facts, to which I have briefly referred, help to render credible and intelligible the alleged Greek influence on Indian literature, science, and philosophy, to the consideration of which I shall now devote a few pages.

Section VIII. The Origin of the Indian Drama.

The existence of a considerable ancient dramatic literature in the Sanskrit language was made known to European readers at the close of the last century by Sir William Jones’ translation of S'akuntalá, a charming pastoral play, which is, perhaps, the only Sanskrit work that has taken a place among the literary classics of the world.

Since Sir William Jones’ time the Sanskrit plays have attracted many students and translators, notably Horace Hayman Wilson, whose well-known work, Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, is still the leading authority on the subject.

The question of the origin and affinities of the ancient Indian drama has excited the curiosity of scholars, from the time of its discovery until the present day, and various attempts have been made to solve the problem.

The circumstance that the Sanskrit name for a dramatic composition is derived from a root which conveys the idea of dancing naturally suggested the theory, which readily found favour, that “the Indian drama arose, after the manner of our modern drama in the Middle Ages,
out of religious solemnities and spectacles (so-called ‘mysteries’), and also that dancing originally subserved religious purposes."

But this plausible theory has, unfortunately, very little historical basis, and a rival theory that the dramatic literature of India is a direct descendant of the epic seems not to rest on any more solid foundation.†

It is not improbable that rude pantomimic representations of the incidents of sacred stories, resembling the modern Rāmāḷā, may have been as popular in ancient times as they are now, but even if they were, they could hardly be regarded as the parent of the Indian drama. Such exhibitions in their modern form, of which alone anything is known, remain unchanged from year to year, and appear quite incapable of literary development. Their ancient predecessors, if any existed, cannot be credited with any greater power of generating literature. The Sanskrit drama includes pastorals, elaborate comedies of real life, complex pictures of political intrigue, and other varieties of highly artificial composition. The gap between such compositions and a clumsy ‘mystery’ like the Rāmāḷā is vast and unbridged, and the interval between them and displays of sacred dancing or formal recitations of epic episodes is equally wide.

The Indian drama, as Professor Weber remarks, “meets us in an already finished form, and with its best productions.” Whence came this finished form; was the ripe fruit not preceded by seed or flower?

It is impossible to believe that the “finished form” sprang, Minerva-like, from the head of Kālidāsā. The dramatic literature of India, like all other ripe productions of art in all countries and ages, must be either the result of an independent, and therefore slow, process of evolution worked out on native soil, or be the more sudden effect of the fertilization of an indigenous germ by a potent foreign influence.

The latter solution of the problem, is, I have no doubt, the true one. It is not easy to disentangle the life history of the indigenous germ, concerning the true affinities of which opinions may well differ.‡

* Weber, History of Indian Literature. (Trübner), p. 197. This theory is well expressed in the brilliant article on Sanskrit Poetry and the Hindu Drama by Dean Milman, which appeared in the Quarterly Review for 1831. Dean Milman considered that the Indian plays more closely resembled the Spanish than those of any other European country.

† Brockhaus, who denies all Greek influence on the Indian drama, maintains the epic theory. I have not seen his writings.

‡ Windisch himself (p. 6) admits that the Epics contain a dramatic element, and that the Indian drama was indebted to some extent, as the Greek also was, to the epos for help. He is of opinion (p. 8) that dramatic representations, based on epic stories, existed in India before foreign influences were felt, such representations being simply due to the natural desire to see, as well as hear, the stories. This
but the vivifying foreign influence can be isolated, and subjected to microscopic investigation.

That foreign influence which gave India her noble dramatic literature is the same which bestowed upon her the arts of the painter, sculptor, and engraver—the undying spirit of Hellas. India received this, her spiritual guest, but for a little while and grudgingly. When he took wing and fled to more congenial dwelling places the arts soon followed in his train.

Professor Weber was the first to suggest that the representation of Greek dramas at the courts of the Hellenistic kings in Bactria, the Panjáb, and Gujarat awakened the Hindú faculty of imitation, and thus led to the birth of the Indian drama; but the suggestion was qualified, and almost negatived, by the remarks appended to it that the hypothesis does not admit of direct verification, and that no internal connection between the Greek and Indian dramatic literature can be proved.

The Danish scholar, E. Brandes, accepted the hypothesis thus doubtingly propounded, and, rejecting the limitations imposed by its author, boldly undertook to prove the reality of an internal connection between the ancient Indian plays and the New Attic Comedy, as chiefly preserved in the Roman adaptations by Plautus and Terence. I have not seen Dr. Brandes' treatise, nor could I read it if I had, but, fortunately for that large class of persons who are ignorant of Danish, substantially the same thesis has been ably argued by Dr. Windisch in a language more generally intelligible.*

It would be impossible to do full justice to Dr. Windisch's argument otherwise than by a complete translation of his essay. I shall merely attempt to indicate in general terms the nature of some of the leading proofs on which he relies in support of the proposition that the Sanskrit drama is of Graeco-Roman parentage.

The general probabilities in favour of the theory that the Indian plays are derivatives of the New Attic Comedy of the school of Menander rest chiefly on the evidence which proves an active and long-continued intercourse between the east and west. Some of this evidence has already been considered (ante, p. 157). A special agency for the diffusion of knowledge of the forms of Greek drama among Oriental popu-

opinion seems to be pure conjecture, and is not shared by my learned friend Professor Atkinson. Windisch also holds (p. 10) that epic recitation, and not a lyrical performance associated with music and dancing, was the germ of the Indian drama.

lations was furnished by the travelling companies of players, who are known to have traversed the Hellenistic kingdoms; and the poets, as well as the players, were not averse to travelling. Menander and Philonomen were both invited to the court of Ptolemy Soter.

Greek ideas entered India chiefly by two routes, one overland through Palmyra and Bactria, the other maritime through Alexandria and the ports of the western coast, especially Barygaza, the modern Bharuch. We know from the anonymous Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, which was written between A. D. 80 and 89,* that a very active commerce was then carried on between Barygaza and the inland city Ozené (the modern Ujjain in Sindia's territory), where Asoka had once been Viceroy, and which, in the time of the author of the Periplus, was the great depot of the foreign trade.

The scene of the 'Toy-Cart,' the most ancient Indian drama extant, is laid at Ujjain, and several considerations lead Dr. Windisch to conclude that the Indian drama was first developed at that city, as a direct consequence of intercourse with Alexandria. The few known facts in the history of the Bactrian king Menander, who flourished about B. C. 110,† indicate that the overland communication between India and the West must have been briskly maintained in his time. The importance of Palmyra as a commercial depot (ante, p. 157) was of later date. Before the Christian era the Western communications of India were with the Hellenized kingdoms of Asia and Egypt. In the first century after the Christian era they were extended to Rome and the Roman provinces. It is, in my opinion, not at all unlikely that the New Attic Comedy was known to learned men in India through the Latin adaptations of Plautus and Terence as well as in the original Greek.

Whether it be admitted or not that the Indian drama is of foreign origin, no one, I suppose, will venture to deny that ample opportunities existed during several centuries for the importation of all sorts of Greek ideas, dramatic or other.

In the opinion of Dr. Windisch the cumulative effect of the evidence of resemblance in particular points between the Indian and Graeco-Roman dramas is so great that "we must recognize either a wonderful case of pre-established harmony, or the existence of Greek influence on the Indian drama." The dilemma appears to me to be expressed with perfect accuracy, and I am fully convinced of the reality of the Greek

* The proof is given in the Introduction to MeGrindle's translation.
† This is the date adopted by Professor Gardner in his Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India.
influence on the Sanskrit drama, and further, that without that influence the dramatic literature of India would never have come into existence.

The formal structure of the Sanskrit dramas closely resembles that with which we are familiar in Plautus and Terence. Like the Graeco-Roman, the Indian plays are divided into acts and scenes, and each piece is preceded by a prologue. The mere fact of the existence of the prologue in the Indian, as in the European plays, is in itself surprising, and can hardly be regarded as a merely casual coincidence. The improbability that it is such becomes much greater when we observe that in both cases the prologue is devoted to the same purposes, the announcement of the names of the poet and the play, the gaining favour of the spectators, and the preparation of their minds for the piece itself.

Again, it cannot well be the result of accident that the love-story of the Indian drama is in plot, development, and dénouement essentially of the same kind as that of Graeco-Roman comedy. The plot of the 'Toy-cart,' the most ancient Indian play extant, may be accurately described in the words applied by Rost to the Curculio of Plautus:—

"The subject of this comedy is very simple, and depends, as usual, on a secret intrigue, the lover's want of money, and the supplanting of a rival."

The fair Perditas of Plautus and Terence, who eventually prove to be high-born daughters of Athenian citizens, find their parallel in the maid-servants of the Indian plays (Mudavikiagnimitra and Ratnavall), who turn out to be princesses in disguise; and the ἄγγιστρομός, or recognition of the disguised young lady, which is a critical incident in nearly every Graeco-Roman play, is repeated, merely with variations of detail, in the Indian adaptations.

Other stock characters of the Torentian comedy have also been imported into the Sanskrit drama.

The parasitus edax, the miles gloriosus, and the servus currens, so familiar to all readers of the Graeco-Roman comedies, are reproduced respectively as the viṣa, śakāra, and vidūṣhaka of the earliest Indian drama. The external origin of these strongly marked characters, is clearly indicated by the facts that the three personages are found together only in the 'Toy-cart,' the oldest drama, which was composed while India was still in communication with the Hellenistic world, and that all three were discarded by Bhavabhūti, who lived about A.D. 700, when Greek influence had ceased to directly affect India. Dr. Windisch's detailed analysis of these characters is very interesting, but is too long for reproduction.

One striking argument, however, must not be omitted. The Sans-
krit author Bharata, who wrote a technical treatise (nātyaśāstra) on dramatic art, lays down the rule that the players should be five in number, namely, the sūtradāra, his assistant, the pārīphārāka, the viṭa, śakrā, and vidūshaka. This enumeration, Dr. Windisch points out, is equivalent to a list of the regular male personnel of a Graeco-Roman play, but does not apply to any extant Indian play, except in so far that all the five personages named appear in the 'Toy-cart,' in which alone the śakrā is found. The viṭa is met with in only one other piece (Nāgānanda). It is therefore difficult to understand why Bharata should have laid down this rule, unless pieces were extant in his time which conformed to it, and these pieces must have resembled the Greek models at least as closely as the 'Toy-cart' does.

The repulsive character of the lēna, or μοιστροσ, the go-between and corrupter of maiden virtue, is faithfully reproduced in the character of the mother of Vasantasenā in the 'Toy-cart,' and the elevation of Vasantasenā herself to a respectable position by the force of unselfish love may be compared with the story of Silenium in the Cistellaria of Plantus. The very name of the 'Toy-cart' (myrchehbkatikā) recalls the names of Plautine plays such as Anulalia and Cistellaria.

The essay by Dr. Windisch, from which I have quoted, does not exhaust all the arguments which might be adduced in support of his thesis, and the partial analysis of his reasoning given above is far from presenting the case, as stated by him, in its full force. Yet, even what has been advanced in the foregoing pages should, I venture to think, suffice to shake the faith of those who believe in the indigenous origin of the Samskrit drama, and to prove that strong reasons exist for holding the opinion that India is indebted for the existence of the most generally attractive department in the vast circle of her literature to contact with the artistic Hellenic mind.

It is, perhaps, necessary to observe that no one contends that any extant Indian play is a translation or free adaptation of a given Greek piece. That certainly is not the case. The best Indian plays are the work of native genius of high order, employing native materials in its own way, and for its own ends, but first set in motion by a powerful impulse received from abroad. The case of the drama is analogous to that of the Amaravatī sculptures. I agree with Mr. Fergusson in thinking that those sculptures would never have come into existence, if the latent powers of Indian artists had not been aroused and stimulated by the example and teaching of Greek, or at least of Hellenistic, sculptors, but no one would maintain that the carvings now on the staircase of the British Museum should be classed among the remains of Greek art. They are thoroughly Indian in subject and style, and skilled criticism
is needed to discern the hidden foreign element. So it is with the drama. The plays are Indian, but the idea of composing such plays is Greek.

The case of the sculptures of the Gandhāra or Peshāwar school, which I have discussed at such length, is on the contrary, analogous rather to an Indian free translation or adaptation of a Greek play. Those sculptures are close imitations of the contemporary, especially the Christian, art of the Roman empire in the third and fourth centuries, and this fact lies on the surface, visible to any commonly attentive observer. The Roman or Christian subjects have been made to serve Buddhist purposes, but have been transferred bodily to India with little change, save that of name.

Section IX. Greco-Roman Influence on the Religion, Mythology, Science, and Philosophy of India. Conclusion.

A smile will, I fear, pass over the gentle reader's countenance when he compares the promise of the title with the performance of the few pages of this section of my essay. A discussion, in any degree adequate, of the topics mentioned in the heading would require the ample room of an octavo to itself, the writer of which should be equipped with a store of varied knowledge to the possession of which I can make no pretension. So far as I am aware, no one has yet attempted such a survey of the religion, mythology, science, and philosophy of India as would give a general view of the boundaries which divide the indigenous components from the foreign. A slight, rough sketch of a survey of the kind will be found in Weber's History of Indian Literature, but a map drawn in more distinct colours is much wanted. I cannot attempt to draw it. The preceding pages will, perhaps, have succeeded in convincing at least some readers that the best elements in the plastic, pictorial, numismatic, and dramatic arts of ancient India are of foreign, chiefly Greco-Roman, origin. In these concluding pages I merely wish to point out that the foreign influence was not confined to those fields, where I have traced its workings in some detail, but extended also to other regions of thought. I am not prepared to follow in detail its operations within those regions, nor to catalogue the instances where its presence may be discerned, and can only offer some unsystematic observations.

The Indo-Scythian coin series affords obvious and conclusive evidence that about the beginning of the Christian era the religions of India and those of the neighbouring countries to the west were acting and re-acting upon each other.

The worship of Śiva was certainly then established among
other cults, in India, and the figure of the god, armed with his trident, and standing beside his sacred bull, is, perhaps, the commonest mythological device of the Indo-Scythian coins. But he is not exactly the Siva of the medieval Puránas, a Hinduized aboriginal demon. Sometimes he is hardly to be distinguished from the Greek Posseidon, and the Greek writers on India themselves perceived that he was akin to Dionysus. Dr. Windisch shows that all the Sanskrit plays are associated with the worship either of Siva or his consort Gaurí, and that they were generally performed, like the Greek dramas, at the spring festival. It seems probable that the Hellenistic settlers in India transferred to Siva some of the honour due to Dionysus, and the idea of the Indian deity must have been influenced by the Greek conception of these gods in the Olympic pantheon who most nearly resembled him.

Some rare coins of the great Indo-Scythian emperor, Kanishka, bear the name of Buddha, BOVΔΟ in Greek characters, and afford us the earliest known examples of the conventional effigy of the teacher.

Other Indo-Scythian coins, again, present figures of the personified Sun and Moon, as Greek deities, with their Greek names Hēlēs and Selēne, while many others represent a pantheon of Iranian deities, bearing such strange names as Oksho (Okro), Ardethro, and so forth, the meaning of which is only now beginning to be understood. I cannot here pursue this topic further, and only allude to it for the purpose of indicating that both a little before, and a little after, the Christian era Hellenic and Asiatic forms of religion were interacting, and that both Buddhism and Hinduism must have been modified by the contact with other modes of religious belief.

Even so late as A. D. 400 the devices of the Gupta coins show that the conceptions of Hindū divinities were partly based on Greek-Roman ideas. Lakshmi, the goddess of plenty and good fortune, is invested with attributes plainly borrowed from the τύχη, Abundantia, and other personifications of abstract ideas current in the west. The conception of Lakshmi, the consort of Vishnu, glides imperceptibly into that of Pārvatī, Durgā, or Gaurī, the consort of Siva, and is related to some of the forms both of Venus and Cybèle.*

The apparent resemblances between the Purānic legend of Krishna and the Gospel accounts of Christ are well known, and have formed the subject of much discussion. I am inclined to believe that the Krishna myth is really indebted to the Gospels for some of its incidents.

* For the Indo-Scythian coins see Gardner's Catalogue, and articles by Stein, Cunningham, West, and Rapson in the Babylonian and Oriental Record for 1888 and 1889, and Indian Antiquary for April 1888. For the Gupta coins see Journal R. As. Soc. for 1889, p. 25, etc.
In the early centuries of the Christian era the religion of Christ in one or other of its forms extended over many parts of Asia where it is now extinct, and it must have modified the ideas and beliefs of the peoples among whom it flourished. The Gnostic variety or corruption of Christianity was especially popular in the East, and strong reasons exist for believing in Gnostic influence on the Vedantist philosophy of India. The Bhagavad-Gítá certainly seems to have much in common with the Gospels.*

The extraordinarily close resemblance between many of the sculptures of the Gándhára or Pesháwár school, and the monuments of early Christian art at Rome, which was first observed by Mr. Fergusson, has been discussed at some length in an earlier section of this paper (ante, p. 164). The resemblance is certainly real, and, however it may be explained, proves with equal certainty that the Christian and the Buddhist artists had many ideas in common. The Buddhism of Gándhára beyond doubt borrowed Christian forms of artistic expression; it would be strange if the Buddhist teachers did not assimilate, along with the forms, some Christian doctrine. But any attempt to follow this speculation further would carry me beyond my depth.

The Gándhára adaptation of Lecocharos’ group representing the Rape of Ganymede (ante, p. 133) shows clearly how easy it was for the ancient Indians to adopt a Greek myth, and convert it to the use of their own religions.

Weber maintains that a substratum of Homeric legend underlies the Rámáyana, and gives good reasons for his opinion. The mere fact that such a suggestion can be supported by plausible arguments indicates that the student of comparative mythology must be careful not to assume the Indian origin of every myth which may have on the surface a purely Indian appearance.

I have shown above (ante, p. 133) that the Asuras of Puránic mythology are probably Hinduized adaptations of the Greek giants, who warred with the gods.

The remarkable fact that no images of Buddha are found among sculptures at Bhárhut (B. C. 150), and Sáuchí (A. D. 80), while they are numerous at Amaraváti (A. D. 180),† suggested to Mr. Fergusson


† This is the approximate date of the outer rail. The inner rail is later, and some sculptures date from before the Christian era. The remains at Amaraváti illustrate the period from about B. C. 100 to A. D. 250 (Burgess, Buddhist stópas of Amaraváti and Jagayapeta, p. 112).
the bold speculation that the multiform idolatry of modern India is due to contact with the image-worshipping Greeks. Mr. Fergusson thus expresses this daring hypothesis in his latest work:—

"I suspect that when the matter comes to be carefully investigated, it will be found that the Indians borrowed from the Greeks some things far more important than stone architecture or chronological eras. It is nearly certain that the Indians were not idolators before they first came in contact with the Western nations. The Vedas make no mention of images, nor, so far as I can learn, [do] any of the ancient scriptures of the Hindus.

"Buddhism is absolutely free from any taint of idolatry till after the Christian era. So far as we can at present see, it was in the Buddhist monasteries of the Gaudhāra country, where the influence of Greco-Bactrian art is so manifestly displayed, that the disease broke out, which was afterwards so completely to transform and pervade the outward forms, at least, of all the ancient religions throughout India."*

The propositions thus stated with Mr. Fergusson's customary directness cannot be implicitly accepted, although they embody a considerable amount of truth. It is not safe to affirm that Buddhism before the Christian era was absolutely free from idolatry, for the Taxila Buddhist temples, adorned with plaster images, were probably erected at the close of the first century B. C. and we do not know, though we may reasonably suspect, that the images are of later date. Statues found at Mathurā, and certain coins of Kanishka (circa A. D. 78 to 110) prove conclusively that images of the teaching Buddha in his conventional attitudes, both seated and standing, were well known at the close of the first century A. D.;† It is rash to affirm that they were unknown a hundred years earlier. A colossal statue of the standing Buddha discovered by Sir A. Cunningham at Srāvastī (Sāhet-Māhet) in Oudh seems to be slightly older than the Mathurā images.‡

It is, however, quite true that in Bihār, Central and Western India, no image of Buddha earlier than the Christian era, or perhaps than A. D. 150, is known, and Mr. Fergusson appears to have been right in holding that the worship of images of the founder of Buddhism was introduced from the North West; and it is probable that the development of sculpture, which was undoubtedly stimulated by Hellenic influence, gave encouragement to idolatrous practices.

Among all the departments of Sanskrit literature the elaborate

* Archaeology in India (London, Trübner and Co., 1884).
† Cunningham, Archæol. Reports, Vol. V, p. vii; and Gardner's Catalogue, pp. 130, 175.
system of Hindú logic, and the marvellous, almost miraculous, structure of grammar erected by Pāṇini and his successors have the greatest appearance of absolute originality. Yet some competent scholars are disposed to seek a western origin even for these. The true position of the Sanskrit logicians and grammarians in relation to the teachers of other countries cannot be satisfactorily determined until the main outlines of the chronology of Sanskrit literature are settled definitely within narrow limits of possible error. The radius of error is gradually being reduced, but a long time must elapse before it is brought within an approximation of zero.

In one branch of Indian science the operation of direct and potent Greek influence, however it may once have been doubted, has been fully demonstrated, and is now admitted by all writers competent to form an opinion on the subject. Indian astronomy, in its exacter form, as taught in the Sanskrit text-books is essentially the astronomy of the Alexandrian schools, and its technical nomenclature is to a large extent Greek in a slight disguise. An earlier, inexact astronomy, probably of Babylonian origin, had been known in India long before the works of Alexandrian professors reached her shores, but all Indian astronomy with any claim to scientific precision is Greek. This scientific astronomy was taught by A'ryabhaṭā in A. D. 500, and by Varāha Mihira about half a century later, but it was probably known to some persons in India at a considerable earlier date. *

It is obvious that highly abstruse and technical works like the treatises of the Alexandrian astronomers could not have been mastered by the Indian astronomers except by textual study at a time when the Greek language was still intelligible to learned men in India. The extensive importation of Greek technical terms into the vocabulary of Hindú astronomy shows that the Greek works themselves must have been read in India, and also proves that the ideas expressed by those terms were unfamiliar to the native scholars. If the ideas had been familiar, Sanskrit words to express them would have existed, and, if such words had existed, they would have been used, and the foreign terms would not have been imported. The necessity under which the Hindú astronomers lay of borrowing Greek scientific terms by the score

* Pandit Shankar Balkrishna Dikshit observes that there are two distinct and separate astronomical works, each bearing the name of A'ryabhaṭā as its author. The first (to which reference is made in the text), known as A'ryabhaṭa-grya-Siddhaňta, bears the date S'aka-saṅvat 482 expired, = A. D. 499-500. It has been published by Dr. Kern. The second work, known as the Laghu-A'rya-Siddhaňta, was composed at some time between A. D. 628 and 1150, and appears never to have been printed. These two distinct works are said to have been sometimes confounded by European writers. (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVII (Nov. 1888), p. 312).
is very strong evidence that their native astronomy was, from the purely scientific point of view, extremely imperfect.

The knowledge of actual Greek books displayed by the Indian astronomers also shows that there is no improbability in supposing that a limited class of readers in India had studied the texts of Greek plays. Dr. Windisch is content to believe that the Greek elements in the Sanskrit drama, the existence of which he demonstrates, were assimilated by the Indian authors through the agency of performances of Greek plays on the stage. It is not necessary, he says, to assume that the texts were known in India. It seems to me impossible that the resemblances between the Greek and Indian dramas should have been brought about in this casual way. It would be nearly as easy to believe that Aryabhaṭa learned the signs of the zodiac and the term ‘diameter’ from chatting with ship-captains on the quays of Barygaza. I can see no reason whatever to feel sceptical about the reality of the diffusion to a limited extent of Greek books in Greek among the learned classes of India during the early centuries of our era.

The coins and the manuals of astronomy are incontrovertible evidence that some people there could read Greek, and why it should be supposed incredible that Kālidāsa could read the plays of Menander I cannot imagine.

We are not bound to accept as literal statements of fact the rhetorically expressed assertions of Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom that the Indians sang the poems of Homer, and that the children of the Gedrosians recited the tragedies of Euripides and Sophocles, and may yet feel full assurance that Indian scholars who studied and assimilated Alexandrian manuals of astronomy cannot have been altogether unacquainted with the classic literature of Greece.

I have now reached the bounds to which a general survey of the action of Hellenic influence on ancient India can be conveniently extended at present. The adequate discussion of the Gāndhāra sculptures alone would fill a goodly volume. The imperfect account of them given above is only intended to stimulate curiosity, and to indicate the directions in which more exhaustive investigation will reward the student.

I do not desire to exaggerate the intrinsic merit of these sculptures, though I feel assured that it is amply sufficient to justify their critical study, and that, even if it were much less than it is, the historical interest attaching to the productions of a school which links together Hellenic and Indian art gives them a right to claim the attention both of Orientalists and of classical scholars.

The discovery of the linguistic and literary treasures of Sanskrit so charmed the imagination of the earlier Orientalists that they lent
a ready ear to the extravagant tales of the pandits, and were willing to attribute the most venerable antiquity and almost absolute originality to the strange civilization and vast literature suddenly brought within their ken.

Modern historical and literary criticism has been steadily engaged in the task of exposing the falsity of Brahmanical tradition or pseudotrADition, the "lying gabbles of Brāhmaṇas," as it has been well called, and of moving up, so to speak, all dates in the early history of India. Pāṇini, the grammarian, Maun, the lawgiver, Kālidāsa, the poet and dramatist, and many other names famed in Indian story, have already been moved up from remote prehistoric, or pre-Christian, times to post-Alexandrian, or post-Christian, dates.*

This process still continues, and simultaneously with the demonstration of the comparatively modern date of all Sanskrit, other than Vedic, literature, the conviction has forced itself upon scholars that the civilization of ancient India was not so indigenous and self-contained as, at first sight, it seemed to be.

India may, apparently, claim with justice to have given birth independently to the mechanical process of coinage, but her weakly numismatic child never attained maturity, and was soon compelled to make way for a stranger of more vigorous growth. The other products of civilization claimed from time to time as independent Indian discoveries are now either proved to be foreign importations, or shown to be, at the best, of doubtful parentage.

I do not know any historical problem more startling at first sight than that propounded by the sudden and simultaneous first appearance in India during the third century B. C. of long documents in two diverse highly developed alphabets, of stone architecture, stone sculpture, chronological ems, inscribed coins, and a missionary state religion.

The problem has not yet been completely solved, and perhaps never can be, but it is certain that the phenomena referred to were largely due to a rapid development of intercourse between India and Western nations in the time of the Mauryan dynasty of Chandra Gupta and Aśoka (B. C. 315 to 222). A further development, or renewal, of that intercourse in the first century before, and the four centuries following, the Christian era, conducted through Bactrian, Alexandrian, and Palmyrene channels, produced new schools of architectural, plastic, and pictorial art, introduced novel types and standards of coinage, taught science in its exacter forms, and gave birth to a dramatic literature of great variety and merit.

* For a convenient summary of much of the recent discussion on the chronology of Indian Literature, see Max Müller's "India, What can it Teach Us?"
The same occidental influences left enduring marks on the religion and mythology of India, modified her epic poetry, and in the opinion of some competent judges, affected even the grammar, logic, and philosophy which are the most characteristic and original products of Indian thought.

The investigation of the relations between the early civilization of India and that of Western nations is still very incomplete, but it has proceeded sufficiently far to warrant the belief that further research will magnify rather than diminish the debt due by India to Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome.

**Addendum.**

When compiling the Bibliographical List (ante, page 113) I omitted to notice the following papers:—

(1.) Indo-Grecian Sculptures from the N.-W. Frontier, by Major J. Abbott (with a Plate). *Proc. As. Soc. of Bengal for 1854, page 394.*

This communication briefly notices a large box of sculptures presented to the Society which were "dug from the site of a temple on the left bank of the Indus, called Kala, close below Ghazi Huzara. The winged female is from another old site at present called Shah ke Tere in Quatur. They are very inferior in grace and execution to those from Trans-Indus...... Those at Kala seem to have belonged to a Buddhist temple of small size, but very richly and elaborately sculptured, the material being black clay-slate." The plate represents a head from Rawalpindi.

(2.) Note on a small Indo-Greek Sculpture, by the same, *ibid. for 1868, page 261.* The figure described and presented to the Society is one of the Atlantean class, purchased from a native, who had found it in an old fort of the Yâsufzai at the foot of the mountains.


The account given is, unfortunately, extremely meagre. It mentions Buddhas almost innumerable, kings of various sizes, a lady sitting on a lion, playing the lute, reliefs, and elaborate figures of warriors in
all kinds of dresses, sometimes purely Greek, sometimes purely Oriental, sometimes a mixture of the two.

The only work described in detail is the panel with the three Greek soldiers below, and grotesque figures above, which has been noticed in the text *(Section III, page 135)* Mr. Loewenthal states that this slab was "lately brought from Naigram in Yusufzai by Lieut. Short." He observes that "some pieces of pottery have also been found in the cantonment [scil. Peshāwar], stamped with figures of pure Greek designs." I have not seen any such pottery.
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Catalogue of the Central Asiatic Coins, collected by Captain A. F. De Lassoe, in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.—By Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle.

(With two plates.)

The coins which are described in the subjoined catalogue were collected by Captain A. F. de Lassoe on the northern frontier of Afghanistán, in the years 1884 to 1886, during the time of the Afghan Boundary Commission, on which he was employed as Assistant Political Officer.

The coins were, under the orders of the Government of India, made over by him to Mr. Chas. J. Rodgers of the Archeological Survey, for a preliminary examination and report. They were afterwards presented by the Government of India to the Indian Museum, with a request that duplicates, when available, should be given to the Museum in Lahore and to the British Museum in London.

At the request of the Trustees of the Indian Museum, the coins were carefully examined by me and catalogued. Mr. Rodgers' preliminary list proved of great advantage in this work, and most of his readings and many of his remarks are embodied in the following pages.

A large number of duplicates were presented to the Lahore Museum, and a somewhat smaller number to the British Museum. The numbers from which presentations could be made, are indicated by the marks † and ‡.
The collection will be found to be one of considerable interest. A large number of coins, especially of 'Alān-d-dīn Khwārizmī are either entirely new or, at least, have hitherto not been published. The most representative ones of these have been figured in the accompanying plates.

Abbreviations.


Explanation.

* prefixed, signifies that the coin is not noted in the existing British Museum Catalogue; † signifies that specimens of the coin have been sent to the British Museum; ‡ signifies that specimens have been sent to the Lahore Museum; g signifies that the coin is in good condition, f, t, i, that it is in fair, tolerable or indifferent condition respectively.
### ROMAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>263.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Antoninus Pius.** *Obv.*, head of emperor; *...NINUS AU...*. *Rev.*, draped female seated on ground, to left. *(t)*

**Constantius II.** *Obv.*, head of emperor: *CONSTANTIUS AUG. Rev.*, standard between two armed soldiers: *GLORIA EXERCITUS*; in exergue *SMANZ*. *(t)*

**GREEK.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>263.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alexander.** *Drachm. Obv.*, head of king. *Rev.*, seated Zeus with eagle. *(t)*

**Antiochus.** *Drachm. Obv.*, head of king to right. *Rev.*, Heracles seated; to left [A]NTIOXO[Y], to right [BA]ΣILE[Ω].

*A barbarous copy or forgery with a hole for suspension.* *(t)*

**INDO-SCYTHIAN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>263.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*This specimen is probably a forgery; the legend is smudged, and "basileos" is double-stuck. None in B. M. C. of 1886, but a specimen lately obtained from Gen. Sir A. Cunningham.*

**Soter Megas.** *Obv.*, bust of king. *Rev.*, horseman. Type like Ar. Ant., pl. IX, 12 (with no fillet to lance, and legend BAΣΙΛΕΩΣ for ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.) *(f)*

**Kanishka.** *Rev.*, OKPO. Type like Ar. Ant., pl. XII, 17. *(t)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225,55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168,05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53,69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56,94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54,99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59,87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60,86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56,30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55,74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**INDO-SCYTHIAN—Contd.**

**Oerki (Oer).** Obv., elephant-rider. Rev., MNIPO (?) Type like B. M. C., No. 153 (p. 155). (t)

**Do.** A crude variety of No. 8. Type like Ar. Ant., pl. XIII, 20. (t)

**PARTHIAN.**

**Mithridates I** (Arsaces VI). Type a in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. I, 26 (Gardner). (t)

**† Sinatroces** (Arsaces X). Type as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. III, 2. (g)


**† Do.** Obv. with crescent, as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. III, 23. (f)

**Do.** Obv. with star and crescent, as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. III, 26. (f)

**† Phraates IV** (Arsaces XIII). Obv. with eagle only, as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. IV, 6. One has a loop attached to the middle of the obv., to turn the coin into a button, and weighs 59, 55 grains. (f)

**Do.** Obv. with eagle, crescent and star, as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. IV, 12. (f)

**† Do.** Obv. with Nike, crescent and star, as in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. IV, 11. Apparently a mixture of silver and copper. One is perforated for wearing, and weighs 57,46 grains. (t)


PARTHIAN—Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>56,44</td>
<td>✠ Goterzes (Arsaces XX). As in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. V, 20. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3...3</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,14</td>
<td>✠ Artabanus IV (Arsaces XXVI) or Mithridates IV (Arsaces XXVII). As in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. VI, 5, 22, 24, 25. Two are perforated for wearing, weighing 55,14 (small hole) and 51,66 (big hole); the third is entire, weighing 52,25 grains. (f, i, g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>54,66</td>
<td>Vologeses IV (Arsaces XXXI). As in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. VII, 10. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,10</td>
<td>Artabanus V (Arsaces XXXIV). As in Int. Num. Or., vol. I, pl. VII, 19. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>63,20</td>
<td>Sapor I. As in Sass., pl. II, 2-6. With a perforation for wearing. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>162,13</td>
<td>Do. As in Sass., pl. II, 8, 9. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>192,54</td>
<td>✠ Ardashir and Sapor I. As in Sass., pl. I, 12. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,95</td>
<td>✠ Sapor II. As in Sass., pl. IV, 2, 3. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,54</td>
<td>Do. Another variety. As in Sass., pl. IV, 4. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,42</td>
<td>✠ Firuz I. As in Sass., pl. V, 8, 9. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1...1</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,26</td>
<td>Khusru I. Naushirvan. As in Sass., pl. VI, 9. (g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Description.

### SASSANIAN—Contd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,44</td>
<td>† Khusru II. Parwiz. As in Sass., pl. VI, 14. The less perfect one weighs only 53,01 grains. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51,44</td>
<td>Do. Of Arab mintage with bismillah on margin; Sass., p. 93. Perforated for wearing. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,61</td>
<td>Yezdegird III. Small sized coin; not in Sass. A very small piece broken away; otherwise in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,87</td>
<td>Al Mansur. 2nd Abbaside. Dirham struck in Madinatu-s-Salam, 152 A. H. As in B. M. C., vol. I, 72 (p. 48). (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,12</td>
<td>Do. Legends of obv. and rev. areas, as in B. M. C., vol. I, 91 and 104 (p. 196, 201). Obv. margin not inscribed, but divided into three sections by three ringlets. Rev. marginal legend, indistinctly visible read by Mr. Rogers: اباهبم دفه دفع 원 서방, i.e., struck in Sijistan, 147 A. H. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,34</td>
<td>Harun ar Rashid, 5th Abbaside. Dirham struck at Ma‘ādīm-sh-Shāsh, 190 A. H. The same as B. M. C., vol. I, 228, (p. 84). With a loop for suspending. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,72</td>
<td>Al Amin, 6th Abbaside. Dirham, struck at Mundat Balkh, 195 A. H. General type of coin exactly as B. M. C., vol. I, 246, (p. 90), except that there are six ringlets instead of five. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,38</td>
<td>* Al Mut‘a, 23rd Abbaside. Dirham struck at Hirat, 369 A. H. (f) Plate I, fig. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBASIDE—Contd.

Obv., small area within single circle, surrounded by double marginal inscriptions.

Area: لا الله إلا 
      الله وحده 
      لا شريك له 

Inner legend: بسم الله ضربت هذا النذر 
              ببرة سنة سبع وسبعين وثمانية 

Outer legend: لله [الإمر ] من قبل و 
              ومن بعد يمتد يفرج [ المومنون بنصر الله ]

Rev., area within single circle, surrounded by one marginal inscription.

Area: الله محمد رسول الله 
      العلائم الله 
      نوح بن منصر 
      إبراهيم محمد 

Margin: محمد رسول الله ارسله بالهدى 
        ودين الحق ليظهروا على الدين كله [ لو كرد 
        للمشركين]

SHAH OF KHWARIZM.

* 'Aláu-d-din Muhammad bin Takaš. Type: on both sides, round areas surrounded by a marginal inscription between single-lined circles. Both margins defective: but on obv., mint Nisábūr legible; date lost. (t) Plate I, fig. 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHAH OF KHWARIZM.—Contd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表现</td>
<td>表现</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا لله إلا</td>
<td>الله الأعظم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الله مصدق</td>
<td>علاء الدنيا والإبداع</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رسول الله</td>
<td>أبو المعافير تكش</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الناصرادين</td>
<td>بن خوارزممشه</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإله</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margins: fragmentary; obv. &amp; rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Duplicate of No. 41, but double struck on both sides. Obverse margin fragmentary, showing only date 5**; reverse margin gone. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv. margin:</td>
<td>بسم الله خمس ماه</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Duplicate of No. 41; but struck on rev. side only, margin entirely gone. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>44.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Duplicate of No. 44; but double struck on reverse side. Margins defective and illegible. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Duplicate of No. 44; but struck on reverse side only. Margin nearly gone. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>36.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Cont'd.**

- **Do.** Duplicate of No. 44; but double struck on rev. side, and struck on that side only. Margin gone. *(i)*
- **†Do.** Duplicate of No. 44; but struck on obv. side only, on which there are no ringlets. One perforated specimen weighs 23.06; two others weigh 20.91 and 18.49 grains respectively. Margins defective and illegible. *(i)*
- **Do.** Type: similar to No. 41, with reverse legend similar to No. 44; and on obv. side letters in place of ringlets. Both legends much blundered. Margins gone. *(i)*

**Obv.**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev.**

- **Mr. Rodgers reads** on rev.

- **Do.** Two round areas with marginal inscriptions within single-lined circles, as in No. 41; but legends different, also characters different, *i.e.*, nastā'īq, as in the early Pāthān coins of India, not Kufic. One half of the coin is broken away. Reverse margin shows 6++. *(i)*

**Obv.**

- **Rev.**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev. margin:**

*STAMMAH...*  
**Obv. margin:**  

*...الدين الحق...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 51            | 18              | 18   |        |        |       | 35.58           | **SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.**
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | * † † Do. Type I, obv., saddled horse with mint, within single-lined circle; sometimes three dots under horse; rev. inscription within single-lined circle. One specimen was assayed by Dr. Scully with the result: copper 80.9 per cent., lead 13.5, silver 5.6. (†) Plate I, fig. 3. The mint is read by Mr. Rodgers Balūqān or Talūqān. |
| 52            | 16              | 16   |        |        |       | 35.58           | **Obv.**
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | تلوقان |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | Horse |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | لدinizیا والدین محمد |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | بن السلطان |
| 53            | 5               | 5    |        |        |       | 35.58           | **Do. Type I, similar to No. 51; same mint, but rev. legend differently arranged.** |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | **Rev.**
<p>|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | السلطان |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | العظم علی |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | لدinizیا والدین محمد |
|               |                 |      |        |        |       |                 | بن السلطان |
| 54            | 1               | 1    |        |        |       | 34.44           | <strong>Do. Type I. Apparently similar to No. 51, but double-struck on both sides. (†)</strong> |
| 55            | 4               | 4    |        |        |       | 37.89           | <strong>† † Do. Type II. Obv., horseman with lance at charge; Variety I, semicircle over head of rider; some dots here and there; name of mint above right of rider. Rev., inscription only. Both obv. and rev. en-</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.**

closed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. Mint Tāliqān both on obv. and rev. (i) Plate I, fig. 4.

**Obv.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM (in minute letters).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHAHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAHAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or 

**Rev.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occasionally the rev. legend is arranged, as on No. 51.

* * * **Do.** Type II, Variety 2, in all respects like No. 55, except that there is a bird to right below horse, instead of the dots. (i)

* * * **Do.** Type II, Variety 3, similar to No. 55, but without semicircular corona, and a trefoil in the place of the bird. Inscriptions on obv. and rev. exactly as on No. 55. (i)

* * * **Do.** Type II, Variety 4, bow-like canopy over head of rider; crescent above over left side, and mint above over right side of rider. Rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. Mint /gin 111/ (Shafūqrān?) or 111 111 (i)

**Rev.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA'H OF KELWARIZM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 53, but bare head; crescent with dot to left and dot to right of it. Rev., inscription exactly as on No. 58. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within a single-lined circle. Mint 111 111 (i)
SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.

* Do. Type II, Variety 6, similar to No. 59, but without crescent and dots, and with some indistinct object below horse. Rev. inscription as on No. 58. (i)

* † † Do. Type II, Variety 7, similar to No. 58, but only with bow-like canopy. Rev., inscription as on No. 58, but below it an illegible mint-name. Both obv. and rev. either within a single serrated circle, or within a double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. (i)

* Do. Type III. Obv., horseman with waving arms, without lance. Variety 1, bird sitting to left below horse. Rev., inscription, nearly obliterated. Obv. and rev. within double lined circle. (b)

* † † Do. Type III, Variety 2, like No. 62, but bird turned to right. Mint Tāliga, visible on obv. over right side of horse. (i)

* † † Do. Type III, Variety 3, a beetle-like mark under horse; mint over right side of horse. Rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within double-lined circles. Mint Tāliga both on obv. and rev. Legends, on both sides, read and are arranged exactly as on No. 55. (i)

* † † Do. Type III, Variety 4, a star, 5 or 6 rayed, under horse; mint over right of horse. Rev., inscription. Obv. enclosed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted; rev. within single-lined circle. Mint Tāliga both on obv. and rev. Legends as on Nos. 55 and 63. Plate I, fig. 5. (Some i)

* Do. Type III, Variety 5, in all respects like No. 65, except the rev. legend which reads as follows: (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Some *)

(Some )

(Plate I, fig. 5.)

(All in minute letters.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.**

* Do. Type III, Variety 6, like No. 64 except the mark under the horse which looks like an anvil (?). (i, b)

* Do. Type III, Variety 7, like No. 65 except that the mark under the horse is a snake, and the rev. legend arranged as on No. 52. (i)

* † Do. Type III, Variety 8, like No. 62, except that there is no mark under the horse. (b)

* Do. Type III, Variety 9, no mark under horse, which is galloping. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. Rev. legend as follows: (i)

\[ \text{cut away.} \]

* Do. Type IV. Obv., horseman with leafed branch in left hand. Mint doubtful over left side of horse, and bird under horse. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. Plate I, fig. 6. (i)

**Obv.**

\[ \text{etc.} \]

**Rev.**

\[ \text{etc.} \]

* † Do. Type V, horseman with shouldered sword. Variety 1, bare head; mint over right side of horse; below it a flower. Rev. inscription. Mint Hirât. Both obv. and rev. within three circles, a dotted one between two lined ones. Plate I, fig. 7. (i)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weighting grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45,38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35,52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46,72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36,88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سلطان</td>
<td>سلطان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>نادر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سلطان</td>
<td>سلطان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نادر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*† ‡ Do. Type V, Variety 2, like No. 72, except that there is no flower below the horse. *(i)*

*† ‡ Do. Type V, Variety 3, like No. 73, but the mark under horse indistinguishable; canopy over head of rider and mint Balkh بلغ *(‡)(i)*

*† ‡ Do. Type VI, Obv., horseman with shouldered flag; bare head; no mint. Rev., inscription in Kufic characters. Both obv. and rev. enclosed within three circles, a dotted one being between two lined ones. Plate I, fig. 8. One specimen was assayed by Dr. Scully with the result: copper 2.2 per cent., silver 7.4, lead 85.4. *(t)*

*† ‡ Do. Type VII, bare elephant to left. Variety 1, Obv., a saw-like mark below, and a mint-name above elephant. Rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. within double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined. One specimen was assayed by Dr. Scully with the result: per cent. copper 39.2, silver 8.0, lead 52.7. *(i)*

*† ‡ Do. Type VII, Variety 2, similar to No. 76, but no mark below elephant, and mint and inscription different. *(t)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td><strong>SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Do. Type VII, Variety 3, similar to No. 77, but different mint and inscription. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* (but without the mint).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Do. Type VII, Variety 4, similar to No. 77, but different mint and inscription. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apparently as in No. 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Type VII, Variety 5, similar to Nos. 77, 79, but different mint and inscription (2 i, 1f). Plate I, fig. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† ‡ (Shufurgán.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Type VII, Variety 6, similar to No. 76; but the mark below is an arabesque; the mint above is the same without the final 8; rev. inscription different. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† ‡ (Samarcand?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. B. What looks like a mint name, may be only an arabesque ornamental mark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Contd.**

* † ‡ Do. Type VII, Variety 7, similar to No. 81, but arabesque mark above and three dots in line below elephant. Rev. inscription different; viz., (f)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{سلاطن} & \\
\text{الكزنك} & \\
\text{بالكزنك} & \\
\text{والدكزنك} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

* † ‡ Do. Type VII, Variety 8, exactly as No. 82, but a different rev. inscription. (3 f)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inscription} & \\
\text{of} & \\
\text{letters} & \\
\text{of} & \\
\text{inscriptions} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

* † ‡ Do. Type VIII, bare elephant to right. Variety 1, obv., mint above elephant; rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. (i or b).

**Obv.** (both in Kufic) **Rev.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inscription} & \\
\text{of} & \\
\text{letters} & \\
\text{of} & \\
\text{inscriptions} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

* † ‡ Do. Type VIII, exactly as No. 84, but style of letters of obv. mint somewhat different. (1 t). Plate I, fig. 10.

* Do. Type VIII, Variety 2, exactly as No. 84, but style of letters of obv. mint slightly indifferent. (i)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>* Do. Type IX, bare elephant to right, with fettered legs. Variety 1, obv., mint over elephant; rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. within double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined. (1 f). Plate I, fig. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>* † † Do. Type IX, Variety 2, exactly as No. 87, but style of letters of obv. mint slightly different. (i, some t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>* † † Do. Type IX, Variety 3, similar to No. 88, but inscription different. (i, one t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>* Do. Type IX, Variety 4, exactly as No. 89, but style of letters of obv. mint slightly different. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>SHAH OF KHWARIZM—Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Do. Type X, elephant-rider with lance at charge, to left. Variety 1, obv., mint below elephant; rider bare-headed. Rev., inscription. Both obv. and rev. within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. (t) Plate I, fig. 12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>؟ حوران</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ الأعظم عالا</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الدنیا والدنیا</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ محمد بن سلطان</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Type X, similar to No. 91, but on obv. no mint; bow-like canopy over rider’s head; dot over elephant’s head; rev. legend different. (t) Plate I, fig. 13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>؟ علی</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>Do. Type XI, Variety 2, as in B. M. C., vol. II, No. 594. (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Type XI, Variety 3. Obv. and rev. within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. On obv., two annulets on each side of the inscription; also on rev. in diverse places. (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ محمد بن</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ الأعظم</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ ﯾ الشام</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ الا ﯾ ﯾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﯾ ﯾ ﯾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |                |       |                 | Rev. |
|               |                |       |                 | ﯾ ﯾ ﯾ ﯾ |
|               |                |       |                 | ﯾ ﯾ ﯾ |
|               |                |       |                 | ﯾ ﯾ ﯾ |

(t, some f)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM.—Contd.**

Do. Type XI, Variety 4. Obv., kalimah; rev. illegible. (i)

* Do. Type XII, small inner circular area on obv.; lettered surface on rev.; both rev. and obv. within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. Variety, 1, Muhammad in Kufic in area, with dot above. Plate I, fig. 14. (i)

**Obv.**

Area: 

Margin: 

* Do. Type XII, Variety 2, inner area formed by a double circle; within, an illegible mint name. (i)

**Obv.**

Area: 

Margin: 

* Do. Type XII, Variety 3, inner area formed of three circles, a dotted between two lined; within, a sexagonal rose or star. Published by W. Rodgers in J. A. S. B. vol. LII (1883), p. 57, No. 15 on Plate IV. (i)

* Do. Type XII, Variety 4, like No. 99 in every respect, except that rev. legend differently arranged. (i)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold.</th>
<th>Silver.</th>
<th>Copper.</th>
<th>Mixed.</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>3... 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,37</td>
<td><strong>SHAH OF KHWARIZM.—Cont'd.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  | Rev. *
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  | 
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  |            |
| 102           | 1... 1          |       |         |         |        | 38,60            | * † Do. Type XIII, a small inner circular area on both obv. and rev.; the latter are both surrounded by a double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. Variety 1, both inner areas formed by three circles, a dotted between two lined; within, mint Zamin-dawar. (i) Plate I, fig. 15 a and b. |
| 103           | 2... 2          |       |         |         |        | 41,99            | Obv. Margin: 
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  |            |
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  | Rev. |
|               |                 |       |         |         |        |                  |            |
| 104           | 1... 1          |       |         |         |        | 52,08            | * Do. Type XIV, two-lined square areas occupying whole of obv. and rev. faces; segments inscribed. Almost illegible. (i) |

*Do. Type XIII, Variety 2, like No. 100 in every respect, except that the circles forming the inner area are wider apart from one another, thus causing the margin to be narrower. Legends as in No. 101. (i)

*Do. Type XIII, Variety 3, obv. area formed by two lined circles; rev. area by three circles, a dotted between two lined; within both areas a boss. (i)

*Do. Type XIV, two-lined square areas occupying whole of obv. and rev. faces; segments inscribed. Almost illegible. (i)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal.</th>
<th>Weighting grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHAH OF KHWARIZM.—Contd.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* ‡ Do. Type XV, on the obv. and rev., square areas enclosed within double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined. Variety 1, ornamental scrolls in the sections, between the squares and circles. Published by W. Rodgers in J. A. S. B., vol. LII, p. 57, on Plate IV, fig. 14. The last line of the obv. legend, wanting in his specimen, was doubtfully supplied as being 'Alau-d-din, but it is really Abu-l-Fath, as shown clearly on the present specimens. (t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ‡ Do. Type XV, Variety, 2, inscriptions in sections; on rev., date 61* in words; on obv., illegible mint (?). Plate I, fig. 16. (t) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal: Gold</th>
<th>Metal: Silver</th>
<th>Metal: Copper</th>
<th>Metal: Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2 ...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>* <strong>Do.</strong> Type XVI, on both obv. and rev., two hexagonal areas intercrossing, with three dots in each section. Mint Farwan. Published by W. Rodgers in J. A. S. B., vol. LII, p. 57, on Plate IV, fig. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> Type XVII, obv., lettered surface within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. Rev., small double-lined square inner area; within, figure of horseman, outside inscription. As in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. II, p. 186, on Plate VII, fig. 603. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.17</td>
<td>* <strong>Do.</strong> Type XVIII, large thin piece obv., circular area; rev., double-lined square area. In marginal sections, apparently, mint Ghaznah. Plate II, fig. 17. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1 ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>* <strong>Do.</strong> Doubtful. Type XIX; obv., horseman to right, with lance at charge, within double circle, outer dotted, inner lined. Rev., inscription within single dotted circle; nearly illegible. Mr. Rodgers observes: &quot;This is the only coin out of about 3,000, which has the horseman to the right.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHAH OF KHWARIZM.—Contd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>34,55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>58,63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>82,70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>45,56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>45,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>41,55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**SHAH OF KHVARIZM.—Contd.**

* Do. doubtful. *Type XX*; obv., maned lion standing to left, below a dot, above mint *Shafurqdn*. Rev., inscription within lined circle, nearly obliterated.

Obr. شاهرخان

Rev. ?????

 ?????

سلطان

**GHAZNAWIS AND GHIRIS, ETC.**

**Masa‘ud I.** Two circular areas and margins, as in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. II, No. 524 (p. 157), but barely legible. (i)

* Farukhzád ibn Masa‘ud. Similar to No. 546 in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. II, p. 166; but star (six-rayed) at top of rev. area, and *gafar* (ٌفرح, so W. Rodgers) at top of obv. area; date 448; the remainder identical. The outer marginal legend of obv. is nearly gone; that on reverse much cut and obliterated. (j)

**Ibrahim ibn Masa‘ud;** with Bull rev., and lettered surface on obv., as in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. II, No. 561 (p. 172), and in Proceedings, A. S. B., for 1881, p. 6. (i)

**Undetermined.** Probably Ghaznawi. Legends illegible; but on right hand side of the legend in the area, there is a perpendicular mark, which is indistinguishable on the obv., but clearly ٓ on the rev. Compare similar marks on Mahmúd’s coin, Pl. V, No 458 in B. M. C., vol. II, p. 131. (i)

* Ghiyásu-d-dín Muhammad bin Sám. Two circular areas; both margins entirely obliterated.
### GHAZNAWIS AND GHORIS.—Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

Mr. Rodgers reads on the obv. doubtfully or 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا الله إلا إله مجد</td>
<td>ن لا إله إلا الله مجد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رسل الله بين سام حسن</td>
<td>وبالله من الديانه</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mr. Rodgers reads on the obv. doubtfully or 

Plate II, fig. 18.

117. **Do.** Same type, but much heavier, than No. 6 in J. A. S. B., vol. LII, p. 56 (Pl. IV, fig. 6). Without mint; but date 600 A. H. The rev. margin, as Mr. Rodgers observes, gives a quotation from the Qurán, Surah IX, 33:

٣٣، viz. that within brackets, is never given on these gold coins. (g)

*Do.** Very similar to No. 117, but with mint Ghaznah, and same date 600 A. H. (g)

118. **Do.** The same as No. 117, except in the matter of weight; also without mint. Its date is 600 A. H. (f)

120. **Do.** Same type, as No. 117, but of smaller size; date 603 A. H., mint obliterated (Ghaznah ?). (i)

121. **Do.** Same as No. 120, except in the matter of weight. Mint Ghaznah; date obliterated (600 ?).

122. **Do.** Type: Turkí horseman, exactly as published, by Mr. Rodgers, in J. A. S. B., vol. LII, p. 55 (Pl. IV, fig. 1.) (I t)
Captain De Lassoe’s Central Asiatic Coins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56,68</td>
<td>45,45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45,72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45,95</td>
<td>42,52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55,06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

GHAZNAWIS AND GHORIS—Contd.

**Do. Doubtful. Inscribed circular areas.**

**Obv.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[سلطان]</th>
<th>[فرین]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rev.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 124 | * Ghiyasu-d-din and Muizzu-d-din bin Sám. Type the same as in No. 117. A silver coin of this type has been published by Dr. Stülpnagel in J. A. S. B., vol. XLIX, p. 31 (Pl. IV, No. III). It shows no mint, but bears the date 599 A. H. |
| 125 | * Do. Type, four concentric circles, exactly as in the silver dirhem, published by Dr. Stülpnagel, in J. A. S. B., vol. XLIX, p. 30 (Pl. IV, No. II). No mint; but date 599 on the rev. with Muizz’ name. |
| 126 | Muizzu-d-din and Táju-d-dín Ildaz. Published by Mr. Rodgers, in J. A. S. B., vol. XLIX, p. 210 (Pl. XVIII, No. 17). See also Ar. Ant. Pl. XX, fig. 18. |
| 127 | † Muizzu-d-din bin Sám. Type, Turk horseman; exactly as in Chron., p. 15, No. 6 (Pl. I, fig. 5). |
| 128 | Do. Type, Rájút horseman; exactly as in Chron., p. 15, No. 5, (Pl. I, fig. 4). |
| 129 | † Do. Type, bull and horseman, exactly as in Chron., p. 15, No. 10, (Pl. I, fig.). |
| 130 | * Do. Type, on both obv. and rev., an inscribed hexagon formed by two interlacing equilateral triangles. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Obv.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[سلطان]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rev.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[محمد بن]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[سام]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

much worn.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**GHAZNAWIS AND GHORIS—Contd.**

* † ‡ Do. Variety 4, similar to No. 133, but with lance at charge, and somewhat different rev. inscription. (f)

**Rev.**

السلطان
العظم أبو
العلي محمد
بادري سام

**Táju-d-dín Il-dáz.** *Type*, Turkí horseman, as published by Mr. Rodgers, in J. A. S. B., vol. LIII, p. 55 (Pl. IV, fig. 2). (t)

† ‡ Do. *Type*: Rájpút horseman, as in Ar. Ant., Pl. XX, fig. 9. (i)

**NISABURI AMYRS.**

† **Tughán Sháh.** Circular areas with inscribed margins, as in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. III, No. 313 (Pl. VI, fig. 313). Mint obliterated, date 57*. (i)

**Obs. margin:** بسم الله وسبعين خمسة...

† ‡ Do. Same type as No. 139, but otherwise as in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. III, No. 314. Mint and date lost. (i)

**BEN† ZENG† ATABEGS OF MOSIL.**

* **Badru-d-dín Lālū.** Mint Mosil, date 650; in every respect like No. CLXXX in Num. Or., p. 170 (Pl. X). It differs from B. M. C., vol. III, No. 574 (Pl. X) only in the omission of the word وسم in the second line of the rev. area inscription, and in the date. (g)

**GREAT SELJUQIS.**

† **Muhammad.** Lettered surfaces, enclosed within double lined circles. The obv. is marked with fath, the rev. with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

GREAT SELJUQIS—Cont’d.

'Adl, as in B. M. C., vol. III, No. 67, p. 34, 35. (s)

*Obv.* 

[الله السالم]  

*Rev.*  

عدل  

Rest illegible.

RUMI SELJUQIS.

Ghiyasu-d-din Kai-Khusru II. *Type:* obv., sun over lion to right; rev. inscription, exactly as in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. III, No. 225. With a small hole near the margin for wearing. (g).

MALIKS OF SIJISTAN.

N. B. On these Maliks, see Major Raverty’s translation of the *Tabaqát-i-Násirī*, pp. 183-202.

† Ahmad bin Muhammad. As described and figured in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. III, No. 94, (1 f., another broken in fragments).

*+ Khalaf ibn Ahmad. Type:* circular areas with inscribed margins, on both obv. and rev. The coin is in indifferent condition, and the legends difficult to read. Mr. Rodgers remarks as follows:

"*Obv.*: خلف بن احمد under in tughrá.

*Rev.*: etc. مما امره الأمير أبو جعفر"

Margins not quite legible, but the mint Sijistán is quite plain.”

† + Táju-d-dín Harab, sixth in descent from Khalaf. *Type:* obv., quarterfoil within double-lined circle; one pellet in each segment; rev., lettered surface within three circles, the inner and
MALIKS OF SIJISTAN—Contd.

outermost lined, the central dotted. Plate II, fig. 20. (f)

Obv.  
الله
حب بن محمد
الدين
 رسول الله
النصارایدین
محمد

Rev.  
The obv. reads: Taju-d-din Ḥarb bin Muhammad.

† * Ruknu-d-dín Bahram Sháh,
grandson of Taju-d-dín. Type, obv. and rev., lettered surfaces within double circles, inner dotted, outer lined. Plate II, fig. 21. (f)

Obv.  
الله
محمد
ابو مسفر بن
پهلوان
 رسول الله
النصارایدین

Rev.  
The same as on No. 146, but omitting final محمد.

† † Taju-d-dín Nasar bin Bahram Sháh. Type, same as No. 146.

Obv.  
The same as on No. 146, but omitting final محمد.

Rev.  
Apparantly identical with Naṣratu-d-dín, another grandson of Taju-d-dín.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold.</th>
<th>Silver.</th>
<th>Copper.</th>
<th>Mixed.</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>* † Asadu-d-din bin Harab. Type, same as No. 146. (†)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>عصِدٌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>إبراهيم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>محمد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رسول الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الدین</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الناصرالدین‌الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † Undetermined. Obv., circular area with marginal inscription; rev. lettered surface within lined circle. (one †)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(illegible.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>حرب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>مُحمد رسول الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الناصرالدین‌الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>مُحمد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Undetermined. Obv. worn blank; rev. shows only مُحمد and traces of To, over it. (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Undetermined. Circular areas with inscribed margins, on both obv. and rev. The margins are nearly gone, and the areas are much worn. Date *77. The legends as read by Mr. Rodgers, are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev. margin: هغب و سبعین...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1... 1... 1...</td>
<td>63,52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1... 1... 1...</td>
<td>46,15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1... 1... 1...</td>
<td>42,60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1... 1... 1...</td>
<td>41,41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1... 1... 1...</td>
<td>62,74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**Mongol Il-Khans of Persia.**

† **Jingis Khan.** *Type:* lettered surfaces within double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined, on both obv. and rev. (†)

**Obv.**

- 업
- 솄
- 안
- 호

**Rev.**

- 업
- 솄
- 안
- 호

*Hulagú Il-Khán.* *Type,* as described and figured in B. M. C. vol. VI, Nos. 21, 25, and Num. Or., No. CCLXXI. But at the bottom of the obv. area is the mint *Isfarnin.* Both margins are entirely cut away.

*Abága Il-Khán.* Obv. has inscription in Mongol characters, giving the name *Abágdin,* rev. has the devise of the Seljúqi coins (lion with kalimah), as on No. 143. (†)

*Do.* Size and type like B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. VI, No. 48; but the legend on the obv. square area is as on *ibid.* No. 51.

**Obv.**

- Square area: *
- Mongol
- وحدة لا شريك له
- محمد رسول الله

**Marginal sections:...**

**157** *† † Do.* Small size; lettered surfaces. Plate II, fig. 23. The legends as read by Mr. Rodgers are:

**Obv.**

- [†]
- الله
- [ب]

**Rev.**

- محمد
- رسول...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.55</td>
<td>66.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MONGOL IL-KHANS OF PERSIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are four minute crude letters in the space between ﷻ and ﷼ which may possibly be Abagha in Mongol characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † Do. Small size; obv. legend surrounded by arabesques within circle; rev. legend within circle. Plate II, fig. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[تَنَان]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﷰ ﷱ ﷰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † Do. Small size. Similar to No. 157, but obv. legend different. Plate II, fig. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ﷰ ﷱ ﷰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* † Do. Type, as in B. M. C., vol. VI, Pl. II, No. 41, but instead of stars there is an arabesque between the first and second lines of the legend in the square area. The segments contain arabesques, except one, which has the mint Marv (مر).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Do. In all respects like No. 160, except that the mint is Isfardin (إسلام).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Do. Similar type to No. 160, but obv. inscriptions different; those in the marginal segments being in Mongol characters. Only the legend Khaghann (the Great Khan's) in the top-segment is legi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description

*Mongol Il-khans of Persia—Contd.*

The name which would probably have been in the bottom segment is entirely rubbed off. This is most unfortunate, as it has been impossible hitherto to determine the coins of this type with certainty. (i)

**Obv.**
- Area: 
  - فان لا لله
  - وحدة لا [شريعت الله]
  - in ornamented hexagram.

**Rev.**
- Margin: illegible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>+</em> Do. Type:</td>
<td>obv., circular area with inscribed margin; rev., scolloped circular area with inscribed margin. Both area legends as in No. 162; rev. marginal legend was in Mongol character, of which only traces of last word (<em>luk sen</em>) visible. Obv. margin entirely rubbed away. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Do. Type:</td>
<td>circular areas with inscribed margins on both sides. Obv. margin entirely rubbed away; on the rev. margin there was the date. (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Do. Type:</td>
<td>circular area with inscribed margins. Obv., creed in area, with date on margin; rev., a bow with 2 dots within it, under the titles. Plate II, fig. 26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Plate II, fig. 26.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 166           | 1... 1......... |       | 39.89           | **Do.** Type: similar to No. 165; but date on rev. margin, and no dots in the bow. 

**Obv. area:** 
- علامة
- لا لعروت
- الله

**Rev. area:** 
- قائد
- العدل

**Margin:** غير هذا الله

**Obv. area:** 
- علامة
- لا لعروت
- الله

**Rev. area:** 
- قائد
- العدل

**Margin:** غير

| 167           | 1... 1......... |       | 43.60           | **Do.** Type: obv., square area within circle; rev., similar area with a bow below titles. Mint **Marr**, date 6**. Plate II, fig. 27. 

**Obv. area:** 
- الملك الله
- لا لعروت
- الله

**Rev. area:** 
- قائد العدل
- رسول الله

**Segment at bottom:** 
- وسماء
- others illegible.

| 168           | 1... 1......... |       | 39.88           | **Arghun.** As described and figured in B. M. C., vol. VI, No. 60. **Mint Baggad**, date 65*. Mr. Rodgers read the mint Qazan, which he supposes to be in Persia. There is no star either on the obv. or rev. (g) 

*† ‡ Do. Similar to No. 168; but segments on obv. read as follows: 

**top:** صرمو
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MONGOL IL-KHANS OF PERSIA—Contd.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>1 ... 1 .......</td>
<td>34,98</td>
<td>left سماحة (*?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bottom صرُو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right ونُماين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>giving the mint Marw apparently twice, and the date 68* incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>1 ... 1 .......</td>
<td>38,10</td>
<td>* Do. Similar to No. 168, but in obv. area, over ام، a quarter-foil instead of the star of B. M. C., vol., VI, No. 60. Segments illegible, except on the left side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right hand صرُو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1 ... 1 .......</td>
<td>38,39</td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Similar to No. 168; but right hand segment contains a bow; the three others are illegible. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>2 ... 2 .......</td>
<td>38,83</td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Similar to No. 169, but there is a bow within the rev. area, to the right of the Mongol legend. The segments read as in No. 169, but in different order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,84</td>
<td>top صرُو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left ونُماين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bottom صرُو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mint: Marw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 68*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right سماحة...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>2 ... 2 .......</td>
<td>40,70</td>
<td>* † ‡ Do. Same general type as in No. 163, but the Mongol legend on rev. is enclosed within a double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined. The obv. area is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>2... 2...</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>1...1...42,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>1...1...60,27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>1...1...59,33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description.**

**MONGOL IL-KHANS OF PERSIA—Contd.**

*Do.* A similar type to No. 168, but on obv. double-lined square area within a lined circle, with arabesques in the segments; on the rev. the Mongol legend in a double-lined quarter-foil area enclosed within a double circle, the outer dotted, the inner lined. Mint Jurján. Plate II, fig. 30. (f)

**Obv.**

*Area:* 

\[ \text{لا إله إلا الله} \]

\[ \text{Legend: Mongol} \]

\[ \text{Margin: illegible.} \]

**Rev.**

*Area:* 

\[ \text{لا إله إلا الله} \]

\[ \text{لالا إللا} \]

\[ \text{صمد رسول الله} \]

\[ \text{سلطان أرغون} \]

\[ \text{سُلِيمان} \]

\[ \text{ Margin: illegible.} \]

**Type:** similar to No. 163; but on rev. a plain circular area, with marginal legend in Mongol characters of which only *luksen* legible. Obv. margin worn off; and the illegible scrawls in the last line of obv. area may have given the mint, as in No. 177. (i)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mongol Il-Khans of Persia—Contd.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>قتِّانِ ابِی‌الله</td>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>مُحمد رسول‌الله</strong></td>
<td><strong>illegible scrolls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>عَزّ الْدُنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ</strong></td>
<td><strong>khusn.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margin: illegible.</td>
<td><strong>Margin:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,66</td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> Type, obv., square area, the segments apparently only filled with dots; rev., small circular area formed by three circles, one dotted between two lined ones; with inscribed margin; mint <em>AstaraBAD</em>, date [68]5. Plate II, fig. 32. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>لا إله إلا الله</td>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>مُحمد رسول‌الله</strong></td>
<td><strong>illegible scrolls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>عَزّ الْدُنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ</strong></td>
<td><strong>khusn.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margin: dots.</td>
<td><strong>Margin:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Segments:</strong></td>
<td>dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Rodgers read the date <strong>قَابِلَةً</strong> and observes: “I believe this is the first coin on which appears the formula <strong>على ولي الله</strong>.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,26</td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> Type: same as in No. 156. Obv. legends same as in No. 152; segments, which probably contained the mint and date, illegible. Rev., Mongol legend with <em>ArghaNun</em>. (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>لا إله إلا الله</td>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>مُحمد رسول‌الله</strong></td>
<td><strong>illegible scrolls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>عَزّ الْدُنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ</strong></td>
<td><strong>khusn.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margin: dots.</td>
<td><strong>Margin:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Segments:</strong></td>
<td>dots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A beautiful coin with a complicated design. Obv., small double-lined square area, within an ornamental margin; the segments between square and marginal circle filled with arabesques. Rev., small double-scrolled circular area, within a margin filled with dots. Plate II, fig. 33. (f)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold.</td>
<td>Silver.</td>
<td>Copper.</td>
<td>Mixed.</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>1...1....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>*Do. Type: similar to No. 156, and to B. M. C., vol. VI, Pl. II, No. 48. The obv. legend as on the latter, and as on No. 182. Both sides are almost illegible; the left hand segment on the obv. is read by Mr. Rodgersانس &quot;کهان نس و&quot; (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>*Do. Type: same as in No. 168, with obv. marked by star, but the whole of margin, and partially sides of areas clipped away, to reduce size. Mint Shirwan or Sabzwar (شیر وان) in minute Persian letters between the 2nd and 3rd lines of rev. Mongol inscription. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>*Do. Type and legends, in all respects, as in No. 174, but exceedingly clipped to reduce size, as in No. 184. Of the obv. segments only remain, top of, and left [باز ر اردو] (ل)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.24</td>
<td>*Do. Type: similar to No. 177, obv., square area, within double circle, the inner dotted, the outer lined; segment partly inscribed, partly filled with arabesques. Rev., scolloped area, within ornamental border. Mint Isfardin. (i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Metal.</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONGOL IL-KHANS OF PERSIA—Contd.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv.</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا إله إلا الله</td>
<td>Khaghanu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ارْسْالَة‌الله</td>
<td>Arbad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كُفْرُ الْعَبْدَ</td>
<td>Arghunu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الفَخْرَةِ الرَّؤْسَ</td>
<td>Deledkeksen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اسْتَقَارَائِنَ</td>
<td>Manghu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left</td>
<td>cut away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>arabesque.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth line of the Mongol legend seems to read as in B. M. C., vol. VI, Pl. II, No. 85. The word in the fifth line is new, either *manghu* or *maghnü*.

**Do.** Type: similar to No. 168, but obv. legend as in No. 186, and the whole exceedingly clipped, to reduce size. Mint *Nisabur*. Obv. segments as follows:

Top: نیسآبُر; left and bottom cut away; right: ......

**BUKHARA HOUSE OF TIMUR.**

**Sháh Rukh.** As in B. M. C. of Or. Coins, vol. VII, Pl. II, No. 61. Date 828, but no mint. (f)

**Do.** Same type as No. 188, except that the corners of the obv. square form small ringlets. Mint *Sabzawar* (سَبْزَوْارُ) between 3rd and 4th lines of rev. legend. No date, unless worn away below last line. (f)

**Do.** Same type as No. 188, but a rosette inserted in rev. between ١٩٠٠٠ and ١٩٠٠٠. Mint *Saltánýah* (سلطانیه), date *47*. The obv. is nearly effaced by being double struck.
BUKHARA HOUSE OF TIMUR—Contd.

with ب idade. In B. M. C., vol. VII, No. 59, the date occupies the place of the rosette. (t)

Do. Obv., square area divided into three compartments, with one line of creed in each; inscribed segments, entirely gone. Rev., circular area with illegible mint and date 848; inscribed margin, nearly gone. Rev. area is counterstruck with Abu Sa'id's name.

Obv. Rev. Counter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا إلا الله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الله محمد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رسول الله</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(؟)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يسرع</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سنة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mr. Rodgers reads the date 848. This is doubtful, however; it may be 868.

Do. Doubtful. Counterstruck with 898 Khan (۸۹۸ خان); original legends illegible.

Husain Baikara, Governor of Khurasan (?). Compare B. M. C., vol. VII, No. 123, 126. Counterstruck in lozenge, on obv. ب بون استرداد (Astarābād); on rev. in smaller lozenge ب بون هرادة (Hirdā). Ascription of original coin unknown.

LINE OF SHAIBAN.

Abdullāh II. Too illegible to be determined with certainty. Obv. area has the creed; the rev. area seems to read as in B. M. C., vol. VII, No. 150.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>40,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined. On obv., in scollop ed area, mint Balkh. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>48,58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined. Two circular areas. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>70,50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MANGIT DYNASTY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>48,20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do. A variety of No. 198; but with date 1283 on reverse. Mint Bukhárá. (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.... 1</td>
<td>83,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined. Broad thin piece, about 1 1/2 inches in diameter; bilingual, Pers ian and Chinese. Obv., small circular area with مسکه نجف (money of Bukhárá); broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>40,01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MANGIT DYNASTY—Contd. ornamental margin, apparently with traces of Persian inscription. Rev., small octagonal area with Chinese legend; broad ornamental margin, apparently with Arabic inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>79,48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠAFAWY DYNASTY OF PERSIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>76,96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ismá'íl I.</strong> As described and figured by Mr. Oliver in J. A. S. B., vol. LVII, Pl. I, No. IV. Mint Nimroz, date 929. About one-third is broken off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>74,15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† Hussain bin Sulaimán. As in J. A. S. B., vol. LVII, Pl. II, No. XXIV. Mint Isfahán, date 1130. With a brass loop for suspension. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>82,16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> The same, but mint Tabríz, date 1131. (g) With a brass loop for suspension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>80,40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> A variety of No. 202; the obv. only, but not the rev., has a marginal circle of pellets. Mint Isfahán, date 1120. With a brass loop for suspension. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>76,90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>† Do. Another variety of No. 202; as in J. A. S. B., vol. LVII, Pl. II, No. XXI. The obv. margin is inscribed, the rev. margin is studded with pellets; the areas are formed by dotted circles. Mint Qazvin, date 1131. With a brass loop for suspension; also pierced near margin. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do.</strong> Another variety of No. 202; as in J. A. S. B. vol. LVII, Pl. II, No. XXII. The obv. margin inscribed, the reverse ornamented with floral design. Mint Tíhás, date 1132. With brass loop for suspension. (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Mahmúd. Type the same as No. 204; obv., circular area with margin studded with pellets; rev., lettered surface without margin. No mint or date. With a brass loop for suspension. Plate II, fig. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold.</td>
<td>Silver.</td>
<td>Copper.</td>
<td>Mixed.</td>
<td>Weight in grains.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.29</td>
<td>SAFAWI DYNASTY OF PERSIA—Contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Obv.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rev.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.05</td>
<td>Ashraf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.37</td>
<td>Tahmásp II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.44</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>2... 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.48 77.94</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.24</td>
<td>Nádir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Weight in grain</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>74,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFAWI DYNASTY OF PERSIA—Contd. LVI, Pl. IV, No. XXXVII. With brass loop for suspension. <strong>Karim Khan</strong> (?). Mr. Rodgers observes: &quot;no name on the coin; obv., the distich as on Karim Khan’s coins in B. M. C. of Shahs of Persia, Introduction, p. lxxxvii. Rev. ضرب دارالموئین کاشان. Mint Káshán; no date. With brass loop for suspension. (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>40,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Undetermined.</strong> Obv., quarter-foil area with Shi‘ah creed, and inscribed margin, nearly illegible. Rev., two scoloped areas, one within the other, and dotted margin. Legend in inner area illegible; outer ... (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>22,34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Undetermined.</strong> Mint Išfahán. Mr. Rodgers reads as follows: &quot;Obv. ضرب اصفهان. Rev. in lozenge Margin lost.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>13,56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Medal or Token</strong> of brass. Obv., the Persian rayed and faced sun in middle of wreath of oak-leaves and acorns. Rev., crescent and stars in middle of ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>1... 1</td>
<td>163,61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFGHANISTAN. <strong>Mahmúd Durráni.</strong> A rupee as figured in Num. Chron., IIIrd Series for 1888, Pl. XIII, fig. 12, p. 352. Mint Hirát, date 1230. Legends on both sides almost entirely worn off. Obv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>AFGHANISTAN—Contd. Do. A quarter Rupee. Mint gone; date 1241. Most of the legend gone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>سنان معلمون</td>
<td>ئیم 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ضرب</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td>141.65</td>
<td>'Abdu-r-Rahmán. A rupee. Mint Kábul, date 1298. Very imperfectly struck, showing portion only of legends; edges much hacked about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ضرب</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>حسين</td>
<td>[کابل ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>عبد</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td></td>
<td>143.10</td>
<td>Do. A rupee. Another Variety. Mint and date cut away. In the same condition as No. 220.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ضرب</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ايء</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الرحمان</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>عبد</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>5... 5...</td>
<td></td>
<td>142.17</td>
<td>Undetermined. All Rupees. Mint Kábul; dates, only visible on three, **97, 141.52, 141.21, 138.41; In the same general condition, as Nos. 220 and 221.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ضرب دار</td>
<td>137,75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>حب</td>
<td>[12]97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>کابل</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>السلطنة</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ما</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ياماحب الزمان</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Number of Coins</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Weight in grains</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>143,18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>46,72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>43,60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>38,57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>47,16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>1... 1...</td>
<td>36,68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFGHANISTAN—Contd.**

**Undetermined.** A rupee, with an incomplete and unread Persian distich on the obv.; and with mint Dáru-s-Salṭanat Kábul and date 1250 on rev.

**Undetermined.** Obv., square area with arabesque in segments; rev., round area with ornamental margin. No mint, date **75.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Área</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Undetermined.** Obv., lozenge area within ornamental margin; rev., floral geometric figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الأداة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Undetermined.** A variety of No. 224. Mint Hirát on obv., and date 887 or 878 on rev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سنه</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Undetermined.** A variety of No. 224, but obv. scollopped area, rev. square area. Mint Hirát, no date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>گرگ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Undetermined.** Mint Hirát; date **55.** Obv., lotus shaped design; the centre has
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
<th>AFGHANISTAN—Contd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.26</td>
<td>Undetermined. Another variety of No. 225, but of much larger size. Mint Hirat, date 919.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.82</td>
<td>Undetermined. Another variety of No. 225; mint Hirat (?), date gone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>Undetermined. Another variety of No. 225. Obv....; Rev. illegible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RAJPUTS OF INDIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Weight in Grams</th>
<th>Prithvi Raja</th>
<th>Chahada Deva</th>
<th>Do.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.02</td>
<td>As in Ar. Ant., Pl. XIX, fig. 18; Ind. Ant., vol. I, pl. XXV, fig. 21; pl. XXVI, fig. 30; also Chron., p. 64, No. 38. (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.23</td>
<td>With legend Samanna-tadeva; as in Ar. Ant., Pl. XIX, fig. 16; also Chron., No. 39, p. 70. (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>With legend Samasara; as in Chron., No. 40, p. 70, pl. I, fig. 15, also Ar. Ant., Pl. XIX, fig. 31, 34, 37; Ind. Ant., Pl. XXVI, fig. 31. (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50,16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RAJPUTS OF INDIA.— (contd)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Madana Pála.</strong> As in Ar. Ant., Pl. XIX, fig. 19, 23, Ind. Ant., Pl. XXV, fig. 16, 47, 10 Pl. XXVI, fig. 27, J. R. A. S., vol. IX, fig. 13; also Chron., p. 62, No. 34. (i)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sallakshana Deva.</strong> As in J. R. A. S., vol. IX, fig. 11, 12; also Chron., p. 62, No. 33. (i)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47,82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MUGHALS OF INDIA.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104,80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Farrokh Siyar.</strong> A rupee. As in Num. Or., No. DCCCXII, but mint Darul-Saltanat Láhor, date 1126, regnal 2. (f)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOUTH INDIAN.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qutbu-d-dín Firúz.</strong> Doubtful, but see Madras Journal of Literature and Science, for 1888-89, fig. 4, p. 56. Lettered surfaces enclosed within double circle, the inner lined, the outer dotted. (i)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Obv.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>قطب الدنیا (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>شا (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>و الدین</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>میرز</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNDETERMINED.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unknown.</strong> Circular areas with inscribed margins. Each area contains the exceedingly crude figure of an animal, which cannot be identified. The marginal legends are almost entirely worn off and quite illegible. (i)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unknown.</strong> Mere copper-drops of varying sizes and weights. Mr. Rodgers observes: 13,66 &quot;No king's name on them. Some are very 12,09 small, weighing only 4 grains of copper. 11,59 They were all made of drops of copper which 7,70 were stamped on both sides by dies bearing 7,52 Kufic inscriptions. The edges are still con-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNDETERMINED.—*Contd.*

Some weigh over 50 grains. They all agree in not being prepared for the die by cutting or hammering. No definite description has yet been deciphered. Some of them have لدُ (‘adl) on one side; some have a geometric device. There is not sufficient inscription on any coin to enable me to assign them to any king.” The weights on the margin are those of seven of the best selected specimens.

N. B. Of the following Numbers there are a number of spare specimens, all being much inferior to those selected for the Indian Museum and noticed in the Catalogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial number</th>
<th>Number of Coins</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Weight in grains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nos. 51—54, 224 specimens.
Nos. 60—70, 48 do.
No. 75, 11 do.
Nos. 76—83, 107 do.
Nos. 84—86, 47 do.
No. 146, 148 do.
No. 240, 210 do.
Postscript.

The foregoing pages had already passed through the press, when I received from Professor W. Tiesenhausen of Petersbourg a copy of his paper on the Oriental Coins of Mr. Linévitch, published in the Transactions of the Oriental Section of the Russian Archaeological Society, Vol. IV, pp. 289—320. Among the coins described in this paper, I find several which appear to be identical with some in the Museum Collection. Thus Prof. Tiesenhausen's No. 6 shown in his Pl. I, figs. 2, 3 is the same as Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 77. The mint is read by the Professor as جزوان. His No. 7 seems to be the same as Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 51, but in the woodcut, accompanying No. 7, the horse is shown without a saddle. His No. 8 (with a woodcut) is the same or nearly the same as Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 101. Others are: No. 1 = Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 149; No. 3 = Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 95 or No. 105. Prof. Tiesenhausen's No. 29, which is dated 798 A. H. in Timúr's reign, very much resembles Ind. Mus. Cat. No. 230; and the latter, therefore, is probably to be attributed to Timúr. So are, in all probability, Ind. Mus. Cat. Nos. 224, 225, 226, which in design have much resemblance with No. 230. In fact, the date of No. 226 is probably to be read 788 in Timúr's reign. No. 229 of the Ind. Mus. Cat., to judge from its date 919 A. H., may be a coin of Ismá'íl I, the first king of the Şafawi dynasty of Persia (905-932 A. H.).
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