

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.



Part I.—HISTORY, LITERATURE, &c.

No. I.—1893.

*The Weber MSS.—Another collection of ancient manuscripts from Central Asia.—By DR. A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.*

(With four Plates.)

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  $77^{\circ} 12'$  long. and  $37^{\circ} 25'$  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  $9\frac{1}{2}$  by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches, the other  $7\frac{1}{4}$  by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  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  $2\frac{1}{2}''$ , in the smaller at  $1\frac{1}{2}''$ , 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 Archæological 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:—

Part	I,	consisting of	9	leaves.
”	II	”	”	7
”	III	”	”	6
”	IV	”	”	1
”	V	”	”	8
”	VI	”	”	5
”	VII	”	”	7
”	VIII	”	”	8
”	IX	”	”	25

—  
 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 Himálayas.” 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,  *th* and  *dh*, while in Parts V-VIII it is round,  *th* and  *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 *ē*, with its curve turned to the right. Secondly, the curious form of the letter *m*. 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 *m*; 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 , , , , 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  *t* and  *n*. They can only be distinguished by the fact, that the right-hand angle of *n* 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 probably belongs to the work contained in Part VII, which treats of a Buddhist charm, the lines are written in Sanskrit and run as follows:—  
 [namó]—*vidyâdharasya—dakṣiṇē hastē—maṇi dhārayitavyam—api cha*  
 [pūrṇa-]rātr-ôvavustēna—*suchi-snâtēna—su-vastra-prāvṛitēna sâdhayivya*  
 [.]é *siddhi* ॥

The words in brackets are broken off and have been conjecturally supplied. The meaning is: "Salutation to the Vidyâdhara! 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."<sup>1</sup>

Here there is the double anusvâra over the akshara *vri* of *prāvṛitēna*. But what it is there intended to signify, I do not know. In Part IX, it is occasionally found on Sanskrit words, thus *mañchamshṭhañ*, which is a mis-spelling for *mañjishṭhâ*. 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 Nâgari 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 Bâbû S. C. Das, on the *Sacred and Ornamental Characters of Tibet* (*ibid.*, p. 41). The resemblance, 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*, *Seendoohée*, 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.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps *sâdhayishyaté* should be read for *sâdhayivya*[.]é, or *sâdhayitavyâ mé*. With *uvavustēna* compare the Pâli *upavuttha*.

<sup>2</sup> The letters on the Plate would seem to be intended for facsimiles, but the accuracy 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 *pa*, but *pâ*.

The Tibetan tradition with regard to the "Wartu" characters is rather uncertain. In the paper, above referred to, Bâbû 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 Kâshmir, called in Tibetan *Kha-che*. He has supplied me with the following passage from the Bu-ston Chos byuñ (f. 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 Śabda Vidyâ. He designed 30 letters, adapting them to the Tibetan language. He based the four fundamental vowels, called *Āī*, (*i. e.*, *i, e, o, u*) on *a*. In form these letters (vowels and consonants) resembled the characters of *Kha-che*. 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 Bâbû 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 *Lantsha* (see Plate VIII in Journal, vol. LVII), introduced in the reign of Thisroñ 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 Bâbû 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 *a*. 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 *Lantsha*.) 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 *y* 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

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 Bâbû 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 Bâbû's "Wartu" characters, and on the other, with the Central Asian characters in the Weber Manuscripts. In the table there is a series of *Khacheehee* 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 (**W**) in the second line, then in an intermediate bi-annulate form (**W**) 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 Bâbû 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 Nāgarī, and in a language which to me is unintelligible. The strange ligatures that occur in it, such as *lkkh*, *tts*, *yl*, *shsh*, *pts*, *bhb*, *ññ*, *ys*, etc., are foreign to Sanskrit or any Sanskritic language that I know of; yet undoubted Sanskrit words do occur numerous interspersed in the text. Such are *āsvakānda* and *āsvagandha*, *sirisha* (Skr. *śirisha*)-*pushpa*, *priyaṅgu*, *punarnava*, *mañchaṁshtham* (Skr. *mañjishṭhā*), *sārava* (Skr. *sārvā*), *médha* and *mahāmédha* (Skr. *mēda* and *mahāmēda*), *prapūṇḍarikha* or *prapuntarikha* (both spellings occur for Skr. *prapaūṇḍarika*), *kaṭu-rôhīṇī*, *kākôri* and *kshtra-kākôri*, *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 *y* ever 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 *r*, preceding another consonant, is uniformly written level with the line of writing (never above it, like the vowel marks). The consonant *p* 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 **W** of *y*, and otherwise throughout the intermediate bi-annulate form **W**. 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 Sambhota 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  $7\frac{1}{2}$  by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  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 :—

- 1, चचं चतुस्रारं मज्जविक्कमसंखितं पञ्चस्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं मधुस्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं वैश्वदेवत मञ्ज
- 2, जिमचचं चितारं गोश्रीषंसंखितं सप्तसुक्कर्मयोगं वायुस्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं वैश्वदेवत गो ॥ व
- 3, वमस्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं पञ्चिमास्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं विष्णुदेवतं ब्रह्मण्यनीगोचे १ ॥ रतो
- 4, पञ्चिमद्वारौकामि मञ्जवादि ॥ धमिष्ठानचचं चतुस्रारं मज्जमसंखितं चिंश-
- 5, वतं कत्याय गोचे १ ॥ इतभिषा मञ्जचं रक्तारं तिस्रकसंखितं पञ्-
- 6, देवतं सास्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं १३ ॥ पूर्वभद्रपदा मञ्जचं द्वितारं पताकसंखितं चिंशम
- 7, चाभिष्टविदेवतं जातुकर्षीगोचे १५ ॥ उत्तरभद्रपदा मञ्जचं द्वितारं पताकसंखित
- 8, गोमास्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं चिरस्रारिणसुक्कर्मयोगं १७ ॥ रवती मञ्जचं रक्त

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  $9\frac{1}{2}$  by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  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.

- 1, kshatram chatus-taram gaja-vikkrama-samsthitam pancha-chatva-  
ri[*m*]sa-muhurta-yogam madhu-laj-abharam Vaisya-daivata[*m*]  
M[*au*]dga[*ladyani-gotrana* 19 ॥ *Abhi*-]
- 2, ji nakshatram tri-taram go-sirsha-samsthitam sapta-muhurta-yogam

- vāyu-kraksh-āhāram Brahmāyani-gôtrêṇa 20 || Śra[*vaṇô naksh-  
atram tri-tāram yu-*]
- 3, va-maddhya-samsthitaṁ trimsa-muhūrta-yôgam pakshi-māms-āhā-  
ram Vikshṇu-dēvataṁ Brahmāvarṇi-gôtrêṇa 21 || It=i[*māni bhô  
Pushkarasāri sapta*]
- 4, paśchima-dvārikāni nakshatrāṇi || Dhanishthā nakshatram chatu-  
s-tāram śakuna-samsthitaṁ trimsa-muhūrta-yôgam [. . .-*āhāram  
Vāsava-dai-*]
- 15 vataṁ Katyāyani-gôtrêṇa 22 || Satabhishā nakshatram ēka-tāram  
tilaka-samsthitaṁ pañchadaśa-muhūrta-*[yôgam . . . -āhāram  
Varuṇa-]*
- 6, daivataṁ Tāṇḍāyani-gôtrêṇa 23 || Pūrva-bhadrapadā nakshatram  
dvi-tāram patākā-samsthitaṁ trimsa-m[*u*][*h*]*[ūrta-yôgam . . . -  
āhāram]*
- 7, Ābhivṛddhi-daivataṁ Jātukarṇi-gôtrêṇa 24 || Uttamra-bhadrapadā  
nakshatram dvi-tāram patākā-samsthita[*m pañcha-chatvārimśa-  
muhūrta-yôgam]*
- 8, gô-māms-āhāram Āryam-ākalpa-daivataṁ Hiranyāyani-gôtrêṇa 25 ||  
Rēvatī nakshatram ēka[*-tāram . . -samsthitaṁ trimsa-muhūrta-*]

*Fifteenth Leaf : Reverse.*

- 1, yôgam guḍa-kāmsār-bhōjanam<sup>3</sup> Pushya-daivataṁ Bhārgavān-gô-  
trêṇa 26 || Āsvini nakshatram tṛi-tāra[*m . . -samsthitaṁ trimsa-  
muhūrta-yôgam ya-*]
- 2, kṛin-māmsa-bhōjanam Gandharva-daivataṁ Āsvāyani-gôtrêṇa 27 ||  
Bharaṇi nakshatram tri-tāram bhaga-sam[*sthitaṁ trimsa-mu-  
hūrta-yôgam]*
- 3, taṇḍul-āhāram Yama-daivatam (arthavam)<sup>4</sup> Bhārgavi-gôtrêṇa 28 ||  
It=i[māni bhô Pushkarasārin=sapt=ōttara-dv[*ārikāni nakshatrāṇi ||  
Ity=ēshām]*
- 4, bhô Pushkarasārin ashtā-viṁśatīnām nakshatrāṇām katamāni nak-  
shatrāṇi pañcha-chatvārimśa-muhū[*rtāni shaṭ tad-yathā Rôhini  
Punarva-]*
- 5, suḥ uttarā Phalguni Viśākhā uttar=Āshāḍhā uttarā Bhadrapadā—  
pañcha nakshatrāṇi pañcha[*daśa-muhūrtāni tad=yathā Ārdra]*
- 6, Āslēshā Svāti Jyēsthā Satabhishā ēka Abhiji ashtau muhūrta  
śēshāṇi trimsa-muhūrtāni nakshatr[*āṇi pūrva-dvārikānām]*

<sup>3</sup> This was the original reading; by the interlinear insertion of the akshara *hā* it is now changed to *guḍa-kāms-āhāra-bhōjanam*.

<sup>4</sup> This word is inserted interlinearly, with a mark indicating the proper place where it should be read in the line.

- 7, nakshatrāṇām Kirtikā pūrvam Aslêshā paschimā dakshiṇa-dvārikā-nām nakshatrāṇām Maghā pūrvam Visākhā paschi[*mā paschi-ma-dvārikānām na.*]
- 8, kshatrāṇām Anurādhā pūrvam Śravanah paschimaḥ uttara-dvārikā-nām nakshatrāṇām Dhanishṭhā pūrvam paschimā Bha[*raṇi . . . . .*]

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

*Thirteenth Leaf: Reverse.*

- 1, katamê Vātsā Brāhma-chāraṇah Chhandôgā katî Chhandôgānām bhêdāḥ shaṭ katamê tad=yathā gôdhû[. . . . .]
- 2 kapimjalêyā atyāsanam=iti kim-gôtri mâtâ Pārāsari—paṭhati bhavan=nakshatra-vamśam=atha kim katha[*yatu mē tad=yathā Kīrtikā 1*]
- 3, Rôhiṇî 2 Mṛigaśirah 3 Ârdrâ 4 Punarvasuh 5 Pushyah 6 Aslêshâ 7 Maghâ 8 Pūrva-phalgu[*nî 9 Uttara-phalgunî 10 Hastah*]
- 4, 11 Chitrâ 12 Svātîḥ 13 Asākhâ (*sic*) 14 Anurādhâ 15 Jyêshṭhâ 16 Mûlah 17 Pūrvāshāḍhâ [*18 Uttarāshāḍhâ 19 Abhijî*]
- 5, 20 Śravanah 21 Dhanishṭhâ 22 Satabhishâ 23 Pūrva-bhadrapadâ 24 Uttarâ-bhadrapadâ 25 Rê[*vati 26 Āsvinî 27 Bhara.*]
- 6, ṇî 28 ity=êtāny=asṭāvimsati nakshatrāṇi kati-tārāṇi kim-samsthānāni kati-muhūrtāni kim-gôtrāṇi ki[*m-bhōjanāni kim.*]
- 7, daivatāni—Kīrtikā nakshatram shaṭ-tāram kshura-samsthānam trimsa-muhūrta-yōgam dadhi-āhāram Agni-daivatam=Agni[*vēśya-gôtrēna 1 || Rôhi.*]
- 8, ṇî nakshatram pañcha-tāram śakaṭ-ōddhi-samsthānam pañcha-chatvārimśa-muhūrta-yōgam vṛisha-matsya-bhōjanam prajā[*pāti-daivatam . . . -gôtrēna 2 ||*]

*Fourteenth Leaf: Obverse.*

- 1, Mṛigaśirasam nakshatram tri-tāram mṛiga-śirsha-samsthitam trimsa-muhūrta-yōgam mṛiga-matsya-bhōjanam Sōma-d[*ai*]vata[*m . . . -gôtrēna 3 || Ārdrâ na.*]
- 2, kshatram ēka-tāram tilaka-samsthitam pañchadaśa-muhūrta-yōgam navanî-āhāram Rudra-daivatam Hāritāyana-gô[*trēna 4 || Punarvasur=nakshatram*]
- 3, dvi-tāram patākā-samsthitam pañcha-chatvārimśa-yōgam sarpi-maṇḍ-āhāram Āditya-daivatam Vasishṭha-gôtrê[*na 5 || Pushyô nakshatram tri-tâ.*]
- 4, ram vardhamāna-samsthitam trimsa-muhūrta-yōgam madhv-āhāram Bṛihaspati-daivatam Alabanēyavi-gôtrê[*na 6 || Aslêshâ nakshatram paṇi.*]

- 5, cha-tāram akāsa-patākā-samsthitaṃ pañchadaśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ matsa-yakri-bhōjanam sarpi-dai[vatam . . . -gōtrēṇa 7 || I-]
- 6, t=imāni bhō Pushkarasāri sapta pūrva-dvārikāni nakshatrāṇi || Maghā nakshatram pañcha-tāram nadi-kramja-samsthi[taṃ trimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ . . -]
- 7, bhōjanam Pitri-dēvatam Pingāyani-gōtrēṇa 8 || Pūrva-phalguni nakshatram dvi-tāram patākā-samsthitaṃ [trimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ . . -āhāram]
- 8, Bhaga-daivatam Gōtama-gōtrēṇa 9 || Uttarā phalguni nakshatram dvi-tāram patākā-samsthitaṃ pañcha-chatvārim[śa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ . . -āhāram]

*Fourteenth Leaf : Reverse.*

- 1, Ārya-daivatam Kauśiki-gōtrēṇa 10 || Hastō nakshatram hasta-samsthitaṃ pañcha-tāram trimśa-muhūrta-yōga[m . . . -āhāram . . . -dai-]
- 2, vatam Kātyāyani-gōtrēṇa 11 || Chitrā nakshatram ēka-tāram tilaka-samsthitaṃ trimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ mudga-[bhōjanam . . . -daivatam . . -]
- 3, kī-gōtrēṇa 12 || Svātir=nakshatram ēka-tāram tilaka-samsthitaṃ pañchadaśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ phal-āhāram [. . . -daivatam . . . -gō-]
- 4, trēṇa 13 || Viśākhā nakshatram dvi-tāram vishāṇa-samsthitaṃ pañcha-chatvārimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ ti [. . -āhāram . . . -daivatam]
- 5, Satkrityāyani-gōtrēṇa 14 || It=imāni bhō Pushkarasārin=sapta nakshatrāṇi dakṣiṇa-dvārikāni || [Anurādhā nakshatram . . -tā-]
- 6, ram ratna-sphaḍika-samsthitaṃ trimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ māsha-sūpōdana-bhōjanam Mitra-daivatam Alamba[nēyavi gōtrēṇa 15 ||]
- 7, Jyēshthā nakshatram tri-tāram yuva-maddhya-samsthitaṃ pañchadaśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ śālī-yav-āhāram Indra-dēvatam Dīya . . . gōtrēṇa 16 || [Mūlō nakshatram cha-]
- 8, tus-tāram gaja-vikkrama-samsthitaṃ trimśa-muhūrta-yōgaṃ nyagrōdha-kashāy-āhāram Āpa-daivatam Darpa-katyāyani-[gotrēṇa 17 || Pūrvāshāḍhā na-]
- 9, kshatram tri-tāram pula . . .-samsthitaṃ trimśa-muhūrta-yō[gaṃ] mūla-phal-āhāra[m] Nṛiti-daivatam [. . . -gōtrēṇa 18 || Uttarāshāḍhā na-]

It will be observed that the spelling and grammar is occasionally irregular. Thus we have a wrong quantity on fl. 13b<sup>7</sup> *trimśa* for *triśa* and *ibid.* and fl. 15a<sup>3</sup> *mūhūrta* for *muhūrta*, fl. 14b<sup>6</sup> *mītra* for *mitra*, fl. 15b<sup>4</sup> *chatvārimśa* and *vimśatinām*, fl. 15a<sup>4</sup> (see plate) *dvārikāni* for *dvārikāni*; *ri* for *ri* in fl. 14b<sup>9</sup> *trimśa* for *irīśa*, fl. 14b<sup>7</sup> *trītāram* for *tritāram*;

*ir* for *ri* on fl. 15b<sup>7</sup> in *kīrtikā* for *kṛitīkā*; *ḍ* for *ṭ* on fl. 14b<sup>6</sup> in *sphaḍika*. Want of sandhi: fl. 13b<sup>7</sup> *dadhi-dhāram* for *dadhyādhāram*. Blunder: fl. 15a<sup>7</sup> *uttaira* for *uttara*; fl. 15a<sup>8</sup> *vikshnu* for *vishnu*; fl. 13b<sup>4</sup> *asākhā* for *visākhā*, 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<sup>5</sup> *sarpi* 'serpent' for *sarpa*, fl. 15b<sup>1</sup> *Bhārgavān* for *Bhārgavō*. Omission of final consonant in fl. 14a<sup>5</sup> *yakri* for *yakrit*, fl. 15a<sup>2</sup> (see plate) and fl. 15b<sup>6</sup> *abhiji* for *abhijit*. Anomalous construction in fl. 15b<sup>6</sup> *ekā abhiji ashṭau muhūrta*. I am not quite satisfied that I have read correctly the words *kraksha* fl. 15a<sup>2</sup>, *Brahmāvarṇi* fl. 15a<sup>3</sup>. In fl. 15a<sup>2</sup> (see plate) there is a curious symbol above *sapta*; and since on fl. 15b<sup>6</sup> it is stated that *Abhijit* has eight (*ashṭa*) muhūrtas, I believe that the symbol is the numeral figure 8, intended as a correction. The *s* of *sapta* has not quite its proper shape; I believe the writer or revisor meant to alter *sapta* into *ashṭa*, 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<sup>2</sup> *krakshādhāram* the *ra* was originally omitted and has been supplied interlinearly; similarly the syllable *nī* of *katyāyanī* in fl. 15a<sup>5</sup>. (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 Vātsas, Brahmachārin and Chhandōgas. How many are the divisions of the Chhandōgas? Six. Which are they? They are as follows:—Those whose food consists in (1) wheat, (2) . . . . ., (3) . . . . ., (4) . . . . ., (5) . . . . ., (6) francoline partridge.<sup>5</sup> To which gōtra does their mother belong? To Parāśara's. Has your honour any (particular) reading of the list of Nakshatras? Tell me! They are as follows:—1, Kṛitīkā, 2, Rōhiṇī, 3, Mṛigaśira, 4, Ādrā, 5, Punarvasu, 6, Pushya, 7, Āślēshā, 8, Maghā, 9, Pūrvaphalgunī, 10, Uttara-phalgunī, 11, Hasta, 12, Chitrā, 13, Svāti, 14, Asākhā (Visākhā), 15 Anurādhā, 16, Jyēshṭha, 17, Mūla, 18, Pūrvāshāḍhā, 19 Uttarāshāḍhā, 20 Abhiji, 21, Śravaṇa, 22 Dhanishṭha, 23, Śatabhishā, 24, Pūrvā Bhadrapadā, 25, Uttarā Bhadrapadā, 26, Rēvatī, 27, Āsvini, 28, Bharanī. These twenty nakshatras—what are the numbers of their stars, what are their configurations, what are the numbers of their muhūrtas, what are their gōtras, 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.

<sup>5</sup> *Atyāsanam* I take to be a mis-reading for *ity-āsanam* (= *āsanam*).

No.	Name.	Stars.	Configura- tion.	Muhūrta.	Food.	Daivata.	Gōtra.
1	Kritikā	6	razor	30	curds	Agni	Agnivésya.
2	Rôhipī	6	seat of a cart	45	beef and fish	Prajāpati	?
3	Mṛigaśira	3	deer's head	30	venison and fish	Sōma	?
4	Ādrā	1	mole	15	butter	Rudra	Hāritāyana.
5	Punarvasu	2	flag	45	froth of boiling butter	Āditya	Vaśishṭha.
6	Pushya	3	vardhamāna	30	honey	Vṛihaspati	Alabanēyavi.
7	Aslēsahā	5	flag in the air	15	fish and liver	Sarpa	?

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

8	Maghā	5	river-arbour	30	?	Pitri	Pingāyanī.
9	Pūrva-phal- gunī	2	flag	30	?	Bhaga	Gōtama.
10	Uttara-phal- gunt	2	flag	45	?	Ārya	Kausīki.
11	Hasta	5	hand	30	?	?	Kātyāyanī.
12	Chitrā	1	mole	30	mudga-bean	?	?
13	Svāti	1	mole	15	fruit	?	?
14	Viśākhā	2	horn	45	?	?	Satkṛityāyanī.

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

15	Anurādhā	?	crystal	30	mess of māsha- beans	Mitra	Alambanēyavi.
16	Jyēsthā	3	waist of a youth	15	rice and wheat	Indra	Dīya —.
17	Mūla	4	elephant's foot	30	infusion of Ficus Indica	Āpa	Darpa-katyā- yanī.
18	Pūrvāshādhā	3	?	30	roots and fruit	Nariti	?
19	Uttarāshā- dhā	4	elephant's foot	45	honey and parched grain	Vaiśya	Maudgalāyanī.
20	Abhijit	3	cow's head	(8) 7	vāyu-krakaha (?)	deest	Brahmāyanī.
21	Shravana	3	waist of a youth	30	bird's flesh	Vishṇu	Brahmāvartī.

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

22	Dhanishṭhā	4	bird (kite)	30	?	Vāsava	Katyāyanī.
23	Satabhishā	1	mole	15	?	Varuṇa	Tāṇḍāyanī.
24	Pūrvā Bha- drapadā	2	flag	30	?	Ābhivṛiddhi	Jātukarṇī.
25	Uttarā Bha- drapadā	2	flag	45	beef	Āryamākalpa	Hiranyāyanī.
26	Rōvati	1	?	30	consistent molas- ses	Pushya	Bhārgavān.
27	Āsvini	3	?	30	liver and flesh	Gandharva	Āsvāyanī.
28	Bharāṇī	3	pudendum muliebre	30	rice	Yama	Bhārgavi.

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

Of these twenty-eight nakshatras, oh Pushkarasarin, how many nakshatras occupy a period of 45 muhūrtas? Six; they are these:—Rohiṇi, Punarvasu, Uttarā Phalgunī, Viśākhā, Uttarāśāḍhā, Uttarā Bhādrapadā. Five nakshatras take up 15 muhūrtas, namely Ārdrā, Aślēshā, Svāti, Jyēshthā, Satabhishā. One, Abhijit, occupies eight muhūrtas. The remainder are nakshatras occupying 30 muhūrtas. Of the nakshatras, situated in the East, Kṛitikā is the first and Aślēshā, the last (counting from East to West). Of the nakshatras, situated in the South, Maghā 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, Dhanishthā is the first, and Bharāṇi, the last.

This work is clearly an astronomical treatise of a very ancient type. The most ancient astronomy of the Hindūs was based on the lunar zodiac, comprising 27 (or afterwards 28) asterisms, the so-called nakshatras, the series of which commenced with Kṛittikā or the Pleiades, and ended with Aśvinī and Bharāṇi. 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 Aśvinī. (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 Kṛittikā, consisted originally only of 27 nakshatras. It was, apparently, only in the later stage of the Vedic period of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, 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 Pāṇini.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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 Sūtras. To this period, belong the two small astronomical treatises, the Nakshatra-kalpa and the Śānti-kalpa,

<sup>6</sup> See Weber, *Die Vedischen Nachrichten von den Nasatra*, part II, pp. 279, 307, 325.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibidem*, part I, pp. 298, 300.

which are attached to the Kausika Sûtra of the Atharva Veda.<sup>8</sup> 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 Nazatra* (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 muhûrtas of every one of the 28 nakshatras, but also of their four-fold distribution into Eastern, Southern, Western and Northern, of their gôtra (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 Pushkarasarin. This renowned teacher is said to have been a contemporary of Buddha. He is mentioned as a teacher in the Prâtisâkhya Sûtra; and is also cited in the Vârttikas to Pânini by Katyâyana, their author.<sup>9</sup>

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 gôtras differs entirely; the only coincidence is in the gôtra of Krittikâ. Most of the daivatas agree; the most striking difference is in the case of the 27th nakshatra (Âsvini), for whom our manuscript gives Gandharva as the daivata, while the Nakshatra-kalpa, in common with all other known works, gives the two Âsvins. Other differences may be mere blunders, thus Vaishya in No. 11 and Pushya in No. 26, for Viśvê and Pûshan respectively. Naṛiti in No. 18 may be a local variety of Nirṛiti. Curious are also, in our manuscript, Âbhivṛiddhi and Âryamâkalpa in Nos. 24 and 25, for Ahirbudhnya and Aja-êkapâd respectively. The transposition of Âpa in No. 17, and of Naṛiti in No. 18, may be an accidental mistake for Naṛiti in No. 17 and Âpa in No. 18. In the case of No. 20 (Abhijit) our manuscript gives no daivata at all, the usually given daivata being Brahman; but this, too, may be an accidental omission.

<sup>8</sup> See Weber's *History of Indian Literature*, p. 153.

<sup>9</sup> 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 muhūrtas, our manuscript has two curious differences. Firstly, it enumerates only five nakshatras of a duration of 15 muhūrtas, while the usual number in the Nakshatra-kalpa and other works is six. These works add Bharanī (No. 28), to which in our manuscript a duration of 30 muhūrtas is given. Secondly, our manuscript gives to No. 20 (Abhijit) a duration of 8 muhūrtas, against the usual one of *one* muhūrta. The whole list of durations stands thus:

Weber MS.		Nakshatra-kalpa, etc.	
6 nakshatras of 45 muhūrtas.		6 naksh. of 45 muh.	
16	“ of 30 “	15	“ “ 30 “
5	“ of 15 “	6	“ “ 15 “
1	“ of 8 “	1	“ “ 1 “

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  $6 \times 2\frac{1}{8}$  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 Gupta.

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 द्वाचम् तस्य तद्द्वयम् जुला रज्ञी वचनसप्तवीत् ॐ अचं शिवो  
विश्राक्षादि सं शिवा नामनाम्नः
- 2, . . . . विनागाय द्वाचमात्राव निष्ठ तु • ॐ वे च त्वा पूजयिष्यन्ति कीर्तयिष्यन्ति  
वे नराः प्रदास्यसि वरं तेभ्यो च
- 3, . . . . वसुधा • ॐ वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् पुण्यदीपानुकेपनैः भस्त्रा च प्रयता मर्त्या  
तेषां सं भवकामदा • ॐ ह्र
- 4, . . . . प्रवक्ष्यामि यानि जुष्टानि वे शिवे • आहूता येस्वनामस्य भविष्यति  
वरप्रदा • ॐ ह्र योजनार्ता
- 5 . . . . वे पि श्चिता जुला मनिष्यति • सोम् जया जयन्ती विजया चमोघा  
अपरजिता • जया जायू

- 6, . . . . जंभनी रिपुनाशनी • OCJ सखसकिरवा भद्रा पुंगवा प्रस्यचारिणी माया  
मायाविनी सद्या कंबुपी
- 7, . . . मना • OCQ मुक्तिकर्षी महामागा अनेया अपराजिता • शक्तिकर्षीप्रिदंद्वाहा  
वेताही वेदनिर्मिताः
- 8, . . . दीर्घलांगुहा ऊडका जातचारिणी • विदिका विजया धन्या असिहोमा  
हकीदरी • OCN घल्लल्ला सर्पना
- 9, . . . जिहा महामहा • गुरूकी च तरुही च बसूकी च शिवा तथा • OCJ चारणी  
च हमाही च धैरवा भीमदर्शनाः

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  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an inch is lost, *i. e.*, that the original length of the leaf must have been  $6\frac{3}{4}$  inches. The work is written in the *śloka* metre.

- 1, . . . . . tā hy=aham [1]  
tasya tad=bachanam śrutvā Rudrō vachanam=abavit || 10  
Aham Sivō Viśāl-ākshi tvam Sivā nāma nāmataḥ [1]
- 2, [*Kāma-dēva-*]vināśāya Dakṣha-nāśāya tishṭha tu || 11  
Yē cha tbām pūjayishanti kīrtayishyanti yē narāḥ [1]  
pradāsyasi varam tēbhya ya
- 3, . . . . . vas=tathā || 12  
Bali-dhūpa-pradānēna pushpa-dīp-ānulēpanaiḥ [1]  
bhaktyā cha prayatā martyā tēshām tvam bhava-kāma-dā || 13
- 4, . . . . pravakshyāmi yāni guhyāni tē Sivē |  
āhṛitā yais=tvam=āgamyā bhavishyasi vara-pradā || 14  
Yōjanānām
- 5, [*saha*]srē 'pi sthitā śrutvā gamishyasi | om [1]  
jayā jayanti vijayā amōghā aparājitā |  
javā jāmbū-
- 6, [*nada-prabhā*] jāmbhanī ripu-nāśanī || 15  
Sahasra-kiraṇā bhadrā puṅgavā brahma-chāriṇī |  
māyā māyāvini sadyā kambu-grī
- 7, [*vā rakt*]-ānanā || 16  
Sukti-karṇī mahā-nāgā ajēyā aparājitā |

- śakti-karṇ=āgni-damshtrālā<sup>10</sup> vētâdî vēda-nirmitâ ||<sup>11</sup> 17  
 8, . . . Â dîrgha-lâṅgulâ huhukkâ jāta-hâriṇî |  
 viddhikâ vijayâ dhanyâ asi-lômâ vṛik-ôdari || 18  
 Dhalaṇḍhalâ sarpa-nâ  
 9, [thâ dîrgha]-jihvâ mahâ-galâ |  
 turûkî cha tarûḍî cha balûkî cha śivâ tathâ || 19  
 Âraṇyî cha srigâlî cha bhairavâ bhîma-darsanâ ||<sup>11</sup>

This may be translated thus:—

(10) Hearing his (her) words, Rudra spoke as follows: (11) I am Siva, oh large-eyed-one! Thou shalt be called Śivâ after my name; and thou shalt be the cause of Kâmadêva's destruction and Daksha's death. (12) Those men that shall worship and extol thee, to them thou shalt grant gifts, as well as to them that . . . . (13) Those mortals that show their faith and devotion to thee by offering of sacrifices and incense, by flowers, lights and anointings, to them thou shalt be the bestower of their worldly desires. (14) I will announce to thee, oh Śivâ, all the secret things concerning thee! By whomsoever thou art called upon, to him thou shalt come and bestow on him gifts. (15) Even if thou art at a distance of a thousand yôjanas, yet thou shalt hear and go to him. Om! Thou art victorious, conquering, triumphant, unerring, unsurpassable, swift, brilliant as gold, crushing, destroying (thy) enemies, (16) thousand-rayed (like the sun), good, spouse of the Puṅgava (bull-like man), holy, illusory, creating illusions, ever-new, shell-necked, red-mouthed, (17) oyster-shell-eared, a great Nâga, invincible, unsurpassable, strong-eared, fiery-toothed, a Vêtâdî (goblin), set up by the Vêdas, (18) spouse of him with the long lîṅga, a roarer, ravisher of new-born babes, transfixer, conqueror, enricher, with sword-like hair and wolf-like belly, (19) *Dhalaṇḍhalâ* (?), mistress of serpents, long-tongued, large-throated, *turûkî* (swift?), *tarûḍî* (young?), *balûkî* (strong?) as well as lucky, wild, jackal-like, awe-inspiring, of fearful aspect.

I add the Roman transliteration of the reverse page. It is still more worn, and still more difficult to read:—

- 1, . . . . . bandha-môchanî || 20  
 Bhagavatyai namas=tubhyam êhy=âraṇyê śivê subhê |  
 adushtë bhaṭṭini bhaṭṭê guhî

<sup>10</sup> The text actually reads śakti-damshtr=âgni-karṇ=âgni-damshtrâlâ, with a stroke of cancellation drawn through the first damshtrâgni. For śakti probably śukti should be read, though the epithet śukti-karṇ is already mentioned in the preceding hemistich.

<sup>11</sup> The interpunctuation is here indicated by two dots placed one above the other, like the visarga (:), instead of the single dot used everywhere else.

- 2, . . . . . sinī # 21  
Ek-ākshara-ravē dhātrē tri-lōka-guru-vatsalē !  
satya-vādiny=amē chaṇḍē viśalyē śatru-nāśani # 22  
Bhaya-dē dhana-dē
- 3, . . . . . katu-vināśani !  
daityānām bala-hartāri māmsa-śōpita-bhōjani # 23  
Vapā-dhūpa-priyē rōdrī kāla-rātri mahā-ravē !  
asi-
- 4, [lōmē] . . danti sūlalō (?) sūla-bhīshaṇī # 24  
Pañch-āyushyē shaḍ-ādhikeyē na<sup>12</sup> ch=āṣṭadaśa-bhīshaṇī !  
kṛiṣṇē gaurī pradīptī
- 5, [cha] . . . . . lamba-chūchukē # 25  
Mēgha-dundubhi nirghōshē sarva-vyādhi-pramōchani !  
sarva-vyasana-mōktāri kali du-svapna-
- 6, . . . . . [ # 26 ]  
. . . . . dūti śivē gaurī karāḍē lōhit-ānanē !  
prachaṇḍē amṛit-ōdgārē<sup>13</sup> abhra-yānē manō-javē # 27
- 7, . . . . . yē vṛiddhē mātri-varga-prachāriṇi !  
śrī-lakshmīr=vapuḥ-puṣṭiṣ=tvam siddhiḥ kirtir=ēva cha # 28  
Hrī śāntiḥ kānti-rasa
- 8, . . . . . tu sādhani !  
yadi pāsa-balam satyam viśvē dēva-balam yadi<sup>14</sup>  
nāśayishyasi śatruṇām=āyur=viryam dhanam .
- 9, . . . . . !  
[dēva-rājasya satyēna pūrva-diśi] yadi sthitā # 30  
Dharma-rājasya satyēna dakṣiṇasyām yadi sthitā !<sup>15</sup>  
Varuṇasya

This work appears to be a *stōtra*, or hymn, in honour of Siva's spouse, Pārvatī, after the manner of the Purāṇas. 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 Pārvatī ?) in the case of each of the four castes. The passage runs as follows :—

Amātyē ghṛita-hōmaḥ kartavyaḥ # Brāhmaṇē dadhi-ghṛita-hōmaḥ  
nāma-gōtram sarvēśhām grāhyam # [Kshatriyē] ghṛita-madhu-hōmaḥ #  
Vaiśyē dhānya-hōmaḥ # Sūdrē matsya-hōmaḥ # Sarva-vaśīkaraṇē vachā-  
hōmaḥ.

<sup>12</sup> Or *navā* for *nachā*.

<sup>13</sup> Or perhaps *ōdbhārā*. The letters are indistinct.

<sup>14</sup> Here the number 29 is omitted in the text.

<sup>15</sup> See note <sup>11</sup> 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  $6\frac{3}{4}$  by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches, with 6 lines to the page. The characters are a North Western Gupta variety. The figured page reads as follows:—

- 1, . . . . . मेन धोवितव्या—स्वस्थो भवति ॥ नमो विद्युजिह्व
- 2, . . . . . युजु युजु—युजि युजि—मालिनि—विमाननि—चतुस्रं च
- 3, . . . . . मयी प्रतिमा कर्तव्या—सा प्रतिमा सर्ववर्तैस्तेन मक्षयितव्या
- 4, . . . . . च<sup>○</sup>ग्नि जुह्या ॥ असुको ज्वरितो भवति— ॥ मोचितुकामेन तद्यथा
- 5, . . . . . इट्टि इट्टि—इट्टि इट्टि इट्टि—कामशि—मामशि—कटकपलि<sup>16</sup>—
- 6, . . . . . इकं प्रेशामि—इमं परवतराजानं रवत—कुष्ठशिंगु परिजप्य—

Roman Transliteration.

- 1, . . . . . mēna dhôvitavyâ | svasthō bhavati || namô Vidyu-  
jihva-
- 2, [*mâtamga-râjasya*] yuju yuju | yuji yuji | mâlini | vimānani | amu-  
kaṁ nri-
- 3, [*pa-sulva*] mayi pratimâ karttavyâ | sâ pratimâ sarshava-tailēna  
makshayitavyâ
- 4, . . . agni juhya || asukô jvaritô bhavati || môchitu-kâmēna | tad=  
yathâ
- 5, . . . itti itti | itti itti itti | kshamasi | mâkshasi | kaṭaka-pali<sup>16</sup> |
- 6, [*ka*]takam prēshāmi | imam parvata-râjānam ravatu kushṭha-  
hingu pari-japya |

The reverse page runs as follows:—

- 1, . . . m=pitavyô môkshô bhavati || namô Vidyu-jihva-mâtamga-  
râjasya | tad=yathâ | kulimâ-
- 2, [*li kulimâ*]li | kulimâli | kulimâli | svâhâ || sulbasya pratimâ kar-  
tavyâ | taila-ghritê-

<sup>16</sup> Or, perhaps, only *kaṭa-pali*. The second *ka* is half deleted.

- 3, [*n = āmuka-nri*]pasya nāmēna sô dahyati — || mōchitu-kāmēna |  
gandh-ōdakam=parijapya | i-
- 4, . . . . . mōcha | satasati | dhana-dhana svāhā || sâ pratimâ  
snâpayita-
- 5, [*vyā*] . . . . . maḥ Sābarānām | prakhalê prakhalê | prakhalê pra-  
khalê | viddhê
- 6, . . . . . gṛihya nisêhitavyaḥ ||

This appears to belong to some work on sorcery; and from the fact that on the second leaf occurs the phrase *sarva-siddhānām pañch-ābhijñānām 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! yuji! Oh Mālinī, oh Vimānañ! 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*): "Itṭi, itṭi, mayest thou forgive, mayest thou wipe off; Oh Kaṭakapali; I send an army; let him praise this mountain-king!" Having uttered a spell over kushṭha 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 Jacquini*)"! 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: "itṭi, itṭi . . . . deliver him, oh Satasatī, Dhana-dhana, hail!" That image should be bathed (*with the fragrant water*) . . . . (worst) of the Sābaras! 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 super-scribed vowel *e* and of the consonants *j*, *t*, *n* may be especially noticed.

The figured page reads as follows:—

- 1, . . . . . मय विचक्ष्वः अहारासंपूर्णं नर . . . . .



5, . . . gachchhati [1]  
kēna pramattō bhavati bravīhy=ētan=mam=ānaghaḥ 1[5 #]

6, . . . . . [mā]rga-sīlēna gachchhati [1]  
śūnyatā-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 impartor 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 . . . . . art thou able (to tell me?) (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 Nirvāna).

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  $2\frac{2}{8}$  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 Nāgarī.

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

- 1, . . . . . ष . . . इ अथत पूज . . . . .
- 2, . . . . . ह्यर्षेद्वेन परिशुचिचति—आव एवमेव परिशुच . . .
- 3, . . . . . अज ○ ज्ञमति न विषा नाग्नि नाग्नीविष न कश्चोर्हं न वैतास न
- 4, . . . . . सं करो ति अत्यथ पुरिसकर्मविपाकेन—एवमुक्तो भजवां न . . .
- 5, . . . . . च . . . शिनापतिभिदमवोचत्—साधु साधु माचिभद्र अनुजानामि मि

In Roman transliteration, as before:—

- 1, . . . . . sha . . . da śashyata pūja . . . . .



- 2, . . . . . ddhy-arha-daṇḍēna parimuchchishyati | yāva evam=eva  
parimuchch[ishyati]
- 3, [na] . . śāstra[m] kramati na vishā n=āgni n=āśi-visha na kak-  
khōrdda<sup>17</sup> na vaitāla na
- 4, . . [ba]lam karōti atyattra<sup>18</sup> purima-karma-vipākēna | evam-uktō  
Bhagavām ma[hārd-]
- 5, [jam] ya[ksha]-sēnāpatim=avōchat | sādhu sādhu Mānibhadra  
anujānāmi mi

The obverse page has the following :—

- 1, . . . . . manta varṇavanta yaśāsvina 6 [■]  
Mahā-bala-mahā-k[ḍ]ya va . . . . . [I]
- ..
- 2 . . na . manasā Buddhaṁ vandanti Gautama 7 [■]  
Kumbhakarṇō Nikumbhas=cha Siddharttham=aparājitam [I]  
ma .
- 3, . . . dantō cha Sahasrākshaś=cha Piṅgala [■]  
Kavilō Dharmadirṇas=cha Ugratējō . .
- 4, . . . . . [I]  
. . tvam śaraṇam yānti su-p-prasannēna chētasā 9 [■]  
tad=yathā kadyē-kōdyē<sup>19</sup> . . . .

<sup>17</sup> 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 *kākkhōrdda* 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 *kākkhōrda*, with the *jihvāmūliya* 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 Śāradā writing the difference between a superscribed *r* and the *jihvāmūliya* 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 *jihvāmūliya* are widely different in the Bower MS., but on the other hand (as, for that matter, in Śāradā also) there is a resemblance between the super-compounded *v* and the *jihvāmūliya*. Hence I took the symbol to be that for *v*, while I should have recognized it as the symbol of the *jihvāmūliya*. Dr. Stein, further, informs me that the word *kākkhōrda* occurs also in VII, 298 of the *Rājatarangīnī*, in the form *khurkhūṣa*, and that it is still used in modern Kashmiri in the form *khurikhākhūs*. 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., *karkhōda*, not *kākkhōrda*). 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 *Rājatarangīnī* and in Kashmiri are more likely to be corruptions.

<sup>18</sup> Perhaps *atyattra* is an error for *anyattra*, and *vipākē na* may have to be separated.

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

5, . . . . . i . i . . i . i . âha — yattra (śibha-dattâ) bhagava . . . . .

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 Kakkhôrda, 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 (6), they of great strength, of great body . . . . . intently praise Buddha. Gautama, (7) Kumbhakârna, and Nikumbha (praise) the Siddhârtha, the invincible, and . . . danta, Sahasrâksha and Pingala, Kapila, Dharmadîrṇa 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 sênâpati Mânibhadra* and four *mahârâja yakshasênâpati* are spoken of, which shows how the lacuna should probably be filled up. The original size can also be calculated from the ślôkas on the obverse page. This page seems to give an enumeration of Mahânâgas. Of the ślôkas, 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 9¼ 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 (Bhagavân) to the Mahâyaksha Mânibhadra.

Part VI. See Plate II, fig. 2. There are five leaves, measuring 7¼ by 2¼ 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 Nâgarî.

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

- 1, . . . . . अथ एत एत च सन्निरक्तः . . .
- 2, . च . रघुस संगतां काले कर्त्वितां कथयो वीदुः ॐ
- 3, . म् . दत्ता पुत्र च अथ रामंतामभिनिर्दिष्टेत् ॐ

- 4, अभिषेका मया ○ तानो राजपुत्रं कुक्षोद्गतः B^ च  
 5, . : सप्त प्रकृतयो यस्य राष्ट्रं च निरपद्रवम् B^ न  
 6, तितः राजानः करदा यस्य विग्रहं विजयीकृतः B^ इष्टिय . .  
 7, अनित्यमानुषां लोकांस्तु संजतेः B^ निघण्टुनिगमप्रौ . . . .

In Roman transliteration I give the obverse page (not figured)  
 first:—

- 1, . . . . . 40 [H]  
 Vyapêta-rôga-maraṇam vipram sa[m]pariki[r]tyatê |  
 apritiś=ch=âbhishakta . . . [ . . . . . 41 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 2, tatô 'yam kuṇḍâśi puṁśchali-patih [I]  
 vapâ-pushpa-nibham vastram mahârâja . . . [ . 42 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 3, jâmbukaś=ch=êti tat-samam [I]  
 lêhakô 'vyakta-vachanô dhûrtas=tu . rtiva . [ . 43 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 4, vidhushikô mataḥ [I]  
 chatur-bhâgas=turiyam syâ jaghanyam kaṭi [ . . 44 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 5, vikramêṇa balêna cha |  
 uttamô yaḥ samânêbhyaḥ sa [ . . . . . 45 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 6, . . . laukikânâm tath=aiva cha [I]  
 parinishṭhâ-vidhi-jñô yaḥ sa [ . . . . . 46 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 7, . . . . . ni . kaḥ [I]  
 shaḍ-vamśô râja-yajñâ yas=tan-tu [ . . . . . 47 H  
 . . . . . ]

*Reverse (figured).*

- 1, . . . . . [I]  
 . ndhava vṛitta vṛitta cha sanniruktaḥ [ . . . 48 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 2, . . va . [I]  
 rahasa samgatâm kâlê kartsnitâm kavayô viduḥ 4[9 H  
 . . . . . ]  
 3, . . m [I]  
 [pra]dattâ purusha-jñân=cha râmanâm tâm=abhinirdiśêt 50 [H  
 . . . . . ]  
 4, âbhipêkshâm mahâtmanô râja-putram kul-ôdgataḥ 51 [H  
 Ya [ . . . . . ]

- 5, . h [1]  
 sapta prakṛitayô yasya râshtram cha nirupadravam 52 [¶]  
 na [. . . . . prakṛi]
- 6, rtitaḥ [1]  
 râjânaḥ kara-dâ yasya viśas=ch=âvijayî-kṛitaḥ 53 [¶]  
 Ishtiya [. . . . . ]
- 7, anitya-mânushâm lôkâm=s=tu samjatê<sup>80</sup> | 54 [¶]  
 Nighaṇḍa-nigama-prâm [. . . . . ]  
 . . . .]

The obverse of the next leaf continues as follows :—

- 1, . . -ch-chhatram kshatriyair=Buddha-nirjitaiḥ 55 [¶]  
 Eka-ch-chhatram mahim vyamktê [. . . . . ]  
 . . . . .]
- 2, vanâd=upavanam smṛitam [56 ¶]  
 Padmint rêju râjiva-chatra-paṭṭavati smṛi[td 1]

The remainder is almost illegible.

The leaf that immediately precedes the foregoing two leaves, reads as follows :—

*Obverse.*

- 1, . . . . shṭhas=chaṇḍa-samjūitam 24 [¶]  
 Paramê-shṭhî mataḥ śrêshṭhaḥ prê . priya . da [. . . ]  
 . . . . .]
- 2, [k]rtitam 25 [¶]  
 Pada-kṛich=charmakara syât=tapitas=tu vamô mataḥ [1]  
 lâvanyam=âhur=madhu [. . . . . 26 ¶]  
 . . . . .]
- 3, . svasâ tu bhaginî matâ |  
 vâta-pitta-kaph-âtmanô vyâdhayaḥ [parikirtitâ 27 ¶]  
 . . . . .]
- 4, . . ttâ hy=upadravaḥ [1]  
 ajñô vêsah samâkhyâtô nuttam prêritam=uch[yatê 28 ¶]  
 . . . . .]
- 5, . . hûtaḥ [1]  
 talpaṁ tu śayanam jñeyam khaṭv=êti . . thâ vaku 2[9 ¶]  
 . . . . . ]
- 6, kilâsam pâṇḍuram jñeyam dôlâ prênkh=êti samjūitaḥ 30 [¶]  
 Barhîmsi cha [. . . . . ]  
 . . . . .]

<sup>80</sup> This verse is blundered ; four syllables are wanting. Perhaps read *samjayatê*. The final double dot is not a visarga, but the mark of interpunctuation.

- 7, . bhavanam=uchyatê | 31 [¶]  
Pradhânam<sup>21</sup> yu[dha]m=ity=âhur=âyôdhanam=iti [smṛitam |  
..... 32 ¶]
- Reverse.*
- 1, . da . ô dâsa-vṛittayaḥ sarandhra iti saṁsmṛitaḥ [1]  
ada ..... [. .... 33 ¶  
......]
- 2, . tam vinirdiśêt [1]  
brindâarakas=tu vijñêyô yaḥ simha-natavaṁ taraḥ [34 ¶  
..... |  
.]
- 3, hanah prêta-râja syâch=chhushmî tu Maghavam mataḥ 35 [¶]  
.. [. .... |  
kum]
- 4, bh[î]las=tu matô nakraḥ kurmô gûḍh-aṅga uchyatê | 36 [¶]  
. ptsava [. .... |  
..]
- 5, . . panâma syâ kâarakô bhṛitakô mataḥ 37 [¶]  
Utthyaṁ prasasta[m] vijñê [yam ..... |  
......]
- 6, . prôktô mallêraḥ kêkarô mataḥ 38 [¶]  
Parô 'patânam martyam<sup>22</sup>=abhidyâ[nê]na [. . . |  
......]
- 7, [sampracha]kshatê | 39 [¶]  
Yôtraḥ sa khalu vijñêyô yaḥ sutasy=âsutô mata[ḥ] |  
......]

This work is written in ślôkas, 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 ślôka. 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 *paramêshṭhin* (he who stands foremost) is meant the best. (26) A *pada-kṛit* (foot-maker, shoe-maker) should be (understood to be) a worker in leather. By *tapita* is meant vomiting. (27)

<sup>21</sup> Read *pradhanam*. So in the Amara Kôsha.

<sup>22</sup> This pâda is short by one syllable. Perhaps read 'patânakam.

By *svasā* is meant a sister. All diseases (are said to be) due to air, or bile, or phlegm. (28) A disguise is called *ajña* (incognito). Something dispatched is said to be *nutta*. (29) *Talpa* should be known to be a bed. (30) *Kilāsa* should be known to be a kind of jaundice. A swing is termed *prēnkhā*. (32) A war they call *pradhana*; it is also known as *āyōdhana*. (34) That charm which contains the *simha-nata* (? , *nata* is *Tabernæmontana coronaria*) should be known to be the *Vrindāraka* (i. e., best of its kind).<sup>23</sup> (35) [*Nṛi*]hana should be understood to be the king of the Prētas. By *sushmin* (i. e., powerful) is meant *Maghavān*. (36) By *kumbhīla* 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 *mallēra* 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 *kuṇḍāsīn* is a keeper of harlots. A garment [fit to be worn by] a *Mahārāja* is one which resembles flowers and the omentum. (43) A *lēhaka* (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* (*kṛitsnatā*, 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 *upavana* (grove or small forest) takes its name from a forest (*vana*). (57) A lotus is known as *rēju* or *rājīva* or *chatrapaṭṭavati* (cf. Skr. *śatapatra*).

This clearly shows that the work is some Sanskrit vocabulary or "kōsha." 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 ślōkas on a page, or 16 on a leaf, there should be about 90 ślōkas (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 ślōka, it may be concluded, that the work was divided in chapters (*adhyāyas*), and that the 40

<sup>23</sup> This is puzzling. Perhas *taraḥ* is a clerical error for *naraḥ*, and the meaning may be "one who has subdued a lion is a *Vrindāraka*."

ślōkas, a portion of which has been preserved, belong to the second chapter, while the first chapter must have contained about 50 ślōkas. 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 ślōkas: 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 *vidhushikō* for *vidushikō* on line 4 of the obverse of the 7th leaf; and *kurmō gūḍhaṅga* for *kūrmō gūḍhāṅga* 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:—

- 1, तंज पूजितम् तथागतं नमस्यामि संबुद्धिपदोत्तमम् भग
- 2, . . . म् ॥ उत्तिले—दले—दुत्तिले—सिद्धिरस्तु स्वाहा—यः क
- 3, वतः श्रवकः भिक्षुर्वा भिक्षुणी वा उपसकौ वा उपसिका वा—इ
- 4, . . इमं च मे हृदि पूर्वरात्रमपररात्रं मनसि करिष्यति
- 5, . . . येन परिसुचिष्यति—इष्यार्षप्रहारैश्च परिसुचिष्य
- 6, . . . . . ि . पेण—परि . . . . . लोम

In Roman transliteration;—

- 1, [. . . . .] . jña pūjitam [॥]  
Tathāgataṃ namasyāmi sambuddha-dvipad-ōttamam [1]  
Bhaga
- 2, [. . . . .] . . . m ॥  
Uttilê, dalê, duttilê, siddhir=astu svâha; yaḥ ka [s=chid=Bhaga-]
- 3, vataḥ śr[â]vakaḥ bhikshur=vâ bhikshuṇi vâ upāsakô va upāsikâ  
vâ, i-
- 4, .. imam̄ cha mē hṛida[ya]m̄ pūrva-râtram=apara-râtram̄ manasi  
karishyati
- 5, .. [da]ṇ[â]ēna parimuchchishyati, daṇḍ-ârha-prahârēṇa pari-  
muchchishya-
- 6; [ti] . . . . . i. pēṇa; pa . i . â . -ârhô lôma-

The reverse reads as follows :—

- 1, . . . . . [*parimu*]chchishyati, imê cha . bhadantê bhaga-
- 2, . . . . . ham=anubhavêna sa sâgar-ânta-prithivîm=anuvicha-
- 3, . . . . . tpalô narô, kumbha-karṇô mahâ-kumbha-karṇô, âri, kôri,  
kâ-
- 4, lê, pêlôlê, âyê, tâyê, ikshôri, kunê kunikê, yaś=cha mê
- 5, .. śukla-pakshasya pratipadam=npādāya kṛishṇa-pakshê vâ snâta-  
śu-
- 6, [*chi*] . . . dharmê saṁghê sa-gauravêṇa, ayô-vihitam chittam  
varjitêna âdi . ê

The first passage (obverse, lines 1 and 2) is a ślôka, 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  $2\frac{1}{4}$  inches. The full size of the original leaf, accordingly, must have been  $7\frac{1}{4}$  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 Mahâyaksha Sênâpati Mânibhadra, with reference to a son of the latter, called Pûrṇaka. 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., Kumbhakarṇa and Mahâ-kumbhakarṇa.

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. . . . . चूर्णेन प्रत्यामन्ति ॥ कपिलाजिह्वां गृह्य
2. शितया हि पूरमिष्टतायाः देवप्रतिमाय धूपो दातव्यो ततो सा च
3. स मुञ्चति मुग्धुधूपेन प्रकृतिस्त्रो भवति ॥ उपरु पुढाञ्चि चण्ड
4. स्नाह ॥ उपचारः ○ कृष्ये चतुर्दशां हराचीपोषितेन सेतप
5. भां दण्डल्ललेष च ति कृष्ये चतसौतैलेन हीपो ज्वालयित
6. . क खं . . तं चा सर्व्वरानि विच परिक्रपतया ततः प्र . . .
7. . . तथ . ना . . . . .

In Roman transliteration :

1. . . . . chûrnëna pratyâgachchhamti ॥ kapilâ-jihvâm gñihya
2. shitavyâ hi pûra-miṣṭitâyaḥ dëva-pratimâya dhûpô datavyô tatô  
sâ a
3. sa munçhati gurgulu-dhûpëna prakṛiti-sthô bhavati ॥ uparu pu-  
ṭâli chaṇḍa
4. svâha ॥ upachâraḥ kṛishṇë chaturdasyâm ṭri-râtr-ôpôshitëna  
svëta-pa
5. bhâm daṇḍala-sûtrëna varti kṛiyatê atasi-tailëna dipô jvâlayita
6. . jra stham . . tam cha sarvva-râtri vidy[ḍ] pariḥap[ḍ] tavyâ  
tataḥ pra
7. . . tathâ . nâ . . . . .

*Reverse.*

1. . . śavi . paśyamti . . . . . ya . . . . . ya . . . . . paṁ ॥
2. kili[k]ilikasya jatu-kârëna śira-gôlakam kârayêt tatra tôlakëna
3. . . rmadëna limpivâ tëna gôlakëna śasy-ôttarê ch=chhubhitavyê  
dhâka
4. . dvitîyaḥ êva bhârô bhavati sarvam vashyati tataḥ prikrich<sup>24</sup>=  
chuddhê
5. dam cha bhavati ॥ tuṇḍa-kilikilikasy=âkshini gñihya piṣhayê  
srôñchatê
6. push[p]a-yôgën=ânjîtëna gavâchyû-piśâcham paśyamti tëna cha  
purusha-vîrya
7. . . trayam piśâcham hanati tapyasya kachchhât=prasêvaka gñihya  
gam [. . . . .]

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 dëva is to be fumigated with incense

<sup>24</sup> The reading is uncertain; it may be *prikrich* or *pritrich* or *prinrich*.

mixed with pûra (*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 . . . svâhâ ॥ 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 *dandala* (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 tôla of . . . . . , with that ball in sifted fine grain . . . . . ; the process is repeated once more ; every thing is brought in one's power ; then in a thoroughly cleaned, . . . . , and it becomes . . . . ॥ Taking the eyes of (*tunḍa*) Kilikilaka, he should grind (them), he ladles . . . . . ; with . . . . . anointed with the preparation of flowers . . . . . they can see a piśâcha at a distance of a *gavâchyû* (*gavyûti* ? , or perhaps the name of a piśâcha) ; and with that power of man . . . . . he can kill three . . . . piśâchas ; (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" Samskrit, 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  $5\frac{1}{4}$  by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  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 ;



## III. (Leaf 36. Fig. 5).

- 1, . *da* . . . . . *tri* — *ha-ri-dri* — *pi-sa* — *pa-la* — *pra-pu-nta-*  
 2, *ri-kh* — *su-kshmê-(u)* — *vi-ra-ñkh* — *ni-lu-tpâ-(u)* — *hri-bê-ra*  
     — *kê-lê-ya-kh* — *pa-ri-*  
*vê-la-kha* — *va-ra-ñg tva-cham* — *mu-stha* — *śa-ra-ba* — *sâ-la-*  
 36 *va-rñi* —  
*pri-śna-va-rñi* — *ji-va-nti* — *dê-va-dâ-ru* — *śa . . ri . . .* [. . .]  
 5, [. . .] *ê* . . . . . [. . . . .] *pa* . . . . . *kê* . . . . . [. . . . .]  
 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, [. . .] *pi ssau lk(kh)a sô k(kh)am rka tha shshi ptsâ* . . . . . [. . . . .]  
 4, . . . *lyyê—ma lk(kh)ê rsa dha ksha llê a śu sa nâ pa llê—ka* . . .  
 5, [*pra-pu-*] *nda-ri-kha—ka-ṭu-ka-rô-hi-ṇi—a-śva-kâ-ndha—dê-va-dâ-*  
     *ru—pi ssau* .  
 6, . . . . . *a-pa-mâ-rga—kô shkê .o .m rkê . . ê [shsh]ê skê ta . . — . .*

## V. (Reverse.)

- 1, . *lkkhê rsa trî (kh)am* . *llye pa ki yê—pi lk(kh)a rsa ra ñka tsi sau*  
     *shpa ka ya*  
 2, *kâ-kô-ri* — *kshi-ra-kâ-kô-ri* — *pi-ta-ri* — *kshi-ra-pi-ta-ri* — *smu ṛi*  
     *ysâ rña yaṃ*  
 3, *kshî yê—mi tatsa bh(b)a rka bhbha llê—kṛi ñka ñña yô tsa lau*  
     *pê kâ*  
 4, [*pê*] *yâ mu sai tê sa kâ tsô pra ka ra . sna* . . . . . [. . . . .]  
 5, . . . *ka ra—yam* [. . . . .] . . . . . *a* . . . . . [. . . . .]  
 6, [. . .] . . . . . [. . . . .]

## VI. (Obverse.)

- 1, *kô lyê ñka rya pi ssau yê rña yaṃ kshî yê—sê ku ñcha ga shshê*  
     *yaṃ llyê saṃ shpaṃ*  
 2, *rka bhbha llê—yô tsa trî (kh)am bha llê—(tu) mêm kâ tsa sa lau*  
     *pê yâ mu sai tê sa*  
 3, *ka tsô ma lya (kka) tha skê dha (ri) mâ ylâ rya ṃ a-śva-ga-*  
     [*ndha*] *m—[a-pa-]*  
 4, *mâ-rga—ta-ka-ru—pra-pu-nta-ri-kha—ma-ñcha-shṭha—ni-lu-*  
     [*tpâ-u—*]  
 5, [. . .] . *m* . . . *ê* [. . . . .] . *tth—kô stê—pô* . . . . . [. . . . .]

## VII. (Reverse.)

- 1, . . . . .  
 2, . . . . .  
 3, *ka .i ka llô na kra mô tsa â snê ya . . . llê . [ . . . ]*  
 4, . . rêthh sâ tkê ■ sa-(kk)a-(ri) dê-va-dâ-ru — sa-rsha-pâ — ku-shṭha  
 5, *kha* — trai (kh)ô shshai mai ki sa bh(b)a rka bha llê — pla tkâ  
 rê tha ścha kê tē — sê lai kô  
 6, . . . . . ■ lā . . . . . — ka . . . . . — pi .

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 :—

Citation.	Name in Weber MS.	Sanskrit.
No. I, line 2	sa-ba-ra-lô-tṛi tṛi-pha-u pra-pu-nda-ri-kha (cf. Nos. III, I, IV, 5, VI, 4) mâ-ñcha-shṭha (cf. No. VI, 4)	śābara-lôḍbra triphala prapaṇḍarika mañjishṭhā
No. I, line 3	sprī-kha ta-ka-ru (also No. VI, 4)	sprikkā tagara
No. III, line 1	ha-ri-dṛi pra-pu-nta-ri-kh (cf. Nos. I, 2, IV, 5, VI, 4)	haridrā prapaṇḍarika
No. III, line 2	su-kshmê-u vi-ra-ñkh (cf. No. III, 3) ni-lu-tpâ-u (also No. VI, 4) hṛi-bê-ra kê-lê-ya-kh pa-ri-vê-la-kha	sôkshmaila varānga nilôtpala hṛivêra kālīyaka paripêlaka
No. III, line 3	va-ra-nga tva-chaṁ mu-stha śa-ra-ba sâ-la-va-rṇi	varānga tvacha musta śārivā (?) śāliparṇi
No. III, line 4	pri-śna-va-rṇi jī-va-nti dê-va-dâ-ru (also No. IV, 5, VII, 4)	priśniparṇi jīvantī dêvadâru
No. IV, line 5	pra-pu-nda-ri-kha (cf. Nos. I, 2, III, I, VI, 4) ka-ṭu-ka-rô-hi-ṇi a-śva-kâ-ndha	prapaṇḍarika kaṭuka-rôhiṇi aśvagandhā

Citaions.	Name in Weber MS.	Sanskrit.
No. IV, line 6	a-pa-mâ-rga (also No. VI, 3 and below)	apâmârga
No. V, line 2	kâ-kô-ri kshî-ra-kâ-kô-ri pi-ta-ri (see bi-dâ-ri, below) kshî-ra-pi-ta-ri	kâkôli kshîra-kâkôli vidâri kshîra-vidâri
No. VI, line 3	a-śva-ga-ndham (see No. IV, 5)	aśvagandhâ
No. VI, line 4	pra-pu-nta-ri-kha (cf. Nos. I, 2, III, 1, IV, 5)	prapaṇḍarika
No. VII, line 4	ma-ñcha-shṭha (cf. No. I, 2) śa-kka-ri śa-rsha-pa ku-shṭha-kha	mañjishṭhâ śarkarâ (?) sarshapa kushṭhaka

On some other leaves I have found the following :

a-mpri-ta-pâ-ttri	amṛita-patra <sup>25</sup>
a-va-mâ-rga (see a-pa-mâ-rga above, No. IV, 6)	apâmârga
ka-ru-ṇa-sâ-ri	kâlânusâri
kshî-ra-bi-dâ-ri	kshîra-vidâri
ta-ma-la-pâ-ttri and ta-ma-la-pâ-dha-ri	tamâla-patra
tri-phâ-u 3	triphala 3
pi-ppâ-u	pippala
pu-ta-na-kê-si	pûtanâkêsi
pu-na-rna-ba	punarnavâ
pri-ñka-ra-chaṁ	bhṛiṅgarâja
pri-ya-ñku and pri-ya-ñgu	priyaṅgu
bi-dâ-ri (see above, No. V, 2)	vidâli or vidâri
bi-la-pa-tti	vila-patra or vilva-patra ?
bha-lla-ta-kha	bhallâtaka
ma-hâ-mê-dha	mahâ-mêda
mê-dha	mêda
lô-tri and lô-dri and lô-tta-ri	lôdhra
śâ-ri-ba	śârivâ
śi-ri-sha-pu-shpa	śirishapushpa
śai-lê-ya-kha	śailêyaka
sa-rja-ra-sha	sarja-rasa
styô-ni-ya-kha	sthaṇḍeyaka

The spelling of such words as *tri-phâ-u*, *ni-lu-tpâ-u*, *pi-ppâ-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-

<sup>25</sup> Or perhaps for Skr. *amṛita-patra*, a bye-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 *virāma*. 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 Nāgarī, 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, *mahākaraṃ* (Skr. *mahākara*, a name of Buddha) in the 1st line (syllables 14–17), *vājirēṃkusha* (Skr. *vajrāṅkuśa*) 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, *bhṛīṅgārēṅku* (*bhṛīṅgārāṅka*?) and *sāstrēṃ* (*śāstra*?), line 4 *nērvāṇam* (*nirvāṇam*); obverse, line 1, *ēṅku* (*aṅka*?), line 3, *āstrēṃ* (*astra*?), and further on *klēsa*. Quite certain is the occurrence of numerals. In the obverse, 2nd line, 74 (**74**), 4th line 75 (**75**); in the reverse, 1st line, 77 (**72**), 3rd line, 78 (**75**), 5th line 79 (**77**). 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 . tsñē kta shshē ē-ṅku khā jri a kau ta chchē—ma-hā-ka-ruṃ  
shē khai pē pē ūya chchē pē shpim nu—dha ryā yknē ymē ttsē  
śmō ūa shshē mi na nā śō [ . . . . . ]
- 2, shshē yai nu stmau shña tkha lñē shshē pi su mē rttē mrā chnē  
70+4 pō yēi ūña shshē tkhē ylai ūam ktē nē stya ltsē sai tsta  
lkā shshē ūchā nai sai rñē śchya shshē [ . . . . . ]
- 3, syi shshēm ā-strēm ūa ○ ktē tsta kha khā rpō — klē-sa tma  
shshēm chēm lām tna sū rēm tēpō nām kshē ūchai — dha lskō  
shshē chau khē ma vi trēm śa . shshē ūchai . [ . . . . . ]
- 4, tma sa 70+5 ūam kchēm yē tkhēm tsa yai nu vā-jrēm-ṅku-sha  
rnē nē — ylai ūam ktñē khē shsa ka pō sta khrō chchē tē lki  
nē — krēm tē [ . . . . . ]

- 5, ysha sta — khê smai klyau nka sta brâ-hma nñai khê rtsyai pô sai shshê — yâ dha shshê ñchai i lai ña ktêm pô ylai ñam ktê ttsâ shtsa pra lya shsha rkhê [.....—.....]
- 6, pê lai ktê shsha na khrô ttsa na — kham rpô rmêm skkha tma pam lsko shsha na rtau sna yâ kê — bhai shshê ttsê kham ttrê â rskô rshêm yâ .... [—.....]

*Reverse.*

- 1, sô kâ né né rvâ tshai — khâ ra sta ñis ykhâ rchla klê né tña ktô pkhâ ñmsta ya mña ram né . la tma . 70+7 â ñmâ lâ shlnê shshau . shpâ [ . . . . . — . . . ]
- 2, pê shshê kha stsyâ strê nau su pê ñya chchê — tkham ttsa ññê jat snai ykô rñê shsha yâ kê ktsê ñê la lam shka sta rya pô ysê ññê shshau rtsa sê ktsau ña [ . — . . . . . — ]
- 3, bhri-ñgâ-rê-ñku<sup>16</sup> sú ○ kê sâ-strêm i té mai tta rshshê 70+8 pû vñêm ktê shshê tkhê bra mñam ktê spâ lmêm snai mé nâkh — yai tmu tha ktau tra [.....—]
- 4, né rmi tyâ mshê ñchai khnô lmê nô ktya knê sa sta rêm — né-rvâ-nam shshai kê ttsa sai shshê dha rkau chai êm shkê tstsêm ta ttha shshê . pa khâ kta [ . . . . . — . . . ]
- 5, sputa kha kô ya khâ spa brâ-hma-ñam 70+9 ê mprê tma shsha na . . tma stkhâ ra a kshâ sta — klai namtth sa ma skamtth ka rsa tsi . . khâ . [— . . . . .]
- 6, . ru tê pa . mâ ga ri — gâ ñpê lai ktê shshai kêm tsa cham rkâ sta a sta ryai — pô pê sai shshê ka llô ynâ shtsi pê lai . . ñai—

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  $3\frac{1}{4}$  to  $4\frac{3}{4}$  inches. The leaf, in its existing state, measures 14 to  $15\frac{1}{4}$  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.

<sup>16</sup> Or perhaps read *ñri-ñgâ-rê-ñku*.