In July last I received from the Reverend F. Weber, Moravian Missionary in Leh in Ladak, a small packet, containing ancient manuscripts.

Regarding the circumstances under which the manuscripts were discovered, and given to Mr. Weber, the latter in two letters, dated the 21st June and 29th July last, gives me the following information. They were found in the neighbourhood of a place called Kugiar, in a “house” which, apparently, since times immemorial had been ruined and buried. An Afghan merchant, hoping to discover buried treasure, with much trouble undertook the excavation of the “house.” He found, however, only the bodies of some “cows,” which on the first contact crumbled into dust. At the same time he found also the manuscripts. As Mr. Weber is known to the people to be a collector of Tibetan curiosities, the manuscripts were taken to him by a person who had received them from the finder. He was also shown an “Urdû” letter from the latter, giving the above account of his exploration, but not knowing “Urdû,” Mr. Weber could not read the letter himself.

It would have been satisfactory to learn something more accurate about the identity of the so-called “house” in which; and the “cows”
with which the manuscripts are said to have been found. But, on enquiry, Mr. Weber wrote me that he was unable to obtain any further information.

The place Kugiar will be found on any good map of Central Asia at 77° 12' long. and 37° 25' lat., about 60 miles south of Yarkand, at an altitude of 6450'. A straight line, drawn from Leh to Yarkand, very nearly passes through Kugiar; it is a little to the left of that line, and lies just within the borders of the Chinese territory.

I found the manuscripts enclosed, after the fashion of Indian manuscripts, between two pieces of wooden boards. These are of unequal size, one measuring 9½ by 2½ inches, the other 7½ by 2½ inches. They are, each, pierced by one hole, which is not in the middle of the board, but towards one side; in the larger board it is at a distance of 2½", in the smaller at 1½", from its narrow margin. Corresponding holes, on one side only, are in all the leaves of the manuscripts. This one-sided position of the string-hole is also observable in the Bower Manuscripts, and it appears to be a peculiarity of Central Asian manuscripts. I do not remember ever having observed it in any Indian manuscript. These have either one string-hole in the middle of the leaf, or they have two holes, one toward either narrow margin. Facsimiles of leaves with one hole are given in Dr. Mitra's Sanskrit Notices, and such of leaves with two holes, in Mr. Bendall's Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. The famous Horiuzi Manuscript, which originally came from India, has two holes, as may be seen from the facsimiles published by Prof. Bühler in the Anecdota Ozoniensia, Vol. I, Part III. On the other hand, the facsimile of the Central Asian manuscript, published by Mr. S. Oldenburg, in the Records of the Oriental Transactions of the Imperial Russian Archeological Society, Vol. VII, p. 81, 82, shows the peculiar one-sided hole. This practice of using an one-sided hole, therefore, would seem to be a mark by which a manuscript may be distinguished as coming from Central Asia. Another point to be noted is, that, like the Bower MSS., the Weber Manuscripts also are of the oblong shape, usual to Indian manuscripts, as distinguished from the square shaped Kashmirian. The square shape, indeed, appears to be an exceptional peculiarity of the Kashmirian manuscripts. All others, Indian, Nepalese, Tibetan and Central Asian are of an oblong shape.

On examining the Weber Manuscripts, I found that they formed a collection of fragments of nine (or possibly eleven) different manuscripts.

These are fragmentary in two ways. In the first place, not one of them is complete, a more or less large number of leaves being wanting both at the beginning and at the end. Secondly, every leaf is mutilated on the right or left or on both sides. On the other hand, they are, as a
rule, perfect at the top and bottom. The following is a list of leaves of the several parts composing the manuscripts:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Consisting of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9 leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine Parts consisting of 76 leaves.

All the nine manuscripts are written on paper. Their paper is of differing qualities. In the main there are two kinds: one kind is thick, soft, flexible and white; it is so soft indeed, that its surface is apt to fret, and thus to injure the writing. The other kind is thin, hard and stiff, and of a more or less brownish colour. No. IX (Central Asian) has the softest and whitest texture. Also soft, but less white is the paper of Nos. 1 and 2 (Indian) and Nos. 6 and 7 (Central Asian). Harder and darker is the paper of Nos. 3 and 4 (Indian) and No. 5 (Central Asian). Distinctly hard and brown is the paper of No. VIII (Central Asian). The manuscripts, written in Central Asian characters, therefore, are inscribed on paper of the greatest variety, from the whitest and softest to the stiffest and darkest.

The paper, by appearance and touch, appears to me to be of the kind, commonly known as Nepalese, which is manufactured from several varieties of the Daphne plant. Dr. George King, the Director of the Botanical Gardens, has been good enough to examine the paper, and agrees with me that probably it is paper "made of the fibres of Daphne papyracea, or of Edgeworthia Gardneri, which are still used as raw material for paper-making in the Himalayas." The better description of paper is made of fibres of Edgeworthia Gardneri. A very full account of this so-called Nepalese paper, its material and manufacture, will be found in Dr. Watt's Dictionary of Economic Products of India, Vol. III, p. 19, where also references to other sources of information are given.

For the purpose of being inscribed this paper appears to have been specially prepared with some kind of sizing, probably made of white arsenic. On the leaves of some of the manuscripts this size forms a thick glazed coat on which the letters are traced. Occasionally this glazed coat has peeled off, in which case the letters which it bore have disappeared with it. This is particularly the case with Part V, and may
be seen on Plate II, fig. 1. In the case of Part IX, the coat, apparently under the influence of damp, has caused the leaves to stick together, and thus extensive damage has been done, as may be seen from figures 3–5 on Plate III.

A very striking peculiarity of the Weber Manuscripts is, that they are written in two quite distinct types of written characters. One of them—that in which Parts I, II, III and IV are written—is the well-known Indian character of the North-Western Gupta variety, being the same type (though a different sub-variety) as that used in the Bower MSS. This type of character is sufficiently well-known, and I need not say anything more about it here.

The other type of characters, used in Parts V–IX, is what I may call the Central Asian Nāgarī. It is a peculiar angular and slanting form of the Indian Nāgarī characters. On the whole the several Parts exhibit these characters in a variety of handwritings, though the essential type of the characters is the same. There is, however, a distinct variety, not merely of handwriting, but of type, noticeable between the characters used in Parts V–VIII and in Part IX. The test letters are the dental th and dh. In Part IX their shape is angular and squarish, $\theta$ th and $\vartheta$ dh, while in Parts V–VIII it is round, $\theta$ th and $\vartheta$ dh. (See Plate IV.) For the purpose of comparing these two varieties of the Central Asian Nāgarī, Parts VII and IX (Plate II, fig. 6 and Plate III, figs. 3–5) are the best, because in their general style of handwriting they most nearly resemble one another. In the sequel, I shall refer to these two varieties as the round and the square varieties of the Central Asian Nāgarī.

I may here refer to a few other peculiarities of the Central Asian alphabet. Firstly, the curious form of the super-scribed vowel े, with its curve turned to the right. Secondly, the curious form of the letter म. I have observed this form, in a few rare cases, on gold coins of Samudra Gupta. It has, clearly, grown out of the angular Indo-Scythian form of म; and its origination would fall in the early time of the Gupta period (Samudra Gupta 380–395 A.D.). The series of changes would be these ङ, ङ, ञ, ञ, all of these forms being represented on Gupta coins, and the last being the parent of the Central Asian form. Thirdly, the curious resemblance between the forms of द t and द n. They can only be distinguished by the fact, that the right-hand angle of द is more decidedly acute-angled. Fourthly, the curious symbol of a double dot over letters,—in fact a double anusvāra. It may be seen frequently in Mr. Oldenburg's Kashgar manuscript. In the Weber Manuscripts, it occurs only in Part IX, which, as above remarked, is distinguished by being written in the square variety of the Central Asian Nāgarī. It is,
however, not so much the mark of a particular variety of characters, as
of a particular language, and its exact power I do not know. Part IX
is not written in Sanskrit, nor have I met with the double dot in any
Sanskrit text, except once. On the smaller of the two wooden boards,
three lines are inscribed in Central Asian characters. The board pro-

ably belongs to the work contained in Part VII, which treats of a Bud-
dhistic charm, the lines are written in Sanskrit and run as follows:

[namō]—vidyādharasya—dakshinē hastē—mani dhārayitavyam—api cha
[pāra-]rātr-ovavstēna—suchi-sndēna—su-vastra-prāvritēna sādhavīyya
[.jē sādhi]

The words in brackets are broken off and have been conjecturally
supplied. The meaning is: “Salutation to the Vidyādharā! Let the
jewel be placed in the right hand; then having fasted the whole night,
washed clean, and put on fresh garments, success will be secured by
me.”

Here there is the double anusvāra over the akshara vri of prāvritēna.
But what it is there intended to signify, I do not know. In Part IX, it
is occasionally found on Sanskrit words, thus maṇchaṁśṭhaṁ, which is a
mis-spelling for maṇiṣṭha. Here it may possibly mark a modification
in the sound of the vowels; but its real power is obscure.

I add a table of the Central Asian alphabet, showing the forms of
single as well as compound letters. See Plate IV. They are nearly all
excerpted from the leaves shown in my Plates I to III. In this table are
also shown the ancient numeral figures. They are found in several of
the manuscripts; viz., Parts I, II, IV, VI.

The Central Asian Nāgārī has a curious resemblance to the so-
called “Wartu” characters of the Tibetans. In this Journal, for 1888,
Vol. LVII, will be found two plates (I and II) showing these “Wartu”
characters. It belongs to a paper, published by Bābū S. C. Das, on the
Sacred and Ornamental Characters of Tibet (ibid., p. 41). The resem-
blance, however, is still more striking to certain characters, shown on
Plate I, in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI (for 1828), and there
designated respectively as Khacheehee, Gramtsodee, Seendoohsee, and
Pookangkee. The plate seems to have been prepared by Mr. Hodgson
from “a vast number of manuscripts, great and small fragments,” as
specimens of “Bhotiya” (i.e., Tibetan) penmanship.

1 Perhaps sādhavīshyatē should be read for sādhavīyya[..jē], or sādhavītavya mē.
With uvavstēna compare the Pāli upavutta.

2 The letters on the Plate would seem to be intended for facsimiles, but the ac-
curacy of the copy is not above suspicion. There are certainly some obvious
mistakes in the identification of the letters; thus the third group (from the left) in
the last line, is not p, ph, b, bh, m, but t, th, d, dh, n. Again the third letter in the
third line is not pe, but pd.
The Tibetan tradition with regard to the "Wartu" characters is rather uncertain. In the paper, above referred to, Babu S. C. Das says, that the "Wartu" characters were introduced into Tibet by Sambhoṭa (or Thon-mi, the son of Anu) from Magadha in North-Eastern India, about 630-650 A.D. Since then he has been re-examining the traditions of Tibet on this point, and he now informs me that the "Wartu" characters were rather introduced from the North-Western extremity of India, namely from Kāshmir, called in Tibetan Khache. He has supplied me with the following passage from the Bu-ston Chos byun (fl. 138): “He (i.e., King Srong Tsan Gampo, 630 A.D.) ascended the throne at the age of 18. He brought the border chieftains under subjection. He made presents to them, (and) read letters (sent by them). Before that (time) there was no written language in Tibet. He sent Thon-mi, son of Anu, with sixteen attendants to learn the letters. He learnt from Pandit Deva-vid Simha the Sabda Vidya. He designed 30 letters, adapting them to the Tibetan language. He based the four fundamental vowels, called Ālī, (i.e., i, e, o, u) on ā. In form these letters (vowels and consonants) resembled the characters of Khache. This was done at the fort of Maru in Lhasa. He wrote eight grammatical works on the orthography and syntax of the Tibetan Grammar.” The Babu also informs me, that in later days the country of Liyul or Khoten was included in the general name of Khache; and further that the letters which were brought from India, through Nepal, were the so-called Lantsa (see Plate VIII in Journal, vol. LVII), introduced in the reign of Thieroṇ Deu-tsan.

Here the following points may be noted: In the first place, the 34 original letters of Tibet (i.e., 29 consonants and 5 vowels) elaborated by Sambhoṭa, are shown on Plate II(a) in Babu S. Ch. Das’ paper. They are the so-called U-chan or "headed" characters. It will be noticed that among them “the four fundamental vowels” are certainly adaptations of the form of the vowel ā. This, so far, bears out the tradition above quoted from the Bustan. But, for the rest, the letters show no particular resemblance to the "Wartu" or "Khache" characters, any more than to any other Indian system of writing (e.g., the Gupta or Lantsa.) Possibly this may be put down to the fact, that Sambhoṭa may have modified the shapes of the letters he adopted; or it may be due to subsequent alterations, the table not showing the exact shape the letters received at the hands of Sambhoṭa, but such as they assumed in the course of time.

But, secondly, it is noteworthy that the letter γ in Sambhoṭa’s alphabet shows the ancient tri-dentate shape of that letter. In the table of "Wartu" characters, on the other hand, that letter shows its
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Modern (square) form. It is clear, therefore, that the "Wartu" letters, from which Sambhoṭa copied his own, cannot have been precisely the same as those exhibited in Babu S. Ch. Das’ table. Now there is an unmistakable similarity of the letters shown in the table of the *Asiatic Researches*, on the one hand, with the Babu’s "Wartu" characters, and on the other, with the Central Asian characters in the Weber Manuscripts. In the table there is a series of Khachehee letters, that is, clearly, letters of Khache (Central Asia.) These, therefore, should be the letters, from which Sambhoṭa adapted his alphabet. And, as a matter of fact, it will be found that the letter y shows in that table its old tri-dentate form. But further, in that table the letter y appears in three different forms: first, in the distinctly tri-dentate form (**) in the second line, then in an intermediate bi-annulate form (**) in the third line, and lastly in the (practically) modern square form in the fourth line. The last of these three forms, the modern one, is never found in any portion of our manuscripts. The form in which it is usually occurs in them, is the intermediate, bi-annulate one. In the most ancient tri-dentate form it only occurs; optionally, in Part V of the Weber Manuscripts. With regard to the Tibetan alphabet, the evidence seems to point to this conclusion, that Sambhoṭa had before him a "Khache" alphabet, similar to those shown in the Plate of the *Asiatic Researches*, but sufficiently ancient, to still show uniformly the ancient tri-dentate form of the letter y, which, in its turn, explains the presence of that ancient form in the current Tibetan alphabet. The characters he had before him may have been something similar to those seen in Part V of the Weber Manuscripts. On the other hand, the "Wartu" letters, shown in Babu S. C. Das’ plate had for their prototype a somewhat later "Khache" alphabet,—one which had already adopted the modern square form of the letter y.

The whole of the Weber Manuscripts are written in the Sanskrit language, of more or less grammatical purity, except Part IX. This is written in the square variety of the Central Asian Nāgārī, and in a language which to me is unintelligible. The strange ligatures that occur in it, such as \(\text{lkh\h}, \text{t\textser}, \text{y\textser}, \text{p\textser}, \text{h\textser}, \text{\\textser}, \text{y\textser}, \text{\textser}, \text{\textser}, \text{\textser}\), etc., are foreign to Sanskrit or any Sanskritic language that I know of; yet undoubted Sanskrit words do occur numerously interspersed in the text. Such are aśvakānda and aśvagandha,  sīrīsa (Skr.  sīrīsa)-pushpa, priyanu, punarnava, maṇiḥmaṇitama (Skr.  maṇiḥmaṇitma),  dūrava (Skr.  dūrīvā),  médha and mahāmēdha (Skr.  médha and mahāmēdha), prapujarīka or prapunjarika (both spellings occur for Skr.  prapujarīka),  katu- rōhīni,  kikōri and  kikōra-kikōri, dēvadāru, etc. It will be noticed that most of the names are not correctly spelled; unaspirates being ex-
changed with aspirates, sonants with surds, cerebrals with dentals, etc. But there can be no shadow of doubt as to the identity of the words. They are Sanskrit names of medicinal plants. I have not yet been able to give to the subject any thorough examination, but I suspect that we have in Part IX a medical treatise written in some Mongolian (Tibetan) or Turki language, treating of Indian medicine, and hence using Sanskrit medical terms.

The curious circumstance, however, with regard to this Part IX is that, both with reference to the characters (square variety) and the language, it clearly belongs to the same class of manuscripts as the Kashgar MS., published by Mr. Oldenburg. Of the latter manuscript I shall give some account at the end of this paper.

On the age of the Weber MSS., I am not able to give such a definite opinion as on that of the Bower MSS., though I am not disposed to believe that any portion of it can be referred to a date later than the 7th century A. D. In the Indian portions of the manuscript (Parts I to IV) no other than the old tri-dentate form of occurs. On this ground these portions should be of the same date as the Bower MSS., i.e., belong to the 5th century A. D. In some points they are even more antique than the Bower MSS. Thus the compound preceding another consonant, is uniformly written level with the line of writing (never above it, like the vowel marks). The consonant has also preserved a more ancient shape.

The Central Asian portions of the Weber Manuscripts show occasionally in Part V, the old tri-dentate form of, and otherwise throughout the intermediate bi-annulate form . No trace of the modern square form is seen anywhere. I call the bi-annulate form "intermediate," not because it presents a stage of development intermediate between the old tri-dentate and the modern square forms, but simply because it is clearly a "current" form grown out of the older tri-dentate. It seems to me doubtful whether it was ever superseded by the later Indian "current" square form. On the other hand, it is so easily formed out of the older tri-dentate form, that it may have been and probably was nearly contemporaneous with it. I am disposed to believe, that the Gupta ya (the old tri-dentate form) as it was carried from Kashmir into the more northern and north-eastern parts (Kashgar, Yarkand, Khoten) of Central Asia, assumed and always retained the bi-annulate form, while in the more south-eastern parts (Western Tibet) it retained at first its tri-dentate form and was afterwards gradually changed into the modern (Indian) square form. When Sambhoṭa went to "Khache" (Central Asia, i.e. Kashmir, Liyul, Khotan) to bring thence the letters in 630-650 A. D., he evidently found the tri-dentate form in use in the particular
part of the country which he visited. Towards the end of the 7th century and early in the 8th, Central Asia was overrun by the Muhammadan armies of the Khalifat, and this put an end to the Sanskrit culture of those regions. Hence our Central Asian manuscripts which still show evidences of a distinct Sanskrit culture cannot well be placed after that date.

I now proceed to describe the several parts of the Weber MSS. in detail:

Part I. (See Plate I, fig. 1.) There are nine leaves, mutilated on the right-hand side. They measure 7 1/2 by 2 3/4 inches, and have eight lines to the page, excepting the obverse of the 14th leaf, which has 9 lines. The leaves are consecutively numbered, from 7 to 15, in the old style of figures. The first six leaves and those after the fifteenth are wanting. The obverse of the 15th leaf is shown in Plate I, fig. 1. The number 15 (i.e., the figure for 10, and below it the figure for 5) is seen on the left-hand margin. The page reads as follows:


In the following Roman transliteration I have added, in straight brackets and italics, the missing portions, so far as it is possible to deduce them from the context and other parts of the manuscript. It will be seen that from 9 to 11 aksharas are missing in each line, which would occupy nearly two inches of the leaf. The original size of the leaf, therefore, must have been 9 1/2 by 2 3/4 inches, that is, exactly the size of the larger of the two wooden boards. This circumstance would seem to prove that the larger board was one of the two covers of this particular manuscript.


2, jī nākṣatratāṃ tri-tāram go-sirsha-saṁsthitam sapta-muhūrtta-yogam J. 1. 2
Fifteenth Leaf: Reverse.

1. yógam guḍa-kaṁsār-bhōjanam 8 Pushya-daivatam Bhārgavān-gōtrēṇa 26 || Āśvinī nakshatram tri-tāram [m . . . samsthitaṁ triṁśa-muhūrtā-yōgam ya-]

2. kṛṇ-māṁsa-bhōjanam Gandharva-daivatam Āsvāyani-gōtrēṇa 27 || Bharant nakshatram tri-tāram bhaga-sam[sthitaṁ triṁśa-muhūrtā-yōgam ]

3. taṇḍul-āhāram Vāma-daivatam (arthavam) 4 Bhārgavī-gōtrēṇa 28 || It=imāṇi bhō Pushkarasārīn=sapta-ottara-dv[ārikāṇi nakshatraṇi || Ity=ēśām]

4. bhō Pushkaraśarīn ashtā-vīṁśatīnām nakshatrapām katamāni nakshatrāṇi paṁcha-chatvārimśa-muhū[ṛtāni sαṭ tαd-yathā Rōhini Punavā]-

5. suḥ uttarā Phalguni Viśākhā uttarā-Āṣāṅīlā uttaraś Bhadrapadā— paṁcha nakshatrapāṁ paṁcha[dāsa-muhūrtāni tαd-yathā Ārdrā]

6. Aśleṣā Svaṭī Jyēṣṭhā Śatabhishā ekā Abhijī ashtau muhūrtā ēśāṇi triṁśa-muhūrtāni nakshatr[āṇi pūrva-dvārikānām ]

8 This was the original reading; by the interlinear insertion of the akṣara ḫā it is now changed to guḍa-kāṁsār-āhāra-bhōjanam.

4 This word is inserted interlinearly, with a mark indicating the proper place where it should be read in the line.
7, nakshatrāṇāṁ Kṛtikā pūrvaṁ Aśleṣhā paśchimā dakṣiṇa-dvārikā-
nāṁ nakshatrāṇāṁ Magha pūrvaṁ Viśākhā paśchīmam[md paśchima-
dvārikānāṁ na-]

8, kṣatratāṇāṁ Anurādhā pūrvaṁ Sravanaṁ paśchimā uttara-dvārikā-
nāṁ nakshatrāṇāṁ Dhanisthā pūrvaṁ paśchimā Bha[raṇi . . . . . . .]

I may add the remainder of the remarks on the nakshatras from
the preceding leaves 13 and 14:—

Thirteenth Leaf: Reverse.
1, katamē Vātsā Brāhma-chāraṇāḥ Chhandogā katī Chhandogānāṁ
bhūdāḥ shat katamē tad=yathā gṛdhū[. . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

2, kapimjalāyā atyāsanam=iti kim-gōtrī mātā Pārāśāri=paṭhāti bhavān=
nakshatra-vamśāṁ=atha kim katha[yatu mē tad=yathā Kṛtikā 1]

3, Rōhiṇi 2 Mṛgaśīraḥ 3 Ārdra 4 Purvarvasuḥ 5 Pushyāḥ 6 Aśleshā
7 Magha 8 Pūrva-phalgun[ni 9 Uttar-phalgunt 10 Hastaḥ]

4, 11 Chitrā 12 Śvātīḥ 13 Aśākha (sic) 14 Anurādhā 15 Jyēṣṭhā 16
Mūlaḥ 17 Pūrvākṣhāḥ [18 Uttarākṣāḥ 19 Abhūjī]

5, 20 Sravanaḥ 21 Dhanisthā 22 Satabhishā 23 Pūrva-bhadrapadā
24 Uttarā-bhadrapadā 25 Rē[catā 26 Āśvinī 27 Bhara-]

6, nī 25 ity=ētāṇy=ashtāvīṁśati nakshatrāṇi kati-tāraṇī kim-samsthā-
nānī kati-muhūrtānī kim-gōṭrāṇi ki[m-bhōjanānī kim-]

7, daivatāṇi—Kṛtikā nakshatraṁ shat-tāraṁ kshura-samsthānāṁ
trīmaṁ-muhūrtā-yogam dadhi-āhāram Agni-daivatam=Āgni[vē-
sya-gōṭrēṇa 1 II Rōhi-]

8, nī nakshatraṁ paṅcha-tāraṁ sakaṭ-ōdīḥ-samsthānāṁ paṅcha-
chatvārīṁśa-muhūrtā-yogam vṛisha-matsya-bhōjanam praṅa[pati-
daivatam . . . -gōṭrēṇa 2 II]

Fourteenth Leaf: Obverse.
1, Mṛgaśīrasam nakshatraṁ tri-tāram mṛiga-śirsha-samsthītam
trīmaṁ-muhūrtā-yogam mṛiga-matsya-bhōjanam Sōma-d[ai]va-
ta[m . . . . . . -gōṭrēṇa 3 II Ārdra na-]

2, kṣatarāṁ ēka-tārama tilaka-samsthitam paṅchadāsa-muhūrta-yogam
navanīt-āhāram Rudra-daivatam Hāritāyana-gō[trēṇa 4 II Purnar-
vasuṁ=nakshatraṁ]

3, dvi-tāram patākā-samsthītam paṅcha-chatvārīṁśa-yogaṁ sarpi-
maṇḍ-āhāram Āditya-daivatam Vaśīṣṭha-gōtrē[ṇa 5 II Pushyō
nakshatraṁ tri-tē-]

4, ram vardhamāna-samsthītam trīmaṁ-muhūrta-yogam madhv-āhā-
ram Brīhaspati-daivatam Alabānēyavi-gōtrē[ṇa 6 II Aśleṣhā nak-
shatraṁ paṁ-]
It will be observed that the spelling and grammar is occasionally irregular. Thus we have a wrong quantity on fl. 13b7 trīṃśa for trīṃśa and ibid. and fl. 15a4 māhūrta for mūhūrta, fl. 14b6 mitra for mitra, fl. 15b4 chatvārīṃśa and viṃśatīṃśa, fl. 15a4 (see plate) dvārikānī for dvārikāni; ri for ri in fl. 14b9 trīṃśa for śrīṃśa, fl. 14b7 trilāram for trilāram;
ir for ri on fl. 15b\(7\) in krtik\(a\) for krtik\(a\); d for \(\ddot{\imath}\) on fl. 14b\(6\) in spaha\(d\)ika. Want of sandhi: fl. 13b\(7\) dadhi-\(\ddot{\text{d}}\)h\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)ram for dadhy\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)d\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)ram. Blunder: fl. 15a\(7\) uttan\(\ddot{\text{v}}\)ra for ut\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)ra; fl. 15a\(8\) viksh\(\ddot{\text{n}}\)u for vish\(\ddot{\text{n}}\)u; fl. 13b\(6\) as\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)kh\(\ddot{\text{a}}\) for vi\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)kh\(\ddot{\text{a}}\), though these two forms may be synonyms; in the Abridged Petersburg Dictionary both forms are given as synonyms of a certain plant. Similarly fl. 14a\(6\) sar\(\ddot{\text{p}}\)i 'serpent' for sar\(\ddot{\text{p}}\)a, fl. 15b\(1\) Bh\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)rgav\(\ddot{\text{a}}\) for Bh\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)rgav\(\ddot{\text{a}}\). Omission of final consonant in fl. 14a\(6\) yak\(\ddot{\text{r}}\)i for yak\(\ddot{\text{r}}\), fl. 15a\(2\) (see plate) and fl. 15b\(6\) abhiji for abhijit. Anomalous construction in fl. 15b\(6\) \(\ddot{\text{s}}\)k\(\ddot{\text{a}}\) abhiji \(\ddot{\text{a}}\)sh\(\ddot{\text{t}}\)au muh\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)ta. I am not quite satisfied that I have read correctly the words krak\(\ddot{\text{\=h}}\)a fl. 15a\(8\), Brahm\(\dot{\text{\=a}}\)v\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)n\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\) fl. 15a\(3\). In fl. 15a\(8\) (see plate) there is a curious symbol above sap\(\ddot{\text{t}}\)a; and since on fl. 15b\(6\) it is stated that Abhijit has eight (ash\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)ta) muh\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)tas, I believe that the symbol is the numeral figure 8, intended as a correction. The \(\ddot{s}\) of sap\(\ddot{\text{t}}\)a has not quite its proper shape; I believe the writer or revisor meant to alter sap\(\ddot{\text{t}}\)a into as\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)ta, but seeing his failure in altering the shape of sa, he abandoned his intention and over-wrote the figure 8. There are numerous traces to be met with of a revisor's work; thus in fl. 15a\(8\) krak\(\ddot{\text{\=h}}\)d\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)d\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)d\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\) the \(\ddot{\text{\=r}}\)a was originally omitted and has been supplied interlinearly; similarly the syllable ni of katy\(\ddot{\text{\=\=a}}\)y\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)nt in fl. 15a\(4\). (See the Plate.)

The portion extracted by me, may be translated thus, observing the proper sequence of the leaves:

(Leaf 13.) Who are they? They are the Vâtsas, Brahmacârins and Chhandôgas. How many are the divisions of the Chhandôgas? Six. Which are they? They are as follows:—Those whose food consists in (1) wheat, (2) ......., (3) ......., (4) ......., (5) ......., (6) francolin partridge. To which gôtra does their mother belong? To Parâsars's. Has your honour any (particular) reading of the list of Nakshatras? Tell me! They are as follows:—I, Kritikâ, 2, Rôhînî, 3, Mrîgâsîra, 4, Árdrâ, 5, Punarvasu, 6, Pus\(\ddot{\text{h}}\)ya, 7, Ás\(\ddot{\text{\=i}}\)shâ, 8, Maghâ, 9, Pûrvaphalgunt, 10, Uttara-phalgunt, 11, Hastâ, 12, Chitrâ, 13, Svâti, 14, Ás\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)khâ (Vi\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)khâ), 15 Anurâdâhâ, 16, Jyêsh\(\ddot{\text{\=t}}\)ha, 17, Mûla, 18, Pûrvâshâdhâ, 19 Uttarâs\(\ddot{\text{\=i}}\)dâdhâ, 20 Abhiji, 21, Sra\(\ddot{\text{v}}\)ana, 22 Dhanisha\(\ddot{\text{\=th}}\)ha, 23, Satabhishâ, 24, Pûrvâ Bhadrapadâ, 25, Uttârâ Bhadrapadâ, 26, Rêvâtâ, 27, Áśvînî, 28, Bharând. These twenty nakshatras—what are the numbers of their stars, what are their configurations, what are the numbers of their muhûrtas, what are their gôtras, what kinds of food may be taken under them, what are their daivatas?

The following part of the translation, I give in tabular form, for the sake of convenient reference.

5 Atûdâsam I take to be a mis-reading for ity-\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)nam (=\(\ddot{\text{\=a}}\)nam).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stars</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Mahbrta</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Daivata</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇīkā</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>curds</td>
<td>Agni</td>
<td>Agnivesya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rūhiṣī</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>seat of a cart</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>beef and fish</td>
<td>Prajāpati</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mrīgaśīra</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>deer's head</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>venison and fish</td>
<td>Sōma</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ardrā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>butter</td>
<td>Rudra</td>
<td>Hāritāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Punarvasu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>froth of boiling butter</td>
<td>Āditya</td>
<td>Vaśishṭha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pushya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>varhamāna</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>honey</td>
<td>Vṛihaspati</td>
<td>Alabanāyavl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Āśākṣā</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>flag in the air</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fish and liver</td>
<td>Sarpa</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These, oh Pushkarasāri, are the seven nakshatras that are situated in the East.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stars</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Mahbrta</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Daivata</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Māghā</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>river-arbour</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pitṛi</td>
<td>Pingāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pūrva-pahal-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bhaga</td>
<td>Gōtama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gūni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Uttara-pahal-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ārya</td>
<td>Kaśkrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gūni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hastra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kātyāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chitrā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mole</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>mudga-bean</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Svāti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Viśākhā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Satkṛityāyant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These, oh Pushkarasārin, are the seven nakshatras that are situated in the South.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stars</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Mahbrta</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Daivata</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anurādhā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>crystal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>mess of māsha-beans</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Alaṁbaneyavl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jyēṣṭhā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>waist of a youth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>rice and wheat</td>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>Diya ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mūla</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>elephant's foot</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>infusion of Ficus Indica</td>
<td>Āpa</td>
<td>Darpa-katyāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pūrvāśadāhā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>elephant's foot</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>roots and fruit</td>
<td>Nārīti</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Uttara śadāhā</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>elephant's foot</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>honey and parched grain</td>
<td>Vaiśya</td>
<td>Mandgalāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Abhijīt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cow's head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>vāyu-kraukṣa (?)</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>Brahmarāyant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sravāṇa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>waist of a youth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>bird's flesh</td>
<td>Vīṣṇu</td>
<td>Brahmarāvan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These, oh Pushkarasāri, are the seven nakshatras that are situated in the West.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stars</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Mahbrta</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Daivata</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dhanishtā</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bird (kite)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Vāsava</td>
<td>Katyāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Satabhīṣā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Varuna</td>
<td>Tāṇḍāyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pūrvā Bhadrāpadā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ābhivṛiddhi</td>
<td>Jātukarṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Uttarā Bhadrāpadā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>flag</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>beef</td>
<td>Āryamākapalpa</td>
<td>Hiraṇyāyant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rāvaṭi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>consistent molas- sses</td>
<td>Pushya</td>
<td>Bhāgarvān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aśvinī</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>liver and flesh</td>
<td>Gandharva</td>
<td>Aśvāyant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bharāṇī</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>pudendum</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>Yama</td>
<td>Bhāgarvī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These, oh Pushkarasārin, are the seven nakshatras that are situated in the North.
Of these twenty-eight nakshatras, oh Pushkarasārin, how many nakshatras occupy a period of 45 muhūrtas? Six; they are these:—Rohini, Punarvasu, Uttarā Phalgunī, Viśākhā, Uttarāśādhā, Uttarā Bhadrapadā. Five nakshatras take up 15 muhūrtas, namely Āḍrā, Aślēshā, Svāti, Jyeṣṭhā, Satabhisāhā. One, Abhijit, occupies eight muhūrtas. The remainder are nakshatras occupying 30 muhūrtas. Of the nakshatras, situated in the East, Kṛiti is the first and Aślēshā, the last (counting from East to West). Of the nakshatras, situated in the South, Mahā is the first, and Viśākhā, the last. Of the nakshatras, situated in the West, Anurādhā is the first, and Śravaṇa, the last. Of the nakshatras, situated in the North, Dhanishṭā is the first, and BhaRaṇī, the last.

This work is clearly an astronomical treatise of a very ancient type. The most ancient astronomy of the Hindús was based on the lunar zodiac, comprising 27 (or afterwards 28) asterisms, the so-called nakshatras, the series of which commenced with Kṛiṭikā or the Pleiades, and ended with Āśvinī and BhaRaṇī. This system obtained among them till the introduction of Greek astronomy into India, about the middle of the 2nd century A. D. (the time of Ptolemy). About that time the order of the nakshatra series, which was now no more in accordance with reality, was rectified, and the two last nakshatras were placed first, so that the series now commenced with Āśvinī. (i. e., β and γ in Aries). This new order is that found in all Indian astronomical works, subsequent to the Vedic period.

Further: the older series, beginning with Kṛiṭikā, consisted originally only of 27 nakshatras. It was, apparently, only in the later stage of the Vedic period of the Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras, that a 28th nakshatra was added; this was Abhijit, which was inserted as No. 20 in the original list. The first mention of Abhijit occurs in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, and it formed already a part of the nakshatra series in the time of the grammarian BhaRaṇī. The latter's date is probably at the end of the 3rd century B. C. The earliest mention of the 28 nakshatras in China (introduced by the Buddhists) is in the middle of 3rd century B. C.

Accordingly we have roughly, as the termini a quo and ad quem for the composition of our treatise, the third century B. C. and the second century A. D. This is about the period of the last stage of the Vedic literature, viz., that of the Śūtras. To this period, belong the two small astronomical treatises, the Nakshatra-kalpa and the Śanti-kalpa,

7 See ibidem, part I, pp. 298, 300.
which are attached to the Kauśika Śūtra of the Atharva Veda. I have not been able to examine any copies of them, but a brief account of them has been given by Professor Weber in his *Vedische Nachrichten von den Naxatra* (pp. 390–393). From this account it appears that the statements, especially, in the Nakshatra-kalpa, show a curious resemblance to those in our manuscript. Thus the Nakshatra-kalpa, too, gives lists not only of the shape, the divinity, the number of stars, and the duration of muhūrtas of every one of the 28 nakshatras, but also of their fourfold distribution into Eastern, Southern, Western and Northern, of their gōtra (or race of Rishi), and of the kind of food that may be taken under them. The Nakshatra-kalpa adds some further particulars, corresponding statements to which may have been in the lost portion of the manuscript, or may possibly be found in that portion which I have not yet been able to examine.

A confirmation of the age of the work may be found in the circumstance, that the information given in it is ascribed to Pushkaraśārin. This renowned teacher is said to have been a contemporary of Buddha. He is mentioned as a teacher in the Prātiśākhya Śūtra; and is also cited in the Vṛttikas to Pāṇini by Katyāyana, their author.

On the whole, therefore, and subject to the result of an examination of the whole manuscript, for which I have not yet been able to find time, I have come to the conclusion that this part of the Weber Manuscripts contains a hitherto unknown work belonging to the last stage of the Vedic period of Sanscrit literature.

I will, however, here add a few curious particulars that I have noticed in my cursory comparison of the manuscript with Prof. Weber's account of the Nakshatra-kalpa and similar works. The list of gōtras differs entirely; the only coincidence is in the gōtra of Kṛittikā. Most of the daivatās agree; the most striking difference is in the case of the 27th nakshatra (Aśvini), for whom our manuscript gives Gandharva as the daivata, while the Nakshatra-kalpa, in common with all other known works, gives the two Ásvins. Other differences may be mere blunders, thus Vaishya in No. 11 and Pushya in No. 26, for Viśvē and Pūshan respectively. Nariti in No. 18 may be a local variety of Nīrīti. Curious are also, in our manuscript, Ābhivṛddhi and Āryamākalpa in Nos. 24 and 25, for Āhirbudhnya and Ajna-ekapād respectively. The transposition of Âpa in No. 17, and of Naŗiti in No. 18, may be an accidental mistake for Naŗiti in No. 17 and Âpa in No. 18. In the case of No. 20 (Abhujīt) our manuscript gives no daivata at all, the usually given daivata being Brahman; but this, too, may be an accidental omission.

---

8 See Weber's *History of Indian Literature*, p. 163.
9 See Weber's *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 102, 285.
As to the number of stars, composing the several nakshatras, our manuscript differs in nine cases from the Nakshatra-kalpa; viz., in Nos. 2, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 27. Curiously enough in five out of these nine cases (viz., Nos. 2, 7, 8, 16, 20) our manuscript agrees with Brahma-gupta's statements.

With regard to the duration of the muhûrtas, our manuscript has two curious differences. Firstly, it enumerates only five nakshatras of a duration of 15 muhûrtas, while the usual number in the Nakshatra-kalpa and other works is six. These works add Bharaqi (No. 28), to which in our manuscript a duration of 30 muhûrtas is given. Secondly, our manuscript gives to No. 20 (Abhijit) a duration of 8 muhûrtas, against the usual one of one muhûrta. The whole list of durations stands thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weber MS.</th>
<th>Nakshatra-kalpa, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 nakshatras of 45 muhûrtas.</td>
<td>6 naksh. of 45 muh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 &quot; of 30 &quot;</td>
<td>15 &quot; &quot; 30 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; of 15 &quot;</td>
<td>6 &quot; &quot; 15 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; of 8 &quot;</td>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; 1 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I now proceed to Part II of the Weber Manuscripts. See Plate I, fig. 2. It consists of seven leaves, unfortunately mutilated on the left-hand side, which would have shown the numbers of the leaves. Their size is 6 x 2½ inches. Four leaves have 9 lines each to the page; the three others, only 6 lines. This may possibly show, that the two sets belong to two different manuscripts, but I have not yet been able to examine them more closely. The characters are again a variety of the North Western Guptas.

The page (obverse of the leaf), figured on Plate I, reads as follows. The paper is very soft, and some portions being rather fretted, are very difficult to read.

1, ..., ता प्रवृत्त तथा तद्रथम् जुजा च चनन्द्रिणीसु नृत्व गयिते विभाज्यि बं विवा नासमासः

2, ..., विधानाच्य देशवासाय सिद्धा • Oक वे व नूतातिषिष्ठि किब्यरिषिष्ठि

3, ..., वधुना • Oक वाधीप्रविष्ठाने प्रवर्तियानुसारे भवना व प्रवत तथा तेना मे वधायात • Oके

4, ..., प्रवृत्तायि यथि नृत्वाचि वे विद्वेन • बाध्या वेगवासाम्य अभिषिष्ठि

5, ..., वि विहाल जुजा गयिति • मोहु तथा अस्मीव विकाया चतुर्थि

J. 1. 3
It may be noticed (see the Plate) that the interpunctuation is indicated by a dot, or occasionally two dots. The numerals are, again, of the ancient style. In the following Roman transliteration I have supplied, in brackets and italic type, the missing portions. Here the metre and context has been a guide, though to some extent, of course, the restorations are conjectural. It will be seen from these that, as a rule, the space of four aksharas or $\frac{2}{3}$ of an inch is lost, i.e., that the original length of the leaf must have been 6$\frac{2}{3}$ inches. The work is written in the sloka metre.

1. \[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ tā hy=aham \] 
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{tasya tad=bachanam śrūtvā Rūdrō vachanam=abravit} \quad \| 10 \\
   &\text{Aham Śivō Viśāl-akshi tvam Śivā nāma nāmataḥ} \quad \| 1
   \end{align*}

2. \[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ \text{vas=tathā} \quad \| 12 \\
   &\text{Bali-dhūpa-pradānānaḥ pushpa-dīp-anulēpanaḥ} \quad \| 1]
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{bhaktyā cha prayātā martyā tēshām tvam bhava-kāma-dā} \quad \| 13
   \end{align*}

3. \[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ \text{ahritā yais=tvam=āgamya bhavishyasi vara-pradā} \quad \| 14 \\
   &\text{Yogājanānāṁ}
   \end{align*}

4. \[ \text{[saha]srē } \text{pi sthitā śrūtvā gamishyasi } \text{ōm } ]
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{jayā jayante vijayā amoghā aparājita} \quad 15
   \end{align*}

5. \[ \text{[nada-prabhā] jambhanī ripu-nāsanī} \quad \| 16 \\
   &\text{Sahasra-kiranāḥ bhadrā puṅgavā brahma-chārīṇī} \quad 15
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{māyā māyāvinta sadyā kambu-grī}
   \end{align*}

6. \[ \text{[vā rakt]-ānanā} \quad \| 16 \\
   &\text{Sukti-karṇī mahā-nāgā ajeyā aparājita} \quad 15
   \end{align*}
1893.]
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The text actually reads *sakti*-*karna*-agni-*damshtra*la, with a stroke of cancellation drawn through the first *damshtra*ni. For *sakti* probably *sukt*i should be read, though the epithet *sakti*-karn is already mentioned in the preceding hemistich.

11 The interpunctuation is here indicated by two dots placed one above the other, like the visarga (:), instead of the single dot used everywhere else.
This work appears to be a stotra, or hymn, in honour of Siva's spouse, Parvati, after the manner of the Puranas. Perhaps it may be possible, hereafter, to identify it with some work already known. I may mention that, in glancing over another page, I have noticed directions given as to the particular kinds of sacrifice which are to be offered (to Parvati?) in the case of each of the four castes. The passage runs as follows:


18 Or nádv for náchá.
19 Or perhaps ódhórd. The letters are indistinct.
16 Here the number 29 is omitted in the text.
15 See note 11 on page 51.
That is: In the case of a minister an oblation of clarified butter should be made; in the case of a Brāhman, an oblation of curds and clarified butter, (and) the name and gōtra should be mentioned in every case; in the case of a Kshatriya, an oblation of clarified butter and honey (should be made); in the case of a Vaiśya, an oblation of rice (or grain); in the case of a Śūdra, an oblation of fish; (and) generally for the purpose of subjecting any one to one's power, an oblation of Vachā (or the root of Acorus calamus).

Part III. See Plate I, fig. 3. There are six leaves; four of them are mere fragments, but two are fairly complete; one of the latter has been figured. These two measure 6½ by 2½ inches, with 6 lines to the page. The characters are a North Western Gupta variety. The figured page reads as follows:

1, . . . . . . . . mēna dhūvitavya śvasthobhavati namō Vidyun-jihva-
2, [mātāmga-rājasya] yuju yuju yuji yuji mālini vīmānani amu-kaṁ nri-
3, [pa-sulva] mayā pratimā kārttavyā sā pratimā sarshava-tailēna makshayitavyā
4, . . . agni jhuya asukō javitō bhavati mōchitu-kāmēna tād= yathā
5, . . . iti iti iti iti iti kshamasi mākshasi kaṭaka-pali16
6, [ka]ṭakam prēshāni imam parvata-rājānam ravatu kushtha-hīngu parijapyā

Roman Transliteration.

1, . . . . . . . . mēna dhūvitavya śvasthobhavati namō Vidyun-jihva-
2, [mātāmga-rājasya] yuju yuju yuji yuji mālini vīmānani amu-kaṁ nri-
3, [pa-sulva] mayā pratimā kārttavya sā pratimā sarshava-tailēna makshayitavyā
4, . . . agni jhuya asukō javitō bhavati mōchitu-kāmēna tād= yathā
5, . . . iti iti iti iti iti kshamasi mākshasi kaṭaka-pali16
6, [ka]ṭakam prēshāni imam parvata-rājānam ravatu kushtha-hīngu parijapyā

The reverse page runs as follows:

1, . . m=pitavyo mōkshobhavati namō Vidyun-jihva-mātāmga-rājasya tād=yathā kuliṁa-
2, [i kuliṁa]li kuliṁāli kuliṁāli svāhā śulbasya pratimā kar-
tavyā tāla-ghṛitē-

16 Or, perhaps, only kaṭa-pali. The second ka is half deleted.
This appears to belong to some work on sorcery; and from the fact that on the second leaf occurs the phrase sarva-siddhānām pañch-abhiṣānām namaḥ it would seem to be a Buddhistic work. For the "five knowledges" are a well-known Buddhist term. The diction is a barbarous mixture of Sanskrit and Pāli. The following is a tentative translation:

"(The image) should be washed with . . . . He will be well. Salutation to the elephant king with the lightning-like tongue! Yuju! Yuju! Yuji! Oh Mālīni, oh Vīmānāni! Of such and such a king let an image of copper be made! That image should be rubbed with mustard oil, (and) having burned (it in) fire . . . . , such a one will be attacked with fever. If it is wished to deliver him (from fever), the following (charm should be used): "Itti, itti, mayest thou forgive, mayest thou wipe off; Oh Kaṭākāpāli; I send an army; let him praise this mountain-king!" Having uttered a spell over kusāṭhā and asafoetida, (this remedy) should be drunk; (then) there will be deliverance. Salutation to the elephant-king with the lightning-like tongue! (Then to be said) as follows: "Hail to her who bears a chaplet of kuli (Solanum Jacquinii)!" An image of copper should be made; (this should be rubbed) with oil and clarified butter (and heated) in such a king's name; (then) he will burn (with fever). If it is wished to deliver (him), a spell should be said over fragrant water: "itti, itti . . . . deliver him, oh Satasati, Dhana-dhana, hail!" That image should be bathed (with the fragrant water) . . . . (worst) of the Sabaras! oh wicked one! oh pierced one! . . . . . . Having taken (him), he should be warded off.

Part IV. See Plate III, fig. 1. No more than the fragment which has been figured exists of this manuscript. It is, however, of very considerable interest, as it presents a species of the North-Western Gupta character, which forms the link between that and the Central Asian type of Nāgarī characters. For comparison the forms of the superscribed vowel e and of the consonants j, t, n may be especially noticed.

The figured page reads as follows:—

1, . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
In the following transliteration, I have, as before, supplied missing portions, where it was possible, in brackets and italic type. The work is written in the śloka metre, and it will be seen that about four or six aksharas are lost on each side, on the assumption that the extant piece formed the middle of the leaf. Accordingly the whole leaf, in its original state, probably measured 7 inches, allowing a little for the margins.

1. 

[ati]śaya-vichakṣaṇaḥ [I]
asbṭ-āṅga-saṃprapūrṇaḥ na [d]v[t]r[a] . . . . [7 n]

2. 

bhavati hy-abhirūpaḥ su-sa[ṁ]ṣṭhitāḥ [.]
jāti-smarō dharma-dānu . . .

3. 

yatām 8 [n]
Dvā-tr[ṁ]sa-lakṣaṇāyāṃ-śvam-āśiti-vyāmjanāṇi cha [I]

4. 

bhavaty=Āṅgīrasaḥ katham 9 [n]
Lakṣaṇaḥ sarva-d[ā]nena . . . .

5. 

suddhastē sama-chittēṇa bhavaty=Āṅgīraso muniḥ 10 [n]
Ha . . . . .

6. 

sambgama jinair=nityam . . . . . . . . [11 n]

Reverse:

1. 

dānasya chēṣṭhitam [I]
t[ē]n-āsi . . . . . . . . .

2. 

[Ś]mṛti[i]m[āṇ]āḥ=cha katham vā syān=matimāṃ=ṣ=cha vichakṣaṇa[ā] [1]

3. 

[rhāsi 13 [n]
Aśaṭṭha smṛtitimāṃ hi syān=matimāṃ=ṣ=cha vichā[kṣaṇaḥ 1]

4. 

eṣ-āpi prajñāyā dharma-dhāraka 14 [n]
Akṣaṇēbhyāḥ ka . . . .
5, \[\text{gachchhati} \] kēṇa pramattō bhavati bravihy=ētan=mam=ānaghaḥ 1[5]

6, \[\text{[md]rga-silēna gachchhati} \] ēṁyātā-bhāvan-ābhyāsa-tapa . . . . . . [16]

This may be translated thus:—

(Angirasa is) pre-eminently clever, thoroughly full of the eight-fold qualities.) (7) He is handsome, well-put-together, a rememberer of his former existences, an imparter of the Law (to others). (8) The 32 attributes as well as the 80 marks, how does Angirasa possess them? (9) By his attributes, his imparting of all things, his equanimity he is purified,—is the Muni Angirasa. (10) his intercourse is constant with the Jinas. (11) his function is the imparting of the Law. (12) How is he thoughtful and intelligent and clever? (13) He is guileless, thoughtful, intelligent and clever, (full of) wisdom, versed in the Law. (14) From inopportune things he goes (away); with reference to what he is indifferent and (yet remains) sinless,—that do thou tell me! (15) he walks in the moral precepts of the path (of holiness), asceticism (and) the practice of meditation on Śūnyatā (or Nirvāṇa).

It is difficult to judge from such a small fragment, what the subject of the whole work may have been. That of the fragment itself is an eulogistic description of the Muni Angirasa. From the technical terms, occurring in the fragment, it seems clear that the work is Buddhist.

Part V. See Plate II, fig. 1. There are eight leaves, measuring $8\frac{1}{2}$ by $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches. They are mutilated, however, on both sides. There are five lines to every page. The characters belong to the round variety of the Central Asian Nāgari.

The figured page, being the reverse, reads as follows:—

1, \[\ldots\] 2, \[\ldots\] 3, \[\ldots\] 4, \[\ldots\] 5, \[\ldots\] 

In Roman transliteration, as before:—

1, \[\ldots\] sha da śashtya pājā . . . .
2, ... ddhy-arha-dandena parimuchchishyati | yava evam=eva parimuchch[ishyati]

3, [na] .. sastra[m] kramati na vishā n=āgni n=āsi-visha na kak-

khōrddaa17 na vaiVāla na

4, .. [ba]lam karōti atyattraa18 purima-karma-vipākēna | evam-uktō

Bhagavām ma[hārā-]

5, [jam] ya[ksha]-sēnāpatim=avōchat | sādhu sādhu Māpihhadra

anujānāmi mi

The obverse page has the following:—

1, ... manta varaṇavanta yasaśvina 6 [i]

Mahā-bala-mahā-k[ā]ya va ... ... [i]

2 ... na . manasa Buddhām vandanti Gautama 7 [i]

Kumbhakarṇo Nikumbhāś=cha Siddharttham=aparājitam [i]

ma .

3, ... dantō cha Sahasrākshaś=cha Pīgala [i]

Kavilō Dharmadirṇa=cha Ugratējō ..

4, ... [i]

tvam śaranaṁ yānti su-p-prasannēna chētasā 9 [i]

tad=yathā kadyē-kōdyē19 ... ...

17 This is the passage referred to in my paper "The Third Instalment of the Bower MSS." in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXI, p. 369. On another leaf of the same MS., the word occurs once more, but spelled kakkhrddaa with a long ā. I wish to take this opportunity to correct my reading of the word in the Bower MS. It is there spelt kakkhrdā, with the jihvāmulīya before kh, not kavkhōrda, as I first read it. I owe this correction to a suggestion of Dr. A. Stein, who informs me that in modern Sāradā writing the difference between a superscribed r and the jihvāmulīya is very small. He suggests that there may be a clerical error in the Bower MS. This, however, is not probable. The forms of the superscribed r and the jihvāmulīya are widely different in the Bower MS., but on the other hand (as, for that matter, in Sāradā also) there is a resemblance between the super-compounded v and the jihvāmulīya. Hence I took the symbol to be that for v, while I should have recognized it as the symbol of the jihvāmulīya. Dr. Stein, further, informs me that the word kakkhrdā occurs also in VII, 298 of the Rājatarangini, in the form khurkhufa, and that it is still used in modern Kashmir in the form kührkhāhus. He suggests that it is rather these more modern forms that represent the proper spelling of the word, with reference to the correct placement of r (i. e., karkhāda, not kakhōrda). I do not agree with this; we have, in the Bower MSS. and the Weber MSS., the earliest (known) spellings of the word, compared with which the more modern spellings in the Rājatarangini and in Kashmir are more likely to be corruptions.

18 Perhaps atyattrā is an error for anyattā, and vipākā na may have to be separated.

19 The letter which I have read dy is doubtful. For a facsimile of it, see Plate IV of the alphabet.

J. 1. 4
This may be translated as follows:—

"He will be delivered from.... condign punishment; and so forth (as before down to) even so he will be delivered...., no weapon can hurt him, nor poison, nor fire, nor poisonous snake, nor Kakkhôrddha, nor Vaitâla, nor.... can have power over him here (in this world) through the natural consequence of his deeds (done) in former existences." Having thus spoken, the Blessed one spoke to the Mahârâja, the General of the Yakshas (thus): "Verily, verily, oh Mânibhadra! I permit thee....

The brilliant, the glorious, they of great strength, of great body.... intently praise Buddha. Gautama, (7) Kumbhakarna, and Nikumbha (praise) the Siddhârtha, the invincible, and... danta, Sahasrâksha and Pingala, Kapila, Dharmadîra and Ugratêja...., they seek thy protection with a well-pleased mind, (9) (saying) as follows: "Kadyê, kôdyê."

I do not think that much can be lost at the two sides. Lines 4 and 5 of the reverse show this. On two other pages the mahâyaksha sêna-pati Mânibhadra and four mahârâja yaksha sênapati are spoken of, which shows how the lacuna should probably be filled up. The original size can also be calculated from the sôkas on the obverse page. This page seems to give an enumeration of Mahânâgas. Of the sôkas, those numbered Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 are preserved. The rest is in prose. The whole reminds one somewhat of the snake-charm in the Bower MSS., which I have published in the Indian Antiquary, vol. XXI, p. 349 ff. The full size of the leaf, in its original state, may have been about 9½ inches, inclusive of margins. The figured leaf is the best preserved; some of the others are in a scarcely legible state. But it seems clear from what remains that the work contained a charm given by Buddha (Bhaâgavân) to the Mahâyaksha Mânibhadra.

Part VI. See Plate II, fig. 2. There are five leaves, measuring 7½ by 2½ inches, with 7 lines to the page. The leaves, though practically complete on the left side, are greatly mutilated on the right side, by nearly one-third. The characters are another specimen of the round variety of the Central Asian Nàgarî.

The figured page is the reverse and reads as follows:—.

1, . . . . . अब देख देख | चिलिपस: . . .
2, . . . राहु संगठना बालो कथितां तथयो वीतुः: 3
3, . . . . दना पुरष बाण रामंताभिनिरिद्धेषु: B
In Roman transliteration I give the obverse page (not figured)
first:

1. Vyapeta-rūga-maranaṃ vipraṃ sa[m]parikṣ[ta]tyate
   apritiś=ch=ābhishaka . . . [. . . . . 41 ]

2. tatō 'yam kūṅḍāśi punśchall-patiḥ [1]
   vam-puspa-nibham vastram mahāraja . . . [. 42 ]

3. jāmbukāś=ch=ēti tat-samam [1]
   lehakō 'vyakta-vachanō dhūrtas=tu . rtiva . [. 43 ]

4. vidhushikō mataḥ [1]
   chatur-bhāgas=turyam syā jaghanyam kati [. . 44 ]

5. vikramēṇa balēna cha
   uttamō yaḥ samānēbhyaḥ sa [. . . . . 45 ]

6. launikānāṃ tath=āiva cha [1]
   parinīśṭhā-vidhi-jūṇō yaḥ sa [. . . . . 46 ]

7. ni kah [1]
   shad-vamśō rāja-yajūn yas=tan-tu [. . . . . 47 ]

Reverse (figured).

1. ndhava vṛitta vṛitta cha sanniruktāḥ [. . . 48 ]

2. va . [1]
   rahasa samgatāṃ kālē kartṣnītāṃ kavayō viduḥ 4[9 ]

3. m [1]
   [pra]dattā purusā-jūñī=cha rāmām tām=abhinirdīṣēt 50 [1]

4. abhipēkshāṃ mahātmanā rāja-putram kul-ōdgataḥ 51 [1]
   Ya [. . . . . . . . . ]
The obverse of the next leaf continues as follows:—

1. Eka-ch-chhatrāmaḥ mahīṃ vyaṃktē [. . . . . ]
2. vanād=upavanāṁ sṛṣṭam [56 [I]
   Padmini rējā cha-pāṭṭavaṁ sṛṣ[ī] [I]

The remainder is almost illegible. The leaf that immediately precedes the foregoing two leaves, reads as follows:—

Obverse.

1. aṣṭhaṣṭa-chanda-samjñītam 24 [II]
   Paramē-sbhthi mātah śrēshṭhāḥ pre. priya. da [. . ]
   [. . . . . . ]
2. [ṛ]tītaḥ 25 [II]
   Pada-kṛch=charmakara syāt=tapita-s tu vaṁdo mātah [I]
   lāvanyam=ahur=madhun [. . . . . . ] 26 [II]
   [. . . . ]
3. svasā tu bhagini mātā
dvāta-pitta-kaph-ātmanō vyādhyāḥ [parikṛtītāḥ 27 [II]
   [. . . . . . ]
4. ttā hy=upadravah [I]
   ajñō vēśah samākhyātō nuttaṃ prēritam=uch[yatē 28 [II]
   [. . . . . . . ]
5. hūtah [I]
   talpaṁ tu sayanāṁ jñēyāṁ khaṭvēti .. thā vaku 2[9 [II]
   [. . . . . . . ]
6. kilāsāṁ paṇḍuraṁ jñēyāṁ dōlā prēukhēti samījītaḥ 30 [II]
   Barhiṃsi cha [. . . . . . . ]
   [. . . . . . ]

20 This verse is blandered; four syllables are wanting. Perhaps read samjñayatē. The final double dot is not a visarga, but the mark of interpunctuation.
This work is written in 416kās, from which it is easy to calculate how many syllables are lost on the right hand side. The number varies from about 12 to 18. Those aksharas which are actually lost are indicated by dots enclosed within straight brackets; those, not thus enclosed, indicate illegible letters. On an average, one-half (or 16 aksharas in each line) is lost of each śloka. The space required for these lost aksharas would be 3\frac{1}{2} inches, allowing for a small margin on the right-hand side. Accordingly the total length of the original leaf must have been 10\frac{1}{2} inches.

In the following I give the translation only of those passages which are complete, taking the proper sequence of the leaves:—

(Verse 25.) By paramēśththin (he who stands foremost) is meant the best. (26) A pada-krit (foot-maker, shoe-maker) should be (understood to be) a worker in leather. By tapita is meant vomiting. (27)
By *svasad* is meant a sister. All diseases (are said to be) due to air, or bile, or phlegm. (28) A disguise is called *ajīna* (incognito). Something dispatched is said to be *nutta*. (29) *Tulpa* should be known to be a bed. (30) *Kīlda* should be known to be a kind of jaundice. A swing is termed *prākkhā*. (32) A war they call *pradhana*; it is also known as *dīvādana*. (34) That charm which contains the *śīnha-nata* (?; nata is *Tabernamentana coronaria*) should be known to be the *Vṛindāraka* (i. e., best of its kind). (35) [*Nṛdhana* should be understood to be the king of the Prētas. By *sushmin* (i. e., powerful) is meant Maghavān. (36) By *kumbhāla* is meant a crocodile. The tortoise is said to be *gūḍhānga*, (i. e., having hidden limbs). (37) By *kāraka* is meant a paid servant. (38) *Utthya* should be known to be that which is excellent. By *mallaśa* is meant squinting. (39) Excessive spasmodic contraction is known by the name of *martya* (i. e., mortal). By *yōtra*, indeed, should be known that which is the means of distilling the Soma extract. (41) A death which is not preceded by any illness is praised as *vipra* (i. e., excellent). (42) A *kundāsān* is a keeper of harlots. A garment [fit to be worn by] a Mahārāja is one which resembles flowers and the omentum. (43) A *lōhaka* (licker, lisper) is one who does not speak plainly. (44) *Turiya* should be (understood to be) a quarter. (49) A mystery (plot?) harmonizing in time is what the poets know as *kartsnitā* (kṛtsnatā, or completeness). (52) Whose state possesses its seven constituent elements, and whose country is free of disturbance. . . . (53) To whom kings pay tribute, and whose people are never conquered. . . . (56) An *upavāna* (grove or small forest) takes its name from a forest (*vana*). (57) A lotus is known as *rēju* or *rājīva* or *chatrapatiṣvati* (cf. Skr. *satapatra*). This clearly shows that the work is some Sanskrit vocabulary or "kōṣha." Perhaps it may be possible, hereafter, to identify it with some one of the existing and known kōshas; or it may turn out to be a new and hitherto unknown kōsha-work. It appears to contain a good number of new words.

On the left-hand margin of the reverse of the last-copied leaf, opposite to the 3rd and 4th lines, there are faint traces left of the number 6. This, therefore, is the sixth leaf of the manuscript. As there are, on the average, 8 ślokas on a page, or 16 on a leaf, there should be about 90 ślokas (allowing a blank page to commence with) on the six initial leaves of the work. As the 6th leaf, however, only brings us down to the middle of the 40th śloka, it may be concluded, that the work was divided in chapters (adhyāyas), and that the 40

---

*32 This is puzzling. Perhaps *taraḥ* is a clerical error for *naraḥ*, and the meaning may be "one who has subdued a lion is a Vṛindāraka."*
...ékas, a portion of which has been preserved, belong to the second chapter, while the first chapter must have contained about 50 ékas. Perhaps when the remainder of the existing fragment has been read, this point may be more certainly known. I have at present only read and copied those leaves, on which I could discern any numbers. These show us the partial preservation of the following ékas: 24–40 and 41–57; and this, consequently, proves that the figured leaf is the seventh of the manuscript.

The manuscript is rather carelessly written; thus we have *vidhushikó* for *vidushikó* on line 4 of the obverse of the 7th leaf; and *kuró gūdhānga* for *kúrmó gūdhānga* on line 4 of the reverse of the 6th leaf, and other blunders.

Part VII. See Plate II, fig. 3. This manuscript consists of 7 leaves, measuring about 5 by 2½ inches, but they are mutilated on the left-hand side. There are mostly six lines to the page; a few leaves have 7 lines, but these may possibly turn out to belong to a different manuscript. The characters are again another specimen of the round variety of the Central Asian Nāgarī.

The figured page reads as follows:

In Roman transliteration:

1. [. . . . . . . .] . jña pújitam [I]  
   Tathāgataṁ namasyāmi sambuddha-dvipad-ōttamam [I]  
   Bhaga

2. [. . . . . . . .] . . . m [I]  
   Uttile, dalé, duttilé, siddhir-astu svāha; yaḥ ka [t̥=chid=Bhaga-]

3. vataḥ ār[̩]vakaḥ bhikshur=vā bhikshuṣi vā upāsakō va upāsikā vā, i-  

4. . imām cha mé hrida[ya]m pûrva-rātram=apara-rātram manasi karishyati

5. . [daṇḍ]ṇ[ḍ]ēna parimuchchishyati, daṇḍ-ārha-prahārēṇa parimuchchishya-

6. [ti] . . . . . . . . i. pēṇa; pa . i . ā-ārhō lōma-
The reverse reads as follows:—

1. . . . . . [parimu]chchishyati, imê cha . bhadantê bhaga-
2. . . . . . ham=anubhavêna sa sâgar-ánta-prithivim=anuvicha-
3. . . . . . tpalô narô, kumbha-karñô mahá-kumbha-karñô, âri, kôri, kâ-
4. lê, pêlôlê, âyê, tâyê, ikshôri, kunê kunikê, yaê=cha mê
5. . . . . . ñukha-pakshasya pratipadam=upâdâya kriçhâa-pakshê và snâta-
6. [chê] . . dharmê samñghê sa-gauravêna, âyô-vihitam chittam varjîtêna âdi è

The first passage (obverse, lines 1 and 2) is a slôka, which affords the means of calculating the extent of the lost portion of the leaf. The dots, inclosed within brackets, indicate the number of lost aksharas. They are ten or eleven, and would occupy the space of about 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches. The full size of the original leaf, accordingly, must have been 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) by 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches. This would seem to show that the smaller of the two extant wooden boards belonged to this manuscript; and this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the board is inscribed with a line of writing in Central Asian Nâgarî (see ante p. 37). The leaf must have been torn exactly in the place where the string-hole originally was situated.

The remainder of the text is in prose. It seems to be another work giving the story of a Buddhist charm. From a remark, which I have noticed on another leaf, it would appear that the charm was communicated by Buddha himself to the Mahâyâksa Sûnâpati Mâñibhadra, with reference to a son of the latter, called Pûrçaka. The subject of the work, therefore, is similar to that in the Vth Part, and it may possibly turn out to be another copy of the same charm.

The text above quoted may be thus translated:—

I salute the Tathâgata, the best of enlightened men, the Blessed one . . . . . Uttilê, dalê, duttilê! May it be effective! Svâhâ! If any disciple of the Blessed-one, any male or female mendicant, or any male or female lay-devotee, keeps in mind this my heart in the former part and in the latter part of the night, he will be delivered from punishment, he will be delivered from any stroke of punishment; etc.

On the reverse occur the names of some Nâgas, e. g., Kumbhakarña and Mahâ-kumbhakarña.

Part VIII. See Plate III, fig. 2. Of this manuscript only 4 leaves are preserved, measuring 5 \(\times\) 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches, but mutilated on the right-hand side. They are inscribed with 7 lines to the page, of which the lowest (or the uppermost on the reverse) is almost wholly obliterated. The characters are again a specimen of the round variety of the Central Asian Nâgarî, approaching rather more to the Indian Gupta type.
The figured page reads as follows:

1. ....... पूर्वेन प्रत्यागच्छन्ति। बपिष्कायिता श्रवः
2. कितब्बाद वि पूरविङ्कल्पयया: इत्यनुसारपान्नो द्रात्तवो ततां घा च
3. ए शुरुति मुतुपुष्किल्प मन्दिराणि भवति। उपयुक्ति चय
4. खच। उपयासः कोषे गुरुरश्रवणं गक्षालोनिवेशं चेत
5. मां द्रव्यधारणेष व सिं हयेद्व गतिनेतेष दीपो प्राकृतिष्म
6. य खः ... सं वा संबंधारिश्व परिच्छयता तसः म....
7. ... ततः ना ............

In Roman transliteration:

1, ........ chūṛṇeṇa pratyāga-chchhamātī। kapilā-jihvām grihya
2, shitāvyā hi pūra-miśrutāyāḥ dēva-pratimāya dhūpō dacavyō tatō
dsā a
3, sa munčhati gurgulu-dhūpēnā prakrti-sthō bhavati। uparu pu-
tāli chaṇḍa
4, svāḥa। upachāraḥ kṛish nave chaturdāsyām tri-rātr-ōpōshitēna
svēta-pa
5, bhām daṇḍala-sūtrēnā varti kriyate atasi-tailēna dipō jvālayita
6, jra stham... tam cha sarvva-rātri vidy[ā] pariṣap[i] tavyā
   tataḥ pra
7, ... tathā nā ............

Reverse.

1, ... sāvī. paśyaṃtī ... ya ... ya ... ya ... paṁ ... .
2, kilī[ū]likasya jatu-kārēṇa śīra-gōlakāṃ kārayēt tatra tōlakēna
3, ... rmadēṇa limpītvā tēṇa gōlakēṇa śasy-ōttarē ch=chhubbhitavyē
   dhāka
4, dvitīyaḥ ēva bhāro bhavati sarvam vashysti tataḥ prīkṛich 21=
   chhuddhē
dhāka
5, daṁ cha bhavati। tuṇḍa-kilikilikasy=ākshini grihya pishayē
   srōṇchate
6, push[ṛ]a-yōgēn=ānjitēna gavāchyū-piśācham paśyaṃtī tēṇa cha
   purusha-virya
7, ... trayam piśācham hanati tapyasya kachchhabḥ=prasēvaka grihya
gām [...........]

The text is too mutilated to admit of a satisfactory translation.
What there is may be thus rendered:—

He approaches with the powder ....... Taking the tongue of a
brown cow ....... the image of the dēva is to be fumigated with incense

21 The reading is uncertain; it may be prīkṛich or pritrich or prinrich.
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mixed with pūra (a fragrant stuff); then that (image).... he gets free (from disease and) through the incense of guggulu (a fragrant gum resin) he becomes (restored) to good health. Above the figure.... svāhā. The physicking (should be had recourse to) in the dark half of the month, on the fourteenth day, by a person after he has fasted for three nights and (put on) white (raiment), a wick should be made of the cord of a daṇḍaḷa (churning-stick?), (and) a lamp lighted with linseed oil, and the spell should be repeated throughout the whole night. Then...... they see...... With red lac he is to form a ball representing the head of Kilikilaka (i.e., Siva)....; then having rubbed it with a tōla of.......with that ball in sifted fine grain.......; the process is repeated once more; everything is brought in one’s power; then in a thoroughly cleaned, and it becomes...... Taking the eyes of (tunda) Kilikilaka, he should grind (them), he ladles......; with...... anointed with the preparation of flowers...... they can see a pīśācha at a distance of a gavācyus (gasydī? , or perhaps the name of a pīśācha); and with that power of man...... he can kill three...... pīśāchas; (then) taking a bag from the side of the person that does penance........

From the above extract it would appear that the work treats of medical charms. It is written in the now well-known species of “mixed” Sanskrit, anciently the prevailing literary language in North Western India and the countries beyond.

Part IX. See Plate III, fig. 3, 4, 5. This manuscript consists of 25 leaves. Some of them show a numbering on the left hand margin in very fine and minute figures. Thus, of the three figured leaves, fig. 3 shows the number 30, fig. 4, the number 33, and fig. 5, the number 36. This circumstance proves that the manuscript is not completely extant, though from the fact that one of the extant leaves is only inscribed on one side, it may be concluded that the manuscript is complete at the end, and that some (10 or 12) of the initial leaves are wanting. Unfortunately the last leaf is too damaged to be read.

The leaves are mutilated at the lower corners, but sufficient is extant to show their full size. It is 5½ by 2½ inches. Each leaf has six lines. Unfortunately, the writing is extensively obliterated, owing to the circumstance that the thick arsenical coating of the leaves, on which the letters were written, has been greatly damaged, apparently, by damp. In many cases the leaves firmly adhered to one another, and on separating them, the coating, together with the letters which it bore, came off. On the original leaves, portions of the obliterated letters, are still sufficiently visible to permit of their being occasionally identified;
but on the photographed facsimiles, they can hardly be seen. Even the undamaged portions have not come out as clearly on the facsimiles as one would wish. Of course, my transcriptions, given below, are prepared from the originals. As a rule, the top-most and the two lowest lines are, practically, destroyed; and the three middle lines alone are, more or less, fully legible. As I have already observed (ante, p. 39), the writing is in the square variety of the Central Asian Nāgarī characters, but, with certain exceptions (see below), in a Non-Sanskritic language. In the transliterations into Roman, I have observed the following method:—

1, Akshara, entirely lost, are indicated by dots enclosed within straight brackets.
2, Akshara, extant but entirely illegible, are indicated by dots.
3, Akshara, extant, but only doubtfully legible, are written in italics.
4, Akshara, lost or partially extant, but conjecturally restored, are italics within straight brackets.
5, Akshara, fully extant and clearly legible, but as to the identity of which I am not fully satisfied, are shown in Roman type within round brackets.

I have printed every akshara separately; but those which make up a Sanskrit word, are joined by hyphens.

The figured leaves read as follows:—

I. (Leaf 30. Fig. 3).

1, . . i . la . ji . . . . pa . . (kh)i . . . . a . . .
2, sa-ba-ra ló-tri — tři-pha-(u) — pra-pu-ṇḍa-ri-kha — mā-ñcha-
   yaṁ r.ē (ṛi) — spṛi-kha — (khē) tē nē — ta-ka-ru — pō ḷṣaṭha . ri
   kē (kh)i yē
   . . . shshē pa lyyē ma lk(khē) rsa dha [kṣa ṭṭa] ā ścē [sō] tō . la
5, [. .] . . . . lē kē .ē .ē sō nō dha lya pō rna [. . . . .]
6, [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

II. (Leaf 33. Fig. 4).

1, traum . . . strau — ka . la ḷē kṛi trau — . . . lyka śka . .sa
2, rna llē — ku ůchē dha shshē pa lyyē — (khā) ktrau tta — ma
   lk(khē)ē ri dha ryā ka (kh)i trau tta
   33 llē ōkēm pō (kh)a rsa dha ksha llē — ā ścē sō tō dha . ē .i yē pyā rē ru ma tai tha skē dha (ṛi) pō ka rtsē n . rk(kh)i . . . [. .]
5, [. . .] — pi ssau . [. .] . . ypē ya yaṁ [kṣē yē] . . . [. . .]
6, [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]
The reverses of the figured leaves do not yield sufficiently satisfactory readings to quote. But I add transcripts of two other leaves, both obverses and reverses,—of as much as is legible.

IV. (Obverse.)

1. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
2. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
3. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
4. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
5. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
6. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]

V. (Reverse.)

1. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
2. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
3. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
4. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
5. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
6. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]

VI. (Obverse.)

1. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
2. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
3. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
4. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
5. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
6. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..] .. [..]
I cannot attempt to translate these extracts, both because they are too fragmentary, and because they are partially written in a language unintelligible to me. I may notice, however, that they contain series of Sanskrit words alternating with series of Non-Sanskritic passages. The former series consist of Sanskrit names of medicinal plants or drugs, spelled, however, in a most extraordinary fashion. The following is a list of these words with their Sanskrit equivalents:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation.</th>
<th>Name in Weber MS.</th>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. I, line 2</td>
<td>sa-ba-ra-lō̃-tr̥</td>
<td>śābara-lō̃bra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tri-pa-u</td>
<td>triphala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prapuṇḍa-ri-kha (cf. Nos. III, I, IV, 5, VI, 4)</td>
<td>prapaṇḍarika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mā-śča-shṭha (cf. No. VI, 4)</td>
<td>maṇjiśṭha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spri-kha</td>
<td>sprikkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. I, line 3</td>
<td>ta-ka-ru (also No. VI, 4)</td>
<td>tagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha-ri-dri</td>
<td>haridrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. III, line 1</td>
<td>pra-puṇṭa-ri-kh (cf. Nos. I, 2, IV, 5, VI, 4)</td>
<td>prapaṇḍarika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. III, line 2</td>
<td>su-kshmē-u</td>
<td>sūkṣmaillā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi-ra-nkha (cf. No. III, 3)</td>
<td>varāṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ni-lu-tpα-u (also No. VI, 4)</td>
<td>nilotpala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hrī-bē-ra</td>
<td>hrivēra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ke-lē-ya-kha</td>
<td>kāliyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pa-ri-vē-la-kha</td>
<td>paripēlaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>va-ra-ha</td>
<td>varāṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tvca-chām</td>
<td>tvaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu-stha</td>
<td>musta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sa-ra-ba</td>
<td>ṣa-rivā (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sā-la-va-rρ</td>
<td>ṣāliparṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. III, line 4</td>
<td>pria-sta-va-ṛpt</td>
<td>pṛśnīparṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jī-va-ntī</td>
<td>jīvantī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. IV, line 5</td>
<td>dē-va-dā-ru (also No. IV, 5, VII, 4)</td>
<td>dēvāḍuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prapuṇḍa-ri-kha (cf. Nos. I, 2, III, 1, VI, 4)</td>
<td>prapaṇḍarika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ka-tu-ka-rō-hi-nī</td>
<td>kaṭukarōhipi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-sva-kā-ndha</td>
<td>aśvagandhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations.</td>
<td>Name in Weber MS.</td>
<td>Sanskrit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. IV, line 6</td>
<td>a-pa-mā-rga (also No. VI, 3 and below)</td>
<td>apāmārga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. V, line 2</td>
<td>kā-kō-ri&lt;br&gt;kah-ru-kā kō-ri&lt;br&gt;pi-ta-ri (see bi-dā-ri, below)&lt;br&gt;kah-ru-pi-ta-ri</td>
<td>kākōli&lt;br&gt;kshira-kākōli&lt;br&gt;vīdārī&lt;br&gt;kshira-vīdārī&lt;br&gt;asvagandhā&lt;br&gt;prapanaḍarika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. VI, line 3</td>
<td>a-svā-ga-ndhaṁ (see No. IV, 5)</td>
<td>mānjishṭhā&lt;br&gt;sārkarā (?)&lt;br&gt;sarṣaḥpa&lt;br&gt;kūṣṭhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. VI, line 4</td>
<td>pra-pu-nta-ri-kha (cf. Nos. I, 2, III, 1, IV, 5)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. VII, line 4</td>
<td>ma-ñcha-sāthā (cf. No. I, 2)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On some other leaves I have found the following:

- a-mprī-ta-pā-tṭṛī
- a-va-mā-rga (see a-pa-mā-rga above, No. IV, 6)
- ka-ru-na-sā-ri
- kha-ta-bi-dā-ri
- ta-ma-la-pā-ṛī and ta-ma-la-pā-ṛī
dha-ri
- tri-phā-u 3
- pi-ppā-u
- pu-ta-na-kē-śī
- pu-na-ma-ba
- pri-nka-ra-chaṁ
- pri-ya-ńku and pri-ya-ńgu
- bi-dā-ri (see above, No. V, 2)
- bi-la-pa-ttti
- bha-lī-la-ta-kha
- ma-hā-mē-dha
- mē-dha
- lō-ṛī and lō-ṛī and lō-ṛī-ta-ri
- sā-ri-ba
- śi-ṛi-sha-pu-shpa
- śai-lē-ya-kha
- sa-rja-ra-sha
- styō-νi-yā-kha

The spelling of such words as tri-phā-u, ni-lu-tū-pa-u, pi-ppā-u is very curious. The identity of the former is clearly established by the numeral figure 3 which I have found following the word in one place, and which is intended to explain its meaning “the three myrobalans.” The liquid consonant l is apparently omitted, and the vowel attached by a side-

85 Or perhaps for Skr. amṛāta-patra, a bya-form of amla-patra, a kind of sorrel.
stroke to the preceding akshara. This side-stroke is also used with final consonants, when they have no inherent vowel; they are, then, attached to the preceding akshara by a side-stroke and written a little below the line,—a practice which is well-known in ancient Sanskrit writing, being used instead of the modern viráma. Thus in pra-pu-nta-rikh (No. III, 1) and pra-pu-nta-ri-kha (Nos. IV, 5 and VI, 4) we have an instance of the same consonant (kh) being written with and without the inherent vowel (a).

Part IX of the Weber MSS. appears to me to belong, both with regard to characters and language, to the same class of writings as the Kashgar manuscript, published by Mr. Oldenburg. The latter, too, is not only written in what I have called the square variety of the Central Asian Nāgari, but it also shows occasional Sanskrit words interspersed in the text. Thus we have brāhmaṇam in the 5th line of the reverse (syllables 7–9), and again, on the obverse, mahākaruṇa (Skr. mahakara, a name of Buddha) in the 1st line (syllables 14–17), vaijraśākṣu (Skr. vajrākṣa) in the 4th line (syllables 10–13); and brāhma in the 5th line (syllables 8 and 9). More doubtful are the following: reverse, line 3, bhringārāku (bhringārāka?) and sāstrāṃ (śāstra?), line 4 nērvānam (nirvāna); obverse, line 1, ēṅku (āṅka?), line 3, āṅkrāṇ (āṅkraṇ), and further on klēśa. Quite certain is the occurrence of numerals. In the obverse, 2nd line, 74 (𐀩𐀩), 4th line 75 (𐀩𐀩); in the reverse, 1st line, 77 (𐀩𐀩), 3rd line, 78 (𐀩𐀩), 5th line 79 (𐀩𐀩). This order shows, that the pages are wrongly placed in Mr. Oldenburg’s plate. The lower part is really the obverse page of the leaf, and the upper part, the reverse.

The following is my reading of the Kashgar MS., observing the proper sequence of the pages:—

**Obverse.**

1. pa . teṅē kta shshē ē-ṅku khā jri a kau ta chchē—ma-hā-ka-rūm shē khai pē pē ūya chchē pē shpiṃ nu—dha ryā ykē ymē ttē ēmō ūa shshē mi na nā ṣō [. — . . . . . . . . . . . . ]

2. shshē yai nu stmau shéa tkha lhē shshē pī su mē rttē mṛa chnē 70+4 pō yēi ūa shshē ttē shal ylai ūaṁ ktē nē stya lttē ēi tttē lkkā shshē ūchā nai ēi rūē śchya shshē [. . . . . . . . . . . . ]

3. syi shshēm ā-strēm ūa 𑇥ktē ttē kha kha rpō — klē-śa tma shshēm chēm lām tna sū rēm tēpō nam kshē ūchai — dha lkkō shshē chau khē ma vi trēm ēa . shshē ūchai. [. — . . . . . . . . . . . . ]

4. tma sa 70+5 ūaṁ kchēṃ yē tkhēm tsa yai nu vājreṃ-ṅku-sha rēnē nē — ylai ūaṁ ktēē khē shsa ka pō sta khṛō chchē tē lki nē — krēm tpē [. . . . . . . . . . . . ]
It will be noticed that a mark of interpunctuation occurs at regular intervals, i.e., after every 13th syllable; thus marking off sections of the text of 13 syllables each. Taking this as a basis of calculation, it will be found that the text between each pair of consecutive numbers is made up of six sections; and that from 9 to 13 syllables in each line are lost at the sides of the leaf. The space required for these would be \(3\frac{1}{2}\) to \(4\frac{1}{2}\) inches. The leaf, in its existing state, measures \(14\) to \(15\frac{1}{2}\) inches in length. The leaf, in its original state, accordingly, must have measured about \(19\frac{1}{2}\) inches, allowing a small margin on either side.

The fact that the text is divided and numbered in regular paragraphs renders it probable that the work is composed in some kind of poetry, each paragraph forming a verse or stanza of six sections of 13 syllables each. I am not aware of any Sanskrit verse of this description. I suspect, that the language is some kind of Mongolian, with Sanskrit technical terms interspersed. The nature of the latter, perhaps, suggests that the work belongs to the Buddhist Tantrik class of literature.

\[\text{Or perhaps read \textit{}\'{\text{h}i\text{-\textit{n}g\text{-\textit{r}e\text{-\textit{n}ku.}}}}\]